

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 6-7, 1986
Thursday-Friday

PLACE: Washington Room, Governor House Motor Inn
521 South Capitol Way, Olympia, Washington

TIME: 9:00 a.m. each day

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair	Jack Wayland, Director, Department of Game
Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver	Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation Commission
Joe C. Jones, Seattle	Raymond Ryan, Designee for William Wilkerson, Director,
Dr. Eliot Scull, Wenatchee	Department of Fisheries
	Cleve Pinnix, Designee for Honorable Brian Boyle, Commissioner
	of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources

+ George Walker, Designee for Jack Wayland 11-6 Thurs

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Ralph Mackey, Everett

APPENDICES: * 1 *Directly to Game Dept.*

- "A" - Letters re Local Agencies' Projects
- "B" - Wash. Administrative Code #86-20-052
- "C" - Wash. Administrative Code as approved
- "D" - Nonhighway Eligibility Guidelines Apprvd.
- "E" - Letters re Off-Road Vehicle Projects

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Anne Cox, Chair, with a quorum present. (Seven: COX, LORENZ, SCULL, WAYLAND, TVETEN, RYAN, PINNIX - MR. JONES ARRIVED SHORTLY AFTER THE MEETING BEGAN MAKING A TOTAL OF EIGHT MEMBERS PRESENT.)

Attendees were welcomed by the chair and asked to introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 25, 1986: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 25, 1986 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA, NOVEMBER 6-7, 1986: There were no additions or deletions to the November 6-7, 1986 IAC Meeting Agenda.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED BY THE DIRECTOR BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder called upon Greg Lovelady, NOVA Coordinator, to present to the Committee a Certificate of Appreciation received from the Forest Service. Mr. Lovelady read the plaque to the Committee which expressed the Forest Service's appreciation for project assistance since 1978 in the off-road vehicle recreational field.

Initiative 90: Mr. Wilder stated though Initiative 90, the Wildlife Tomorrow Initiative, had not passed, it was of particular importance to the IAC and those involved in parks, recreation, and conservation because it had acknowledged the concern of many, many people in this most important subject. The fact that the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation was a part of the wildlife initiative package was a compliment to the ongoing programs of the agency. He particularly noted that 211,000 people had signed the initiative which indicated there were many persons who care about wildlife and recreational areas.

President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO): Two meetings attended by the Director in behalf of the Interagency Committee of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors was

* Appendices "C" and "D" are included in this set of the minutes.
If you desire other appendices, please write to the IAC Office.

mentioned by Mr. Wilder. One had taken place in Orlando, Florida; the other in Anaheim, California. Both had been of importance to the IAC and the State of Washington in its parks, recreation, and conservation programs. The PCAO has received excellent support over the past eighteen months. Though many items may not come into fruition, others will, and these will focus on key recommendations of the Commission in a report due to the President in December, 1986.

Land and Water Conservation Fund: Mr. Wilder reported that the Land and Water Conservation Fund was retained in the budget for the National Park Service. However, only about \$600,000 to \$620,000 will be apportioned to the State of Washington. Half of this amount will be for use by state agencies; the other half, by local agencies. In passing the legislation, Congress also expressed interest in the forthcoming recommendations of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO). Mr. Wilder noted there could possibly be a Trust Fund suggested for parks, recreation, and conservation purposes.

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation: Mr. Wilder mentioned the opportunity presented at the National Congress for Parks and Recreation in Anaheim, California, to present the IAC's "story". The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation's program has been pointed out as a model by the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO) which might be applicable to the networking and coordination needs at the national level.

Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities Advisory Committee (NOVA): A report was also given by Mr. Wilder on the newly formed Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities Advisory Committee -- to be called NOVA. This Committee was formed through the passage of Substitute House Bill #1382 - now Chapter 206, Laws of 1986. The new committee completed its review of projects and Washington Administrative Codes, which are to be adopted at this current IAC meeting.

11. B. - STATUS REPORTS - Management Services: Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, was introduced to the Committee. Mr. Ogden called upon Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, to present the fiscal status reports of the Management Services Division, noting that Mr. Baker had just recently passed the CPA examination.

Mr. Baker referred to the Grant-in-Aid Fund Summary dated October 20, 1986, which indicated the most up-to-date information available on cumulative available, pending, and approved monies in LWCF, Referendum 28, Initiative 215, and HJR 52 bonds. Mr. Baker explained the negative balances. Mr. Tveten brought out the fact that the allotment for LWCF would be approximately \$620,000, which would mean that \$310,000 would be for local agencies and \$310,000 for state agencies. The figures in the Fund Summary are based on appropriation authority in the present allotment, and he asked the difference between the two. Mr. Baker replied about \$1 million.

Mr. Baker referred to the Off-Road Vehicle Status Report, dated October 10, 1986, (status as of June 29, 1986), and stated this would be the last ORV report submitted for Committee review in this fashion. A new report has been started for the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program. Total commitment to date for the ORV Program was shown as \$13,177,645.20. \$1,776,138.70 of this represents the balance transferred to the new NOVA Program Fund Summary. Mr. Baker briefly reviewed the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities Report dated October 20, 1986, (status as of September 30, 1986). The transfer of \$1,776,138.70 was added to receipts since June 30, 1986, for a total revenue of \$2,355,149.21 in the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program. Mr. Baker pointed out the footnotes on the report as to percentages of total receipts for the various program commitments. Program commitments must now indicate

Education/Enforcement Projects, Acquisition, Development, Management/Maintenance, Planning in the off-road vehicle program, and acquisition, development, and planning in the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program, plus administrative costs.

In response to a question from Dr. Scull, Mr. Baker stated dealer permit fees over the past eight or nine years have only amounted to \$1,400. There followed discussion on a cut-off time for the program in order to work out the percentages and ensure that monies were being allocated according to the law. Mr. Pinnix felt the footnotes on the report were very useful to the Committee to refer to each time the report is presented. It will be possible through this system to establish grants for nonhighway and off-road vehicle projects accurately.

11. B. STATUS REPORT. Projects Services: Mr. Jim Webster, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Project Services Division Report", reporting as follows:

(1) Ninety local agencies applications had been received; thirty-eight were withdrawn; leaving fifty-two to review for funding consideration.

(2) The Technical Advisory Committee had met September 4-5 in Mount Vernon and September 11 in Pullman to review the projects. IAC staff and local project sponsors appreciate the time and effort of the TAC. Their suggestions are constructive and most helpful.

(3) Evaluation Team: The Evaluation Team met October 20-24 in Ellensburg to evaluate each project. Appreciation was expressed for the assistance of the team as follows:

Roger DeSpain, Whatcom Co., representing Assoc. of Counties;
Glenn Clifton, City of Kelso, representing Assoc. of Cities;
Jodi Wroblewski, City of Yakima, representing Washington Recreation and Park Association;
Darryl Piercy, Port of Bremerton, representing Washington Public Ports Association;
Jon Aarstad, Skagit County, representing the local agencies - Technical Advisory Committee;
George Volker, Department of Game, representing the state agencies - Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Craig Carlson, Director of the Ellensburg Recreation Department, was given special thanks for making arrangements for the Evaluation Meeting at the Holmes Community Center.

(4) Approved Project Administration: Sixty-one active ongoing local agencies projects are being maintained and assisted by the staff. In addition, there are 93 active state agencies projects which are in various stages of completion.

(5) STATE AGENCIES MASTER LIST APPROVALS:

<u>Game</u>	<u>Newman Lake</u>	<u>86-604D</u>	<u>\$99,000 State Funds</u>
-------------	--------------------	----------------	-----------------------------

Redevelop an existing launch area on Newman Lake, Spokane County.

<u>Game</u>	<u>Langlois Lake</u>	<u>86-603D</u>	<u>\$56,000 State Funds</u>
-------------	----------------------	----------------	-----------------------------

Redevelop a boating access on Langlois Lake, King County.

(6) Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Program (DNR): Twenty-four project applications were received from local agencies for grants from the Department of Natural Resources, Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account program. Each has been evaluated and scored. The Commissioner of Public Lands will select the projects for funding. The IAC staff will then process contracts and administer the projects through the implementation period.

11 D. STATUS REPORTS - Planning Services: Mr. Gerald W. Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Local Agencies, Technical Assistance", and noted the following:

(1) A total of 104 eligible agencies includes: 63 cities, 14 counties, 15 port districts, 6 special districts (park and recreation and public utility districts), 4 school districts, and 2 Indian Tribes.

(2) Eight local agencies were granted interim planning eligibility to participate in the 1986 Grant-in-Aid Program.

(3) IAC staff is currently working with an additional 93 local agencies in the process of preparing or updating their comprehensive plans. Approximately 23 of these agencies have finalized their draft plans and are awaiting adoption of them, or need to finalize the CIP or Inventory in order to establish eligibility.

(4) Twenty-two local agencies completed the updating of comprehensive plans this year.

Mr. Pelton noted the attachment to the Local Agencies Technical Assistance memorandum:

"How the Comprehensive Plan is Used to Score Question D-1"

This question concerned: "To what extent does the project meet outdoor recreation needs as identified in local and state comprehensive plans?" ... A. The sponsoring agency's Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan scoring; and B. Public Involvement scoring. Mr. Pelton explained this is given to local agencies to indicate how the comprehensive plan is used in the scoring process and evolved from a need to outline the point system for clarification.

Nonhighway Road and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Nonhighway Road and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report", reporting as follows:

(1) Through July of 1986, the Committee has approved 185 NOVA (ORV) projects. 59 are active, 29 are scheduled for completion by the end of the year. Since 1978 126 projects have been completed.

(2) The Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Advisory Committee (NOVA) has met twice to discuss nonhighway road funding guidelines, evaluate the projects proposals, and to confer with staff regarding the final project recommendations.

(3) Statewide NOVA Plan: Research is drawing to a close (Project #85-01P). Attachments concerning the Plan were explained; "Planning District Differences on Outdoor Activities and ORV Use" and "Table 8", which indicated these differences.

PNRRC: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Status Report-Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee (PNRRC)", noting the following:

(1) The Demand Survey update for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho is continuing on schedule. On November 20 the Committee will determine the details of federal participation in the analysis phase of the survey.

(2) The Western Washington University under contract with the IAC is administering Washington State's segment of the program.

(3) Telephone survey for the current reporting period was completed in mid-October; and mail survey questionnaires have been sent to over 600 respondents throughout the state. The full year's survey will include 2,400 survey participants.

(4) Results of the survey will be used by federal, state, and local agencies throughout the northwest in addressing recreational impacts in their respective programs. IAC will use the data in an update of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).

IAC REPORT "Partners in Progress": Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, reporting on the newly formatted newsletter of the IAC. The next edition will be distributed in early January. Since the publication of the first edition, the agency has received many compliments and excellent comments. Lorinda Anderson of the Planning Services Division serves as editor and will continue to coordinate development of each publication.

Internship: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Internship" and commented on the services of Peter Hatlestad who began his internship with the IAC on September 2. Mr. Hatlestad was not present due to a death in his family but will complete his internship upon his return to the state next week. Mr. Pelton noted Peter Hatlestad is the sixth intern from the Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois, to work with the IAC staff. He is developing a facility standards handbook for local park and recreation facilities in Washington, and has been in contact with local agencies' park and recreation offices throughout the state.

Upon the completion of the Planning Services Division status reports, Mr. Wilder mentioned the initiative of two staff members in completing examinations for their individual development: Ray Baker, the CPA examinations, and Ms. Lorraine Flemm, the Certified Landscape Architect examinations.

III. OLD BUSINESS. Legislation: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Agency Request Legislation (Repeal of RCW 43.99.115)", stating there had been no further contacts from OFM or the Governor's Office on the agency's legislative package sent to OFM on September 19, 1986. The Governor will be reviewing the proposal and the IAC will be notified if it is to be modified or rejected. Ms. Cox as Chair urged all Committee members to actively support the repeal of RCW 43.99.115 and to work towards retaining the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation as a viable state agency. She pointed out the legislation would affect all local agencies sponsors as well and urged their support.

III. B. Initiative 90 - Wildlife Tomorrow: (No further comments were made regarding Initiative 90.)

Following a short recess, the Committee reconvened at 10:00 a.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. A. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATION: Ms. Cox reminded those attending the meeting to complete a Participant Participation Card if they wished to speak to their project or any other agenda item.

Mr. James Webster, Chief, Projects Services Section, referred to memorandum of staff, "Local Agencies Project Funding", dated November 6, 1986. Letters in regard to various projects were sent to each IAC member prior to the meeting. An additional local agency letter was distributed for information: City of Port Orchard, IAC Project #87-017D, Repair Floating Dock, signed by Leslie J. Weatherill, Mayor. (Local agencies' letters - APPENDIX "A".)

Mr. Webster cited the following:

(1) Fifty-two project resumes would be reviewed by staff as noted in Table I. Table I represented the ranking of each project application as determined by the Evaluation Team during its session held October 20-24, 1986.

(2) Initiative 215 funds (unreclaimed marine fuel tax) can only be used for transient recreational boating related projects.

Projects Requesting Funding - 1986
Table Number 1

Rk	Name	Rq	Sponsor	Score	LMCF #	Bonds	Init 215	INC Totl	Local Sh	Tot Cost	I
1	Burnt Bridge Creek Acq.	05	Vancouver, City of	136.2		150,000		150,000	150,530	300,530	49
2	Seacrest Park	04	Seattle, City of	135.3			161,181	161,181	1,565,819	1,727,000	9
3	Boat Launch Rehab. & Exp.	03	Bellingham, Port of	134.5			199,687	199,687	66,563	266,250	74
4	Fittlow Shoreline Rec. Area	04	Tacoma, City of	134.1		150,000		150,000	197,461	347,461	43
5	Mountlake Park Improvements	09	Moses Lake, City of	131.3			72,416	72,416	24,139	96,555	74
6	Kitsap Lake Development	04	Bremerton, City of	130.0		32,952	116,317	149,269	71,724	220,993	67
7	Sarg Hubbard Park, Phase II	08	Yakima County	129.5		150,000		150,000	170,000	320,000	46
8	Riverfront Park	04	Everett, City of	128.4			160,013	160,013	184,294	344,307	46
9	Golden Gardens Boat Ramp	04	Seattle, City of	127.5		150,000	309,435	309,435	309,123	698,558	55
10	Meadowdale Playfields Phase 3	04	Lynnwood, City of	126.9		150,000		150,000	240,000	390,000	38
11	Headwale Co. Park	04	Snohomish County	126.6		150,000		150,000	2,598,700	2,748,700	46
12	Auburn Game Farm	04	Auburn, City of	126.0		81,130	309,435	309,435	81,130	162,260	50
13	Waterfront Trail	07	Leavenworth, City of	124.8		106,350		106,350	106,350	212,700	50
14	Community Centre Park	06	North Bonneville, City of	124.7			310,000	310,000	103,600	414,400	75
15	Columbia Point Boat Access	10	Richland, City of	124.5		106,350	416,893	416,893	327,935	744,828	55
16	Possession Point Development	03	Port of South Whidbey	124.5		146,820		146,820	146,820	293,640	50
17	Green River Corridor Develop.	04	Kent, City of	123.6		150,000		150,000	178,000	328,000	45
18	Swimming Pool	07	Bridgeport, Town of	123.5		150,000		150,000	211,280	361,280	41
19	Gateway Park	13	Clarkston, Port of	123.4		139,778	142,031	142,031	99,969	242,000	58
20	Restroom & Guest Deck Conv.	04	Kingston, Port of	122.3			10,022	10,022	842,766	992,766	15
21	Alder Lake Development Phase 3	04	Tacoma, City of	122.0			249,435	249,435	83,146	332,581	74
22	Marina Expansion	03	Oak Harbor, City of	120.8		8,250	141,750	150,000	102,500	252,500	59
23	Lisabeula Resort Acquisition	04	Vashon F & R Dist/King County	120.6		150,000		150,000	153,000	303,000	49
24	Swimming Pool Construction	11	Kettle Falls, City of	120.2			189,443	189,443	1,291,940	1,481,383	12
25	Parcival Landing West	05	Olympia, City of	119.0		150,000		150,000	293,182	443,182	33
26	Dunsmuir Trail	04	Seattle, City of	118.6		150,000		150,000	150,000	300,000	50
27	So. Co. Regional Park Dev.	05	Lewis County	117.0			136,500	136,500	45,500	182,000	75
28	Shoal Renovation	03	Friday Harbor, Port of	116.8		150,000	57,926	57,926	19,309	77,235	74
29	Hakaya Harbor Launch	03	San Juan County	116.4		150,000		150,000	225,268	375,268	39
30	Swimming Pool	06	Castle Rock, City of	113.9		75,000		75,000	75,000	150,000	50
31	Salmon Creek Acq. Phase IV	06	Clark County	113.9		150,000		150,000	150,289	300,288	49
32	Lacamas Lake, Phase I	06	Clark County	113.3		51,067		51,067	51,067	102,134	50
33	Riverfront Trail	10	Kennecook, City of	110.8			77,334	77,334	25,770	103,112	75
34	Dockton Addition	04	King County	110.0		34,000		34,000	34,000	68,000	50
35	Smith Property Acquisition	04	Bremerton, Port of	108.9		80,000		80,000	90,000	100,000	50
36	Stiebhaller Park	04	Sumner, City of	107.0		88,812		88,812	88,812	177,684	50
37	Battlepoint Park Phase II	04	Rainbridge Isl. PAR District	107.6			15,420	15,420	5,145	20,565	74
38	Floating Dock Improvement	04	Port Orchard, City of	107.6			68,598	68,598	22,867	91,465	74
39	Forst Park Boat Launch	05	Centralia, City of	107.6			37,500	37,500	12,500	50,000	75
40	Wash. Park Boat Launch Improvement	03	Anacortes, City of	106.3							

87-019A
87-037D
87-085D
87-034D
87-050D
87-013D
87-056D
87-068D
87-036D
87-014D
87-018D
87-024D
87-038D
87-055D
87-053D
87-054D
87-015D
87-039D
87-063D
87-064D
87-035D
87-076D
87-052A
87-040D
87-049D
87-010D
87-016D
87-011D
87-060D
87-063D
87-058A
87-042D
87-071D
87-057D
87-081A
87-067D
87-003D
87-017D
87-033D
87-064D

Projects Requesting Funding - 1986
Table Number 1

Rk	Name	Rq	Sponsor	Score	LMCF \$	Bonds	Init 215	IAC Tot1	Local Sh	Tot Cost	X
41	Petrovitsky Athletic Complex	04	King County	104.6		150,000		150,000	829,549	979,549	1587-059D
42	Cummings-Trans-Moorage	04	Tacoma MFD	104.1			261,516	261,516	235,364	496,880	5287-0200D
43	Pope Marine Park/City Dock	01	Port Townsend, City of	104.0		30,713	67,998	98,711	53,380	152,091	6487-009D
44	Softball Park	11	Ione, Town of	102.5		14,452		14,452	14,453	28,905	4987-022D
45	Boat Launch & Dock	05	Squaxin Indian Tribe	102.2			33,170	33,170	11,057	44,227	7487-023D
46	Guest Moorage Expansion	06	Kalama, Port of	99.4			102,562	102,562	34,188	136,750	7487-008D
47	Chico Boat Launch	04	Brenerton, Port of	97.9			89,675	89,675	29,892	119,567	7487-047D
48	Pioneer Park Expansion	03	Ferndale, City of	96.5		30,000		30,000	30,000	60,000	5087-005D
49	Recreation Park	05	Chehalis, City of	95.2		90,299		90,299	90,299	180,598	5087-031D
50	Boat Haven Boat Launch	01	Fort Angeles, Port of	92.0			8,085	8,085	2,695	10,780	7587-090D
51	Boathaven Imp./Boat Launch	01	Fort Angeles, Port of	90.6			21,242	21,242	86,040	107,282	1987-006D
52	Port Orchard Marina Restroom	04	Brenerton, Port of	83.0			51,243	51,243	37,107	88,350	5887-049D
<TOTAL>					0	3,119,853	3,588,192	6,708,045	12,221,159	18,929,204	

(3) For non-boating related projects funding levels of 50 percent IAC and 50 percent local participation with \$150,000 ceiling or a maximum amount of matched funds was applied.

(4) For boating related projects, 75 percent IAC and 25 percent local participation with no maximum ceiling on the amount of matching funds applied.

(5) Local projects sponsors are to be congratulated for presenting only their highest needs.

Each project was then presented to the Committee utilizing slides and verbal summaries.

Those projects receiving comments or questions from Committee members while being reviewed were as follows:

Port of Bellingham, Boat Launch Rehab. and Exp., IAC #87-085D: In reply to Mr. Pinnix and Dr. Scull, Mr. Fairleigh stated the ramp would be usable at any tide level.

City of Tacoma, Titlow Park Waterfront Acquisition, IAC #87-034D: Several Committee members asked questions concerning the railroad crossing safety features and the water quality in that area. Mr. Taylor stated: Access to the waterfront over the railroad right-of-way is via a lighted/controlled arm safety crossing; the crossing has been in use for some time and there has not been any problem with safety; approximately thirty trains a day cross over the track traveling about thirty-five miles an hour. Mr. Volker pointed out that the safety features in this project had been extensively discussed during the evaluation process. In reply to questions on water quality broached by Mr. Ryan, Mr. Bart Alford, City Planner, City of Tacoma, replied it was very good and a prime location for scuba diving; there are no industries close by; and there is some geoduck harvesting in that area.

City of Moses Lake, Montlake Park Improvements, IAC #87-050D: In reply to Ms. Cox, Mr. Clark stated the St. Helens ash continues to be a problem in the Moses Lake area, which is one of the main factors for paving the access road to the boat launch area. Dr. Scull asked if access would also be provided for the handicapped. Both Mr. Clark and Mr. Webster responded that all grant-in-aid projects must provide for the handicapped. Ms. Cox was informed there was only one parking lot involved in the project; however, there is additional land nearby for future phase development.

City of Bremerton, Kitsap Lake Park Development, IAC #87-013D: In response to Dr. Scull's question, Mr. Taylor stated a decision on use of the existing house on the project site had not yet been determined. It could be an interpretive center possibly later on. Mr. Tveten asked about the Department of Game site and its use for fishing. Could it not be also used for other purposes? Mr. Volker replied in this particular site, it was not feasible.

Yakima County, Sarg Hubbard Park Phase II - Greenway, IAC #87-056D: Mr. Tveten pointed out that this project was a unique example of community effort--- private and public agencies working together. In 1984-85 the Yakima Greenway Foundation raised, in less than 12 months, one-half million and acquired several pieces of land on the Greenway. He considered this an outstanding effort by the City, County, and private people. The Department of Game and the Parks and Recreation

Commission, along with the Department of Natural Resources, are included in the Yakima Greenway Project. The Sarg Hubbard Park Phase II will complete the development in the park and is a part of the Yakima River Greenway Park system between Selah and Union Gap, Washington.

City of Everett, Everett Riverfront Park, IAC #87-068D: Mr. Scull expressed his concern regarding the ORV activity in that area and asked if there would be a buffer from the rest of the park for the noise element. Mr. Fairleigh replied the site would not receive any more noise than at present through its being adjacent to the freeway, and that the ORV use, though close to the area, would not impact the project site. Ms. Cox questioned "informal camping" for the project, stating Spokane does have considerable difficulty with this type of camping. Mr. Scull asked that his concern with the possibility of ORV noise impact be registered and that the sponsor take this under advisement because he felt that specific use would detract from the surrounding use of the park. The ORV element is about one-half mile away from the site. Mr. Tveten asked if the project would be tied in with the interpretation of the Everett Jetty as well as the mouth of the river. Mr. Fairleigh stated the main objective of the project was to serve boaters who wish to go up stream and into the delta that surrounds the island. This would be for small boats - 16' and under fishing boats. He pointed out the area has also been designated for crew activities and the boat house for the crew will be funded from other sources than IAC and located at the boat ramp. The crew shells will be kept there in a boat-haven situation. Ms. Cox expressed her concern about the future of the project also. Mr. Tveten also noted his reasons for raising questions about the project. There will be increased efforts made to preserve wetlands and in order to recognize the value of the wetlands an interpretive center will be needed. He encouraged the City to consider this aspect in future planning.

City of Seattle, Golden Gardens Boat Ramp IAC #87-036D: Mr. Tveten asked if the project would increase the capacity of the boat launch area, and was informed by Mr. Fairleigh there would be two floats with four ramps, each ramp having access to a float. Additionally, the project will improve parking in the area. In reply to Mr. Jones' question, Mr. Fairleigh stated there would be replacement of the breakwater presently at the site.

City of Lynnwood, Meadowdale Play Fields, IAC #87-014D: Ms. Cox was assured there would be fencing installed specifically for the ballfield activities. Ms. Cox observed this project was indicative of joint cooperation -- the School District and the cities of Edmonds, Lynnwood, Snohomish County all involved in bringing the project to development. She commended them for their efforts.

Snohomish County, Meadowdale County Park, IAC #87-018D: There was discussion concerning access to the park. Mr. Fairleigh explained there would be two access roads -- one lane will only be used by the handicapped, bicycles, emergency vehicles and buses. The other primary parking area and access road is proposed for the east end of the park since soils are stable and slopes gradual. A trail will connect this area to the beach (paralleling the stream in the gulch). Mr. Scull asked if the concrete tunnel under the railroad tracks would be retained and was assured it would be. Mr. Jones asked concerning the resident ranger system -- to patrol the site in order to prevent vandalism and run the interpretive programs. He asked if there was a formula worked out as to how many rangers would be needed for each project of this type. Mr. Fairleigh replied each project differs in its provisions of this type; there is no set "formula". Ms. Lorenz was informed the project did receive IAC funds when acquired in 1972; no development occurred since that time.

The project was closed by the County at one time, but the IAC informed the County it was necessary to open the park since IAC funds had been used to acquire it, or it would be necessary to ask for a conversion, substituting other park land for that having been acquired. There followed discussion on access to the park in relation to the parking situation.

City of Auburn, Game Farm Park, IAC #87-024D: Ms. Cox asked that at the next funding session the slides presented to the Committee be more readable. She asked for a run-down on the project from Mr. Taylor. Following this, she asked how the fields would be used. Mr. Taylor replied all would be for organized sports activities and that all are full-sized. At this point, Mr. Tveten noted the 1980 legislation which had directed the IAC and the State Parks Commission to put high emphasis on parks and recreation facilities for urban areas. This particular project is an outgrowth of that legislation. The Parks and Recreation Commission purchased the site and entered into an agreement with the City of Auburn. The City will develop this area; however, the Parks and Recreation Commission will be developing a group camp site at a later date on property south of the river. He felt this project was consistent with the direction received from the State Legislature.

City of Leavenworth, Waterfront Trail System, IAC #87-038D: Dr. Scull noted the increased cross-country skiing in this area and the fact that this park would be used by those recreationists as well as others. In reply to Mr. Ryan, Mr. Taylor stated there would be restroom facilities in the main park area which has already been developed. Michael Cecka, City Administrator, City of Leavenworth, responded to several questions from the Committee in regard to ski-areas and river rafting.

City of North Bonneville, Community Center Park, IAC #87-055D: Mr. Clark explained to Mr. Tveten, that there were no other park facilities in that community. When the town was relocated the land for parks was provided but no funds for development. The construction of the Community Center will provide many elements for the park. The project involves only construction of softball field, soccer fields and tennis courts. Ms. Cox asked if the soccer fields were on a north/south orientation, and was informed that the staff did review this for tennis courts and baseball fields, etc. Ms. Cox recommended to staff that in the future they ensure that soccer fields are in a north/south orientation as well. Mr. Ryan asked why the difference in cost as shown on the resume sheet and on Table 1. Mr. Webster stated there had been some adjustments made in cost to some of the projects and these would be pointed out -- that the cost as noted on the resume was accurate.

City of Richland, Columbia Point Boating Access Development, IAC #87-053D: Dr. Scull brought out the need to eradicate the milfoil weed in certain projects. It affects use of other parks, and he asked if local communities have given any thought as to how to handle this problem. If not, he felt it should be addressed in future plans. Mr. Ryan pointed out the project was needed since there are very few access areas for boats in this particular location. Mr. Fairleigh stated when completed the project site would be heavily used.

Port District of South Whidbey Island, Possession Beach Waterfront Park, IAC #87-054D: Ms. Cox commended the Port of South Whidbey Island for their location map which pinpointed the site of the project. She suggested this type of slide be used for other projects to enable the Committee to understand the exact location of each site. In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Fairleigh said there would not be any permanent moorage, only a loading float with two launch ramps. There will be some guest transient shelter. Mr. Tveten complimented the port on its recreational planning.

City of Kent, Kent Green River Corridor Park, IAC #87-015D: The Boeing plant and KOA Campground area were pointed out on the slide in response to Committee questions.

Town of Bridgeport, Swimming Pool, IAC #87-039D: Ms. Cox supported the need for a swimming pool in this area of the state.

Port of Clarkston, Gateway Park/Boat Tie-Up, IAC #87-063D: In response to Mr. Tveten's question, Mr. Fairleigh stated the moorage slips would be only for day-use. Mr. Tveten then pointed out that the Chief Timothy State Park downstream has a continuous problem with boaters looking for permanent moorage, which is not provided in the park. Mr. Fairleigh pointed out that the Port of Clarkston is working with a private group to build a private marina which would probably ease this situation. Ms. Lorenz asked the soil conditions and was informed the area is sandy with rocks. Mr. Volker pointed out that the land is not subject to flooding, that there is a controlled water level.

Port of Kingston, Restroom and Guest Dock Renovation, IAC #87-004D: Mr. Scull stated his concerns with the design -- finger floats appeared to be too close to the existing float indicated on the slide. Mr. Taylor stated this would be taken into consideration and the problem alleviated during development.

Tacoma Department of Public Utilities, Alder Lake Recreation Area, Ph 3, IAC #87-035D: Mr. Scull questioned the draw-down on the lake. Jim Murphy, Tacoma City Light, Supervisor of Parks and Wildlife, responded stating though the site would be open year-round there would be times during drawdown when it would not be available for launching purposes. Mr. Tveten noted the PUD's assistance under the FERC program in providing recreational facilities for the public in various locations such as Mayfield Lake, Ike Kinswa, etc.

City of Oak Harbor, Marina Expansion, New Transient Moorage, IAC #87-076D: Mr. Pat Nevins, City Supervisor, City of Oak Harbor, replied to questions concerning this project: Guest moorage will constitute two or three days and the breakwater will be constructed according to Corps of Engineer standards and will meet the Department of Fisheries' requirements.

King County/Vashon Park District, Lisabeula Resort Acquisition, IAC #87-080A: Dr. Scull asked if consideration was given regarding the historical value of existing buildings in projects. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative, and noted that these particular buildings may possibly be used for an interpretive center following future development. Mr. Webster noted that projects having buildings or residences in them are routinely reviewed by the Archaeology and Historic Preservation Commission.

City of Kettle Falls, Swimming Pool Reconstruction, IAC #87-040D: Mr. Pinnix asked if in reconstructing swimming pools communities may also look into the matter of enclosing or sheltering them. He was informed this is always possible if the community wishes to incorporate that into their project.

City of Seattle, Duwamish Recreational Multi-Use Trail, IAC #87-010D: Ms. Cox expressed concern about the width of the path (separated from the highway). Mr. Fairleigh stated it would be a twelve foot wide, concrete pathway landscaped on both sides. Dr. Scull asked if it could be divided so that skate boarders, bicyclists, etc., could be separated from the walkers. Mr. Fairleigh said this

could be considered by the sponsors. Mr. Webster pointed out, however, that there was really not enough space to do this.

Port of Friday Harbor, Shoal Removal, IAC #87-011D: Ms. Lorenz asked why this type of project was coming to the IAC for assistance. Mr. Fairleigh stated it was eligible because it provides the ability to use the outside of the breakwater for moorage. Approximately 900' of space for moorage will be provided. Mr. Webster stated the project funds would be used to make additional improvements to the outside of the breakwater to enable boats to tie up; there will also be electrical power outlets provided. Mr. Tveten assumed this project would be the "cheapest" way to provide additional moorage in this location and that there was no other place in this area where cost could be less and the same type of moorage accomplished. Mr. Fairleigh stated this was true. He also stated it was possible to anchor boats in this area.

San Juan County, Mackaye Harbor Park/Launch Ramp, IAC #87-050D: Ms. Cox asked if there were any plans for camping in this project. Mr. Fairleigh replied there was a small camping area under the auspices of the local Fire District, but that other camping areas are uncertain at this time. Ms. Cox asked if there was a water problem on the island. Mr. Tveten stated there is a problem on Lopez Island. If too much water is drawn, some salt water seeps into the system. Mr. Webster felt this was not an issue in this project since it relates only to boat launch facilities. If recreational facilities were to be provided, then it would be necessary to look into this matter.

City of Castle Rock, Swimming Pool, IAC #87-043D: In reply to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Clark stated the resume was incorrect in stating the owner was the City and the Castle Rock School District. The word "donated" had been inadvertently omitted from the resume. Mr. Tveten complimented the School District and the community for cooperating in this type of project, and felt that the Committee should encourage this type of donation. Honorable Michael D. Huson, Mayor of Castle Rock, explained the funding sources to the Committee.

Clark County Parks, Lacamas Lake Development, Phase I, IAC #87-042D: Ms. Lorenz was familiar with this area and its popularity. She said there are no other facilities there at present and this development is needed.

City of Sumner, Siebenthaler Park, IAC #87-007D: In response to Mr. Jones' question, Mr. Taylor explained an "exercise cluster" ... an exercise course along paths with signing advising the person using the course to perform certain exercises at given locations.

City of Port Orchard, Launch Ramp Improvements, IAC #87-017D: Mr. Taylor corrected the resume to indicate 8' X 100' w/d piles instead of the 8' X 250' indicated.

Centralia Parks Dept., Borst Park Boat Ramp, IAC #87-033D: Mr. Jones asked why A & E was indicated on some projects and not on others. Mr. Clark stated A & E is considered for all projects and was inadvertently left off when it was not so indicated. Mr. Webster pointed out that in some cases the engineering is done by staff and is not separately accounted for in certain projects. Also, sometimes the sponsor programs administrative costs into each of the elements which presents a different breakdown. Mr. Jones felt the Committee should be able to see this cost on the resume. Mr. Webster then stated that as a general rule the IAC allows only 10 percent of the total project cost to be devoted to A & E costs, as per Participation Manual Guidelines. This applies to local

agencies; state agencies have a different set of guidelines applicable to Department of General Administration's guidelines.

Anacortes Park & Recreation, Washington Park Boating Improvements, IAC #87-064D: Dr. Scull was informed by Mr. Fairleigh that the boat launch will not be an "all-tide launch". Dr. Scull felt this was unfortunate considering the amount of use the facilities receive.

King County, Petrovitsky Athletic Complex, IAC #87-058D: Ms. Cox raised questions concerning the athletic facilities provided by school districts in the area. Mr. Webster stated though there are several schools, these do not have any major developed athletic fields, and there is a need for this project to alleviate that situation.

Port of Bremerton, Chico Boat Launch Improvements, IAC #87-047D: Dr. Scull questioned whether there were still conflicts from homeowners in the surrounding area. Mr. Taylor replied that the homeowners had been contacted and did not have any problem with the improvement of the ramp. The ramp has been in existence for several years and well used. In evaluating the project, the Evaluation Team had taken this into consideration.

The project slide presentation concluded at 12:15 p.m. The Chair called for a recess until 1:15 p.m.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1986, "Local Agency Project Funding Recommendations", which was distributed to each Committee member and the audience. The criteria used in the recommendation for project funding was briefly reviewed by Mr. Webster:

- (1) Amount of available funding for local projects;
- (2) Source of funding and relative restrictions.
- (3) Relative ranking of the 52 projects as determined through the evaluation system.
- (4) Suggested funding guidelines of a maximum of 50 percent IAC participation, with \$150,000 ceiling for non-boating projects.
- (5) The attempt to fund as many worthy projects as possible.

The Available Funding of Local Projects indicated the following (with \$3,431,942 available):

	LWCF	SOURCE OF FUNDS		TOTAL
		INIT. 215	STATE BOND	
Cash on Hand (Fund Summary)	\$ (13,985)	\$1,191,529	-0-	\$ 1,177,544
Projected Receipts to:				
Estimated Apportionment LWCF	310,000	-0-	-0-	310,000
Estimated Reapportion. LWCF	11,398	-0-	-0-	11,398
* Estimated-Allot. Authority	-0-	-0-	993,000	993,000
Estimated Receipts D.O.L.	-0-	940,000	-0-	940,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED AVAILABLE:	\$ 307,413	\$2,131,529	\$993,000	\$ 3,431,942

(*Corrected to "Remaining Authority", pg. 14, para. 4)

Mr. Webster also pointed out that the ranking scores were a result of the Technical Advisory Committee review and the Evaluation Team process. He commended both for their time and dedication to this effort. He emphasized that Initiative 215 funds may only be used for boating related projects. Reduction in project costs and IAC recommended share for each have been worked out with the project sponsor prior to the evaluation process. Mr. Webster further noted that the recommendation for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is contingent upon final apportionment amount of at least \$310,000 being granted to the State of Washington for local funding.

The projects as listed on Page 15 of these minutes were recommended for funding by staff - projs. #1 & 3 to 17 - projects #20, #22, and #23 - \$3,424,420 IAC share.

Mr. Webster then read the listing of projects and the funding recommendations for each one.

Mr. Tveten questioned the word "estimated" before "Allotment Authority" concerning the State Bond monies. Both Mr. Webster and Mr. Baker corrected this to indicate "Remaining Authority" which is a valid figure of \$993,000. The other funding sources were briefly discussed. Mr. Ryan asked when the Initiative 215 funds would be received, and Mr. Baker replied the figure shown was estimated through June 30, 1987.

Comments were made during the review of projects.

City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge Creek Acquisition, IAC #87-079A: Mr. Webster reported this project had been reduced from original proposed cost of \$300,530 to \$260,000 without jeopardizing the project.

Port of Bellingham, Boat Launch Rehab. & Expansion, IAC #87-085D: Ms. Cox asked staff how the percentages of Initiative 215 were decided by staff. Mr. Webster stated that certain of the projects had boating elements in them as well as non-boating elements. Those having boating elements could apply for up to 75% funding, whereas the non-boating projects would be reviewed at 50-50. Ms. Cox noted that the Port of Bellingham project was being recommended for funding at 74%, but further down the listing of projects the City of Everett's Riverfront Park was being recommended at only 46%. Mr. Webster replied this represented the 75% boating elements within that particular park project.

At the conclusion of Mr. Webster's reading of the funding recommendations, the following points were made:

(1) City of Seattle, Seacrest Park, IAC #87-037D: This project was not being recommended by staff because a considerable amount of money was being recommended for the City of Seattle's Golden Gardens Project, IAC #87-036D, which was ready to proceed, whereas the Seacrest Project, though very outstanding, was not ready and could be brought back to the Committee for consideration in the funding session for 1987. Also, additional monies in Initiative 215 are provided for funding other projects.

(2) Vashon Park & Recreation District/King County, Lisabeula Resort Acquisition, IAC #87-080A: Mr. Webster also pointed out that the additional 215 monies would allow the next eligible project for these funds to receive monies - the Lisabeula Resort Acquisition. There is a need to fund this project, and there is an additional amount of saltwater property which could possibly be donated and added to the project if it were funded. Therefore, staff had recommended funding of the Lisabeula Project

Table 2 - Staff Recommendations

Rank	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Score	Rg	LMCF	6-0 Bonds	I-215	Total IAC Share	Local Share	Project Total	%
1	Burnt Bridge Creek Acq.	Vancouver, City of	136.20	6	0	130,000	0	130,000	130,000	260,000	50
2	Seacrest Park	Seattle, City of	135.30	4							
3	Boat Launch Rehab. & Exp.	Bellingham, Port of	134.50	3	0	0	199,687	199,687	66,563	266,250	74
4	Titlow Shoreline Rec. Area	Tacoma, City of	134.10	4	0	150,000	0	150,000	197,461	347,461	43
5	Mountlake Park Improvements	Moses Lake, City of	131.30	9	0	0	72,416	72,416	24,139	96,555	74
6	Kitsap Lake Development	Bremerton, City of	130.00	4	0	32,952	116,317	149,269	71,724	220,993	67
7	Sarg Hubbard Park, Phase II	Yakima County	129.50	8	0	150,000	0	150,000	170,000	320,000	46
8	Riverfront Park	Everett, City of	128.40	4	0	0	160,013	160,013	184,294	344,307	46
9	Golden Gardens Boat Ramp	Seattle, City of	127.50	4	0	0	389,435	389,435	309,123	698,558	55
10	Meadowdale Playfields Phase 3	Lynnwood, City of	126.90	4	0	150,000	0	150,000	240,000	390,000	38
11	Meadowdale Co. Park	Snohomish County	126.60	4	150,000	0	0	150,000	171,600	321,600	46
12	Auburn Game Farm	Auburn, City of	126.00	4	150,000	0	0	150,000	2,598,700	2,748,700	5
13	Waterfront Trail	Leavenworth, City of	124.80	7	0	83,330	0	83,330	83,330	166,660	50
14	Community Center Park	North Bonneville, City of	124.70	6	0	111,257	0	111,257	111,257	222,514	50
15	Columbia Point Boat Access	Richland, City of	124.50	10	0	0	310,800	310,800	103,600	414,400	75
16	Possession Point Development	Port of South Whidbey	124.50	3	0	0	416,893	416,893	327,935	744,828	55
17	Green River Corridor Develop.	Kent, City of	124.50	4	0	146,820	0	146,820	146,820	293,640	50
18	Swimming Pool	Bridgeport, Town of	123.60	7							
19	Gateway Park	Clarkston, Port of	123.50	13							
20	Restrooms & Guest Dock Renov.	Kingston, Port of	123.40	4	0	0	128,815	128,815	81,439	210,254	61
21	Alder Lake Development Phase 3	Tacoma, City of PUD	122.30	4							
22	Marina Expansion	Oak Harbor, City of	122.00	3	0	0	249,435	249,435	83,146	332,581	74
23	Lisabeula Resort Acquisition	Vashon P & R Dist/King Co	120.80	4	0	38,532	87,718	126,250	126,250	252,500	50
24	Swimming Pool Renovation	Kettle Falls, City of	120.60	11							
25	Percival Landing West	Olympia, City of	120.20	5							
26	Duwamish Trail	Seattle, City of	119.00	4							
27	So. Co. Regional Park Dev.	Lewis County	118.60	5							
28	Shoal Removal	Friday Harbor, Port of	117.00	3							
29	Makaye Harbor Launch	San Juan County	116.80	3							
30	Swimming Pool	Castle Rock, City of	116.40	6							
31	Salmon Creek Acq. Phase IV	Clark County	113.90	6							
32	Lacamas Lake, Phase I	Clark County	113.90	6							
33	Riverfront Trail	Kennewick, City of	113.30	10							
34	Dockton Addition	King County	110.80	4							
35	Smith Property Acquisition	Bremerton, Port of	110.00	4							
36	Siebenthaler Park	Suener, City of	108.90	4							
37	Battlepoint Park Phase II	Bainbridge Isl. P&R Distr	107.80	4							
38	Floating Dock Improvement	Port Orchard, City of	107.60	4							
39	Borst Park Boat Launch	Centralia, City of	107.60	5							
40	Wash. Park Boating Improvement	Anacortes, City of	106.30	3							
41	Petrovitsky Athletic Complex	King County	104.60	4							
42	Cummings-Trans-Moorage	Tacoma MPD	104.10	4							
43	Pope Marine Park/City Dock	Port Townsend, City of	104.00	1							
44	Softball Park	Ione, Town of	102.50	11							
45	Boat Launch & Dock	Squaxin Indian Tribe	102.20	5							
46	Guest Moorage Expansion	Kalama, Port of	99.40	6							
47	Chico Boat Launch	Bremerton, Port of	97.90	4							
48	Pioneer Park Expansion	Ferndale, City of	96.50	3							
49	Recreation Park	Chehalis, City of	95.20	5							
50	Boat Haven Boat Launch	Port Angeles, Port of	92.00	1							
51	Boathaven Imp./Boat Launch	Port Angeles, Port of	90.60	1							
52	Port Orchard Maring Restroom	Bremerton, Port of	83.00	4							
		Totals			300,000	992,891	2,131,529	3,424,420	5,227,381	8,651,801	

with the remaining Initiative 215 funds.

Discussion on Staff Recommendations followed.

Town of Bridgeport, Swimming Pool, IAC #87-039D: Ms. Cox asked why the Bridgeport project was not being recommended, and was informed that funds were not available that far down in the ranking of the projects, and other than the \$38,532 given to the Vashon Park and Recreation District project, they would not have had sufficient funds elsewhere to be able to complete their project. Mary Zacchanti, Council Member, Town of Bridgeport, was recognized by the Chairman. She stated the Town of Bridgeport was ready to proceed with the project at \$178,000 local share and would have taken any amount of funds that the IAC could have given to the project. Mr. Webster stated it was his understanding in the last discussions with the Town of Bridgeport that without the funding of \$150,000 from the IAC, they would not be able to proceed.

Dr. Scull stated he realized how difficult it was to rank and score projects, but he felt that communities the size of Bridgeport and Ione, and some of the other smaller communities, had very few recreational facilities and the IAC Committee should be trying to meet those needs. The other larger communities do have facilities and in many instances the means to provide funds. He shared Ms. Cox's concerns that Bridgeport does have a great need for the swimming pool development project. He asked if some funds couldn't be transferred into the Bridgeport project from some of the other projects being recommended for funding.

Mr. Wilder stated the IAC staff had been very sensitive for some time concerning funding of smaller communities' projects, and in fact, had revised and modified the point system to allow for such funding. The Evaluation System may be modified from time to time; it is continually being reviewed to make it a better system. He noted it was not easy for staff to make final recommendations since none of the projects are poor projects and all are equally important -- some, in fact, score very close in points. Staff must also work within the dollars and the limited funding available. He stated there had been ninety-two projects submitted and out of that fifty-two were evaluated over a week's time period. Project sponsors were advised of the limited funding and were aware of the situation.

Ms. Cox asked for an explanation on the scoring system which would assist smaller communities. Mr. Webster cited from the Project Evaluation Procedures Manual #6 Section A - Question A-1, "Considering the availability of existing facilities within the service area, to what extent are additional or improved facilities warranted?" This is followed by points given for high need (15-25), medium need (5-14), and low need (1-4). Other questions relate to how does the project help to meet the needs, etc. In addition, two years ago, Mr. Webster pointed out, staff and the Committee had approved the addition of Section D in the Evaluation System, Pre-Scoring. Question D-3 - "Project is located within a county for which no project has been funded for a period of two, three, four, or five or more years" was addressed, which would give bonus points to certain projects. Many efforts have been made by staff and the Committee over the years to assist the smaller communities.

Mr. Webster also stated that:

- (1) Staff looked at every project carefully to determine whether any of the amounts being funded could be adjusted without compromising the project itself.
- (2) Staff did not want to delete elements within projects after having been through the Evaluation Session since that could in all likelihood compromise the projects.

(3) The present Evaluation System has evolved over time and is the best system which has been developed to date.

Ms. Cox asked if economics was a factor within the system and was advised this also is taken into account in the Pre-Score question section of the Evaluation System. Mr. Pinnix was advised the maximum score any one project could receive was about 190 points. Mr. Pinnix then noted the projects #10 down to #20 were very close in points - less than 2% leeway. He felt the scoring system was a subjective system and also acknowledged the limited dollars available for funding.

Ms. Lorenz questioned why project #23 (Vashon - Lisabeula Resort Acquisition) funding was different on staff's recommendation than the amount indicated on the project listing received by the Committee in the kit. Mr. Webster reviewed the need for some projects to qualify for Initiative 215 - others bond funds and LWCF. Staff must determine those projects which are eligible to receive Initiative 215 funds for boating-related elements. Also in discussions with local sponsors, they indicate whether or not they can meet the percentage match. Mr. Volker asked what the likelihood was of a successful project if the Vashon Park & Rec. District Project was funded at 50% level. Mr. Webster replied the sponsor had indicated it could accomplish this project with this percentage, and if it was not possible for them to do so staff would not have recommended the project.

Mr. Tveten stated in staff's recommendation from the first project down to the last being funded (Lisabeula Resort Acquisition), there apparently had been \$38,532 left over in State Bond Funds which had been given to that particular project. He offered to make a proposal concerning the Initiative 215 funds which he assumed indicated revenue up to June 30, 1986. Staff corrected this assumption stating the Initiative 215 funds were indicated up to June 30, 1987. Mr. Tveten then withdrew the proposal he was about to make.

Mr. Ryan asked if the funds to be received from DOL (Initiative 215) in the amount of approximately \$40,000 which Mr. Baker had mentioned could be allocated to the Town of Bridgeport's Project. Mr. Webster stated these were to be used only for boating related projects and would not be available for that project. Dr. Scull asked if a project was not funded at this session and was resubmitted for consideration at a new funding session would it be re-evaluated as a new project? Mr. Webster replied it would be considered along with all others submitted for that funding session.

Mr. Pinnix stated if the \$38,532 remaining bond monies was given to the Town of Bridgeport project that would still leave about \$87,000 available for the Lisabeula Resort Acquisition project out of Initiative 215. This would apply only to the boating element of their project. Mr. Webster felt if only \$87,000 was given to the Lisabeula project the sponsor might not be able to accomplish the intended project.

At this point the chair recognized Richard Bain, Chairman, Vashon Park and Recreation District. Mr. Bain said it was hard for him to say at this point whether they could accomplish the project. The District is presently dealing with land acquisition negotiations based on estimates. Appraisals have been made and the owner is anxious to sell the land; some relocation will be required for people living on the site.

Mr. Tveten asked if any of the development projects were tied-up in the permit procedures and was assured by each project manager they were not. All projects are clear as to the permit process.

Ms. Cox asked Ms. Zaccanti, Council Member, Town of Bridgeport, how much it would cost to replace the pool and the mechanical system. Ms. Zaccanti replied around \$200,000 without the other elements in the project. She stressed this was the only recreational facility in the Bridgeport area, and presently the system is losing 1,600 gallons of water per day due to faulty equipment. She also advised Ms. Cox there were fees charged for the pool.

Ms. Lorenz questioned Mr. Richard Bain (Vashon Park and Recreation Dist. Chrmn.) about the Lisabeula project acquisition. Mr. Ryan suggested looking at Project #17, City of Kent, Green River Corridor Development, as well as other projects and perhaps reducing some of the projects to make up a balance of funding for the Town of Bridgeport's project. Mr. Volker and Mr. Pinnix asked that other funding also be reviewed as well as Initiative 215; perhaps some funding could be reallocated from LWCF funds.

At this point Mr. Wilder reiterated the staff's review of the project funding, Evaluation System Team's review, as well as the Technical Advisory Committee. The package before the Committee was, in staff's estimation, the most expedient funding possible. The objective was to fund as many worthy projects as possible with the limited funding available. He stated staff was willing to open the project funding for discussion if this was necessary but the ramifications of this would be felt on down the listing of projects.

Ms. Lorenz stated she was certain the Town of Bridgeport would take any amount of money for the project and that it was, in her estimation, necessary to reconsider it. Also, she noted that staff had stated the Town could not accomplish the project unless \$150,000 was allocated; however, Ms. Zaccanti has stated this was not true and the Town would be able to accept any amount. She asked for reconsideration of the project.

Dr. Scull felt, in reviewing the projects, that many could be cut without harm in order to assist a small community like Bridgeport.

The Chair recognized Barney Wilson, Director, Parks and Recreation, Kent (City of Kent, Green River Corridor, IAC #87-015D): Mr. Wilson noted the following:

- (1) The Kent project as number 17 is almost tied with #15 and #16 in points.
- (2) Kent is in fast growing area; building two new schools - youth population is high and need for parks great.
- (3) The project calls for Green River Corridor development; would be used by many of the 7,000 people in the area.
- (4) Is extremely important urban area.
- (5) Kent is short of money, and if the Committee decides to start "shaving" projects, suggested additional Initiative 215 funds should be considered.

Jim Murphy, Supervisor, Parks and Wildlife, Tacoma City Light: Commented as follows: (Alder Lake Development, Ph 3)

- (1) Project is directed to recreational vehicle overnight camping - a critical need in this area.
- (2) Requested reconsideration for funding of this project.
- (3) Approximately 1,660,000 visitors in the park per year.

David Schilperoort, Director, Lewis County Parks & Recreation, Regional Park Site, IAC #87-016D:

- (1) County has been working with the acquisition and development of the regional park site since 1980.
- (2) Are disappointed not to receive funding; past IAC funding has been appreciated.
- (3) Stated there was a need for everyone at the meeting to lobby for additional Land and Water Conservation Funds and bond monies to fund park and recreation projects.
- (4) This project Lewis County's #1 priority.
- (5) Thanked the IAC and staff for its support and assistance.

Darryl Piercy, Harbor Master, Port of Bremerton - Smith Property Acquisition, IAC #87-081A:

- (1) Served on the Evaluation Team as a representative of the Washington State Ports Association, and realized that every project sponsor feels his/her project is a good one and should be funded.
- (2) Felt IAC evaluation process is exceptional; the review system is very clear; fair.
- (3) Thanked the staff for their assistance and the Committee for their time and efforts.

Michael Cecka, City Administrator, City of Leavenworth - Waterfront Trail, IAC #038-D:

- (1) Spoke on behalf of small communities. Deciding to submit an application for consideration is a major commitment on the part of a small community.
- (2) Appreciated assistance from the IAC staff during project process. Echoed Mr. Piercy's comments on the evaluation process.
- (3) Felt small communities do need consideration in funding from the IAC since their recreational facilities are used by tourists as well as the citizens of the towns.

Mr. Richard Kirk, Port of Kingston - Restroom and Guest Dock Renovation, IAC #87-004D:
Thanked the staff and Committee for their efforts.

Mr. Len Chapman, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Auburn - Auburn Game Farm IAC 87-024D:

Thanked the staff and the Game Department for their cooperation. Project has been through the procedure twice. Pleased with the funding recommendation and willing to accept whatever proposal Committee recommends for the project listing.

Mr. Lawrence J. Curles, P. W. Engineer/Superintendent, Port Orchard - Floating Dock Improvement, IAC #87-017D:

- (1) Felt IAC process is excellent and approved of its processing.
- (2) Spoke to the need of assistance for smaller communities. \$100,000 is a great deal to a small community, but not so much to a larger, urban area.
- (3) Recommended that the point system be reversed so that a small city of 5,000 or less has a change to pick up three or four points.
- (4) Port Orchard did not receive funding, but hoped the Committee would look at the impact on smaller communities of the point system.

Ms. Shirley Brent, Mayor, City of Port Townsend - Pope Marine Park/City Dock, IAC #87-009D: Did not present comments. Participation Card was filed.

Following sponsor comments, the Committee continued its discussion of the staff's project funding recommendation and adjustments to it. Comments included the possibility of moving \$38,532 in bond funds from the Lisabeula project to the Bridgeport Swimming Pool project. Mr. Webster pointed out that if this was done, Lisabeula would end up with only \$87,718 in Initiative 215 funds for its \$252,500 project. Ms. Lorenz felt there were many options which the Committee could consider -- should the Lisabeula project then be dropped completely and those funds allocated to other projects? She noted that Oak Harbor's Marina Expansion project was ahead of Lisabeula and shouldn't it be considered for the remaining funding? Mr. Webster noted that this project was being funded strictly from Initiative 215 funds (\$249,435). Mr. Volker asked if it would be possible to reduce some of the Initiative 215 in projects 20 and 22 (Port of Kingston and City of Oak Harbor) to make up what would be taken from 23 in General Obligation bonds. At this point Mr. Pinnix stated there were two ways the Committee could consider the funding:

(1) Recognize that in any scoring system there are certain restrictions. Consider staff's evaluation and the Evaluation Team's scoring to meet objectives. The Committee could take the last remaining bond money and place it in a higher scoring project and fund the project as best as it can at that level; and at the same time deduct another \$10,000 from the Lisabeula project and place it on the higher-ranking project...or,

(2) Recognize that the Committee cannot fund every project recommended and at some point decide where the breaking point is. Draw an arbitrary line at some point and working with staff and the project sponsors arrive at funding levels.

Ms. Lorenz felt the Committee should consider projects below #17 (City of Kent, Green River Corridor Development project). Mr. Pinnix questioned whether the Committee was being fair to the scoring system in taking this approach. He felt all projects being recommended by staff should be considered. Whereupon Ms. Lorenz stated this would be defeating the whole process; that only those projects below #17 should be reviewed by the Committee.

Mr. Webster pointed out the difference in project costs if monies were moved from the Lisabeula Project to the Bridgeport Project, and the need to reallocate the funding sources. Mr. Volker suggested to compensate the Lisabeula Project perhaps a share of Initiative 215 in the Oak Harbor project and the Port of Kingston project. Mr. Tveten suggested taking the \$38,532 in state bond monies from the Lisabeula Project and moving it up to the City of Bridgeport's project; then within the three remaining projects having Initiative 215 monies in them take \$37,000 from the City of Oak Harbor Project and move it into the Lisabeula Project. Each of the three projects would then have about a 61% funding.

Ms. Cox asked what the impact would be for the City of Oak Harbor. Mr. Pat Nevins, City Supervisor, City of Oak Harbor, responded.

- (1) Pointed out that the City of Oak Harbor is a small community also.
- (2) The total cost of the project is \$332,581; that is attributable to the transient moorage that is going to be created in the project.
- (3) The breakwater and expansion will cost \$1.25 million. A considerable amount of money will be needed for the various projects connected with the marina expansion.
- (4) Taking funds away from the City is not a fair analysis when you consider

the size of the community and the need to provide this type of recreational facility for all the people in the state who will use the facility.

Ms. Cox asked if staff had considered limiting the Initiative 215 funds to a 50-50 match. Mr. Webster indicated it had been limited in previous years to 50 percent, but with additional funds available it was the feeling that it would be possible this year to entertain projects at 75-25% once again. Mr. Ryan stated he did not want to lose sight of the fact that there might be additional Initiative 215 funds received from the Department of Licensing and some of these monies could be placed in the City of Oak Harbor project.

Mr. Wilder then noted there was some uncertainty in the amount of Initiative 215 funds to come in, and he would be reluctant to make a commitment in view of the statute which states there must be adequate resources available to fund a project. He offered an alternate suggestion, that the IAC could offer \$25- to \$30,000 from its operating funds to offset the bond money in the proposal and thus move funding of the project. He stated he would rather take this option than start to move around the funding of the various projects as recommended by staff.

Mr. Webster stated that if certain elements were deleted from projects due to less funding, then the project as evaluated by the Evaluation Team would not be consistent. The projects as recommended by staff have gone through the Evaluation Team intact.

Ms. Wendy Brand, Chief, Recreation Assistance Division, National Park Service: Ms. Brand advised the Committee that she had spent the entire week in Ellensburg evaluating the projects and she was aware of the considerable effort put forth by sponsors, staff, and the members of the Evaluation Team in the entire project processing. She felt the Committee was "playing with the point system" and setting a bad precedent.

IT WAS MOVED BY JAN TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS.

DR. SCULL AMENDED THE MOTION: THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FUND THE LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH THE FOLLOWING PROVISOS:

- (1) \$38,532 BOND MONEY ALLOCATED TO THE LISBEAULA PROJECT #23 BE MOVED TO PROJECT #18, THE TOWN OF BRIDGEPORT SWIMMING POOL PROJECT; AND
- (2) \$38,532 IN INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS BE ALLOCATED TO THE LISBEAULA PROJECT FROM INITIATIVE 215 SOURCES OF THE IAC MAKING THE TOTAL INITIATIVE 215 FUNDING FOR THAT PROJECT \$126,250.

MR. VOLKER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Discussion followed. Ms. Lorenz was opposed to the amendment to the motion. Mr. Tveten commended Mr. Wilder as Director of the IAC in suggesting funds from Initiative 215 of the agency be allocated to the Lisbeaula project. He expressed his support for the amendment to the motion. Ms. Cox had grave reservations about allocating this money at this time. Mr. Baker requested that the motion itself not indicate that "operating money" will be used since the funds will be simply Initiative 215 continuing funds.

Question of clarification was called for on the amendment to the motion. Mr. Pinnix repeated it stressing the funding for Lisabeula would come from Initiative 215 available. Mr. Baker advised it was not advisable to use the wording "if available". The amendment to the motion on page (21) of these minutes reflects the wording as approved by the Committee.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR BY THE CHAIR ON THE RECOMMENDED FUNDING FOR THE REST OF THE PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF.

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 23 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JULY 25, 1985, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN;

WITH THE STIPULATION THAT LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDING SO APPROVED IN THESE PROJECTS IS CONTINGENT UPON RECEIPT OF THESE FUNDS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 23 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Ms. Cox thanked the sponsors and other attendees for their attendance and participation, and asked their assistance in lobbying for funding sources for the Interagency Committee in order that it might continue meeting the needs of eligible agencies for parks, recreation, and conservation.

Mr. Tom Roehl, Project Manager, Port of South Whidbey Island - Possession Point Development, IAC #87-054D:

(1) Pointed out as a small community sponsor, points are lost in the scoring system, but also gains are made because of points given to "lack of resources" in the area.

(2) Felt \$150,000 ceiling should be reviewed and perhaps raised.

(3) Thanked IAC staff for their assistance; commended the process.

Ms. Zaccanti, Council Member, Town of Bridgeport, thanked the Committee for their consideration of the Bridgeport Swimming Pool project and meeting some of the urgent needs for the citizens of that town.

Mr. Richard Bain, Vashon Park and Recreation Chairman and Mr. David Schilperoort, Director of Lewis County Parks and Recreation, thanked the Committee for their efforts and expressed appreciation for staff assistance. Mr. Schilperoort felt the staff had processed the projects through to funding stage in an excellent manner.

LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECTS AS FUNDED AT IAC MEETING NOVEMBER 6, 1986 OLYMPIA

Project Name	Sponsor Name	LWCF	G-0 Bonds	I-215	Total IAC	Local Share	Project Total	%
Burnt Bridge Creek Ac.	Vancouver, City of	0	130,000	0	130,000	130,000	260,000	50
Boat Launch Rehab. & Exp.	Bellingham, Port of	0	0	199,687	199,687	66,563	266,250	74
Titlow Shoreline Rec. Area	Tacoma, City of	0	150,000	0	150,000	197,461	347,461	43
Mountlake Park Improvements	Moses Lake, City of	0	0	72,416	72,416	24,139	96,555	74
Kitsap Lake Development	Bremerton, City of	0	32,952	116,317	149,269	71,724	220,993	67
Sarg Hubbard Park, Phase II	Yakima County	0	150,000	0	150,000	170,000	320,000	46
Riverfront Park	Everett, City of	0	0	160,013	160,013	184,294	344,307	46
Golden Gardens Boat Ramp	Seattle, City of	0	0	389,435	389,435	309,123	698,558	55
Meadowdale Playfields Phase 3	Lynnwood, City of	0	150,000	0	150,000	240,000	390,000	38
Meadowdale Co. Park	Snohomish County	150,000	0	0	150,000	171,600	321,600	46
Auburn Game Farm	Auburn, City of	150,000	0	0	150,000	2,598,700	2,748,700	5
Waterfront Trail	Leavenworth, City of	0	83,330	0	83,330	83,330	166,660	50
Community Center Park	North Bonneville, City of	0	111,257	0	111,257	111,257	222,514	50
Columbia Point Boat Access	Richland, City of	0	0	310,800	310,800	103,600	414,400	75
Possession Point Development	Port of South Whidbey	0	0	416,893	416,893	327,935	744,828	55
Green River Corridor Develop.	Kent, City of	0	146,820	0	146,820	146,820	293,640	50
Swimming Pool	Bridgeport, Town of	0	38,532	0	38,532	178,000	216,532	18
Restroom & Guest Dock Renov.	Kingston, Port of	0	0	128,815	128,815	81,439	210,254	61
Marina Expansion	Oak Harbor, City of	0	0	249,435	249,435	83,146	332,581	74
Lisabeula Resort Acquisition	Vashon P&R Dist./King Co.	0	0	126,250	126,250	126,250	252,500	50
TOTALS		300,000	992,891	2,170,061	3,462,952	5,405,381	8,868,333	

At 2:55 p.m., Ms. Cox called for a brief meeting of the Interagency Committee members and supervisory staff of the IAC. She felt the Committee needed to review certain programs of the IAC at a work session: (1) Evaluation of Projects procedure; (2) the Point System itself; (3) the New Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program. Dr. Scull suggested including a review of Initiative 215 funding, perhaps meeting somewhere in the San Juans and taking advantage of seeing some of the projects funded by the IAC. Mr. Ryan endorsed reviewing the scoring system. He felt staff had done a wonderful job in using the criteria, but he needed background into the mechanics of the process. Mr. Volker pointed out there were four people on the Committee who had not had the opportunity to review the point system. There followed discussion on staff's responsibilities in meeting the legislative mandate to fund projects in urban areas. Ms. Lorenz suggested there be points given for an isolation factor. Mr. Tveten suggested Committee members attend the Technical Advisory Committee meetings and Evaluation Sessions. At this point, Mr. Webster offered to set up a mock evaluation session for the Committee members where they would have the opportunity of following a project through both the TAC system and the Evaluation system. Committee members approved of this suggestion.

The present funding situation of the IAC was then discussed. Only twenty out of fifty-two projects were funded due to lack of resources. Mr. Wilder suggested Committee members talk to Senators and Representatives of their districts and others they might know about the problem. Also written communications would be encouraged. Ms. Lorenz suggested that Mr. Wilder send drafted letters or tapes to Committee members outlining what they could say to the legislators. The repeal of RCW 43.99.115 was included in the discussion.

Dr. Scull noted the length of appointment for Committee members. He felt longer terms should be considered though this is set by legislation. Mr. Tveten noted that Committee members are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate (citizen members). If the Senate fails to confirm appointments, the committee members are considered automatically confirmed. *take action to*

Mr. Webster, in discussing the present Evaluation System, stated staff are constantly revising the point system through contact with local agencies sponsors. Memorandum is sent to local sponsors asking their assistance in reviewing the point system and offering their suggestions. This is then taken under advisement and perhaps changes could be made bettering the system.

MR. PINNIX SUGGESTED THE COMMITTEE MEET SOMEWHERE IN NORTHWEST WASHINGTON, THE DIRECTOR TO SELECT THE LOCATION, FOR DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS ITEMS IN A WORK SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE, AND THAT THE COMMITTEE ALSO BE ABLE TO REVIEW CERTAIN PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WHICH MIGHT BE CLOSE BY.

The following meeting dates were then APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE:

MARCH 26-27	OLYMPIA
JULY 16-17	WORK SESSION - NORTHWEST WASHINGTON
NOVEMBER 5-6	OLYMPIA

Mr. Wilder mentioned the packet of letters received from off-road vehicle users and others, and suggested that the Committee review these prior to Friday's IAC meeting. Mr. Tveten stated many people had based their comments on their

own personal involvement during the legislative hearings. The law, however, did not establish the program in the manner some are alleging. Therefore, he said he would be looking for the Assistant Attorney General to advise the Committee and the attendees of established facts.

The Committee recessed at 3:40 p.m.

NOVEMBER 7, 1986

9:00 a.m.

Ms. Cox, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with a quorum of eight: COX, JONES, LORENZ, SCULL, PINNIX, WAYLAND, RYAN, AND TVETEN.

Attendees were welcomed by the chair and asked to introduce themselves.

Ms. Susan Jensen, Assistant Attorney General, called the WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE HEARING to order by reading the Notice of Intention to Adopt, Amend, or Repeal Rules as filed by the Interagency Committee with the Code Reviser, September 29, 1986, WSR 86-20-052 (APPENDIX "B" TO THESE MINUTES).

Ms. Cox indicated that copies of the amended proposed rules were available on the information table in the room. Included for distribution to attendees were the proposed amended WACs 286 and the existing WACs 286. (AMENDED WACS - APPENDIX "C")

Memorandum of staff, dated November 7, 1986, "Washington Administrative Code (WAC 286) Hearing" gave information on necessity of amending the WACs in order to launch the agency's new recreational nonhighway road grant-in-aid program. Certain changes in wording were required and WAC Chapter 286-26 extensively modified.

Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, reported comments had been received from only one source and had been included in the kit material to the Committee and was available on the information table. The deadline for receipt of comments was October 20, 1986. Mr. Ogden outlined the following procedure for the WAC hearing:

- (1) Discussion of rules will be on a section-by-section basis - there being four chapters for review;
- (2) Committee members will discuss each section;
- (3) Attendees may offer comments following Committee input identifying themselves clearly and agency or organization they represent.

Mr. Ogden then proceeded with presentation of the WAC amendments.

WAC 286-04-010 - Items (15) and (17) added the term "nonhighway road and off-road vehicle program" for clarification.

Discussion: Mr. Tveten and others questioned why the "nonhighway road and off-road vehicle program" was not considered a grant-in-aid program of the IAC. Mr. Dovel, Mr. Wilder, and Mr. Lovelady all responded, acknowledging that NOVA

is a grant-in-aid program, but in the WACs wording has been used to separate the NOVA grant program from the traditional grant-in-aid program for state and local agencies.

Ms. Louise Marshall, President, Washington Trails Association withdrew the comments she had submitted to the IAC, but registered her feelings that the WACs in this instance were inaccurate and "sloppy".

Mary Fries, Citizen, Tacoma, Washington: Stated she was concerned about the new definition of "nonhighway and off-road vehicles program". She felt the new law interpreted adding nonhighway road areas to the former criteria of off-road as eligible projects under the ORV program. Her concern was with the guidelines to be reviewed by the Committee later but she wanted to speak at this point in the proceedings also.

Ms. Jensen noted when legislation is passed by the Legislature and placed into law, if it changes procedures of the agency, there must be amendments made to the administrative codes of that agency so that it will be in conformance. The Attorney General's office representative, therefore, must review with the agency all amendments to the WACs. This had been done. If citizens feel it is necessary to "correct" the law, then this must be done through the legislative procedure.

Committee members discussed ways to clarify WAC 286-04-010 (15). Following considerable discussion as to possible changes which could be made, the Assistant Attorney General advised if substantial changes were made in the WACs they could not be approved at this session, but would need to be brought back for further review. The Committee did have the option to determine what would be "substantial". With the understanding that the change was merely "housekeeping", IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT WAC 286-04-010 (15) AND (17) BE ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

WAC 286-16-010 Scope of Chapter: Ms. Marshall referred to her comments as received by the Committee stating the WACs were inaccurate in many places, this being one of them. She did feel they should be adopted by the Committee, but wanted to point out the necessity of a rewrite of the WACs at some point in time. In this particular WAC she noted the deletion of "maintenance", which is in the law and, in her opinion, should be in the WAC. Mr. Wilder complimented her on the time she had taken to review the amendments. These had been included for Committee and public review. Many of her comments, he felt, were good ones for future consideration.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT WAC 286-16-010 AS AMENDED BE ADOPTED. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

WAC 286-24-010 Scope of Chapter: No comments were made on this WAC amendment following the explanation.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT WAC 286-24-010 AS AMENDED BE ADOPTED. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

WAC 286-26 Amendments:

1. WAC 286-26-010 Scope of Chapter. Adding "nonhighway road" in two places.

No comments

2. WAC 286-26-020 Definitions. Adding "nonhighway and off-road" where applicable, deleting "self-propelled", clarifying two, three or four-wheel off-road vehicles, revising "trail" definition, changing ORVAC to NOVA, and in (8) defining a non-highway road.

Discussion: In response to Mr. Wayland's question, Mr. Lovelady cited RCW 46.90.020, which had been changed by the State Legislature in passage of ESHB #1382, Chapter 206, Laws of 1986, by several deletions one being the term "self-propelled" with the change to "motorized". The WAC admendment was, therefore, consistent with state law.

Mr. Phil Glass, Recreation Staff Member, Wenatchee National Forest, mentioned the Cushman tracked vehicle which is also considered a motorized vehicle.

3. WAC 286-26-030 Eligibility. Addition of wording "nonhighway road and off-road vehicle" and adding Indian tribes as eligible for funding under the program.

No comments.

4. WAC 286-26-040 Qualification. Deleted certain wording and added "a nonhighway road and off-road vehicle grant", added NOVA as advisory committee, substituted "requirements" for the word "process" (per Asst. Atty. General), and added wording "application fof funds and" along with the project review.

Ms. Marshall pointed out that in this section reference is made to "participation manuals" whereas in other section of the WACs these documents are referred to as "procedural guidelines". She felt the WACs should be consistent and use the same reference for these documents.

5. WAC 286-26-055 Funded Projects. Changed ORVAC to NOVA and inserted new wording "nonhighway road".

No comments.

6. WAC 286-26-060 Disbursement of Funds. Added "nonhighway road" where applicable.

No comments.

-
7. WAC 286-26-070 Fund Accountability. Fund name changed from ORV to "nonhighway road and off-road vehicle funds".

Discussion: Ms. Marshall referred to her comments forwarded to the committee. She had referred to additional standards for performance needing to be set up for enforcement and education monies granted to law enforcement agencies. She questioned whether these funds are being accounted for competently. She said she was not challenging the budgeting procedure, but knew that the off-road vehicle people themselves have experienced a lack of confidence in the education and enforcement program and she felt there needed to be some guidelines or standards set to accomplish a better system of accounting.

Mr. Tveten read the categories of projects the IAC would be recommending for funding in the NOVA program and asked if these categories were fully covered in the WACs. He was assured by staff that they were.

Following review of Chapter 286-26 in its entirety, the Committee discussed whether the guidelines for the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program were adequately covered within the WACs. Ms. Jensen explained that the administrative code is written by an agency to meet legislative law. Within the context of the law, the agency may then develop guidelines from which to administer its various programs. Not all facets of guidelines need be in the administrative code, but the agency is bound by the law to follow closely the WACs which it adopts and ensure that the guidelines do not overstep authority. Mr. Jones pointed out that in the guidelines the agency would be pointing out in a broader sense the directions to be followed within the program. Ms. Jensen felt staff was aware of the limitations and no doubt has in the past adhered to them. She stated there was some flexibility within the confines of the WAC for written guidelines. She felt the staff was administered through a high level committee and both would not jeopardize the intent of the law in administering the guidelines. Mr. Tveten stated he wanted to be sure that what was in the guidelines could be easily referenced in the WACs. In Mr. Wilder's opinion and that of staff, it was agreed this could be done and was at present workable. Mr. Wilder noted that Jeff Lane, Asst. Atty. General, and liaison A.G. with the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, had reviewed the WACs amendments and had been satisfied they met the intent of the law and the new legislation relating to the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program.

At this point the chair called a ten minute recess (10:00 a.m.).

The committee reconvened at 10:10 a.m. and continued its discussion whether the WACs amendments to be adopted by the committee would be inclusive enough for adoption of guidelines later. The chair recognized Mr. Arthur Sandboe, citizen hiker, Tacoma:

- (1) The WAC states that funds can be used for non-highway road activities, and what those are will no doubt be determined by the guidelines.
- (2) Felt hiker trails would be excluded if not given as an example.

Ms. Jensen stated that in her opinion the WAC as written would not preclude guidelines regarding development of this type. She had read the guidelines and found nothing which would not be allowed by the WACs as written. However,

as guidelines are reviewed by staff, the committee, and attendees, determination can be made through a consensus. She noted this had been the policy of the IAC for some time and would continue. In other words, she felt the WACs could be amended again, if so desired, as new programs, etc., are given to the IAC. Though she had not had a chance to study the question whether hiker trails would be included specifically, she did know about the Assistant Attorney General's Informal Opinion which had been rendered recently defining nonhighway road activities and she would abide by that decision. Apparently the Assistant Attorney General had not found any problem with the WACs at that time. If there is a problem, this can always be brought back to the Committee for deliberation.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 286-26 IN ITS ENTIRETY BE ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT GUIDELINES AS PRESENTED BY STAFF MAY BE DEALT WITH LATER ON AND COULD BE ADOPTED FOLLOWING DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE AT THAT TIME.

"APPENDIX C"

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

At 10:15 a.m., Mr. Ogden declared the Washington Administrative Code Hearing officially closed.

C. NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECT ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "Nonhighway Road Project Eligibility Guidelines. He asked that the record indicate the guidelines were evolved in normal procedure, that staff had worked with many groups, organizations, and the Assistant Attorney General in arriving at the guidelines as well as the WACs. The memo cited several meetings which had taken place:

- 4/16/86 - General meeting, Lacey - representatives of Washington State Horsemen, Backcountry Horsemen, ORV organizations, Department of Natural Resources, Audubon, Alpine Lakes Protection Society, Mountaineers, and Washington Trails Association.
- 6/19/86 - Assistant Attorney General, Jeff Lane - meeting with Bob Wilder, and off-road vehicle staff.
- 7/25/86 - IAC meeting - Wenatchee, Washington.
- 8/14/86 - Communications with all NOVA Advisory Committee and interested agencies (Mountaineers, ORV organizations, Auduon, Horsemen, Forest Service, DNR, Parks, Game, Issaquah Alps, Trails Association). Soliciting comments on first draft.
- 10/9/86 - NOVA Advisory Committee meeting; draft WACs and second draft of guidelines presented/discussed.

Alternate #2 Eligibility Guidelines was then distributed to the Committee and the attendees. These were specifically for Recreation Nonhighway Road Projects. Dr. Scull presented the guidelines (Alternate #2). Ms. Cox asked what changes had been made in Alternate #2 from Alternate #1. Mr. Wilder cited these and stated the guidelines were to be considered a recommendation to the Committee from the

staff as a statement of policy for the administration of the program. Background information was given to Mr. Jones who had asked concerning the conflicts and the specific areas of same. Mr. Tveten was informed that Item #1 (projects must support recreational motor vehicle use facilities accessed by a nonhighway road) and the classifications shown must be met prior to meeting Items #2 through #5.

Michael Sacha, President, Northwest Motorcycle Association, stated the Committee could save a lot of time if it would allow the "two camps" which are at "loggerheads" to meet and go over Alternate #2. The chair stated there would be time allowed for audience input and referred to the Participation Card Registration System, asking that those who had not filled out a card but who desired to speak to the Committee complete a card and bring it to her station. Mr. Pinnix suggested suspending the guidelines discussion and have the staff present the projects before the committee for funding returning to the guidelines discussion later. Mr. Ryan agreed. Mr. Wayland felt those in the audience wanted to discuss the guidelines first prior to project presentations so that they would have an understanding of the application of the guidelines and the reasons for each one. Mr. Wilder assured the Committee of staff's willingness to relieve conflicts, to fund trails but only under the categories indicated. He noted that item #3 was left "open" in regard to examples using the wording "but are not limited to", so that the Committee would have leeway. He assured Ms. Lorenz nothing had been deleted from Alternate #1; Alternate #2 had, instead, been expanded to allow compromise.

Mr. Wayland referred to Item #4 which did not include "maintenance". Mr. Wilder explained the item outlined how the 20% would be used -- that is, for nonhighway road projects. Maintenance is being funded in the other off-road vehicle category program percentage - not the nonhighway road's 20%. Mr. Wayland said he was sensitive to the maintenance issue, knowing of the problems inherent in building and maintaining trails and facilities. Ms. Lorenz agreed maintenance was a problem but since those funds were being provided for elsewhere in the ORV program, it was not necessary to use monies from this particular funding program. Comments were made concerning the Forest Service and its maintenance program for its trails.

Paul Wiseman, Trustee, The Mountaineers, questioned Item #1 "trailheads/trails". Mr. Wilder explained the need to provide trailheads.

At this point Louise Marshall informed the chair there were people present who needed to testify whose schedules would not allow them to remain through project presentations if the Committee opted to review them first. The chair ruled there would be audience input following a ten minute recess. (10:50 a.m.)

The Committee reconvened at 11:00 a.m. The Chair asked that each participant limit his/her remarks to three minutes. Questions from the Committee might prolong a discussion. With this understanding, she called upon Mr. Arthur Sandboe.

Mr. Arthur Sandboe, Citizen, Hiker:

(1) Speaking as an individual, noted he had helped support HB #1382, believing it would allocate funds for use in developing and maintaining hiker trails.

(2) Hikers use four-wheel drive vehicles on nonhighway roads to get to hiking areas.

(3) Concerned that guidelines state before a trail can be considered there has to be a conflict with other uses, mainly ORV. Suggested that guidelines be revised to protect hiker trails.

Michael Sacha, President, Northwest Motorcycle Association:

- (1) Difficult for him to make a statement since Alternate #2 had been presented and his remarks had been based on the first guideline written by the IAC.
- (2) Felt IAC was attempting to force the groups to compromise.
- (3) Unfortunate that this was not included in the legislation; commented on efforts prior to passage of HB 1382.
- (4) Felt Director Wilder's presence at the legislative meetings had assisted everyone, and was in support of the funds for use to benefit the nonhighway recreation user.

Mr. Pinnix asked if Mr. Sacha had any suggestions concerning Alternate #2. Mr. Sacha replied hikers and other forest trail users are going to have to get together on issues, and he felt this was a good thing. Noted he was a member of the NOVA Advisory Committee as an alternate. Stated the groups could work together and he would strive toward that end. In response to Ms. Lorenz' questions, Mr. Sacha stated he felt the IAC's guidelines were appropriate. Ms. Lorenz felt the guidelines were a beginning; that the IAC must start somewhere with this type of program.

Louise Marshall, President, Washington Trails Association: Ms. Marshall distributed pages from the current IAC Off-Road Participation Manual relating to "Eligibility Guidelines": 02.04.000; 03.04.000; 04.02.000; 04.03.111- 04.04.000; 05.02.010; 05.03.000; 05.04.000, 05.05.000 and 06.03.000.

(1) Reminded the Committee that HB 1382 was based on the Governor's Commission for Outdoor Recreation's recommendations and a statement in their report stating that one percent of the state gas tax solely for off-road vehicle programs should be broadened so that it could serve more general recreation.

(2) There was no way to promote a new tax for hiker trails; felt the new guidelines should protect hiker trails.

(3) Eligibility guidelines (ORV) of the IAC: Trails guidelines should in some way be comparable to the existing ORV guidelines - include trails and include maintenance. These guidelines do not refer to "conflict resolution". This probably should be added, and new guidelines created. Asked that the words "and facilitating cooperation" be added.

(4) Had no difficulty with the categories of projects as in Alternate #2.

(5) Item #5 of Alternate #2 - \$150,000 limit is not in the present guidelines and should be added.

(6) Contention was that the guidelines ought to follow the original ORV guidelines and the entire citizenry of the state be benefited as recommended by the Governor's Recreation Resources Advisory Committee.

Ms. Cox asked for clarification. Did Ms. Marshall suggest that the Committee change the existing guidelines to conform to the new nonhighway off-road vehicle program as well as the off-road vehicle program and not adopt Alternate #2? Ms. Marshall agreed this was her suggestion. She felt Alternate #2 alluded to trails through conflicts and this was not what the Governor's Committee had in mind. What is needed is more funding for broader recreational use, and user conflict was not the reason HB 1382 had been amended.

Mr. Pinnix appreciated Ms. Marshall's comments, but felt the Committee was now in a position where it was necessary to give the NOVA program specific categories so that the project selection could be instigated. He felt the guidelines addressed that subject and were needed. He asked Ms. Marshall if she had any specific comments as to Alternate #2. Ms. Marshall replied she would not delete the "intent"; would add "conflict resolution"; Item #1 is too narrow "projects must support recreational motor vehicle use facilities, etc." - there are only four categories; "userconflict" belongs in existing 02.04.000, but it is too narrow to state only a trail with user conflict will be considered; maintenance and operation are not in the guideline and NOVA will recommend how the money should be allocated regardless; and lastly, do not approve of Alternate #2 as it is too narrow.

Mr. Jones asked for specific changes to Item #1 Ms. Marshall would recommend. She stated it should be comparable with the existing manual 02.04.000 which states "grants may be made for acquisition, planning, development, and maintenance management..." and should state "but not limited to" and include the categories. Both Mr. Jones and Ms. Lorenz pointed out that Item #3 of Alternate #2 provided for this. Ms. Marshall said to be more specific "corrals" should be added, "rest areas", "vista points", etc.

Mary Fries, Citizen, Tacoma:

- (1) Glad that category "trails" had been added in Item #1.
- (2) Hiked various areas in the state for forty years.
- (3) Concerned about second to last paragraph concerning conflict resolution.
- (4) Noted large scale ORV projects in forest areas Committee will be considering for funding.
- (5) Gave example of forest trail built for ORV's which had encroached upon a wild flower area; certain fragile specie was in danger in that area; found only in the Rockies and in Alaska.
- (6) Felt wilderness areas were very important to citizens and hikers, those who use the forests; there is a feeling that some of these areas should be wilderness areas and not used by ORVs.
- (7) Guidelines need to be rewritten to give less restriction to money used for foot trails.

Ms. Micki Wressell, Pacific NW Four-Wheel Drive Association, Membership Officer and Sensitive Area Land Specialist:

- (1) Recommended that Alternative #2 be accepted.
- (2) Wanted to see the guideline used on case-by-case basis and also used to resolve conflicts.
- (3) Recognizes there is conflict, but there are 30,000 miles in the state designated for foot traffic, and only 2,000 miles for ORVs.

Mr. George Doucett, Citizen of Graham, Washington:

- (1) Supported the Alternative #2 on case-by-case basis.
- (2) Only to be used as guidelines - should be able to work out other guidelines as program proceeds. Work out plans together.

Mr. Robert Urdal, Alpine Lakes Protection Society, Trustee:

- (1) Felt 20% for this program should not be used for user conflict. Statute indicates there should be nonhighway off-road vehicle recreational projects, facilities for hikers.

(2) Agreed with Mike Sacha that IAC is attempting to use the guidelines as a means to reduce conflicts.

(3) Agreed with Mike Sacha that non-ORV people do drive nonhighway roads to get to trail destinations and they deserve assistance from the gas tax monies as well as ORV people. Is not fair to restrict those people from the program.

(4) Would broaden Item #1 to include such things as horse corrals, horse camps, and some of the items as listed in Item #3 of Alternate #2.

(5) Would remove paragraph #2 concerning user conflicts

(6) Agreed with Director Wayland that Item #4 was not reasonable since it did not include "maintenance". Should be able to maintain those trails that are built.

(7) Would change the guidelines to broaden the scope of use.

Ms. Marilyn Carter, Tennessee Walking Horse Trail Riders Representative:

(1) Felt guidelines were too restrictive.

(2) Equestrians use money to get to the trails and thus should have something more comparable to the ORV guidelines.

Mr. Fritz Lorenzen, Vice President, Washington State Horsemen:

(1) Felt Alternate #2 guidelines were too restrictive and needed broadening as suggested by others.

(2) Bob Ordal presented a fair estimation of the problems.

Mr. Paul Wiseman, Trustee, The Mountaineers:

Agreed with Bob Ordal and Louise Marshall's comments.

Mr. Phil Glass, Recreational Staff Member, Forest Service, Wenatchee National Forest:

(1) Felt basically the Committee had the responsibility to issue the guidelines.

(2) Sponsors should be able to maintain trails throughout the year, not the IAC, using this particular 20% of the program.

(3) Forest Service budgets for maintenance; keeps them up to acceptable standards if at all possible.

(4) Comfortable with Alternative #2 as written. Appreciated the statement "but not limited to" which gave leeway for consideration of projects.

(5) Louise Marshall brought up matters which could be taken up at a later time by the staff and the committee.

Mr. Norman Winn, The Mountaineers: Mr. Winn was not present but had asked that Louise Marshall address the Committee for him.

Louise read a letter from Mr. Winn dated November 3, 1986, in which he requested that the guidelines be broadened for trails.

Mr. Ira Spring, Citizen, Edmonds, Washington:

(1) Noted he was speaking for himself. Felt the guidelines were too restrictive, although there are some good points.

(2) Understood the new program would include recreational outlets for hikers, fishermen, horsemen - did not see that spelled out in the guidelines.

(3) All users should be included. All benefit from the picnic areas, campgrounds, etc.

(4) Second to last paragraph regarding "conflict resolution" bothered him.

(5) Discussed cost-benefit ratio and if applied this to guidelines would be variance concerning ORVs and hikers. "Cost-benefit ratio" should be removed from the guidelines.

Public testimony and remarks concluded at 11:50 a.m.

Ms. Lorenz thanked all those who had come many miles to testify. As an individual member of the Committee she expressed her appreciation for the time and effort they had spent in coming to the meeting and addressing the Committee.

Committee discussion followed. Mr. Tveten stated he did not want to appear insensitive to the legislative process and that the Committee should look at the guidelines with respect to the wording of the final bill. He read the following:

Sec. 8, 1 (d) (iii)... "Not more than twenty percent may be expended for RCW 46.09.170 nonhighway road recreation facilities.

He emphasized the word "may". Because this term is broad, it is up to the Inter-agency Committee to decide how it can form guidelines to administer the program. Secondly, he pointed out only 20% of the IAC's 54.5% of 1% share is being discussed. Mr. Jones, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tveten, and Mr. Wilder then discussed the various programs included in RCW 46.09, noting that certain percentages of the funds were to be given to education, information and law enforcement programs, ORV recreational facilities, planning, etc. Mr. Tveten suggested striking from Item #4, "such as education or enforcement" because it is not possible within the funding being discussed to go into those kinds of projects.

Dr. Scull suggested deleting in Item #5 the wording "under special circumstances". Ms. Lorenz agreed and added that the entire sentence following that should also be deleted. She then suggested transferring Item #3 into Item #1 as part of the intent. Ms. Carol Jensen, NOVA member, asked for clarification and was informed Alternate #2 would become a guideline for staff to follow in reviewing projects. Mr. Ryan corroborated her statement adding that the staff would not be locked in to the categories there being the wording "but are not limited to". Ms. Jensen said if it was policy for staff to follow it ought to state that in the heading or title. Ms. Lorenz suggested dropping in the opening paragraph "intent" the following words, "in the most direct way feasible" and substituting "and encourage cooperation among recreationists".

Mr. Tveten suggested that Ms. Lorenz's suggestion to transfer Item #3 into Item #1 was a good one and should be accepted, but that Item #1 should be changed to delete "support recreational motor vehicle use facilities, accessed by a non-highway road"...and delete "which can be classified as" adding "and can be classified as", then add "foot trails and horse camps" to the major classifications.

Mr. Wayland asked that "maintenance" be added to Item #4; Mr. Tveten agreed and suggested deleting the major portion of the following sentence.

In response to Mr. Pinnix's questions, Ms. Jensen stated the intent of the law from her perspective as an Assistant Attorney General. She read a portion of the opinion rendered by Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, July 24, 1986,

"Nonhighway Road" means any road owned or managed by a public agency, or any private road, for which the owner has granted a permanent

easement for the public use of the road, other than a highway, generally capable of travel by a conventional two-wheel drive passenger automobile during most of the year and in use by such vehicles and that is not built or maintained with appropriations from the motor vehicle fund."

She read portions from the summary opinion. This satisfied Mr. Pinnix and Mr. Tveten who had been questioning the definition of a nonhighway road. Mr. Wayland felt that those getting to the nonhighway road were also users; once they arrive at the nonhighway site they are users of the special funds.

Ms. Ruth Ittner, citizen, then gave the Committee some trail statistics which she thought might be helpful. She said that two-thirds of the roads in the state were considered nonhighway roads. Mr. Ryan noted the general consensus of the Committee to favor the suggestions of Mr. Tveten as a modification to Item #2. He suggested this be rewritten by the staff during lunch and the new version with all suggestions returned to the Committee when it reconvened.

The Committee recessed at 12:30, and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Alternate #3 with all suggested revisions and a combined draft without the revisions were distributed to the Committee members, staff, and all attendees. Mr. Pinnix suggested the Committee review Alternate #3 paragraph-by-paragraph. Dr. Scull was asked to read each paragraph.

Alternate #3 - Intent - No comments were received.

Project Eligibility - 1. - Mr. Pinnix suggested deleting "or by a public highway". There followed discussion by Mr. Tveten, Mr. Pinnix, and Dr. Scull concerning state parks and other facilities, whether access to them could be considered a nonhighway road. Ms. Jensen re-read the Assistant Attorney General Opinion. Mr. Tveten agreed that "or by a public highway" should be stricken. Mr. Pinnix explained to Mr. Wayland why it was being deleted: The definition of the Attorney General states that a nonhighway road facility must somehow be associated with a nonhighway road. An earlier A.G. opinion directed that many of these projects need to have as a common element that they are related to a nonhighway road. Therefore, it is necessary to strike "or by a public highway".
Mr. Ryan asked that a consensus be reached at the end of each Item discussion.

Mr. Pinnix asked that the category "Foot trails" be changed to simply "trails". Mr. Scull agreed, likewise Mr. Jones and Ms. Lorenz. Both Mr. Sacha and Mr. Spring acknowledged this change. At this point, input from the audience suggested both foot trails and horse trails be in the categories. The consensus of the Committee was to delete "or by a public highway", and the word "foot" before "trails".

Project Eligibility 2. - Ms. Jensen suggested that the words "It is desirable that" begin this sentence instead of "Where possible". "Where possible" would indicate that it will always be a major priority and is more of a mandate than a policy. User conflicts and use of this wording was then discussed. Mr. Spring recommended that Item #2 be left out entirely. He felt that it was the responsibility of the ORV fund as well as this particular funding program to resolve conflicts and it was unfair to

make this stipulation. At this point Mr. Wilder noted these were guidelines which the Committee could adopt and have the power to change at any time it saw fit.

Mr. David C. Veley, Yakima County, asked if a project did not show user conflict would it still be considered as eligible? He was assured it would be.

Mr. Joseph Higgins, Forest Service, Portland: Desired to have "where possible" deleted also.

Mr. Ordal felt if the nonhighway road projects are singled out based on user conflicts, then the same ought to hold true for the off-road vehicle projects. Both should have the same guidelines. He suggested deleting Item #2 and establishing another guideline more appropriate to cover both the 20% funding program and the 60 percent projects funding.

Ms. Marshall suggested using the words "conflict resolution is an acceptable use of these monies" and not refer to it in the same sense as in Item #2.

Mr. Tveten pointed out that the guidelines as proposed are not meant for the Committee to resolve conflicts. They will be guidelines for staff to look at various projects to bring to the Committee. It is indicative of the fact that staff and the Committee will work together through the guidelines to bring good projects into being.

It was the consensus that the wording "Where possible" be changed to "It is desirable that" and that the "resolve user conflicts" be left in Item #2.

Project Eligibility, Item #3: There was discussion on Item 3 involving wording stating education or enforcement projects are not eligible. Mr. Jones opted to change the wording to "funding is provided for elsewhere".

Mr. Pinnix suggested the deletion of the word "maintenance". Following discussion it was the consensus to delete the word "maintenance" from Item #3, though Mr. Wayland did not feel comfortable with this decision and explained his reasons.

It was the consensus that "funding is provided for elsewhere" be inserted, and that the word "maintenance" be dropped.

Mr. Charles Leach, Eastern Washington Dirt Riders' Association, was assured that education and enforcement projects are taken care of from another percentage of the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Funding Program. He pointed out that people have difficulty finding locations for riding and felt that some of this money could be used for mapping and flyer information. Mr. Dovel replied there was a wealth of such information now available to people seeking the type of recreation outlets used for dirt bike riding.

Mr. Len Gardner, Washington Native Plant Society and State Conservation Co-Chairman, said he was hearing a "double standard" with respect to ORV and nonhighway facilities, and he felt maintenance should apply to both. Mr. Pinnix reiterated that the funds being discussed were from a different percentage of the overall funding program and that had to be kept in mind. Mr. Lovelady stated though maintenance would be eligible the funds were so

limited it was felt maintenance could be provided from other sources. The Forest Service has indicated that it will provide necessary maintenance and operation. However, maintenance is a low priority due to limited funds. Mr. Dovel mentioned the various kinds of Forest Service projects not actually maintenance, but which provided clearance of trails: hardening of trails projects, log-out as emergency situations, etc. Mr. Wilder noted that the Forest Service some time ago had stated it would not be asking for actual maintenance of trails, that it would provide this service if the funding program could take care of other elements in the trails program.

Louise Marshall stated the RCW does specifically state "development, planning, maintenance, etc." and the IAC should not attempt to change the law in the guidelines. Again, Mr. Lovelady stated the IAC was not attempting to eliminate this type of project, but was attempting to set up a program through the guidelines which would cover the most needed trails and give the IAC staff direction in bringing projects to the Committee for its approval. Ms. Jensen suggested the wording "Preferred projects will fall into one of these categories". Mr. Pinnix preferred the word "must" as presently in the guideline. Ms. Jensen felt the guideline did talk about "maintenance" and thought it should remain because it is so stated in the law and in the ORV guidelines. Mr. Wayland agreed.

At this point Mr. Jim Webster suggested including the wording "or more", so that the statement would then read "projects must fall into one or more of the following categories". A gentlemen from the audience stated leaving out the word "maintenance" would be ignoring the legal interpretation. Ms. Jensen then stated she was not giving an official legal interpretation, that she considered the guidelines a draft being reviewed by the Committee and she was recommending certain changes to that draft for the Committee's consideration. Mr. Webster stressed the fact that the RCWs are considered enabling legislation and that the director and staff of an agency must then set up guidelines to follow the legislation, but they do not necessarily have to accomplish everything in the RCW. The guidelines allow the agency to administer the programs which the enabling legislation intended, as long as the agency follows the intent of the legislation.

Ms. Lorenz then read Item #3: "Projects must fall into one or more of the following categories: site plans, development, renovation, and/or land acquisition. Education or enforcement project funding is provided for elsewhere." It was the consensus that this was correct and should stand approved.

Project Eligibility, Item #4: This would limit project grants to \$150,000 annually. Mr. Ira Spring stated he did not like to see this "set in concrete". Again, Mr. Lovelady noted these were merely guidelines for the staff to follow and that \$150,000 or less projects will be given special priority points. The guideline does not specifically say that the staff cannot consider a higher amount. Mr. Wilder noted that as a part of its traditional funding program criteria the IAC did accept \$150,000 as a recommended limit so that funding would be able to accomplish several projects.

It was the consensus that Item #4 stand approved.

Project Eligibility, Item #5: Dr. Scull read Item #5. Ms. Cox asked why this Item had to be in the guidelines; could it not be deleted? Mr. Jones felt it added to the entire perspective of the guidelines and it also added to the Intent paragraph. It was pointed out that user conflict

was already taken care of in Item #2 and that Item #5 was superfluous and could be struck. Mr. Sacha noted that SHB 1382 specifically states that monies will be provided for nonhighway road facilities and he felt this did not mean trails. If the paragraph were struck, this would mean that funds could be spent on whatever staff felt it should be spent on for the hiking community. He felt staff would be changing the intent of SHB 1382 -- that hiker trails be recognized but that these be funded from its own source of funds rather than the funding for ORV facilities. Dr. Scull asked that the paragraph be deleted; it was the consensus the paragraph be deleted in its entirety.

The last paragraph of the proposed guidelines was accepted as revised in Alternate #3.

Ms. Lorenz then read the proposed guidelines as revised by the Committee (Alternate #4).

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, UNDER CHAPTER 206 LAWS OF 1986 (RCW 46.09.170 (d) (iii), RECEIVES 54.5 PERCENT OF THE ONE PERCENT MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX REVENUES; AND

WHEREAS, IN THAT CHAPTER THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION IS DIRECTED TO ADMINISTER THE ALLOCATION OF NOT MORE THAN TWENTY PERCENT (20%) OF THESE MONIES FOR NONHIGHWAY ROAD RECREATION FACILITIES; AND

WHEREAS, THE IAC IS ALSO DIRECTED TO ADOPT RULES GOVERNING APPLICATION FOR FUNDS IT ADMINISTERS UNDER THIS CHAPTER;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE 'RECREATIONAL HIGHWAY ROAD PROJECT POLICY ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES' (APPENDIX D TO THESE MINUTES) ARE HEREBY ADOPTED.

Discussion followed. Mr. Pinnix supported the guidelines but felt it should not be their purpose to only provide trails. There are other facilities which can be provided not just back country trails. As an example he noted a nonhighway road might have a campground developed which would be of recreational benefit to many people using that road system not hikers only. Ms. Cox concurred with this example and suggested that staff look into a broader context. Mr. Tveten stated it was already taken care of in Item #1, and staff would have this leeway.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 2:55 and reconvened at 3:05 p.m.

IV. D. OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS: Mr. Gregory Lovelady, NOVA Coordinator, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 6, 1986, "1986 Off-Road Vehicle Project Considerations", reporting as follows:

- (1) Forty-six (46) nonhighway and off-road vehicle project applications were received for consideration. One was withdrawn; three were withheld pending resolution of the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Project Eligibility Guidelines and would be presented at the March, 1987 IAC Meeting. Forty-two (42) projects remained for Interagency Committee consideration. (SEE PAGES 38-A, B, C, D, & E - Special Conditions re Game Dept. Assessment)

IAC STAFF

1986 ORV PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	Staff Recommenda.	IAC Staff Notes
				A maximum of \$40,000 per FTE (Full-Time Equivalent), and two FTEs per agency are recommended.
<u>EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS</u>				
86-20e Chelan Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 8	\$ 83,806	\$ 80,000	2 FTEs min.
21e Douglas Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 8	27,175	- .00	too little ORV activity
22e Dept. of Game	ORV Ed/Enf 1	50,000	- .00	not a valid ORV project
23e Grant Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 4	97,299	80,000	2 FTEs min.
24e Kittitas Co Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 9	134,041	80,000	2 FTEs min.
25e Mason Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 2	79,075	40,000	1 FTE min.
26e Pierce Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 2	125,919	40,000	1 FTE min.
27e Pierce Co. Sheriff	Co. Fair Display	43,865	40,000	
28e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 2	56,917	50,000	1.25 FTE min.
29e Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 8	6,000	6,000	
30e Thurston Co. Sherf	ORV Ed/Enf 1	88,961	- .00	DNR & Thurs Co provide adequate E&E service
31e Richland, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 5	79,116	38,593	1 FTE min.
32e Shelton, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 1	45,843	- .00	too little ORV activity
33e Yakima Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 9	104,080	80,000	2 FTE min.
		Subtotal = \$1,022,096	\$534,593	
<u>PLANNING PROJECTS</u>				
86- 1p USFS MtBkr-Snoq.	Tinkham Trials	\$ 7,557	\$ 7,557	
3p USFS Wenat. S.O.	Trl Hardening Test	24,906	24,906	
6p USFS Wenat. S.O.	Trail Supervisor	11,798	11,798	
7p USFS Wenat. Lvwth	Negro/Shaser Surv.	24,386	- .00**	appeal process is incomplete
8p USFS Wenat. Entiat	Shetipo, Lost, Billy	8,880	8,880	
11p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Manastash 4x4 Surv	5,887	5,887	
13p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Kaner Campgd. Surv	6,600	6,600	user fee strongly discouraged
14p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Quartz - Cliff D.	3,086	3,086	
15p USFS Wenat. S.O.	Manastash Study	64,400	64,400	
17p USFS G. Pinchot SD	Blue Lk Area Plan	17,898	17,898	
19p Game Dept.	Game Asent Process	44,286	44,286	see attached page 3 for conditions
40p Yakima Co. Parks	Ahtanum Area Surv	6,644	6,644	
41p Walla Walla, City	ORV Feasibility	21,680	21,680	any resultant proposal should not be costly to implement
46p Tacoma Metro Parks	Area Site Search	12,000	12,000	
		Subtotal = \$260,008	\$235,622	

** Recommendation differs from the NOVA Advisory Committee's counsel.

IAC STAFF

1986 ORV PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

(Continued)

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	Staff Recommend.	IAC Staff Notes
<u>CAPITAL PROJECTS</u>				
86- 2d USFS Wenat. CleElum	Icewater Capgd	\$107,023	\$ -	fund in '87 w/ NHR projects; 95% ORV, 5% NHR
5d USFS Wenat. S.O.	Goose Ck Capgd	291,698	-	fund in '87 w/ NHR projects; 60% ORV, 40% NHR
9d USFS Wenat. Entiat	Blue Ck Trl Redev	53,907	53,907	
10d USFS Wenat. Entiat	Mad Riv Trl Redev	63,612	63,612	
12d USFS Wenat. Naches	Crow to Quartz	6,723	6,723	
18d USFS Colville, Col	L'il Pend Oreille	44,229	44,229	
34d Adams Co. P&R Dist	ORV Use Area Dev.	18,377	5,000	apply \$5k to start-up costs; a joint proposal w/ 86-45a
35d Richland, City of	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph.6	99,902	48,850	** apply to top priorities
36d Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph.7	49,500	45,500	** delete trailer to be provided by Yakima Co.
37d Spokane Co. Parks	Airway Hts Dev Ph 1	353,000	353,000	
	Subtotal =	\$1,087,971	\$620,821	
<u>MANAGEMENT PROJECTS</u>				
86- 4a USFS Wenat. S.O.	Forestwide log-out	\$ 4,045	\$ 4,045	
38a Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Pk. M&O '87-88	318,570	300,000	** 2 yr grant; recom'd amt is \$4k more than 2x 1986 grant
39a Adams Co. P&R Dist	ORV Use Area M&O	28,191	-	see 86-34d, (\$5,000), above
	Subtotal =	\$350,806	\$304,045	
<u>LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT</u>				
86-49a Adams Co. R&R Dist	ORV Use Area Acq	\$ 11,137	\$ 10,125	recommended amt equals appraised value; this is a "seed" grant recommendation; for voting purposes, combine w/ 86-34d
	Subtotal =	\$ 11,137	\$ 10,125	
<u>TOTAL ALL REQUESTS</u>		<u>\$2,732,018</u>	<u>\$1,705,201</u>	

** Recommendation differs from the NOVA Advisory Committee's counsel.

TOTAL E&E REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS \$1,022,096 \$ 534,593 (\$562,000 estimated to be available)

TOTAL ORV REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS \$1,709,922 \$1,170,612 (\$1,500,000 estimated to be available)

Nonhighway Road requests will be considered after WACs and guidelines have been adopted. This will probably occur in 1987. An estimated \$500,000 of 1986 nonhighway deposits will be held in reserve for this purpose.

NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1986 ORV PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	NOVA Recommend.	NOVA Advisory Committee Notes
<u>EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS</u>				A maximum of \$40,000 per FTE (Full-Time Equivalent), and two FTEs per agency are recommended.
86-20e Chelan Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf B	\$ 83,806	\$ 80,000	2 FTEs min.
21e Douglas Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf B	27,175	- .00	too little ORV activity occurs in this county
22e Dept. of Game	ORV Ed/Enf 1	50,000	- .00	not a valid ORV project; emphasis is on roads
23e Grant Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 4	97,299	80,000	2 FTEs min.
24e Kittitas Co Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 9	134,041	80,000	2 FTEs min.
25e Mason Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 2	79,075	40,000	1 FTE min.
26e Pierce Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 2	125,919	40,000	1 FTE min.
27e Pierce Co. Sheriff	Co. Fair Display	43,865	40,000	
28e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 2	56,917	50,000	1.25 FTE min.
29e Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 8	6,000	6,000	
30e Thurston Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 1	88,961	- .00	currently DNR & Thrus. Co. provide adequate E&E services
31e Richland, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 5	79,116	38,593	1 FTE min.
32e Shelton, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 1	45,843	- .00	cost-benefit is questionable
33e Yakima Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 9	104,080	80,000	2 FTE min.
	Subtotal =	\$1,022,096	\$534,593	
<u>PLANNING PROJECTS</u>				
86-1p USFS MtBkr-Snoq.	Tinkham Trials	\$ 7,557	\$ 7,557	
3p USFS Wenat. S.D.	Trl Hardening Test	24,906	24,906	
6p USFS Wenat. S.D.	Trail Supervisor	11,798	11,798	
7p USFS Wenat. Lvnwth	Negro/Shaser Surv.	24,386	24,386	
8p USFS Wenat. Entiat	Shetipo, Lost, Billy	8,880	8,880	
11p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Manastash 4x4 Surv	5,887	5,887	
13p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Kaner Campgd. Surv	6,600	6,600	future user fee strongly discouraged
14p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Quartz - Cliff D.	3,086	3,086	
15p USFS Wenat. S.D.	Manastash Study	64,400	64,400	
17p USFS G. Pinchot SO	Blue Lk Area Plan	17,898	17,898	
19p Game Dept.	Game Asmnt Process	44,286	44,286	see note, below, for conditions
40p Yakima Co. Parks	Ahtanum Area Surv	6,644	6,644	
41p Walla Walla, City	ORV Feasibility	21,680	21,680	any resultant proposal should not be costly to implement
46p Tacoma Metro Parks	Area Site Search	12,000	12,000	
	Subtotal =	\$260,008	\$260,008	

Note: ORV 86-19p is recommended for approval by the NOVA Advisory Committee contingent on the establishment of a steering committee by the project sponsor. This steering committee should be composed of representatives of organized recreational groups and be charged with guiding the progress of this proposal.

NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1986 PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

(Continued)

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	NOVA Recommendat.	NOVA Advisory Committee Notes
<u>CAPITAL PROJECTS</u>				
86- 2d USFS Wenat. CleElum	Icewater Capgd	\$107,023	\$ -00	fund in '87 w/ NHR projects; 95% ORV, 5% NHR
5d USFS Wenat. S.O.	Goose Ck Capgd	291,698	-00	fund in '87 w/ NHR projects; 60% ORV, 40% NHR
9d USFS Wenat. Entiat	Blue Ck Trl Redev	53,907	53,907	
10d USFS Wenat. Entiat	Mad Riv Trl Redev	63,612	63,612	ORV reps request 46,09,110 funds be applied here
12d USFS Wenat. Naches	Crow to Quartz	6,723	6,723	
18d USFS Colville, Col	L'il Pend Oreille	44,229	44,229	
34d Adams Co. P&R Dist	ORV Use Area Dev.	18,377	5,000	apply \$5k to start-up costs; see 86-45a, below
35d Richland, City of	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph.6	99,902	50,000	apply to top priorities
36d Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph.7	49,500	49,500	
37d Spokane Co. Parks	Airwy Hts Dev Ph 1	353,000	353,000	
	Subtotal =	\$1,087,971	\$625,971	
<u>MANAGEMENT PROJECTS</u>				
86- 4a USFS Wenat. S.O.	Forestwide log-out	\$ 4,045	\$ 4,045	
38a Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Pk. M&O '87-88	318,570	296,000	2 yr grant; recommended amt is 2x 1986 grant
39a Adams Co. P&R Dist	ORV Use Area M&O	28,191	-00	see 86-34d, (\$5,000), above
	Subtotal =	\$350,806	\$300,045	
<u>LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT</u>				
86-49a Adams Co. R&R Dist	ORV Use Area Acq	\$ 11,137	\$ 10,125	recommended amt equals appraised value
	Subtotal =	\$ 11,137	\$ 10,125	
<u>TOTAL ALL REQUESTS</u>		<u>\$2,732,018</u>	<u>\$1,730,737</u>	
<u>TOTAL E&E REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>		<u>\$1,022,096</u>	<u>\$ 534,593</u>	(\$562,000 estimated to be available)
<u>TOTAL ORV REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>		<u>\$1,709,922</u>	<u>\$1,196,149</u>	(\$1,500,000 estimated to be available)

Nonhighway Road requests will be considered after WACs and guidelines have been adopted. This will probably occur in 1987. An estimated \$500,000 of 1986 nonhighway deposits will be held in reserve for this purpose.

Project 86-19p, Game Assessment Process.

Staff recommends that the approval of Project 86-19p, the Game Assessment Process, be based on three conditions:

1) That no change to current assessment activities will occur until the results of 86-19p have been evaluated. Current assessment activities consist of -

- a. A Department of Game review and recommendation on all NOVA projects prior to IAC staff acceptance of those projects;
- b. Utilization of the joint Game Department-Forest Service eight step "Process to Request Funding From IAC" (7/26/85);
- c. Execution of an agreement between the project sponsor, the IAC and the Department of Game regarding specific wildlife assessment and impact reduction measures;
- d. Reasonable funding for each assessment to allow specific project proposals to be completely evaluated by the Department of Game as part of the approved contract;
- e. An interdisciplinary review (soil scientist, wildlife biologist, etc.) of each project prior to submission to the IAC;
- f. Adherence to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or State Environmental Policy Act;
- g. Public hearings conducted as required by law;
- h. Use of the "Washington Intergovernmental Review Process Weekly Log" to report statewide on each proposal;
- i. Review and evaluation of each project by the NOVA (Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities) Advisory Committee;
- j. Reasonable efforts by project sponsors to inform interested parties of the details of individual project proposals.

2. That 86-19p will not proceed until the IAC's director has approved a work program. The work program will be prepared, by the Department of Game, with sufficient detail to allow determination of how the requested \$44,286 will be spent. It will include a matrix timeline with detailed and measurable objectives.

3. That the Department of Game will form an advisory committee, including representatives of key recreational groups, to assist in all aspects of this project.

- (2) \$2.5 million were available for allocation (\$500,000 has been set aside for future nonhighway road recreation projects).
- (3) All projects were technically reviewed and evaluated by the IAC's Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Advisory Committee (NOVA).
- (4) Attachments included listing of projects by order of presentation by staff -- and resumes for each project.
- (5) Packet of letters in reference to ORV Projects - APPENDIX E.

Mr. Roger Dovel gave a short slide presentation of various ORV facilities in the state. Slides were then shown of the various projects. Comments from the Committee during the presentation referred to the following projects:

Kittitas County Sheriff Dept., Kittitas County ORV Education & Enforcement, #86-24E: In response to Mr. Wayland, staff stated this was a continuing funding program for the past 8 years and the department was asking for an increase of one deputy (total of 3).

Pierce County Sheriff Dept., Education & Enforcement, 86-26E: At this point, Mr. Lovelady explained that majority of the Sheriff Department projects were ongoing. "ORV Grants to Date" were indicated in that box on the resume' with total value of the projects funded previously.

Pierce County Sheriff Department, Puyallup Fair ORV/E&E Display, 86-27E: Staff explained this project involved a \$43,865 request from the County to set up and man a booth at the Fair and provide information to the public, users and nonusers alike, about ORV recreation. Printing costs were included.

Ms. Cox suggested the Committee take action on the E&E projects immediately if this was agreeable with the members. Because of snow on the pass, law officers were anxious to return to their counties. It was the Interagency Committee's consensus this be accommodated. IAC staff 1986 ORV Project Recommendations had been distributed to the Committee members and the attendees: Yellow sheets indicated IAC staff recommendations; Green sheets, that of the NOVA Advisory Committee. Mr. Lovelady referred to the E&E projects stating that staff and the NOVA Advisory Committee were in agreement on the funding for these projects, totaling \$534,593. He further explained the reasoning behind the funding of \$40,000 per FTE. Where there were two deputies, \$80,000 had been recommended for funding. This "ceiling" had been approved previously by the Interagency Committee. Mr. Dovel pointed out that \$558,630 had been allocated last year; \$534,593 was being recommended for 1986 in the overall E&E program. A certain amount has been retained to meet any emergencies in this program.

Ms. Lorenz asked how the staff monitored the E&E projects to ensure that the Sheriff Departments were meeting their obligations. Mr. Dovel stated there were requirements for reports and that staff also visited the sponsors from time-to-time throughout the year. Monthly logs are turned in to the IAC for monitoring. Ms. Lorenz asked if the deputies were easily identified as ORV deputies and was assured that each sheriff department had a means of identification of those officers used for ORV E&E purposes. In response to Mr. Pinnix, Mr. Dovel stated the present recommended funding program was an increase of \$100,000 from six years ago.

Ms. Cox asked about the Puyallup Fair project (86-27E), Pierce County, and was informed the fair would run approximately 21 days, averaging 9 to 11 hours in

the booth, which requires that the booth be staffed at all times. Pierce County is requesting the assistance of other deputies in other counties. The activities in the booth were explained, and the fact brought out that printing costs were the main cost in the project...\$36,000. Ms. Cox asked for a rundown on the \$40,000 being recommended in the project. She was informed that there would be about \$1,078 would be for a "tent", \$280 for chairs/tables, cost for fair space, plus \$36,000 for printing of materials which would be handed out to the public. Mr. Tveten cautioned that the IAC should not get into the business of developing/reviewing flyers/material for the booth and that the Director of the IAC should be given some direction in how to handle this matter. Mr. Wilder replied the NOVA Advisory Committee could assist, that the IAC staff would not be involved in writing pamphlets, etc.

Mr. Wayland asked to speak to the representatives of the Kittitas County Sheriff's Department Project, E&E 86-24E. Undersheriff Carl Christensen, responded to his questions of concern. The County had submitted a request for \$134,040 funding and was being recommended for only \$80,000 (2 FTEs). Mr. Christensen stated an additional deputy was required to assist with the continuing conflicts between ORV users and communities in Kittitas County. There followed discussion concerning the Department of Game's project, E&E #86-22E, which Mr. Wayland stated would provide overall law enforcement through the Department's wildlife agents; felt it should be a valid ORV project but was not being recommended by staff. Mr. Lovelady stated it was not valid because the program would concentrate on roadways - road recreation only and efforts to work with private landowners. Road recreation is not ORV recreation and is not in the statute. NOVA Advisory Committee concurred with staff. Mr. Tveten noted that the Parks and Recreation Commission had applied for assistance under the ORV program for its Beacon Rock park, and had closed this out when the ORV users did not support it.

Ms. Cox referred to the Participant Registration Cards, calling for input from the attendees.

Pete Peterson, Sergeant, Chelan County Sheriff's Office, Chelan County E&E Project 86-20E:

Did not have any further comments.

Larry Hively, Undersheriff, Grant County, E&E Project, Grant County, #86-23E:

- (1) Had asked for \$97,299; with amount being funded it will not be possible to purchase another vehicle. One vehicle now has 144,000 miles on it. Attempting to repair this vehicle.
- (2) Asked that consideration be given to an additional \$12,000 for the purchase of a vehicle.

Mr. Carl Christensen, Undersheriff, Kittitas County Sheriff Dept., E&E #86-24E:

- (1) Unprepared at this meeting because was not aware that the project would be cut from \$134,040 to \$80,000 (2 FTEs).
- (2) Do need three deputies in this particular area; heavy concentration of ORV use.
- (3) Noted there will be additional trails added to the area if the Committee approves ORV projects today and this will increase workload of the deputies.

Honorable Roy Lumaco, County Commissioner, Kittitas County, E&E #86-24E:

- (1) Heard the Committee's comments on user conflicts. The most effective way to resolve these is through education and enforcement programs. Urged the Committee to reconsider funding of this project.
- (2) No other sources for handling this matter; need is critical to add another deputy.

Mr. Chris Anderson, Deputy Sheriff, Thurston County Sheriff's Office, E&E #29E/30E:

- (1) Second time around for E&E program (\$88,961); with nothing being funded.
- (2) Staff feels that DNR and Thurston County Parks and Recreation are able to provide education and enforcement. Does not agree.
- (3) Simpson Logging Company has closed off roads because of indiscriminate use by ORVs.
- (4) Recreational lands in Thurston County are open year-round and there is little service provided concerning ORVs.
- (5) Though requested \$88,000 plus, could live with \$40,000 if allocated.

Ms. Lorenz asked why staff was not recommending funding for Thurston County's E&E program. Mr. Lovelady explained that in relation to the other counties in the state, Thurston County does not have that much ORV use. Other counties are heavily into the program and need assistance. Though there is a need in Thurston County there is more need for funding projects in the counties having heavy ORV use.

Mr. Wayland asked Mr. Peterson (Chelan County) how the reduction of \$3,800 in the project would affect the County. Mr. Peterson said he believed it would still be possible to replace the vehicle mentioned and that the County could accept the \$80,000 and meet its program needs. He stated he was a member of the NOVA Advisory Committee and was aware of the deliberations made on the projects, thus supported the decision.

In reply to Mr. Ryan, Mr. Dovel explained the process of reviewing, evaluating, and eventually funding of NOVA Projects. He mentioned the NOVA Statewide Plan and how projects must relate to that plan.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAYLAND THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ACCEPT THE NOVA E&E PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS:

AMEND CHELAN COUNTY'S E&E PROJECT #86-20E TO ADD \$3,000;

AMEND GRANT COUNTY'S E&E PROJECT #86-23E TO ADD \$15,000;

AND, FURTHER, THAT STAFF LOOK AT THE HIGHER DEMANDS OF YAKIMA AND KITTITAS COUNTIES.

THERE WAS NO SECOND TO THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME.

Mr. Lovelady stated there were other agencies further on in the listing of projects to be presented which also had requested equipment and the Committee, before considering a motion, might want to look at those projects also.

Mr. Rod Weast, ORV Deputy, Pierce County Sheriff's Department, E & E #86-26E:

Noted that Pierce County is one of the newer ORV programs available. Have been cooperating with King County in several efforts.

Mr. Tveten suggested concerning Pierce County's other project (Puyallup Fair, E&E 27E) that IAC staff, state agencies involved, and other counties, as well

those participating in NOVA attempt to use existing publications as much as possible; then use the printing costs available funds to assist other project applications. Mr. Wilder said he would hesitate to commit staff to this project because of the workloads within the various divisions. Mr. Tveten felt if other counties could participate in the publications, it might be possible to free up some money to fund Thurston County's project. Perhaps the ORV people themselves could get involved in helping to manage the fair booth. Mr. Sacha agreed this would be a way to proceed since there is a need to spread the money further. Mr. Wayland asked that the record indicate he was not against recreation, but he felt the booth if funded at all would need to be run properly and administered through Pierce County.

At this point MR. WAYLAND RESTATED HIS MOTION. Ms. Lorenz said she was in favor of adding the \$3,000 to Chelan County and the \$15,000 to Grant County, but was not in favor of using the remaining funds as suggested in the motion. Mr. Ryan stated he supported the motion and also the concerns expressed by Mr. Tveten.

There followed discussion on transferring of the funds from the Puyallup Fair Display (\$40,000) to the Thurston County Sheriff's Office (\$30,000) (E&E 86-30E) leaving \$10,000 with the Director and staff of the IAC to use for a Puyallup Fair program which could be allayed through the services of various agencies. The remaining \$9,000 would be transferred equally \$4,500 ea.) to assist Kittitas County (E&E 24E) and Yakima County (E&E 86-33E). Mr. Dovel clarified present funding for Kittitas and Yakima counties' programs. Dr. Scull stated he could see the need for deputies in all of the counties being reviewed, and was disturbed at the \$36- or \$35,000 being expended for publication purposes for the Puyallup Fair Display project. Mr. Chuck Leach (EWDR Association) felt the emphasis in the program has been mostly on enforcement, and it was the feeling of the NOVA Advisory Committee that it was time to begin to do something with education in a more positive way.

Stephen Sutliff, ORV Deputy, Yakima County:

- (1) Association of Deputies now has a working program regarding education. Although printed matter is important, the one-on-one approach is best.
- (2) Users in the field have specific questions they ask which need to be in some sort of information flyer.
- (3) Approved of Mr. Tveten's suggestion to use IAC staff's input as well as other sources. Need the information out on individual basis - one-to-one.

Mr. Tveten asked questions concerning other county fairs and participation of sheriff's departments.

Mr. Pinnix was asked to restate the entire motion. Ms. Cox and Mr. Wilder stated that giving \$10,000 to the staff of the IAC to assist with the Pierce County Puyallup Fair project was not a good suggestion. The staff of the IAC is already maintaining a heavy workload and might not be able to absorb this added responsibility.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. WAYLAND, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORV EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS, WITH THE FOLLOWING FUNDING CHANGES:

1. #86-20E - CHELAN COUNTY E&E - \$83,000 TOTAL FUNDING.
2. #86-23-E - GRANT COUNTY E&E - \$95,000 TOTAL FUNDING.

3. #86-24E - KITTITAS COUNTY \$ 84,500 TOTAL FUNDING
4. #86- - IAC (PIERCE COUNTY PROJECT) - THE SUM OF \$10,000 ALLOCATED
TO THE IAC FOR THE DISPLAY PROJECT
AT THE PUYALLUP FAIR
5. #86-30E - THURSTON COUNTY - \$ 30,000 TOTAL FUNDING
6. #86-33E - YAKIMA COUNTY - 84,500 TOTAL FUNDING

AND THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN. (SEE PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MS. LORENZ AND JOE JONES VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

There followed discussion on the additional funds necessary to fund the E&E projects. Mr. Baker reported there were sufficient funds and that there would be additional monies coming in soon from the Department of Natural Resources to augment the balance.

PLANNING PROJECTS: Following review of the Planning Projects, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAYLAND, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING OF THE ORV PLANNING PROJECTS BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE (SEE PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES), AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

Dr. Scull asked why the Negro-Shaser Survey appeal process was incomplete. A Forest Service spokesman said the Supervisor had not yet made a decision, but this could come in late November. He may remand the appeal back to the District Ranger for additional work on the environmental easement, or he could suspend it until another later date, etc.

#86-17P - Department of Game Assessment Process: Ms. Lorenz asked for an explanation of the attachment to the funding summary regarding the Game Assessment process. Mr. Lovelady stated the IAC was suggesting that the Department of Game agree to the conditions or restraints in their project. A work program must be approved by the IAC and an advisory committee formed to assist the project. Mr. Wilder pointed out that the Game Department had worked with the IAC on the provisions in the Assessment Process and had agreed to them. Mr. George Volker explained the process to the Committee, how it had evolved and why.

Ira Spring commented on user conflicts and felt that planning of ORV projects could enter into compromise also. Mr. Tveten suggested that if the Forest Service Projects in planning are approved, that they assure they address user conflicts. The Forest Service representative said this is a part of their usual program.

Len Gardner, Washington Native Plant Society, State Conservation Co-Chair,

- (1) Endorsed staff's recommendations and reminded everyone that this is a broad field.

Mr. Thomas Savage, Gifford Pinchot Natl. Forest Landscape Architect:

(Had left the meeting.)

Mr. Leach gave a short history of the recreational resources available in the State of Washington to all persons. He noted there were about 500,000 acres of non-highway roads available for ORV use.

- (2) After completion of the Forest Plan, would expect that to be reduced to some 250 acres of nonhighway roads available for ORV use.
- (3) There are 9,000 miles of trails - but 1,700 of that is open to ORV use.
- (4) Of the 1,000 roadless area lakes, twelve are open to ORV use; and of those six are open for direct access, which includes hiking to the lakes.
- (5) Felt ORVS had lost some 8 lakes in the one million acres of forest land and 103 miles of trails.
- (6) Planning is therefore essential and he supported the planning projects.

Mr. Sacha asked if it would be possible to halt the funding of certain projects at the Committee meetings just because an appeal had been filed. Ms. Cox informed him the Committee would consider and fund projects following deliberations as it has previously.

Robert Ordal was gratified to see the staff's recommendation for the Negro-Shaser project and supported it.

- (2) Supported Ira Spring's desire to delete planning funds for Negro-Shaser and the Blue Lake area.
- (3) Felt these were very sensitive areas and required careful planning.
- (4) Suggested there is growing support that ORVs may not belong in the National Forests and cited recent publicity.

Phil Glass, Wenatchee National Forest Service, replying to Mr. Ordal stated the Forest Service did not make decisions without public hearings. Further, that the Forest Service is not 100% IAC funded.

Robert Freimark, The Wilderness Society, Regional Associate:

- (1) The Wilderness Society supported staff's recommendation concerning the Negro Shaser area and the Blue Lake area.
- (2) Not appropriate to fund these two projects until the Forest Service Plan has been made public and published.

Jim Tyler, Naches Ranger District, Wentachee National Forest:

Spoke to project 86-13P, Manastash - stated his original request had been \$15,500 rather than the \$6,600 noted in the recommendation sheets.

Mr. Lovelady said the request had been in the amount of \$6,600; if a clerical error had been made, however, the IAC could allow staff to allocate up to \$5,500 to this project, at the direction of the Director.

DR. SHULL AMENDED MR. WAYLAND'S MOTION TO FUND THE PLANNING PROJECTS AS FOLLOWS:

THAT STAFF FUND THE USFS WENATCHEE NACHES, KANERCAMPGROUND, 86-13P PROJECT AT \$15,500 IF THAT HAD BEEN THE ORIGINAL REQUEST, MAKING UP THE DIFFERENCE FROM THE PROPOSED ORIGINAL \$6,600 THROUGH ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE FUNDS.

MS. LORENZ SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Ms. Cox asked for an explanation concerning #86-3P, USFS Wenatchee S.O., Trail Hardening Test. Why did 300' of trail work require \$24,906? Mr. Glass, USFS, replied that this is a research project; intent is to find a durable and inexpensive tread hardening material. The NOVA Advisory Committee approved of the project.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO FUND THE PLANNING PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH THE ADDITIONAL MONIES TO THE USFS WENATCHEE NACHES, 86-13P IF IN FACT THAT PROJECT HAD BEEN REQUESTED AT THE HIGHER FIGURE OF \$15,500, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT IF STAFF IN RESEARCHING THIS PROJECT DETERMINED THIS AMOUNT HAD NOT BEEN REQUESTED, THEN THE \$6,600 WOULD STAND.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

CAPITAL PROJECTS: Following review of the projects, the staff pointed out to the Committee that Adams County had two other projects - one in Management and one in Land Acquisition which it had submitted to the IAC. It was suggested that the Committee review the Management Projects and Land Acquisition Project also at this time.

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS: Mr. Jones asked if the Thurston County Parks M&O Project #86-38A was for two years at their request. Mr. Dovel replied they have been under a year funding program for some time and it is their prerogative to ask for this funding. Questions were asked by Mr. Scull concerning the Adams County, Othello Youth ORV Mini-Park Project, #86-39M. Mr. Dovel noted that the City of Othello had come forward with the project following a two-year study. The study had indicated a need to develop, maintain, and operate a mini-park for the younger people to have this type of facility. This would be seed-money to begin the project under Adams County's project #86-49A with #86-34D as start-up costs. Ms. Cox asked if Adams County had permission of the railroad to use their land. Mr. Tveten referred to the Adams County Acquisition project, #86-49A in the amount of \$10,125 as recommended by staff.

MR. TVETEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FUND THE LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT #86-49A, ADAMS COUNTY, ORV USE AREA ACQUISITION, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,125 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF.

AND THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSOR AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.
(SEE PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

CAPITAL PROJECTS DISCUSSION:

#86-36D, Thurston County, ORV Pk. Dev., Ph. 7, \$44,500. Mr. Tveten was given an explanation as to the decrease in funding for this project from original request of \$49,500. NOVA had recommended the full \$49,500. Mr. Dovel explained that the sponsors had requested a trailer which could be transferred from a Yakima project and would suit their needs and thus lower the cost of the project.

#86-35D, Richland, ORV Pk. Development, Ph. 6, \$48,850. \$99,902 was requested by the sponsor; \$50,000 recommended by NOVA; and \$48,850 recommended by staff. Explanation was given in regard to this project. The staff recommendation was based on the sponsor's input regarding how the \$50,000 recommended by the NOVA Advisory Committee would be used.

#86-2D and #86-5D - USFS Wenatchee, Icewater and Goose Creek campgrounds, no funding recommended. Dr. Scull asked why funds were not being recommended. Mr. Lovelady stated these projects would be considered at the March funding session. The concept was that nonhighway road funding could be used in these projects in part as well as the regular off-road vehicle funds. Since combining fund sources is recommended, and one of these sources (nonhighway road) is on hold at this time, postponement is the only alternative. NOVA had concurred in this action. Both projects were proposed to use nonhighway road funds as well as the regular ORV funds. Ms. Cox was advised there was a trail being added to the Icewater Creek project; it was not already in existence.

#86-10D USFS Wenatchee, Entiat, Mad River Trail Redevelopment, \$63,612 requested and recommended by IAC staff and NOVA: In response to Mr. Tveten's questions, Mr. Lovelady stated:

(1) ORV individuals sitting on NOVA are the only members who can provide funding advice on monies derived from the ORV permit fees. Those members recommended that these funds be placed with #86-10D.

(2) The project did relate to the Mad River project which had been tabled and later funded by the IAC (85-19D - March 28, 1986). It is in the same area.

Mr. Tveten noted there had been conflict by users in that area.

The Chair recognized Ira Spring who presented a slide program on the Mad River area. On a map of the area he indicated existing trails for hikers, those for ORV recreationists, noting those where there was conflict and where there was, in his estimation, no conflict. He particularly pointed out the Mad River project area contemplated for development by the USFS in project #86-10D and Blue Creek #86-9D.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Mike Welter, Assistant Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation - #86-36D, ORV Pk. Dev., Ph. 7: (No Participation Card filed)

(1) If the transfer of the trailer from Yakima County does not work out, wanted to ensure at least \$49,500 funding.

(2) Felt might be ending up with a trailer that would do only half the job and not be usable in this particular project.

Robert Freimark, Wilderness Society - #86-10D, Mad River Project: Agreed and accepted Mr. Ira Spring's proposal not to fund this project nor the #86-9D - Blue Creek Project.

Phil Glass, USFS, Wenatchee National Forest - speaking to #86-10D, Mad River and #86-9D - Blue Creek projects.

(1) The Forest Service is cautious in recommending projects and does consult with users. Its plans are known through public hearings; and the public does have input. Forest Service sponsors do recognize conflicts and seek to correct them.

Mr. Tveten asked if the Forest Service would have any problems if these projects were delayed until the March funding session in 1987. Mr. Glass replied actually this wouldn't solve the hikers' contentions and the Forest Service did need the funds in order to proceed with the redevelopment. All planning has been accomplished. Mr. Glass felt there was very little conflict in this particular area. The projects, however, could be delayed.

Les Julian, USFS, Wenatchee: Noted that the Forest Service had been involved in the process of planning for ORVs since 1976. Public meetings give input. Another analysis was made in 1982 for the Mad River, Chiwawa environmental aspects.

(2) Described some of the trails in the project and surrounding it.

(3) There is a seasonal closure on the trails and at certain times of the year horses and bikers are allowed to use them. (Did not file Participation Card)

Ms. Cox pointed out that user conflict in 1976 would really not have been an issue in 1976 since the program had just started. Now, in 1986 there is considerable conflict.

Chuck Leach, ESDRA: Spoke to the point made by Ms. Cox.

(1) There has been an increase in ORV use, but very little increase in ORV facilities. In fact, there has been a severe reduction in ORV resources.

(2) Certain areas are now closed to ORVs and have been dedicated to hikers and horsemen only.

(3) Finding there are less areas for ORV recreation. Therefore, need to ensure that the Forest Service has the funds to repair trails and keep them open.

(4) Are interested in having other places developed as Ira Spring suggested, but not in the areas he had pointed out. Some do not follow the Forest Service Plan. Logging operations in those areas would prevent their ORV use.

(5) Mr. Spring was allowed to present his program and most of the alternatives he suggested are areas in logging-connected places.

(6) Mad River is one of 11 areas used by ORVs in the Wenatchee Natl. Forest, and if closed, would cut back the areas to ten.

(7) ORV recreationists do appreciate view point as pointed out by Mr. Spring, but this will not necessarily satisfy the 150,000 ORV people in Washington State.

(8) If Committee does not fund these projects, the trails will continue to deteriorate. (Did not file Participation Card.)

Ms. Ruth Ittner, citizen, stated there had been no new public hearings under the new act - that these were new projects which did not apply at that time. The Forest Service representative replied there had been a hearing on the Mad River project recently. Mr. Dovel replied this had not been under the new requirements. Ms. Ittner suggested that the projects not be funded until such time as there has been a negotiating process or "meeting of the minds". (Did not file Participation Card.)

Mr. Tveten agreed that there should be negotiations taking place between the two groups prior to the projects coming to the Committee for approval.

Mike Sacha, President, NMA - speaking to the conflict problems.

(1) Felt the non-ORV users had been allowed to indicate their feelings at the meeting and they had made the conflict situation larger than it is.

(2) In relation to the total miles available in the state for trail use, the effect on the hikers and others using the forest is minimal.

(3) Spoke of his meetings with people in the forests - both hikers and bikers - wanting to cooperate in the use of the trails. Felt the conflicts in the Mad River area were not that high.

Mr. Freimark stated it would be better to delay the projects until March, giving the public a chance to testify at a hearing. Mr. Leach suggested that since the trails advocates had had their chance to testify before the Committee, the bikers should be given equal treatment. The Chair asked that he not comment in this manner.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CAPITAL PROJECTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS:

DELETE: #86-9D, USFS Wenatchee Entiat Mad River Trail Redev. \$ 63,612
#86-10D, USFS Wenatchee Entiat Blue Creek Trail Redev. 53,907

AND THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSOR AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.
(SEE PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES.)

Mr. Welter then asked the Committee if it was going to reconsider the additional funds for Thurston County at another meeting?

MR. PINNIX AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE A TOTAL OF \$49,500 FOR #86-36D, THURSTON COUNTY, ORV PARK DEVELOPMENT, PHASE 7.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION, AND IT WAS CARRIED.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS AS ON PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS AS PRESENTED BY STAFF, AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSOR AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.
(SEE PAGE 50 OF THESE MINUTES.)

Mr. Welter stated that the County had applied for \$318,570, but staff had recommended \$300,000.

- (2) Attendance at the park has increased fifty percent (50%) from previous years.
- (3) Did not feel staff was out of line, but the project represents the highest use facility in the state; need the \$318,570 level to maintain it.
- (4) Mentioned the management "bad debt" issue and the need to offset it.

Mr. Tveten felt the County ought to pay off the debt for mismanagement. Mr. Welter stated this would be done and mentioned the staffing problems involved in the project. In response to questions, he referred to a graph of Thurston County's maintenance and operation over the past several years, stating the staff is attempting to keep the costs down to a certain level.

DR. SCULL CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Dr. Scull then asked the Forest Service the results of a delay in the funding of projects #86-9D and #86-10D. Response was that the Forest Service could wait until March 1987 for further consideration.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS FUNDED

NOVEMBER 7, 1986

EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

86-20E	Cheilan Co. Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	\$ 83,000	
86-23E	Grant Co. Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	95,000	
86-24E	Kittitas Co. Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	84,500	
86-25E	Mason County Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	40,000	
86-26E	Pierce Co. Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	40,000	
86-00	I.A.C.	Co. Fair Display	10,000	
86-28E	Tacoma Metro. Pks.	ORV Safety/Education	50,000	
86-29E	Thurston Co. Pks.	ORV Safety/Education	6,000	
86-30E	Thurston Co. Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	30,000	
86-31E	Richland, City of	ORV Education/Enforcement	38,593	
86-33E	Yakima County Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement	84,500	
				\$ 561,593

PLANNING PROJECTS

86-1P	USFS Mt. Baker-Snoq.	Tinkham Trials	\$ 7,557	
86-3P	USFS Wenatchee S.O.	Trail Hardening Test	24,906	
86-6P	USFS Wenatchee S.O.	Trail Supervisor	11,798	
86-8P	USFS Wenatchee Ent.	Shetipo, Lost, Billy Trail	8,880	
86-11P	USFS Wenatchee Naches	Manastash 4 X 4 Surv.	5,887	
86-13P	USFS Wenatchee Naches	Kaner Campgd. Surv.	6,600	
86-14P	USFS Wenatchee Naches	Quartz - Cliff D.	3,086	
86-15P	USFS Wenatchee S.O.	Manastash Study	64,400	
86-17P	USFS G. Pinchot S.O.	Blue Lake Area Plan	17,898	
86-19P	Game Department	Assessment Process	44,286	
86-40P	Yakima Co. Parks	Ahtanum Area Sur.	6,644	
86-41P	Walla Walla, City	ORV Feasibility	21,680	
86-46P	Tacoma Metro Parks	Area Site Search	12,000	
				\$ 235,622

CAPITAL PROJECTS

86-12D	USFS Wenatchee Naches	Crow to Quartz	\$ 6,723	
86-18D	USFS Colville, Col.	L'il Pend Oreille	44,229	
86-34D	Adams Co. P&R Dist.	ORV Use Area Dev.	5,000	
86-35D	Richland, City of	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph. 6	48,850	
86-36D	Thurston Co. Pks.	ORV Pk. Dev. Ph. 7	49,500	
85-37D	Spokane Co. Pks.	Airway Heights Dev. Ph 1	353,000	
				\$ 507,302

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

86-4A	USFS Wenatchee S.O.	Forestwide Log-out	\$ 4,045	
86-38A	Thurston County Pks.	ORV Pk. M&O 87-88	300,000	
				\$ 304,045

LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT

86-49A	Adams Co. R&R Dist.	ORV Use Area Acquisition	\$ 10,125	\$ 10,125
--------	---------------------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------

TOTAL OF ALL PROJECTS \$ 1,618,687

DR. SCULL MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT CONSIDERING THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED ABOUT THESE TWO PROJECTS, THAT #86-9D and #86-10D BE DELAYED UNTIL THE MARCH FUNDING SESSION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

He asked that it be on the record that it is the Committee's wish that conflict between user groups be resolved through these groups getting together, and that a report of their meeting be made a part of the March 1987 agenda.

Ms. Cox asked if it was Dr. Scull's intention that the Forest Service be the leader in this effort. Dr. Scull agreed. Mr. Phil Glass, USFS, stated that the Forest Service would not have a plan finalized by March. He was then asked to have an analysis available for review by the Committee of the comments on the Forest Service Plan, since these would be available by that time. Mr. Volker agreed this would be helpful to have as a summary.

Mr. Pinnix, though he appreciated Mr. Spring's comments, stated he as a Committee member had to look at the fact that the Mad River area is currently an active ORV trail area. It is presently open to public use and needs to be maintained. He felt delays in funding of projects recommended by staff and NOVA did not get the Committee anywhere. The Committee has to take the responsibility to fund projects after consideration. Mr. Volker also commented stating he did not like to rely on 1976 and 1982 reports for forest information, and he would appreciate an analysis of comments on the Forest Plan as suggested by other Committee members. Mr. Tveten concurred with Mr. Pinnix and Mr. Volker, stating that the Committee should not allow itself to get into debate situations.

Ms. Ittner: (1) Commented on her work with a mediation group which had helped in other instances of conflict concerning wilderness recreation.

(2) Hoped that in some way the services of this Mediation Institute could be used to help resolve the conflicts discussed at the meeting today.

Mr. Glass approved of Ruth's suggestion, and likewise Mr. Spring, who suggested that Ruth coordinate the meeting between the groups to resolve the conflict issues.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR, AND IT WAS CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS: Mr. Wilder presented to the Committee prepared resolutions for the following persons who had served on the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC): JIM CARTER, TOM JESMER, PAT MILLIKEN, AND BARRY PETERS.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. VOLKER, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT

WHEREAS JIM CARTER, TOM JESMER, PAT MILLIKEN, AND BARRY PETERS HAVE SERVED THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AS MEMBERS OF THE FORMER OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ORVAC) FOR SEVERAL YEARS AND HAVE ASSISTED THE COMMITTEE AND THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE OVERALL OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROGRAM AND THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, RENOVATION OF ORV RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES; AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WISH TO RECOGNIZE THEIR DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED DURING THAT TIME, AND WISH THEM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS MEMBERS OF ORVAC, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO JIM CARTER, TOM JESMER, PAT MILLIKEN, AND BARRY PETERS FOR THEIR SERVICES;

AND, RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THESE FORMER ORVAC MEMBERS WITH A LETTER OF APPRECIATION FROM THE DIRECTOR ON BEHALF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Wilder noted that Certificates of Appreciation would also be sent to these volunteers.

IV E. IAC MEETING DATES: Ms. Cox advised that the dates of the Committee meetings for 1987 were:

MARCH 26-27 - JULY 16-17 - AND NOV. 5-6

She thanked the attendees for their participation and remaining through a long meeting. She urged that there be a cooperative effort made concerning conflict resolutions.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

3-26-1987
Anne B. Cox
ANNE COX, CHAIR