

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 5-6, 1987
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Shilo Inn, 50 Comstock Street
Richland, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair
Joe C. Jones, Seattle
Dr. Eliot Scull, Wenatchee
Ralph Mackey, Everett
Jack Wayland, Director, Department of Wildlife
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation Commission
Raymond Ryan, Designee for Joseph R. Blum, Director
Department of Fisheries
Cleve Pinnix, Designee for Honorable Brian Boyle,
Commissioner of Public Lands, DNR

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Jeanie Lorenz

APPENDIX "A" - LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJS. LETTERS
APPENDIX "B" - CHANGES/WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN
APPENDIX "C" - TRAILS DIRECTORY PROPOSAL
APPENDIX "D" - LETTERS RE NOVA PROJECTS
APPENDIX "E" - CONCEPTS/PARAMETERS FOR PROGRESS
APPENDIX "F" - LETTERS RE ORV PLAN

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Anne Cox, Chair, with a quorum present: COX, SCULL, WAYLAND, TVETEN, RYAN, PINNIX, MACKEY - 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. (Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General was present.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 17, 1987: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 17, 1987 INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - NOVEMBER 5-6, 1987 IAC MEETING: There being no additions or deletions to the November 5-6, 1987 agenda, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAYLAND, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 5-6, 1987 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Ms. Cox reminded the Committee members that at some point during the meeting she wanted the Committee to discuss funding alternatives - a critical issue for the IAC. Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum dated November 5, 1987, "Director's Report", noting the following:

- (1) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND: Reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and funding for Fiscal Year 1988 have been two items of major concern. The Executive Branch and House of Representatives zeroed out the states' share from the FY 88 budget; whereas the Senate included a \$35 million item for the states. The House/Senate Conference Committee now must iron out differences; hopefully, the \$35 million will be available.

Reauthorization of the LWCF (HR 1320) is tied up in senate budget problems. The reauthorization of LWCF (at \$900 million per year in the House bill and at \$1 billion in the Senate committee bill) is not

controversial and should pass Congress early next year, if not soon.

Graph indicated the following:

| Pending Bills | Status | Comment |
|--|--|--|
| Fiscal '88 - Yates' unnumbered | House approved June 25 Senate subcommittee approved Sept. 18, 1987 | House puts LWCF at \$127 M, states at zero. Senate at \$212 M, \$35 M for states |
| LWCF Reauthorization HR 1320 (Vento) S 735 (Johnston) S 1338 (Chafee) | HR 1320 approved by House April 1, by Senate committee June 10. S 1338 introduced June 9. S 735 on Senate committee agenda | HR 1320 would authorize \$900 M per year. S 735 would establish fund with oil/gas royalties from refuges. S 1338 \$1 billion per year trust fund reflects PCAO recommendation. |

A Land and Water Conservation Fund information sheet was distributed to the members by Mr. Wilder. As well as giving information about HR 1320, it listed Congressional senators and representatives to contact to express an interest in the LWCF funding program and the critical need for receipt of these monies for states' use in the acquisition, development, redevelopment, and renovation of recreational areas and facilities. There followed discussion on the need for the Committee members to support the fund. Both Mr. Wayland and Mr. Tveten suggested that the Committee go on record by means of a Resolution which could be forwarded to the Washington State delegation and other members of Congress, as well as park supporters in other jurisdictions and representing other organizations interested in parks for the people. Mr. Tveten mentioned that the Parks and Recreation Commission had recently passed such a resolution which also gave the history of the LWCF program, and he would not object to its being used as a "sample" if the Committee so desired. Mr. Wilder pointed out the work that had already been done by the IAC in attempting to see that at least \$35M for the states would be in the final bill. Mr. Pinnix suggested the Committee not only support the \$35 million, but that it also look at the LWCF monies as having a much larger purpose and potential. The decrease in funding over the years should be emphasized, and the fact that the need for park and recreation facilities in the state has increased at the same time.

(2) ANNUAL MEETING OF NASORLO: The Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) attended by Mr. Wilder dealt with primarily legislative matters. NASORLO's principle goal is to follow the situation concerning the LWCF program. The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO), state programs, the National Park Service (NPS), and additional federal regulations and liaison functions were also on the agenda.

(3) UDALL BILL: Twenty different organizations have been working with Representative Udall on his proposal: Retain and embellish the LWCF; retain and embellish the Historic Preservation Fund; establish entity to coordinate grants; finance through greater share of oil and gas royalties from Outer Continental Shelf. Money would be made available each year based on the existing \$900 M LWCF authorization plus interest from the corpus with financing entirely through interest from the corpus eventually.

(4) IAC STUDY - AUDITS: Mr. Frank Hensley of the Legislative Budget Committee is currently reviewing the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program (NOVA) particularly the effect of the parameters established in Chapter 206, Laws of 1986 (SHB 1382). Special emphasis will focus on education and enforcement.

The study of the IAC will be taking place, but as yet no indication has been received from the Governor's Office or OFM. The report on the agency is due January 1, 1989. The success of the agency will no doubt be noted and there may possibly be a member or two added to the Committee.

(5) LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS: Testimony was given for the IAC by Mr. Wilder on October 3, 1987 before the House Natural Resources Committee. A Subcommittee on Parks has been set up by this committee chaired by Representative Karla Wilson.

Representative Wilson's Subcommittee on Parks will have a meeting on November 24, 1987, at the Sea-Tac Office Building, Room 500, 18000 Pacific Highway South, Seattle, beginning at 7:00 p.m. The premise of the proposal being made by Representative Wilson is that the recreation needs of the state exceed the resources currently available to provide for them and the imbalance needs to be resolved which will require a stable, adequate funding source or sources. Ms. Wilson's invitation has been extended to the IAC and its members and the Parks and Recreation Commission members. A "Statement of Recreation Issues" accompanied the meeting notice and Committee members were sent copies.

Mr. Pinnix asked if there could be extended discussion of the proposed meeting later on after all members had had opportunity to review the invitation from Representative Wilson. (SEE PAGE 49 OF THESE MINUTES.)

(6) AQUATIC LANDS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM: This program continues well and affords opportunity for the IAC to help our clientele meet some of their park, recreation, and conservation needs (public access and development areas).

(7) CONFLICT RESOLUTION - WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN, OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PLAN AND A TRAILS GUIDE PROPOSAL: Mr. Wilder briefly touched upon each of these items, noting that all but conflict resolution would be further discussed on the agenda for November 5-6.

(8) COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE COMMISSION: Assistance may soon be given to the Columbia River Gorge Commission, particularly in the area of planning. A formal letter of request had been received from the Commission (Nancy Sourek, Chair, Recreation Committee), dated September 15, 1987. IAC had replied it would be interested in participating in the Recreation Assessment but was at the present time overprogrammed and understaffed. A meeting was held with the Department of Community Development (DCD), the Governor's Coordinator on Natural Resources, and the Office of Financial Management (OFM). The IAC is presently in a waiting position on giving this assistance to the Commission.

(9) NOVA POSITION: The need to make the NOVA position permanent was stated by Mr. Wilder, and explanation given.

(10) LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS: The IAC legislative proposals were briefly covered by Mr. Wilder, to be further clarified on the agenda.

(11) FUNDING STATUS AND FUNDING ALTERNATIVES: Mr. Wilder referred to the enclosed information sheet "Funding Alternatives - Parks, Recreation, and Conservation", outlining the historical support documents leading up to a listing of funding alternatives. A listing of funding options of other states throughout the nation was reviewed also.

Mr. Mackey referred to the Director's Report item NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION (NRPA) and the need to establish a statewide coalition to discuss, develop, and support a program of funding opportunities for parks and recreation. He felt the potential for such a coalition is tremendous, but nothing has as yet been done. He thought the professionals in the field should take the lead in establishing such a coalition. Also the state agencies - Wildlife, DNR, Parks - need to be involved. Dr. Scull brought up the discussions held at the July IAC session to make the IAC more visible with a higher profile. The emphasis placed on parks and recreation as brought out by the Governor's Recreation Resource Advisory Committee and the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO) was then detailed by Mr. Wilder. The "marketing" of a coalition proposal needs to be done by some group or organization. His conclusion was that a coalition of citizens (individuals) as well as the professionals is needed.

Mr. Mackey felt the Washington Recreation and Park Association (WRPA) could take the lead in concert with others. Mr. Wilder pointed out that at a recent meeting of the Legislative Committee in WRPA, he had learned there was considerable support for funding of parks and recreation, but many professionals did not have the time to devote to a concerted effort. Less than half of the persons at this particular meeting said they could take on this type of effort.

Mr. Wayland noted the restrictions on legislative efforts from the state agencies' standpoint. All proposed legislation from state agencies must be screened by the Office of the Governor and OFM, and it is not possible for lobbying efforts to occur on legislation other than that which has received approval. Mr. Mackey felt the hunters and fishermen could be much more effective and there are organizations who could direct their efforts to this type of action.

Mr. Jones asked that the Chair ensure this matter received further discussion from the Committee at this IAC meeting. Mr. Pinnix complimented IAC staff and Mr. Wilder for the "blueprint" presented in the Funding Alternatives information sheet. The history of actions up to this point in time are detailed and can be used in discussions with legislators and others. He felt the recognition given to the IAC by Representative Wilson was excellent and there is now opportunity to promote the issue of parks and recreation funding alternatives. They, however, will need the ammunition and background as outlined by Mr. Wilder.

Dr. Scull suggested taking the Committee's lunch hour to discuss this further. Mr. Ryan and Mr. Pinnix agreed. It was the consensus that the funding alternatives and coalition matters be discussed at twelve noon, bringing back to the public meeting the results of the discussion. Mr. Pinnix stated though state agencies are restrained and restricted from taking a stand on certain legislation unless the Governor so directs, they can respond to the Legislature if specifically asked by committees of the legislature or specific legislators.

At the conclusion of the Director's Report, the Chair recognized Mr. Neil Schulman, City Manager, Richland, who welcomed the members on behalf of the City and mentioned some of the projects in Richland which had received funding from the IAC (Columbia Point Beach Access, ORV park, etc.). He expressed appreciation for funding of these projects, and hoped that at some time the members could visit the areas.

II. B. MANAGEMENT SERVICES. FUND SUMMARIES: Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, was called upon to present the Financial Status Reports. Mr. Baker referred to

(1) Fund Summary - Grant-in-Aid - October 28, 1987: Noted that this fund summary had been prepared for the new State Biennium which began July 1, 1987. Therefore, certain negative balances result. The report covered the most up-to-date information available on pending and approved monies in the various categories (Init. 215, LWCF, Ref. 11, Ref. 18, Ref. 28, and G-0 Bonds.) Federal monies have not yet been received and will be incorporated into the report late. In response to question of Mr. Jones, Mr. Baker explained the appropriations from the State Legislature for the State Agencies.

(2) Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Fund Summary: Reported the IAC is in compliance with all of the regulations, and that the report did not at this point in time include monies to be received for October. Mr. Mackey was informed the total of revenue received since the program began was \$5,321,171.37; monies available (current fund status) are \$2,851,538.25. Mr. Tveten asked if the Legislative Budget Committee's (LBC) study of the NOVA program would include percentage allocations in the current program. Mr. Baker replied in the affirmative, that the Legislature would be attempting to determine whether or not the percentages were doing what the Legislature in setting them up had intended they do. Mr. Jones was advised LWCF funds are not used in the NOVA program projects.

IV. A. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS (10:00 a.m.): Mr Jim Webster, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff, "Local Agency Project Funding", dated November 5, 1987, stating there were fifty-three local projects to be considered for funding (one had been withdrawn recently). Table I represented ranking of each project application as determined by the Evaluation Team at its session held October 19-23, 1987. He reminded the Committee that Initiative 215 funds (unreclaimed marine fuel taxes) can only be used for recreational boating related projects. Staff shared with sponsors the funding levels of 50% IAC, 50% local participation, with \$150,000 maximum amount of matching funds any one sponsor might expect to receive. (Letters in regard to specific projects were sent to each IAC member prior to the meeting. APPENDIX "A" TO THESE MINUTES.) Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, asked that the record indicate the Committee members had received the project resumes and Table I one week or more prior to the meeting and had thus had opportunity to review each project. (TABLE I - page 5-A of these minutes.)

Each project was then presented to the Committee by Project Services staff using slides and verbal summaries.

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

City of Seattle, Seacrest Park: (88-029D) Mr. Mackey and Mr. Jones were informed that the project was adjacent to and south of the Don Armeni Project.

Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, Pt. Defiance Waterfront Development: (88-041D) Mr. Steve Knauer, Planner, Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, reviewed for the Committee the present and proposed parking situation. Dr. Scull was informed the tides would not impact the beach stairways. Mr. Wayland noted the total acreage and asked if there could be additional development and/or expansion within them. Mr. Taylor replied there could be.

LOCAL PROJECTS REQUESTING FUNDING - 1987
Table Number 1

| k | Name | Rq | Sponsor | Score | LMCF \$ | Bonds | Init 215 | IAC Totl | Local Sh | Tot Cost | X |
|---------|--------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----|
| 1 | Seacrest Park | 04 | Seattle, City of | 146.0 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Willapa Nature Park | 02 | Raymond, City of | 136.5 | | | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,650,000 | 9 |
| 3 | Pt. Defiance Park Mtrft. Dev. | 04 | Tacoma MPD | 136.1 | | | 143,246 | 143,246 | 143,246 | 286,492 | 50 |
| 4 | Cummings Prop. Dev., Phase II | 04 | Tacoma MPD | 135.6 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 266,647 | 416,647 | 36 |
| 5 | Lacamas Lake Dev. Phase I | 06 | Clark County Parks | 133.2 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 294,191 | 444,191 | 33 |
| 6 | Wapato Park Development | 08 | Wapato, City of | 132.4 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 150,171 | 300,171 | 49 |
| 7 | Burlington Regional Playfields | 03 | Skagit County | 130.5 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 50 |
| 8 | Rotary Lake | 08 | Yakima County | 130.0 | | 47,500 | | 47,500 | 181,022 | 331,022 | 45 |
| 9 | Everett Rfrt. Park, Phase II | 04 | Everett Park Department | 129.5 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 47,500 | 95,000 | 50 |
| 10 | China Lake Wetland Enhancement | 04 | Tacoma, City of | 126.3 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 50 |
| 11 | Lake Fenwick Park Development | 04 | Kent Parks & Recreation | 125.0 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 157,000 | 307,000 | 48 |
| 12 | A. M. Cannon Park Expansion | 12 | Spokane, City of | 124.1 | | 146,500 | | 146,500 | 146,500 | 293,000 | 50 |
| 13 | Dayton Levee Project | 13 | Dayton, City of | 124.0 | | 130,193 | | 130,193 | 130,194 | 260,387 | 49 |
| 14 | Columbia Pt. Btng. Acc. Ph. II | 10 | Richland, City of | 123.9 | | 7,738 | | 7,738 | 7,739 | 15,477 | 49 |
| 15 | Community Swimming Pool | 06 | Castle Rock, City of | 123.3 | | | 149,017 | 149,017 | 149,017 | 298,034 | 50 |
| 16 | Develop New Regional Park Site | 05 | Lewis Cty. Parks & Recreation | 123.0 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 201,272 | 351,272 | 42 |
| 17 | Acquisition of 3 Acres - Exp. | 02 | Elna, City of | 122.8 | | 15,000 | | 15,000 | 15,000 | 30,000 | 50 |
| 18 | George H. Seallwood Mem. Park | 04 | Eatonville, Town of | 122.4 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | 40,000 | 80,000 | 50 |
| 19 | Lower Valley Regional Park | 08 | Yakima County | 122.1 | | 92,250 | | 92,250 | 92,250 | 184,500 | 50 |
| 20 | Northport Coa. Sball/Lit Leag | 11 | Northport School District | 120.9 | | 35,550 | | 35,550 | 35,550 | 71,100 | 50 |
| 21 | Evergreen Park Boat Lch. Imp. | 04 | Bremerton, Port of | 120.8 | | | 109,848 | 109,848 | 109,849 | 219,697 | 49 |
| 22 | Recreational Vehicle Park | 12 | Medical Lake, City of | 120.7 | | 114,970 | | 114,970 | 114,970 | 229,940 | 50 |
| 23 | Skykomish River Centennial Par | 04 | Monroe, City of | 120.6 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 325,436 | 475,436 | 31 |
| 24 | Marina Development/Acquisition | 04 | Edmonds, Port of | 120.5 | | | 150,000 | 150,000 | 183,000 | 333,000 | 45 |
| 25 | Geraldine Oldhorn Swan Plgd. | 11 | Inchelium School District #70 | 120.0 | | 32,293 | | 32,293 | 32,293 | 64,586 | 50 |
| 26 | Morrison Rft. Park Phase II | 02 | Aberdeen, City of | 119.6 | | 94,713 | | 94,713 | 94,713 | 189,426 | 50 |
| 27 | Town Ball Park Renovation | 09 | Wilson Creek, Town of | 119.4 | | 32,512 | | 32,512 | 32,512 | 65,024 | 50 |
| 28 | Washougal River Greenway | 06 | Canas, City of | 118.9 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 50 |
| 29 | Bender Road | 03 | Lynden, City of | 118.3 | | 80,786 | | 80,786 | 80,786 | 161,572 | 50 |
| 30 | Grange Park Phase I Develop. | 10 | Kennewick, City of | 117.1 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 170,651 | 320,651 | 46 |
| 31 | Marymoor Athletic Fields | 04 | King County | 116.9 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 632,317 | 782,317 | 19 |
| 32 | Park at Bothell Landing Exp. | 04 | Bothell, City of | 115.8 | | 81,637 | | 81,637 | 81,638 | 163,275 | 50 |
| 33 | Saltwater Marine P/T System | 03 | Bellingham, Port of | 115.5 | | 103,825 | | 103,825 | 103,825 | 207,650 | 50 |
| 34 | Hoquiam Buttress Park | 02 | Hoquiam, City of | 115.1 | | 21,830 | | 21,830 | 56,500 | 78,330 | 50 |
| 35 | Alma Park Extension | 07 | Okanogan, City of | 115.0 | | 31,800 | | 31,800 | 31,800 | 63,600 | 50 |
| 36 | Robert Bush Waterfront Park | 02 | South Bend, City of | 113.9 | | 63,060 | | 63,060 | 44,764 | 107,824 | 50 |
| 37 | Cascade Park Btg/Support Fac. | 09 | Moses Lake, City of | 113.8 | | | 64,180 | 64,180 | 64,180 | 128,360 | 50 |
| 38 | Public Sand Beach, Dock, BBQ | 06 | Klickitat, Port of | 113.6 | | 11,593 | | 11,593 | 11,593 | 23,186 | 50 |
| 39 | Renovate/Cover Exist Pool/Park | 02 | Willapa Park & Recreation | 112.7 | | 133,492 | | 133,492 | 133,493 | 266,985 | 50 |
| 40 | Columbia Park West Phase I | 10 | Benton Co. Parks/Rec. Dept. | 112.6 | | | 126,200 | 126,200 | 126,200 | 252,400 | 50 |
| 41 | Public Boat Ramp and Dock | 05 | Squaxin Island Tribe | 111.0 | | | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 50 |
| 42 | Battle Point Park Phase II | 04 | Bainbridge Isl. P/R District | 110.9 | | 66,000 | | 66,000 | 66,000 | 132,000 | 50 |
| 43 | Des Moines Beach Park | 04 | Des Moines, City of | 107.3 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 167,500 | 317,500 | 47 |
| 44 | Play Shed | 11 | Wellpinit S.D. #49 | 102.9 | | 37,750 | | 37,750 | 37,750 | 75,500 | 50 |
| 45 | Cochrane Park | 05 | Yela, Town of | 102.8 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 289,000 | 439,000 | 44 |
| 46 | Floating Dock Improvements | 04 | Port Orchard, City of | 102.7 | | | 22,650 | 22,650 | 22,650 | 45,300 | 50 |
| 47 | Riverside Park | 07 | Cashmere, City of | 99.8 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 150,162 | 300,162 | 49 |
| 48 | Parker's Landing Park Dev. | 06 | Canas-Washougal, Port of | 99.1 | | 55,277 | | 55,277 | 55,278 | 110,555 | 49 |
| 49 | Snoqualmie CBD to Falls Rec. | 04 | Snoqualmie, City of | 96.6 | | 30,139 | | 30,139 | 30,139 | 60,278 | 50 |
| 50 | Bakerview Park | 03 | Mt. Vernon Parks & Recreation | 93.9 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 176,920 | 326,920 | 45 |
| 51 | Sultan River Park | 04 | Sultan, Town of | 92.7 | | 34,555 | | 34,555 | 34,556 | 69,111 | 49 |
| 52 | N. Keiso Nbrhd. Playground | 06 | Kelso, City of | 92.2 | | 8,296 | | 8,296 | 8,196 | 16,492 | 50 |
| 53 | 16th Avenue West Path | 04 | Seattle Engineering Dept. | 91.3 | | 37,600 | | 37,600 | 37,600 | 75,200 | 50 |
| <TOTAL> | | | | | | 4,136,859 | 1,041,405 | 5,178,280 | 7,773,460 | 12,951,724 | |

Clark County, Lacamas Lake Development (Ph. I): (88-065D) Mr. Del Schleichert, Director, Clark County Park and Recreation Department, clarified for Dr. Scull whether there was any size restriction for motorboats on the main part of the lake. In response to Mr. Jones' question, Mr. Webster stated A&E maximum is 10% on any project. The sales tax depends on where the project is located within the state, fluctuating from 7.3% on up.

- City of Wapato, Wapato Park Development: (88-030D) Committee members questioned the elimination of the golf course since the resume' seemed to include it as a part of the development project. Mr. Taylor stated the golf course would be removed to allow for other features in the park, and there are other golf courses available for use. Helen Hatzenbeler, Park Board Chairman City of Wapato, explained that the golf course was in disrepair and had not been kept up or used for many years. The people in the area do not golf but require the usual types of park equipment and facilities. The golf course is not playable nor usable.

Yakima County, Rotary Lake Development: (88-071D) Mr. Scull asked the water quality of the lake. Mr. Taylor replied it was considered good and the lake is spring fed with an outflow.

Everett Park Dept., Everett Riverfront Park, Phase II: (88-049D) Dr. Scull mentioned the concern about the very heavy off-road vehicle or trail bike activity near the park area. Mr. Larry Fairleigh explained the area being used by ORV recreationists is actually not an ORV park per se, but consists of a large sand pile. The City of Everett will be studying a request whether or not to make this into an ORV site. Dr. Scull said he was concerned about having a functioning ORV site near a public park since this would have an effect on the quality of use of the park. Mr. Webster stated there would be a NOVA Project on the agenda for review of the Committee on November 6th, calling for a feasibility study (ORV-87-39P - Riverfront Park ORV Feasibility Study), and that nothing would be finalized until this had been analyzed by the City of Everett. In reply to Mr. Ryan, Mr. Fairleigh stated the public pier/dock would be for fishing and local fishermen groups had been coordinating efforts to retain it.

City of Castle Rock, Community Swimming Pool: (88-048D) Mr. Jones asked about the "ash" area, which was actually a dredge spoils area on the slide. Parking facilities were also noted.

Lewis County Parks, Recreation and Senior Service: (88-003D) It was brought out that there is no other park in Southwest Lewis County allowing swimming recreation. Mr. Jones asked for the service area population on this project, and said he would like to see it included on all of the projects. Mr. Clark replied about 6,000 persons would be serviced by this park. Mr. Tveten pointed out there were other parks, however, - Mayfield Lake, Rainbow Falls, etc. Mr. Wayland stated there are several boat launching areas under his department, but people who use them come from all over, as far as Seattle. He assumed other people would gravitate to the park areas as well. Mr. Ryan asked how many of the projects being viewed had been before the Committee previously and how many were new. Mr. Webster replied though this was not on the resume, staff could provide the information with the remaining projects.

City of Elma, Acquisition - 3 Acre Expansion: (88-009A) Ms. Cox was informed the acquisition would be approximately 3.6 acres as an expansion of the existing park.

Private property appeared to encroach on adequate space for one of the ball-fields. Staff advised field was adequate for its purpose of use - Little League Baseball. The City will also be attempting to acquire the private property in the future.

Town of Eatonville, George H. Smallwood Memorial Park: (88-006A) Mr. Pinnix questioned the Waiver of Retroactivity given to the town by IAC staff. Mr. Webster explained this is only given upon evidence that there will be a lost opportunity and there is an emergent need for acquisition. The Town had so advised staff and was permitted an IAC Waiver of Retroactivity.

Yakima County, Lower Valley Regional Park: (88-050A) It was noted this would be a regional park serving Clark County residents in the Lower Valley area. Some questions were asked about locations of various elements, and Mr. Taylor asked that the Committee keep in mind this was an acquisition project and that later on the facilities might be placed elsewhere than as presently indicated in the proposed later development.

Northport School District, Community Softball/Little League Field: (88-012D) In response to questions, Mr. Clark pointed out this would be a combination softball and little league field primarily for children, older youth, and women. The adult male program will use school site facilities four or five blocks from this area. The service population was given as about 400.

City of Aberdeen, Morrison Riverfront Park Phase II: (88-023D) Mr. Clark explained the previous projects funded by IAC to the City of Aberdeen for this park: 1977 acquisition of 6.1 acres and 1st phase development in 1983. Also, the site of an old logging mill was discussed. Mr. Clark also noted that the next phase for this park would include a boat launch ramp.

Town of Wilson Creek, Town Ball Park Renovation: (88-060D) Ms. Cox asked about lighting, and was informed the two ball fields will be lighted, and that some of the smaller communities sometimes receive donations for elements within their projects. It was pointed out there are no similar facilities in the town for use by the public.

City of Bothell, Park at Bothell Landing Expansion: (88-033A) Mr. Taylor advised that the land was available now for purchase; there is a willing seller. Mr. Wayland asked if it was in danger of being converted to some other use if not acquired now. Mr. Taylor replied the sponsor had not so indicated, but it could be in jeopardy.

Port of Bellingham, Saltwater Marine Park & Trail System: (88-021D) Parking facilities were pointed out for Dr. Scull. Other park facilities were also indicated on the slide for Committee members. The park is essentially for non-boaters. Mr. Webster explained that all support elements are accessible to the handicapped, but in some projects it might not be geographically convenient to make all areas of a project so accessible.

City of Hoquiam, Hoquiam Buttress Park: (88-046D) In response to a question from Mr. Ryan, Mr. Webster stated staff would be recommending funding of only the boating elements of this project with Initiative 215 funds.

Port of Klickitat, Public Sand Beach, Swim Dock, BBQ: (88-036D) In response to Dr. Scull, Mr. Clark stated the Port owned certain property adjacent to the project, with logging operations in one area. He also noted that the Port is the site for an ALEA grant application presently being discussed with the Department of Natural Resources, and is committed to recreational aspects of the Port's overall operation. He also explained that it was not possible to place Init. 215 funds in the project since it was not boating-related. Mr. Webster also noted there was an existing boat ramp in the area which had been funded sometime ago. Drainage materials will be used to elevate a part of the land so that it may be usable in the project.

Squaxin Island Tribe, Public Boat Ramp and Dock: (88-044D) The parking area located about 500' from the boat ramp was noted for Mr. Tveten. Mr. Jones asked why the ranking was low; was this due to lack of maintenance? Mr. Taylor replied this was a reflection of the fact that the parking is a long ways away from the facilities. The area is, however, heavily used.

City of Des Moines, Des Moines Beach Park: (88-010D) The site location in relation to the Saltwater State Park was explained by Mr. Tveten (five or six miles south). Buildings were to be removed from the project except one residential house, which will be used as a senior center, and another smaller residence. Mr. Taylor pointed out on the slide where access to the beach would be in the project. Mr. Tveten stated the upper portion of this particular park would also tie in with the King County Trail System.

Wellpinit School District #49, Play Shed: (88-055D) Ms. Cox observed there was no provision for lighting in the project. Mr. Clark explained that the shed would be unlighted but that the lights from the parking would be there. Service area was given as about 900.

City of Cashmere, Riverfront Park: (88-061D) Mr. Taylor mentioned the local share dependent on voter approval of a bond issue would not be available since the bond issue failed to pass.

Mt. Vernon Parks and Recreation, Bakerview Park: (88-035D) In response to a question of Dr. Scull, Mr. Fairleigh stated the current land use was open field, but the City has begun the site preparation.

Town of Sultan, Sultan River Park: (88-037D) Access to the river was discussed. There are some requirements under the Department of Transportation system to provide access where there are bridges.

Presentation of the local agencies' projects concluded at 10:50 a.m.

Mr. Tveten complimented the City of Raymond and the City of Willapa on submitting their projects to the IAC for consideration. These are two depressed areas and yet they were able to formulate their plans and apply for funds. Mr. Pinnix mentioned the City of South Bend also.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "Local Agencies Project Funding Recommendation", which was distributed to the Committee and attendees. (FUNDING RECOM. PAGE 9) The following points were noted:

- (1) Funding was formulated on the basis of five basic criteria:

LOCAL FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS - 1987

November 5, 1987

Table Number 2
Staff Funding Recommendation
1987

| Rk | Name | Re | Sponsor | Score | LACF \$ | Bonds | Init 215 | IAC Total | Local Sh | Tot Cost | % |
|---------|--------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----|
| 1 | Seacrest Park | 4 | Seattle, City of | 146.0 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,650,000 | 9 |
| 2 | Willapa Nature Park | 2 | Raymond, City of | 136.5 | 0 | 0 | 143,246 | 143,246 | 143,246 | 286,492 | 50 |
| 3 | Pt. Defiance Park Wtrft. Dev. | 4 | Tacoma MPD | 136.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Cummings Prop. Dev., Phase II | 4 | Tacoma MPD | 135.6 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 | 294,191 | 444,191 | 33 |
| 5 | Lacamas Lake Dev. Phase I | 6 | Clark County Parks | 133.2 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,171 | 300,171 | 49 |
| 6 | Wapato Park Development | 8 | Wapato, City of | 132.4 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 50 |
| 7 | Burlington Regional Playfields | 3 | Skagit County | 130.5 | 30,000 | 120,000 | 0 | 150,000 | 181,022 | 331,022 | 45 |
| 8 | Rotary Lake | 8 | Yakima County | 130.0 | 47,500 | 0 | 0 | 47,500 | 47,500 | 95,000 | 50 |
| 9 | Everett Rfrt. Park, Phase II | 4 | Everett Park Department | 129.5 | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 50 |
| 10 | China Lake Wetland Enhancement | 4 | Tacoma, City of | 126.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Lake Fenwick Park Development | 4 | Kent Parks & Recreation | 125.0 | 120,000 | 0 | 0 | 120,000 | 173,000 | 293,000 | 41 |
| 12 | A. M. Cannon Park Expansion | 12 | Spokane, City of | 124.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Dayton Levee Project | 13 | Dayton, City of | 124.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Columbia Pt. Btng. Acc. Ph. II | 10 | Richland, City of | 123.9 | 0 | 0 | 149,017 | 149,017 | 149,017 | 298,034 | 50 |
| 15 | Community Swimming Pool | 6 | Castle Rock, City of | 123.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | Develop New Regional Park Site | 5 | Lewis Cty. Parks & Recreation | 123.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | Acquisition of 3 Acres - Exp. | 2 | Elma, City of | 122.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | George H. Smallwood Mem. Park | 4 | Eatonville, Town of | 122.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | Lower Valley Regional Park | 8 | Yakima County | 122.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | Northport Coa. Sball/Lit Leag | 11 | Northport School District | 120.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | Evergreen Park Boat Lch. Imp. | 4 | Bremerton, Port of | 120.8 | 0 | 0 | 109,848 | 109,848 | 109,848 | 219,697 | 49 |
| 22 | Recreational Vehicle Park | 12 | Medical Lake, City of | 120.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | Skvkomish River Centennial Par | 4 | Monroe, City of | 120.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | Marina Development/Acquisition | 4 | Edmonds, Port of | 120.5 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 163,000 | 333,000 | 45 |
| 25 | Geraldine Oldhorn Swan Plgd. | 11 | Inchelium School District #70 | 120.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | Morrison Rft. Park Phase II | 2 | Aberdeen, City of | 119.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 | Town Ball Park Renovation | 9 | Wilson Creek, Town of | 119.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 | Washougal River Greenway | 6 | Canas, City of | 118.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29 | Bender Road | 3 | Lynden, City of | 118.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | Grange Park Phase I Develop. | 10 | Kennewick, City of | 117.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | Marvmoor Athletic Fields | 4 | King County | 116.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32 | Park at Bothell Landing Exp. | 4 | Bothell, City of | 115.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33 | Saltwater Marine P/T System | 3 | Bellingham, Port of | 115.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 | Hoquiam Buttress Park | 2 | Hoquiam, City of | 115.1 | 0 | 0 | 56,500 | 56,500 | 56,500 | 113,000 | 50 |
| 35 | Aima Park Extension | 7 | Okanogan, City of | 115.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36 | Robert Bush Waterfront Park | 2 | South Bend, City of | 113.9 | 0 | 0 | 22,382 | 22,382 | 22,382 | 44,764 | 50 |
| 37 | Cascade Park Btg/Support Fac. | 9 | Moses Lake, City of | 113.8 | 0 | 0 | 64,180 | 64,180 | 64,180 | 128,360 | 50 |
| 38 | Public Sand Beach, Dock, BBQ | 6 | Klickitat, Port of | 113.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39 | Renovate/Cover Exist Pool/Park | 2 | Willapa Park & Recreation | 112.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | Columbia Park West Phase I | 10 | Benton Co. Parks/Rec. Dept. | 112.6 | 0 | 0 | 126,200 | 126,200 | 126,200 | 252,400 | 50 |
| 41 | Public Boat Ramp and Dock | 5 | Squaxin Island Tribe | 111.0 | 0 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 50 |
| 42 | Battle Point Park Phase II | 4 | Bainbridge Isl. P/R District | 110.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43 | Des Moines Beach Park | 4 | Des Moines, City of | 107.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44 | Play Shed | 11 | Wellpinit S.D. #49 | 102.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | Cochrane Park | 5 | Yelm, Town of | 102.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | Floating Dock Improvements | 4 | Port Orchard, City of | 102.7 | 0 | 0 | 22,650 | 22,650 | 22,650 | 45,300 | 50 |
| 47 | Riverside Park | 7 | Cashmere, City of | 99.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48 | Parker's Landing Park Dev. | 6 | Canas-Washougal, Port of | 99.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 49 | Snoqualmie CBD to Falls Rec. | 4 | Snoqualmie, City of | 96.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 | Bakerview Park | 3 | Mt. Vernon Parks & Recreation | 93.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51 | Sultan River Park | 4 | Sultan, Town of | 92.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 52 | N. Kelso Nbrhd. Playground | 6 | Kelso, City of | 92.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 53 | 16th Avenue West Path | 4 | Seattle Engineering Dept. | 91.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (TOTAL) | | | | | 347,500 | 570,000 | 1,019,023 | 1,936,523 | 3,547,908 | 5,484,431 | |

1. Amount of available funding for local projects;
2. Source of funding and relative restrictions.
3. Relative ranking of the projects as determined through the Evaluation System.
4. Suggested funding guidelines of a maximum of 50 percent IAC participation, with \$150,000 ceiling for projects, and
5. Attempt to fund as many worthy projects as possible.

Mr. Webster referred to Available Source of Funds:

| | SOURCE OF FUNDS | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | TOTAL | LWCF | INIT. 215 | STATE BONDS |
| Cash on Hand (Fund Summary) | \$ 430,576 | \$ 2,038 | \$ 356,802 | \$ 71,736 |
| Projected Receipts to June 30, 1988: | | | | |
| Estimated LWCF Apportionment | 310,000 | 310,000 | -0- | -0- |
| Estimated LWCF Reapportionment | 38,121 | 38,121 | -0- | -0- |
| Estimated Allotment Authority | 500,000 | -0- | -0- | 500,000 |
| Estimated Receipts from D.O.L. (Initiative 215) | 985,000 | -0- | 985,000 | -0- |
| <u>TOTAL ESTIMATED AVAILABLE</u> | \$ 2,263,697 | \$ 350,159 | \$ 1,341,802 | \$ 571,7356 |

\$2,263,697 was available for allocation contingent upon the Land and Water Conservation Funds being allocated by Congress. (\$620,000 - one-half for local projects; one-half for state agencies projects.)

It was pointed out that the Initiative 215 funds in the amount of \$985,000 were only through the current Fiscal Year (June 30, 1988).

Mr. Tveten questioned the \$500,000 Estimated Allotment Authority in State Bonds. This was not shown in the Fund Summary. Mr. Baker replied it was not included in the Fund Summary in order to give the Committee leeway to use it at their discretion. It is not the intent of staff to program that money in the Fund Summary since the Committee might want to use it in some other manner within their authority. Mr. Tveten agreed that there are two different programs and the state agencies funds are included in the Fund Summary to show consistency since state projects are already appropriated by projects in the Capital Budget. Mr. Wilder pointed out the \$500,000 in state bonds for local agencies was all that would be available for this biennium, and since there are urgent needs, staff was recommending it be allocated now.

Mr. Webster proceeded with Staff Funding Recommendations, TABLE 2, citing funding recommendations project-by-project.

(THE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 9 OF THESE MINUTES WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY STAFF - PROJECTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 21, 24, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, and 46.)

#9 - Everett Park Department, Everett Riverfront Park, Ph. 2: (88-049D) Mr. Wayland felt there should be more information on the City of Everett's proposal in conjunction with the Off-Road Vehicle area which is being used now by recreationists. He wanted to know if the ORV activities would be compatible with the park's use. Mr. Webster returned to the slides of the project and pointed out the ORV area and its relationship to the park site. He reiterated the fact that there was a NOVA Project for review by the Committee on November 6 which involved a feasibility study (ORV 87-39P).

Mr. Robert Cooper, Director, Parks and Recreation City of Everett explained the present use of the ORV site and the proposal for a feasibility study. Mr. Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, briefly outlined the purpose of the feasibility study: it will explore methods of sanctioning and operating areas for ORV use, ways of monitoring and managing the area, type of facilities, and legal and liability aspects of operating an ORV facility. Also it will take into account any conflicts involved. Dr. Scull felt the continued use of the ORV site would have a direct impact on the Everett Park proposal, and he stated he had strong reservations about funding the project. Mr. Cooper advised there was no commitment to use the ORV site at this time and the City regards it as a waterfront park possibility. ORV recreationists are, however, using the site. The purpose of the study is to deal with this use and to find out the impacts. Mr. Lovelady stated the entire area is impacted heavily by the noise coming from the freeway, and actually the ORV use is not that noticeable. Mr. Pinnix felt this was a worthwhile point to consider, and also the fact that there will be a feasibility study made. He did not feel the ORV use would harm the Riverfront Park use.

Mr. Webster continued review of the projects ending with #46, City of Port Orchard, Floating Dock Improvements.

Dr. Scull stated his bias toward the small communities who don't seem to have the opportunity to develop plans and when they do are unable to receive funding. He mentioned the #8, Yakima County, Rotary Lake project and asked if it would be possible to take some of those funds, since it is a project that appears to be doing very well, and place them into #20, Northport School District, Northport Community Softball/Little League Project and #27, Town of Wilson Creek, Town Ball Park Renovation. He felt Yakima County already had many recreational opportunities for its citizens whereas the smaller communities did not.

Ms. Cox asked if there were any supplemental points in the Evaluation System given to smaller communities. Mr. Webster noted the legislative mandate that the IAC must give some preference to urban development, and this is reflected in Question D-1 of the Evaluation System. Additional scoring is thus given on larger populated areas. Mr. Wilder stated the IAC tries to do the best it can to assist the smaller communities and they are provided for to some degree in the Evaluation System.

Mr. Wayland brought out the fact that the Committee is looking at very limited funding. Once certain funds are allocated to the high scored projects, there remain only Initiative 215 funds which must be placed in boater-oriented projects. There are no bond funds nor Land and Water Conservation Funds left. Mr. Wayland said he sympathized with the smaller communities, but it would be necessary to go back over staff's recommendations and reallocate monies to assist projects which had not scored very high. If projects are reduced, then the project scope is also reduced, and the project may not fulfill the needs of the public.

Mr. Webster pointed out that staff and the Evaluation Team had spent considerable effort in bringing to the Committee the best projects. Staff felt very strongly that the evaluation process has been used to fund the quality projects based on ranking. If these are cut in funds, the quality of the projects will suffer and they might not rank the same on reconsideration. Mr. Webster stated there were sufficient Initiative 215 funds to fund all of the boating projects.

Dr. Scull was assured that project applications are reviewed as to service areas and there is a Question related to this in the Evaluation system. Dr. Scull referred to #7 - Skagit County, Burlington Regional Playfields, stating there were a lot of other facilities in that particular area; whereas in Wilson Creek there were no other areas to recreate. Mr. Wayland noted that Wilson creek is about 10 miles from Soap Lake and fifteen from Ephrata. Mr. Webster again stated this was considered in the Evaluation System. Mr. Ryan asked to what extent does an urban community receive total points. Mr. Webster referred to Question D-1 of the Evaluation System, Section C: Cities and Districts of 100,000 and above - 10 points; 30,000 to 100,000 - 8; 10,000 to 30,000 - 6 and 10,000 and below - 4. Mr. Fairleigh mentioned there is one question which has entirely benefited the smaller communities--Question D-1 - Is the project located within a county for which no project has been funded for a period of "X" number of years. Ten points is given for five or more years and Northport received that amount.

Ms. Cox referred to the Evaluation Workshop Session held for the benefit of the IAC members which had assisted her in understanding the point system. Mr. Wilder also mentioned the need for the Technical Advisory Committee to review each project prior to the Evaluation Session.

Mr. Pinnix felt something should be done to assist the acquisition projects since he had observed that not many of these receive funding. Perhaps at some point the Committee could look at the Evaluation System and revise it to aid acquisition projects. He then asked if staff had attempted to spread the dollars further by going back to project sponsors and asking if their projects could be matched locally at a greater amount than stipulated. Mr. Webster stated this could have been done, but this approach had not been used except in the case of the City of Kent which had opted to come up with an additional \$30,000. Mr. Pinnix asked if some funding was "moved around" would it still be possible to fund the high priority projects? Mr. Wilder stated it was not possible to give a "yes" or "no" answer on this question. The staff has reviewed the projects and is aware of elements within them. The question is available funds and these have been distributed through the Evaluation System.

Mr. Ryan stated he was uncomfortable with changing the recommendations for this funding session. Staff has "played by the rules" and if the Evaluation System needs changing, this can be accomplished later. Mr. Pinnix stated he was not making a motion but was concerned that it would not make sense to change funding of the projects which had already gone through an Evaluation System. Mr. Wayland accepted the fact that staff had followed the usual procedures for funding of projects, and that the local sponsors had indicated the dollars they would need. It would be very difficult for locals to change their funding programs.

At this point, Mr. Mackey asked Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, if he should comment since he was a private consultant to the Everett project. Mr. Lane advised him not to comment since the outcome of the discussion might affect that particular project.

Mr. Jones shared the concern of the Committee members, stating he had a greater appreciation for the problems staff faces in evaluating projects after he had attended the Evaluation Workshop. He felt it would not be right to change the funding amounts in view of what has already taken place in ranking the projects. Dr. Scull agreed stating he had great respect for the staff's efforts, yet he was sad that nothing could be done for the smaller communities at this time.

Following a quick review of projects that staff recommended for funding as requested by Mr. Jones, the Chair called for public input.

Helen Hatzenbeler, Park Committee Chairman, City of Wapato - Wapato Park Development (88-030D): Asked that the Committee approve staff recommendations and fund the City of Wapato's Park Development project.

Robert Cooper, Director Parks & Recreation, City of Everett - Everett Riverfront Park, Phase 2 (88-049D): Stated he had already addressed the Committee concerning the Everett project.

IT WAS MOVED BY BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 14 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) 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 14 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

MR. MACKEY ABSTAINED FROM VOTING. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

Ms. Cox asked that the local agencies' sponsors present speak up for continued funding sources for the IAC.

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 1:00 AND RECONVENED AT 2:03 P.M.

II. C. PROJECTS SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS REPORT: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "Project Services Division Report", reporting as follows:

IAC LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECTS FUNDED NOVEMBER 5, 1987

| Name | Sponsor | LWC | Bond | Initiative 215 | Local Share | Total Cost |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|----------------|-------------|------------|
| Seacrest Park | Seattle, City of | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,650,000 |
| Willapa Nature Park | Raymond, City of | 0 | 0 | 143,246 | 143,246 | 286,492 |
| Cummings Prop. Dev., Phase II | Tacoma MPD | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 294,191 | 444,191 |
| Lacamas Lake Dev. Phase I | Clark County Parks | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,171 | 300,171 |
| Wapato Park Development | Wapato, City of | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 | 300,000 |
| Burlington Regional Playfields | Skagit County | 30,000 | 120,000 | 0 | 181,022 | 331,022 |
| Rotary Lake | Yakima County | 47,500 | 0 | 0 | 47,500 | 95,000 |
| Everett Rfrt. Park, Phase II | Everett, City of | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 300,000 |
| Lake Fenwick Park Development | Kent, City of | 120,000 | 0 | 0 | 173,000 | 293,000 |
| Columbia Pt. Btng. Acc. Ph. II | Richland, City of | 0 | 0 | 149,017 | 149,017 | 298,034 |
| Evergreen Park Boat Lch. Imp. | Bremerton, Port of | 0 | 0 | 109,848 | 109,849 | 219,697 |
| Marina Development/Acquisition | Edmonds, Port of | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 183,000 | 333,000 |
| Hoquiam Buttress Park | Hoquiam, City of | 0 | 0 | 56,500 | 56,500 | 113,000 |
| Robert Bush Waterfront Park | South Bend, City of | 0 | 0 | 22,382 | 22,382 | 44,764 |
| Cascade Park Btg/Support Fac. | Moses Lake, City of | 0 | 0 | 64,180 | 64,180 | 128,360 |
| Columbia Park West Phase I | Benton County | 0 | 0 | 126,200 | 126,200 | 252,400 |
| Public Boat Ramp and Dock | Squaxin Island Tribe | 0 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| Floating Dock Improvements | Port Orchard, City of | 0 | 0 | 22,650 | 22,650 | 45,300 |
| <TOTAL> | | 347,500 | 570,000 | 1,019,023 | 3,547,908 | 5,484,431 |

LOCAL PROJECTS AS FUNDED BY THE COMMITTEE 11-5-87

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|
| Acq. & Dev. | 1 | |
| Acquisition | 1 | |
| Developmtn | 16 | |
| | | 18 projects |
| IAC Funding: | | |
| | LWCF | 347,500 |
| | Bonds | 570,000 |
| | Init. 215 | 1,019,023 |
| | TOTAL | 1,936,523 |

(1) One hundred and seventeen (117) Letters of Intent were received; twenty-two were withdrawn, leaving 53 applications for funding consideration.

Projects were reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) - September 10-11, Kent and September 15-16, Richland.

(2) Evaluation Team met October 19-23 for evaluating and scoring of the project applications.

(3) Appreciation expressed to the Evaluation Team:
Earl Williams, Thurston Co. (Assoc. Counties)
Steve Colby, City of Anacortes (Assoc. Cities)
Steve Knauer, Metro. Park Dist., Tacoma (WRPA)
Gene Baker, Port of Bremerton (Public Ports Assoc.)
Rich Costello, Dept. of Fisheries (State Agencies, TAC)
Gordon Atkins, National Park Service Representative.

(4) State Agencies Project Administration: Seventy-two (72) projects ongoing.

(5) STATE AGENCIES MASTER LIST APPROVALS:

Parks & Recreation:

Boat Traffic Control 88-500D \$ 110,000 State Funds (215)

Provide boat traffic control markers/buoys for boating safety at 13 state parks.

Boating Facilities - Omnibus 88-501D \$ 969,000 State Funds (215)

Development of boating facilities in 17 state parks.

Boating Facilities - Contingency 88-502D \$ 221,000 State Funds (215)

Provide renovation and/or improvements to/for boating facilities at 11 state parks.

Moses Lake Boat Launch 88-503D \$ 192,000 State Funds (215)

Provide boat launch facility/parking, comfort station/related support facilities at Moses Lake State Park, Grant County

Chief Timothy Boat Launch 88-504D \$ 230,000 State Funds (215)

Project will expand existing boat launching facilities at Chief Timothy State Park, Asotin County.

Department of Natural Resources :

Statewide Site Renovation 88-700D \$ 574,000 State Funds

Recreation site renovation at 16 DNR recreation sites.

TOTAL Funding: \$2,296,000

(6) Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Program (ALEA): Twenty-five (25) applications were received from local agencies for grants from the Department of Natural Resources' Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) program. There are sixteen local and eighteen state projects presently being administered through the IAC. The new applications were evaluated and scored on October 28-29. Commissioner of Public Lands will be selecting the projects for funding soon.

III. A. PROJECT CHANGES:

(1) Snohomish County, Southwest County Park, IAC #71-031A, Land Exchange: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, concerning exchange of lands. The County requested conversion of a small (920 square feet) parcel of park property to road right-of-way as part of an access to a new subdivision bordering the park. A like amount of property would be added to the park as additional forested open space.

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

WHEREAS, IN 1971 SNOHOMISH COUNTY WITH IAC ASSISTANCE ACQUIRED A 120 ACRE PARCEL OF LAND KNOWN AS THE SOUTHWEST COUNTY PARK (IAC #71-031A), AND

WHEREAS, SNOHOMISH COUNTY AND AN ADJACENT LANDOWNER WISH TO EXCHANGE PARCELS OF LAND EACH HAVING 920 SQUARE FEET WITH AN EQUAL VALUE OF \$920 FOR A ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THIS EXCHANGE MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.17A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

1. THE EXCHANGE WILL HAVE NO NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE 120 ACRE SOUTHWEST COUNTY PARK PROPERTY;
2. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF EACH PARCEL IS IDENTICAL;
3. THE PARCEL TO BE ACQUIRED HAS A RECREATION UTILITY AT LEAST THAT OF THE PARCEL BEING EXCHANGED;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE LAND EXCHANGE IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

(2) City of Bremerton, Lions Community Playfield, IAC #80-010D - Request for Reinstatement of Project Contract and Extension of Ending Date: Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, stating that the City of Bremerton requested reinstatement of its project contract and extension of the ending date for its Lions Community Playfield. The City will construct a new restroom in the park to replace an obsolete facility, and has funds remaining in the project if it could be reinstated and extended.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX THAT,

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE CITY OF BREMERTON LIONS COMMUNITY PLAYFIELD PROJECT (IAC #80-010D) IN NOVEMBER, 1979, AND

WHEREAS, THE PROJECT CONTRACT EXPIRED JUNE 30, 1987, WITH A NEEDED RESTROOM FACILITY YET TO BE COMPLETED, AND

WHEREAS, IT IS NECESSARY TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT ENDING DATE IN ORDER TO MAKE EXPENDITURES ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW RESTROOM ELIGIBLE FOR REIMBURSEMENT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CITY OF BREMERTON LIONS COMMUNITY PLAYFIELD PROJECT CONTRACT, IAC #80-010D, BE REINSTATED AND THE ENDING DATE EXTENDED TO DECEMBER 31, 1988, AND THE IAC DIRECTOR AUTHORIZED TO REQUEST AN EXTENSION OF THE ENDING DATE OF THE IAC/NPS AGREEMENT (NPS 53-00449) TO DECEMBER 31, 1988, AND UPON THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE APPROVAL EXECUTE THE NECESSARY PROJECT CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

(3) State Parks and Recreation Commission, Auburn Game Farm, IAC #82-501A - Land Exchange: Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, concerning the Auburn Game Farm Land Exchange, reporting the following:

(a) State Parks requested approval to exchange approximately 8 acres of park land lying South of the Stuck River Road for a parcel of privately owned property and about 7.5 acres in size contiguous to the park site and North of the Stuck River Road. This exchange would consolidate park ownership and better utilize the park area South of White River. State Parks plans future development of this portion to include day camp and overnight camping.

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

WHEREAS, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS COMPLETED ACQUISITION OF THE AUBURN GAME FARM SITE (IAC #82-501A) WITH FUNDS (\$1,500,000 HJR 52) APPROPRIATED TO THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT (ORA) AS PART OF THE STATE AGENCIES CAPITAL BUDGET MASTER LIST APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON JUNE 26, 1981, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT A LAND EXCHANGE OF APPROXIMATELY 8 ACRES OF PARK LAND FOR ABOUT 7.5 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND AS REQUESTED BY THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL ENHANCE PUBLIC RECREATION USE OF THE PARK BY CONSOLIDATING PARK PROPERTY IN ELIMINATING SEPARATION BY A COUNTY ROAD, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN FURTHER DETERMINED THAT THIS EXCHANGE MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

1. THE EXCHANGE WILL ENHANCE PUBLIC RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES BY ALLOWING RECREATION FACILITIES TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONTIGUOUS UNITS WITHOUT SEPARATION BY A COUNTY ROAD.
2. THE VALUE OF THE RESPECTIVE PARCELS OF LAND HAVE BEEN DETERMINED BY APPROVED APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES WHICH HAVE DETERMINED THE REPLACEMENT PARCEL IS OF HIGHER FAIR MARKET VALUE THAN THE PARK PARCEL TO BE EXCHANGED,

3. THE PARCEL TO BE RECEIVED IS AT LEAST EQUAL IN RECREATION UTILITY;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE EXCHANGE OF LAND REQUESTED BY STATE PARKS IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE REQUIRED CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

- Mr. Wayland was aware of this particular park property and said the proposal was a good one.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(4) Department of Wildlife, Methow Wildlife Area, IAC #75-626A - Land Exchange: Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, concerning the land exchange for the Methow Wildlife Area project, noting the following:

(a) The Department of Wildlife requested an exchange of 35.15 acres of its original acquisition (Big Buck Ranch) together with another department parcel of 43.83 acres, not funded with IAC monies, in exchange for 346.32 acres of land approximately eight miles north of Big Buck Ranch. The department would retain a five acre fishing access together with a pedestrian fishing easement along the river on the parcel to be exchanged.

(b) The department will gain a threatened critical winter range and migration route for mule deer adjacent to the Methow Habitat Management Area, and at the same time retain parking and fishing access to the exchanged properties on the Twisp and Chewack Rivers.

Discussion followed. Ms. Cox was assured the exchanges were necessary and would be of assistance to the Department of Wildlife in its management of critical winter range area and migration route for wildlife. Mr. Clark stated there was a possibility of losing this particular range area for wildlife, the land sold for private use. Mr. Wayland explained the project further pointing out on the slides each parcel and its purpose in the transaction. Dr. Scull mentioned his concern for the ski trail in that area. He hoped this would remain open to the public as it is extensively used. Mr. Wayland assured him this was in the plans and the ski trail would be retained.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE ACQUIRED APPROXIMATELY 2,750 ACRES IN 1975 WITH IAC ASSISTANCE KNOWN AS THE BIG BUCK RANCH (IAC #75-626A) FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A WINTER DEER RANGE AND GENERAL RECREATION AREA NORTHWEST OF TWISP IN OKANOGAN COUNTY, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT APPROXIMATELY 35.15 ACRES OF THE BIG BUCK RANCH WHILE RETAINING FISHING ACCESS AND PEDESTRIAN EASEMENT ALONG THE TWISP RIVER IN EXCHANGE FOR APPROXIMATELY 346 ACRES OF CRITICAL WINTER RANGE AND MIGRATION ROUTE FOR MULE DEER ADJACENT TO THE METHOW HABITAT MANAGEMENT AREA, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION PROCESS AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL MEET THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PROCEDURAL MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.17A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

1. ALL PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES TO THE CONVERSION HAVE BEEN EVALUATED AND REJECTED ON SOUND BASIS;
2. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE LAND TO BE CONVERTED HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED AND THE LAND PROPOSED FOR SUBSTITUTION IS OF AT LEAST EQUAL CURRENT FAIR MARKET VALUE;
3. THE LAND PROPOSED FOR REPLACEMENT IS OF REASONABLY EQUIVALENT RECREATION UTILITY AND LOCATION TO THAT BEING CONVERTED;
4. THE LAND PROPOSED FOR SUBSTITUTION MEETS THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT FOR ACQUISITION PROJECTS. THE REPLACEMENT LAND WILL STAND ON ITS OWN MERITS AS OR PART OF, A VIABLE RECREATION AREA;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AFFECTING BIG BUCK RANCH (IAC #75-626A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

Ms. Cox wanted to be assured that the animals would have access; the public, access to the waters, and the skiers, to their trails. Mr. Wayland assured her this would be authorized through the project's approval.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Chair recognized Mr. John Aarstad, Director, Skagit County Park and Recreation Department: He advised the Committee that he was a member of the Legislative Committee for the Association of Counties Park Affiliates. This group will be going on record to support the Land and Water Conservation Fund program and will be working toward any assistance it can give regarding fund sources. Further, he stressed the group's concern for the Interagency Committee and the forthcoming study to be completed by January 1989. Speaking for the group, he felt the IAC as presently organized is working very well and has proved itself in allocating the various funds it has been authorized to administer. The County Affiliates will be able to help in lobbying to retain the IAC in its current status. He hoped the Committee would help to establish the coalition it had discussed earlier in the morning. His group, he said, would be talking to the Washington Recreation and Park Association and the Association of Cities. Local agencies need to be involved. On behalf of the Committee, Ms. Cox thanked Mr. Aarstad for his message.

IV. D. WASHINGTON WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN - SCORP ADDITION: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "Washington Wetlands Priority Plan - SCORP Amendment". He advised there were copies of the Wetlands Plan available, though in limited supply. The proposed final draft of the Plan was mailed to IAC members and designees on October 14, 1987, to assure review prior to the Committee's meeting. Appendices were included in that mailing. Ms. Cox mentioned the Committee members also received two letters concerning the Plan from interested persons and organizations.

Enclosures with the memorandum to the Committee were:

- (a) Draft of letter from Director, IAC, to Governor Booth Gardner transmitting the Wetlands Priority Plan when approved by the Committee.

- (b) Suggested letter from Governor Gardner to Charles H. Odegaard, Regional Director, Pac. NW Region, NPS - transmitting the Priority Plan when finalized.
- (c) Draft of an Amended Wetlands Plan Adoption Motion for review by the Committee today.

Ms. Lorinda Anderson, Recreation Resource Planner, was introduced as the staff member who had spearheaded the plan's preparation through an advisory committee. Ms. Anderson introduced Gordon Atkins, National Park Service, who had served on the Wetlands Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee had been composed of five Federal agencies, 6 State agencies, as well as a representative from The Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Lands.

Ms. Anderson reported as follows:

- (1) Preservation of Wetlands is essential - "they aren't making them any more".
- (2) The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors identified wetlands and their preservation as critical.
- (3) An Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986, (EWR), Section 303, was passed amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.
- (4) The IAC was asked to add an official Wetlands Plan as a part of its Sixth Edition of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan - SCORP.
- (5) The Plan will continue Washington's eligibility in the LWCF program.
- (6) The Plan complies with the direction received through the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Services' National Wetlands Priority Plan, as well as the above mentioned Emergency Wetlands Act.
- (7) A deadline date of October 1, 1987 was set by the EWR Act (item 3 above) for receipt of the Plan. A draft was submitted to meet that deadline and was accepted. Committee approval is required for the plan through a motion.
- (8) Consider the plan as an interim step toward development of specific focus of wetlands in recreation. It is a working plan and will change.
- (9) The Wetlands Advisory Committee met several times and there were comments received for inclusion in the final draft of the Plan.
- (10) There were two months to write the plan, review it and submit it. There were two advisory committee meetings; one legislative meeting; and two drafts were sent out for public review and comment.
- (11) Contents of the Plan: (a) an assessment of the status of wetlands (inventory/estimation of threat); (b) identification of protection strategies for wetlands; (c) discussion of issues of concern regarding wetlands; and (d) development of a criteria system that selects priority wetlands.

Ms. Anderson stated the plan will require further study; and improved coordination of various programs for wetlands should occur. She referred specifically to Chapter 6 - Implementation/Recommendations and commented on what needs to be done now that the plan has been written. The IAC can continue to use its current evaluation process for local agency and state agency projects since the wetlands criteria is already considered in this process. A criteria system will need to be developed for classification of wetlands to be preserved. The Department of Ecology will be the lead agency (with assistance of DNR and the Department of Wildlife) in development of a wetlands preservation program for the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority. DNR will take the lead in the wetlands

preservation mode, necessary to preserve and protect in perpetuity those wetlands chosen. There will also be local participation in wetlands management through a to-be adopted statewide minimum standards for local management programs.

At the conclusion of Ms. Anderson's remarks, Mr. Mackey complimented her on her report and the Wetlands Priority Plan. Dr. Scull asked if there would be ongoing work with The Nature Conservancy and Trust for Public Lands. Mr. Pinnix replied that DNR had its Natural Heritage Preservation Program and the most recent funding specifically calls for private non-profit groups to use matching funds along with the monies appropriated by the legislature for this purpose. There is a charge to match one dollar for every four public dollars into the acquisition program. Ms. Anderson acknowledged the assistance given to the IAC in the Wetlands Plan by The Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Lands.

Jack Wayland expressed his support for the plan since wetlands are a part of the habitat for wildlife, providing resources for them. However, the Department of Wildlife did have some questions and had written a letter to the IAC. He asked if the plan conformed to the National Wetlands Conservation Plan in terms of priorities and acquisition. Mr. Lovelady replied it currently does, but because of the rapidity of the actions taken on wetlands, the National Plan has not yet been adopted. It will be necessary to continually update Washington's plan. He said staff will suggest that the plan be adopted on an interim basis, to be updated from time to time.

Mr. Wayland felt specific wetland areas should be in the plan -- identification of these regionally or in some specific way, and that this should conform to the National Plan. Ms. Anderson said this would be done; that the most important wetland areas would be identified and included as a part of the National Plan. Mr. Wayland then asked if this meant that his letter of comments had been accepted and would be incorporated into the Wetlands Plan. Mr. Lovelady stated for the most part they would be, but it will be necessary because of the short time limit given to prepare and write the plan, to continue meeting with certain agencies and ensure everything necessary will be included in the plan. He stated the Second Draft was received by the various interested and cooperating agencies, and some had suggested room for improvement. Four letters and three phone calls were received after the plan had been mailed out. There will need to be some changes and additions. A listing of staff supported changes has been prepared for the Committee - containing clarifications, corrections, some housekeeping changes, etc. He asked that staff be allowed to present these and other changes to the IAC.

Gordon Atkins, National Park Service, clarified the issue of the Second Draft Plan, stating drafts had been received from three states in the region (Alaska, Washington, and Idaho) with the understanding they would be added to from time to time and eventually evolve into the required State Plan. Because of the short time allowed, NPS would approve the Draft Plans.

Ms. Cox asked Mr. Lovelady how to proceed at this point. Ms. Anderson distributed the listing of "Staff Supported Changes to Wetlands Plan, October 1987" and an amended proposed motion to that in the kit material. Ms. Wendy Brand, National Park Service, pointed out that the National Plan has not yet been completed by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife - priorities have not yet been finalized - and therefore, it would be appropriate to submit the Washington State Wetlands Priority Plan as drafted. This could be updated when the National Plan is available.

(The Staff Supported Changes to Wetlands Plan, October 1987 has been included as APPENDIX "B" TO THESE MINUTES.)

Mr. Wayland said he did not want to criticize staff's efforts, but at the same time he did not want to commit himself to something that the state could not live with later on. Mr. Atkins then stated the State Plan and National Plan are proceeding on the same track in his opinion. The state can later establish the priorities within the wetlands areas. He said he could foresee where some states might have priorities in their state plans which would not be in the National Plan. Mr. Wayland said that regionally the State of Washington has identified wetlands areas two of which are among the top ten in the nation. Yet, these are not provided for in the present Draft Plan. Ms. Wendy Brand, NPS, pointed out the entire Wetlands Plan would be subject to change and new considerations. Washington State should identify those wetlands in need of protection, however, and include them in the plan at some point in time. Mr. Tveten agreed it would be possible to amend the State's Wetlands Plan later and suggested the Committee could so designate this information in its motion. However, it ought to be possible to publicly acknowledge the two areas that Mr. Wayland suggests be in the plan today.

Mr. Lovelady stated the plan could very well include certain wetlands areas, and his main concern was that the Committee understand the plan as of now could be used for the funding of projects applying for Land and Water Conservation Funds. The plan provides for this consideration and details the merits of wetlands. It will be possible through the plan to consider wetland projects along with the usual ball fields, swimming pools, and other types of recreational projects. Ms. Anderson felt the plan could be either specific or generic in regard to wetlands. The National Plan has a generic aspect - a priority type system. That plan does not talk about specific wetland areas.

Mr. Pinnix asked if the plan as it is now proposed would give the Committee guidelines for future Land and Water Conservation funding of wetlands? Mr. Lovelady replied affirmatively. Whereupon Mr. Pinnix said this would compliment the use of LWCF monies and should be supported. Mr. Lovelady stressed that the plan focuses attention on wetlands and their importance. It does not ask the Committee to put higher priority on wetlands. Ms. Anderson said the Puget Sound Water Quality Commission were deleting all reference to ranking and just preparing a listing of the wetlands areas in the state. Mainly the plan will maintain LWCF eligibility for the State of Washington. Ms. Brand noted that January 1, 1988 was the deadline for a final Wetlands Plan.

There followed discussion on what should be included in the motion to approve the plan. It was suggested by Mr. Ryan that the motion contain reference to the Staff Supported Changes List of October 1987 as presented by staff. Mr. Wayland asked that the motion be amended to include wording about the criteria established by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1985: "two areas in Washington State - Eastern Washington "Intermountain West" and "Upper Pacific Coast, which includes Puget Sound among the top ten waterfowl habitat acquisition areas in the United States." Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Wayland to provide the written material on this for inclusion in the plan. Mr. Lovelady stated his concern that this item should also be reviewed by the several other state agencies on the Wetlands Advisory Committee since they might wish to discuss it. Mr. Ryan emphasized that the IAC Committee would be approving an "interim document" only, subject to change.

Mr. Tveten referred to Chapter IV, PROTECTION MEASURES FOR WETLANDS, and suggested the addition of "LOCAL ZONING". He cited Hylebos Park where wetlands had been protected in the overall planning of the park through zoning.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT

WHEREAS, A WETLANDS AMENDMENT TO THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) IS REQUIRED FOR WASHINGTON'S CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM, AND

WHEREAS, THIS WETLANDS AMENDMENT HAS BEEN DEVELOPED ACCORDING TO FEDERAL MANDATE IN "CONSULTATION WITH THE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES" AND OTHER AGENCIES IN WASHINGTON, AND

WHEREAS, THIS WETLANDS AMENDMENT REFLECTS CURRENT AND FUTURE PROGRAMS FOR THE WETLANDS RESOURCE, AND

WHEREAS, THERE HAVE BEEN CHANGES SUGGESTED BY VARIOUS AGENCIES REPRESENTED ON THE WETLANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WHICH MUST BE CONSIDERED FOR INSERTION IN THE PLAN (AS LISTED BY INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE STAFF, LISTING DATED OCTOBER 1987 - APPENDIX "B" TO THESE MINUTES), AND

WHEREAS, TWO AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION WITHIN THE PLAN:

1. INCLUDE THE U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICES RECOMMENDATION OF TWO AREAS IN WASHINGTON STATE - EASTERN WASHINGTON "INTERMOUNTAIN WEST" AND "UPPER PACIFIC COAST", WHICH INCLUDES PUGET SOUND AMONG THE TOP TEN WATERFOWL HABITAT ACQUISITION AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES;

2. INCLUDE LOCAL ZONING AS AN IDENTIFIED ITEM.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY ADOPT AND RECOMMEND TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THE OCTOBER, 1987 DRAFT WASHINGTON WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN WITH THE ABOVE-REFERENCED INCLUSIONS AND CHANGES AS PRESENTED AT THE NOVEMBER 5, 1987 IAC MEETING, AS AN OFFICIAL AMENDMENT TO THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP); IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS PLAN MAY BE AMENDED FROM TIME-TO-TIME AS THE NEED ARISES THROUGH REVIEW PROCEDURES AS ESTABLISHED BY THE WETLANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE; AND

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S ACCEPTANCE IS CONDITIONAL BASED ON GUBERNATORIAL APPROVAL AND SUBMITTAL OF THIS PLAN TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. Pinnix asked why #14 on the Staff Supported Changes to the Wetlands Plan was being deleted (Linda Kunze report). Ms. Anderson explained that the report (entitled Puget Trough Freshwater Wetlands, A Summary of Biologically Significant Sites: Phase I: Northern Puget Trough Impounded Wetlands and Phase II: Southern Puget Trough Impounded Wetlands) was not yet ready for public information.

Mr. Wayland mentioned the Department of Wildlife's letter had also pointed out local efforts, such as Snohomish County, in preserving wetland areas.

Ms. Anderson said local government efforts would be recognized and supported.

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

On behalf of the Committee, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. WAYLAND, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAD BEEN ADVISED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE THAT IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PREPARE A WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON BY OCTOBER 1, 1987, IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN ELIGIBILITY IN THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (LWCF) PROGRAM, AND

WHEREAS, STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAD LITTLE TIME IN WHICH TO PREPARE THE PLAN, YET WAS ABLE TO SET UP AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW OF THE WETLANDS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, AND FROM COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS HAD EVOLVED A DRAFT WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN FOR REVIEW OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT ITS NOVEMBER 1987 MEETING, WHICH THE COMMITTEE DEEMS TO BE AN EXCELLENT BEGINNING DOCUMENT;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS DO HERewith COMMEND THE DIRECTOR AND THE IAC STAFF ON PRODUCING A COMMENDABLE DRAFT WETLANDS PRIORITY PLAN IN THE SHORT SPAN OF TIME ALLOTTED TO THEM.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Wilder acknowledged that Mr. Lovelady and Ms. Anderson had done an outstanding job in producing the draft plan, and thanked the Committee for their recognition of staff's efforts.

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 3:30 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 3:38 P.M.

II. D. PLANNING SERVICES REPORTS: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "Planning Services Report", noting the following:

1. Local Agencies, Technical Assistance: A total of 117 agencies are eligible for the traditional project grants. These include 74 cities, 13 counties, 15 port districts, 7 special districts (park & recreation and public utility districts), 6 school districts, and 2 Indian Tribes.

Five local agencies were granted interim eligibility to participate in the 1987 Grant-in-Aid Program. Their draft comprehensive plans are yet to be adopted; most indicating that their public review and adoption process should be completed by the end of November 1987.

Planning eligibility was cited:

1. Current comprehensive park & recreation plan or a park and recreation element in a comprehensive plan;
 2. Evidence of adoption of the plan by resolution, motion at a meeting or an official action;
 3. A Capital Improvement Program (CIP).
 4. Public Lands inventory forms.
2. Promotion of Lori Flemm to Deputy Chief of the Planning Services Division, effective September 1, 1987.
 3. Recreation Resource Planner 2 Position: The first phase of recruitment has been completed for this opening in the planning Services Division.

D. 2. Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Report: Memorandum of November 5, 1987, was referred to by Mr. Lovelady - a report on the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program:

- (a) Project Status: Through July 1987, 221 NOVA projects have been approved. One project not funded: IAC's "State NOVA Assistant". Currently, 68 projects are active, with 41 scheduled to close by the end of the year. One hundred and fifty-two (152) projects have been completed since 1978.
- (b) NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Has met twice in 1987...to review and recommend for adoption the ORV Plan, discuss nonhighway road funding guidelines, and evaluate the project proposals.
- (c) Project Changes:
 - (1) ORV-86-24E, Kittitas County ORV Education/Enforcement, Cost Increase (\$3,916 - .04 percent) granted to replace unanticipated equipment failure.
 - (2) ORV-86-46P, Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, Tacoma Area ORV Site Search, time extension to December, 1988 due to unexpected personnel changes in sponsor agency.
- (d) Legislative Budget Committee (LBC) Review: An amendment (1986) to the NOVA Act called for the Legislative Budget Committee to,
"....review allocations and limitations on allocation of monies made in this Act. The review will include an analysis of requests compared to the allocations made in 1986-1987. The review will include the specific functions for which law enforcement and education funds have been expended by grant recipients."

This review, to be submitted to the State Legislature January 1, 1988, has begun. (Mr. Frank Hensley of LBC staff was assigned to this study.)

IV. B. LEGISLATION: Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 5, 1987, "Proposed Legislation - 1988 Session". The procedure for state agencies to follow in submitting legislation to the Office of Financial Management and through that agency to the Office of the Governor was explained. The IAC request was submitted as required on September 21, 1987, and full package of materials was sent to the IAC members for their review. There were at that time nine proposals:

- 1. Z-1006-87 - Redirect camper-trailer excise tax to the 070 Account.
- 2. Z-1005-87 - Provide for \$230 million bond bill to be referred to the voters.
- 3. Z-1007-87 - Provide for a property tax levy of twelve cents (12¢) per thousand to generate approximately \$230 million over a twenty-year period.
- 4. Z-1026/88 - Authorize the State Lottery Commission to conduct one game per year; proceeds to 070 Account for urban parks.
- 5. Z-1105/88 - Provide for \$90 million bond bill to be referred to the voters.

6. Z-1002/87 - Strike IAC termination clause of June 30, 1989.
7. Z-1004/87 - Remove cost recovery language for the Washington State Recreation Guide.
8. Z-1027/88 - Add \$4.5 million to Chapter 6, Laws of 1st Extraordinary Session 1987 (ESHB #327) 1987-89 Capital Budget for grants to public bodies
9. Z-1003/88 - Amend Chapter 6, Laws of First Extraordinary Session 1987 (ESHB #327) 1987-89 Capital Budget to provide one FTE per year for the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program.

The first five bills were not approved by the Governor's Office because of the shortage of General Fund resources to operate state government. Ms. Cox asked for explanation of the two bond bills. Mr. Ogden stated the differences were in the ranges - one would support a \$40 million figure, the other a \$90 million figure. Mr. Wilder brought out the fact that the \$90 million bill was similar to that which was formerly House Bill #171 in 1977, and there had been support for this amount at that time thus the bill was resubmitted as the need was still great. The \$230 million bond bill had been discussed by many persons and at one time was supported by the WRPA.

Dr. Scull asked why the Committee itself could not submit legislation to the State Legislature; how can the Governor control these bills? Mr. Mackey explained that the IAC is considered a state agency and as such must follow the usual procedures for submitting legislation. But, he said there was no reason why the citizen members could not as individuals ask for these types of bills directly. Mr. Tveten stated he had not read the two bond bills thoroughly, but from his recollection, he had some problems with them. Some of the bills that he had seen give the 50-50 split of funds to state and local agencies but stipulate "up to 50%", which could ultimately scale down to zero for state agencies if all monies were placed in the local program. He said he would like to see the bills amended if they so state "up to 50%", and remain with the present program.

The camper-trailer tax was then discussed. Mr. Webster stated it had been placed in the present tax form about 1974. Ms. Cox felt these funds going into the General Fund could have been allocated for outdoor recreation. Some of the monies were marked for schools.

Mr. Ogden completed his review of the legislation. Ms. Cox referred to proposed bill Z-1003/88 - concerning the ORV Position and asked how many of the state agencies representatives present had had additional work given to their departments, requested additional staff to do that work, and had been rejected by the legislative procedure followed by the IAC. All of the representatives present (Dept. of Wildlife, Dept. of Fisheries, Dept. of Natural Resources, and the Parks and Recreation Commission) stated this was not unusual. The most difficult position for state agencies, per Mr. Pinnix, is to be given additional tasks and no funds with which to do the work. He noted that in the case of the Off-Road Vehicle position there is a source, and it is not a General Fund source. It made it very difficult to understand why the position was not forthcoming when the IAC staff had specific responsibilities transferred to it by legislation. Ms. Cox stated she could not fathom the reasoning since IAC did have funds for the position and the work was not being done as called for by the law.

Mr. Mackey suggested that the Committee look into this matter with the Governor at the time an appointment is confirmed to discuss IAC matters. Mr. Wilder said that the Governor's Office had responded to the request for a meeting, but nothing has as yet been finalized. The meeting will most likely be with Mr. Curt Smitch, who handles the natural resource agencies' programs for the Governor. Ms. Cox noted that an appointment had been requested since July.

Mr. Mackey suggested this also be brought to the attention of the House Subcommittee on Parks at the November 24th meeting. Mr. Ryan spoke of the funding in the Department of Fisheries where funds for a new program of licensing will be placed in the General Fund and not return to the Department of Fisheries. It is expected to generate \$4.5 million, but no monies will supply the department with the needed personnel for the tasks.

Mr. Pinnix stated the Department of Natural Resources does have some leeway in its land management programs which generate revenue and can be used by the Department. He felt the Committee should talk to the Governor's staff about the urgent need for the Off-Road Vehicle position and request their help. Mr. Wayland pointed out how difficult it is to get the message out that recreation is an important part of life and is of value to everyone. It is taken for granted. His department also generated funds but did not receive them back into its programs.

At this point Ms. Cox stated she had been advised it might be better to concentrate on the Ways and Means committees of each house rather than the Natural Resources or parks committees.

Dr. Scull expressed his feeling that in the long-run recreation will come out on top since in the next decade people will perceive it as the #1 economic boon. He sensed a growing awareness. Mr. Mackey agreed with Dr. Scull but stated this would be some time in coming.

Mr. Ogden finalized his report by referring to the letter of October 15, 1987, from Curt Smitch, Special Assistant for Policy, rejecting seven of the proposed bills and placing on hold the remaining legislation (Z-1004/87 - cost recovery for the Recreation Guide, and Z-1003/88, to provide one FTE for the NOVA program).

Mr. Ryan referred to page 3, of the Governor's memorandum of July 31, 1987, paragraph (4), which stated in the second paragraph:

- "4. Under no circumstances will agency personnel support legislation that has been disapproved in the course of this process, or seek support through other individuals or organizations."

IV. C. WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS DIRECTORY: Mr. Lovelady introduced Ms. Lorraine Flemm, Recreation Resource Planner, who had the responsibility for preparing a plan for the production and distribution of a trail guide. Mr. Lovelady cited the legislation (Section 306 of the 1987-89 Biennial Budget which directed the IAC to coordinate the preparation of a plan for a comprehensive guide of recreation trails in the State of Washington. The plan for the production and distribution of the guide is to be submitted to the Legislature by January 1, 1988.

An advisory committee consisting of trail providing public agencies and trail users was created to assist the IAC in this effort. This committee met in July and August, reviewed a draft copy of the plan for the production and distribution of the trail guide in September, and the final draft plan was evolved. Copy of the plan was in the kit material (SEE APPENDIX "C" OF THESE MINUTES).

Ms. Flemm reported as follows:

(1) The directory if approved would be free to the public and would contain a map, matrix, and text with listings for the trail-providing agencies and trail-related organizations. Names, addresses, telephone numbers, and the type of information available would be included in the listings.

(2) The document would, therefore, be a directory. Examples were shown to the Committee members. Size to be: approximately 17" X 22", folded to 3-1/2" X 8-1/2" to fit into information distribution racks. Paper quality was shown to the Committee as well as black and white and two-color samples.

(3) The format for indicating types of trail activities was also shown by Ms. Flemm.

Mr. Tveten asked if any funds had been given by the Legislature for the plan of the directory. Ms. Flemm replied none had been given. Mr. Wilder noted the monies could come from Init. 215, some LWCF, and possibly NOVA funds to cover the expense of preparing the plan for the directory. Mr. Tveten then asked if there were monies for publishing the directory. Ms. Flemm referred to page (2) of the Directory Plan Proposal, item "FUNDING", stating it was the intent that the State General Fund would finance the project. Mr. Tveten felt since there were funds within the IAC to do the job, why ask for General Funds which would probably not be available, and would cause a delay in getting the directory before the public for use. He suggested there be included in a motion concerning the directory a sufficient amount of money to hire staff necessary to do the job. It is necessary to get the document out to the public as quickly as possible. Mr. Ryan asked if the staff had cost estimates prepared. Mr. Lovelady distributed the cost estimate information:

TRAILS DIRECTORY COST ESTIMATE

| | <u>One-Color</u> | <u>Two-Color</u> |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| Information Collection/Coordination | \$ 3,500 | \$ 3,500 |
| Paste-up, Layout, and Design | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Printing | 29,570 | 60,000 |
| Promotion (1,000 posters @ \$350; press release/postage at \$600) | 850 | 850 |
| Distribution (State/Federal Agencies - \$1,775 Organizations, others - \$500) | 2,275 | 2,275 |
| Storage (six months) | 250 | 250 |
| Postage (2,500 IAC Directories) | 625 | 625 |
| TOTAL | \$ 40,250 | \$ 70,500 |

Ms. Flemm discussed the one-color versus the two-color directory and the quality of paper which could be used. Distribution centers throughout the state were mentioned by various Committee members. Dr. Scull wanted the IAC logo on the document and was assured that this was staff's intent.

Ms. Cox asked that the Recreation Equipment, Incorporated, (REI) be considered as an avenue for distribution of the directory. In response to Mr. Tveten, Ms. Flemm advised the costs shown were for a one-time printing, to provide a one-year supply of directories. At the end of the first year, the IAC would assess the program and update the directory, if needed. At that point, the IAC would seek funding alternatives -- General Fund, NOVA, private, or cooperating agencies -- in order to reprint the directory. Dr. Scull felt the people would be surprised to receive the directory for nothing and would no doubt make good use of it. However, he felt if it could be sold it would help pay for the cost of the printing. Mr. Wilder said the agency had had some experience in this already and felt that if at all possible the directory being so worthwhile and needed, it should be distributed free of charge. Ms. Flemm pointed out (1) people want and need this type of information now; there is heavy demand for it; (2) handling administrative costs at the IAC would be a hassle; (3) once the information is out to the public there will be further demand for it at which time reprinting costs and technique could be considered; (4) the directory leads users to another source for information which might charge for that information. The IAC does not want to charge users twice.

In response to Mr. Ryan, Ms. Flemm advised the time frame involved in printing the directory and getting it out to the public following its approval by the Legislature.

There followed considerable discussion on the proposal being submitted to the Legislature, the time element in getting the information out to the public, the financial details involving staff production and distribution costs, and the color quality and paper type desired by the Committee. Funding was suggested from the NOVA program, and Mr. Wilder was asked to include this in the proposal for the trails directory, if feasible. Mr. Lane, Assistant Attorney General, noted that administrative costs were not planning costs and the two should be considered separately. Did the IAC have authority which would permit it to fund from planning costs? Mr. Wilder stated this would be considered an administrative cost.

At this point, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT THE TRAIL DIRECTORY PROJECT PROCEED AND BE ACCOMPLISHED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, THAT THE COMMITTEE GO ON RECORD IN A DIRECTIVE TO THE IAC DIRECTOR THAT THE DIRECTORY BE PUBLISHED IN A TIMELY MANNER IF APPROVED BY LEGISLATIVE ACTION, WITH FULL STAFF COSTS TO BE INCLUDED IN ANY FULL PRODUCTION COSTS. (ESTIMATED UP TO \$73,000.)

Discussion followed. A figure of \$70,500 for staff production and distribution costs for the two-color paper quality was in staff's proposal. The one-color directory was estimated to cost \$40,250. It was the consensus that the directory be of good quality paper and that the two-colors be used to have a better product for public use. Mr. Jones felt the directory should carry the IAC logo and was assured it would. He suggested this would be a good time to perhaps change the IAC logo and give the IAC a better image. He asked what had been done about the IAC logo since the July 1987 meeting discussion. Mr. Wilder replied considerable time had been spent on this matter as well as a better image for the IAC. Staff was, however, reluctant to change the logo due to cost involved and the general feeling that the logo was a good one to retain.

Mr. Ryan asked if the motion would convey the understanding that the Committee include a figure for staff production and distribution costs. Ms. Cox and other Committee members agreed there should be a "clean" motion to include a cost figure as well as quality of paper, etc. MR. TVETEN WITHDREW HIS MOTION; MR. JONES WITHDREW HIS SECOND TO THE MOTION.

Mr. Wilder was asked to prepare a motion for consideration of the Committee on Friday, November 6, 1988.

IV. G. IAC 1988 PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, proposing the 1988 IAC meeting schedule. Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT THE FOLLOWING 1988 IAC MEETING DATES BE CONFIRMED:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| MARCH 24-25, 1988 | OLYMPIA |
| JULY 14-15, 1988 | PLACE TO BE DETERMINED |
| NOVEMBER 3-4, 1988 | PLACE TO BE DETERMINED |

The Committee asked the Director to determine locations of the July and November meetings and notify them later.

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

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND RESOLUTION: The Chair asked that the Land and Water Conservation Fund Resolution be read for approval of the Committee.

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

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS AGREED TO SUPPORT FEDERAL LEGISLATION CALLING FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, AND,

WHEREAS, THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND IS FINANCED PRIMARILY BY REVENUES FROM FEDERAL OFFSHORE OIL LEASE RECEIPTS; AND

WHEREAS, FEDERAL LEGISLATION AUTHORIZES THAT \$900 MILLION ANNUALLY BE ALLOCATED TO LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR RECREATIONAL LAND ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION; AND

WHEREAS, THIS FULL \$900 MILLION AMOUNT HAS NEVER BEEN APPROPRIATED IN THE TWENTY-ONE YEAR HISTORY OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND; AND

WHEREAS, ALLOCATED FUNDS, FOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, HAVE DECLINED AT A TIME WHEN THE DEMANDS ON OUR PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES HAVE GROWN RAPIDLY AND THE AVAILABLE LOCAL DOLLARS ARE SHRINKING; AND

WHEREAS, SINCE THE INCEPTION OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND IN 1966, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON HAS RECEIVED OVER \$53.3 MILLION FROM THE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES' RECREATIONAL PROJECTS; AND

WHEREAS, THESE FUNDS HAVE BEEN UTILIZED TO ACQUIRE, DEVELOP, AND RENOVATE NEEDED RECREATIONAL AREAS AND FACILITIES LOCATED THROUGHOUT WASHINGTON STATE; AND

WHEREAS, THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND IS DUE TO EXPIRE IN THE YEAR 1989; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION RECOGNIZES THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AS A VALUABLE PROGRAM AND URGES CONGRESS TO PROVIDE FOR ITS CONTINUATION;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION REQUESTS THAT THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION TO THE STATE AND LOCAL SIDE OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND BE INCREASED TO \$200 MILLION DURING 1988; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE WASHINGTON STATE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, OTHER KEY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, AND OTHER PARK SUPPORTERS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 5:25 p.m. to reconvene 9:00 a.m., Friday, November 6, 1987.

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 6, 1987

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with the following quorum: COX, MACKAY, SCULL, WAYLAND, TVETEN, RYAN, PINNIX, JONES.

She called upon Dr. Scull to read the motion prepared by the Director and staff concerning the Trails Directory Proposal. IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN THAT

WHEREAS, SECTION 306 OF THE 1987-89 BIENNIAL STATE BUDGET DIRECTS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL FOR THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE OF RECREATION TRAILS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE, AND

WHEREAS, THE PROPOSAL HAS BEEN PREPARED WITH THE COORDINATION OF STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES, TRAIL ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS, AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE BUDGETARY MANDATE, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE HEREIN AUTHORIZES THE DIRECTOR TO SUBMIT SAID PROPOSAL TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE BY JANUARY 1, 1988, AND TO DEVELOP THE FINANCIAL DETAILS INVOLVING ALL STAFF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION COSTS NOT TO EXCEED \$73,000;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COMMITTEE INSTRUCTS THE DIRECTOR TO EXPEDITE THE PUBLICATION OF SAID DIRECTORY FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE APPROVAL. THE INTENT BEING TO DEVELOP A TWO-COLOR QUALITY DIRECTORY FOR USE PRIOR AND AS PART OF THE STATE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION. IT IS ALSO THE INTENT OF THE COMMITTEE TO FUND THE DIRECTORY FROM THE IAC NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE GRANT PROGRAM. IF FEASIBLE, THE TRAIL DIRECTORY PROPOSAL SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT SAID INTENT.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY APPROVE AND ADOPT THE PROPOSAL FOR CREATING A TRAILS DIRECTORY, FOR THE SUBMISSION TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE BY JANUARY 1, 1988, AS AMENDED ABOVE BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Dr. Scull reported for the benefit of the audience on the directory's cost, format, and use.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT

WHEREAS, JAMES E. WEBSTER HAS SERVED IN THE CAPACITY AS CHIEF PROJECT SERVICES FOR THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS PROVIDING CONSULTATION AND ADVICE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON PROJECTS AND PROJECT-RELATED MATTERS, AND

WHEREAS, JAMES E. WEBSTER HAS VERY SKILLFULLY DEALT WITH PROJECT MANAGERS AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL TO ACHIEVE IAC GOALS AND SUCCESSFULLY COORDINATE THE NEEDS OF LOCAL AGENCIES WITH THE COMMITTEE, AND

WHEREAS, JAMES E. WEBSTER WILL BE RETIRING IN JANUARY OF 1988,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COMMITTEE HOLDS JIM'S WORK IN THE HIGHEST ESTEEM AND COMMENDS HIM FOR A JOB WELL DONE WITH GOOD WISHES FOR HIS PENDING RETIREMENT.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Webster thanked the Committee for their commendation.

IV. NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS:

Mr. Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, introduced Ms. Ruth Ittner (citizen) & Mr. Joe Higgins (U. S. Forest Service), members of the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Advisory Committee.

Mr. Lovelady advised that the Committee had received a packet of letters concerning nine NOVA projects, and others in addition to those were distributed to the members. ("APPENDIX D" TO THESE MINUTES.) He referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "1987 Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Project Proposals", and stated that rather than \$2.7 million of NOVA deposits available for allocation, there were \$2.9 million. The sponsors request \$2.4 million. There are some "caps" which must be met in certain funding programs, and staff allowed for these in its recommendations. All projects underwent two separate reviews by the IAC's NOVA Advisory Committee: a technical review on August 12, and an evaluation of all projects on October 7. Mr. Lovelady noted there were three categories of projects at this meeting: Education/Enforcement; ORV Recreation Facilities; and Nonhighway Road Projects.

Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, presented a slide program on the overall education/enforcement programs throughout the State of Washington. Following this presentation, Planning Staff personnel, using slides and verbal summaries, presented the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities projects. (SEE PAGE 33.)

Comments from the Committee during this presentation included:

ORV-87-03E - State Parks and Recreation Commission, Squak Mountain ORV Barriers:

Mr. Mackey noted that the deed to the Bullitt family donation of this site requires prevention of any vehicle use in the area in order to maintain a passive park area for enjoyment of the public. The deed specifically states no horses or motorized vehicles will be allowed in the area. Mr. Tveten said the Parks Department was having difficulty eliminating use by off-road vehicle recreationists and needed to install a specific type of barrier.

NOVA PROJECTS AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE 11-6-87
 1987 IAC - NOVA PROGRAM APPLICATIONS
 (Education/Enforcement Projects)

| | Number | Title | Sponsor | ORV \$ | NHR \$ | Resume Color |
|---------|---------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------|--------------|
| Page #1 | 87-003E | Squak Mt. ORV Barriers | State Parks and Recreation Commissi | 20,350.00 | | Pink |
| #2 | 87-025E | ORV Education/Enforcement 9 | Chelan County ORV Board | 76,717.00 | | " |
| #3 | 87-027E | ORV Education/Enforcement 5 | Grant County Sheriff | 95,229.00 | | " |
| #4 | 87-028E | ORV Education/Enforcement 10 | Kittitas County Sheriff | 85,502.00 | | " |
| #5 | 87-029E | ORV Education/Enforcement 3 | Mason County Sheriff | 113,705.00 | | " |
| #6 | 87-030E | ORV Education/Enforcement 1 | Ocean Shores Police | 6,000.00 | | " |
| #7 | 87-031E | ORV Education/Enforcement 3 | Pierce County Sheriff | 118,408.00 | | " |
| #8 | 87-032E | ORV Education/Enforcement 6 | Richland, City of | 39,487.00 | | " |
| #9 | 87-033E | ORV Education/Enforcement 2 | Thurston County Sheriff | 52,012.00 | | " |
| #10 | 87-034E | ORV Education/Enforcement 10 | Yakima County Sheriff | 104,080.00 | | " |
| #11 | 87-035E | ORV Education/Coordination 3 | Tacoma Metro Park District | 51,400.00 | | " |
| #12 | 87-036E | ORV Puyallup Fair Booth - 1988 | Tacoma Metro Park District | 11,116.00 | | " |
| #13 | 87-037E | ORV Safety/Education 9 | Thurston County Parks | 6,000.00 | | " |
| #14 | 87-041E | ORV Guide Reprint | Dept. of Natural Resources | 68,900.00 | | " |
| | <TOTAL> | | | 848,906.00 | 0.00 | |

(ORV Recreation Facility Projects)

| | Number | Title | Sponsor | ORV \$ | NHR \$ | Resume Color |
|-----|---------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| #15 | 87-006P | Mad River/Blue Creek Trl Monitoring | Wenatchee National Forest | 9,844.00 | 9,844.00 | Green |
| #16 | 87-007P | Republic ORV Site | Ferry County Park & Recreation Dist | 39,000.00 | | " |
| #17 | 87-010D | Horn Rapids Development Phase 5 | City of Richland | 52,674.00 | | " |
| #18 | 87-011D | ORV Sports Park Development Phase 8 | Thurston County Parks & Recreation | 28,600.00 | | " |
| #19 | 87-012D | Divide Ridge 4x4 Sign Pln | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | 4,777.81 | | " |
| #20 | 87-013D | Little Pend-Oreille ORV Trl-Seq. 4 | USFS Colville National Forest | 91,250.00 | | " |
| #21 | 87-014D | Nason Ridge Trail Reloc & Trailhead | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | 11,485.00 | | " |
| #22 | 87-015D | Airway Heights ORV Area | Spokane County Parks | 531,488.00 | | " |
| #23 | 87-016P | Treadlightly Update 1988 | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | 38,992.00 | | " |
| #24 | 87-020A | Airway Heights ORV Acquisition | Spokane County Parks | 63,700.00 | | " |
| #25 | 87-021M | Management Facilities: Six Sites | Grant County Sheriff | 8,780.00 | | " |
| #26 | 87-022M | Horn Rapids ORV Park M & O 1988-89 | Richland | 240,828.00 | | " |
| #27 | 87-023M | Forest Trails Log-Out - 1988 | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | 4,045.00 | | " |
| #28 | 87-040A | BNRR Republic-Fairgrounds Access | Ferry County Parks & Recreation Dis | 19,000.00 | 19,000.00 | " |
| #29 | 87-038P | ORV Awareness & Education Program | Snohomish County Parks & Recreation | 20,000.00 | | " |
| #30 | 87-039P | Riverfront Pk ORV Feasibility | Everett Parks & Recreation Dept. | 39,750.00 | | " |
| | <TOTAL> | | | 1,204,213.81 | 28,844.00 | |

(Nonhighway Road Projects)

| | Number | Title | Sponsor | ORV \$ | NHR \$ | Resume Color |
|-----|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| #31 | 87-004D | Mt. Spokane Picnic/Warming Shelter | State Parks and Recreation Commissi | | 37,400.00 | Yellow |
| #32 | 87-005D | Beacon Rock Equestrian Facilities | State Parks and Recreation Commissi | | 90,660.00 | " |
| | ((87-006P)) | Mad River/Blue Creek Trl Monitoring | Wenatchee National Forest | 9,844.00 | 9,844.00 | - |
| #33 | 87-008P | Middle Fork Trail #1003 Reconstruc. | USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Nat'l For | | 13,945.00 | " |
| #34 | 87-017D | Haney Meadows Campground Develop. | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | | 44,890.00 | " |
| #35 | 87-018D | Siaikanaan River Trl Dev, Ph.1 | Wildlife, Dept. of | | 147,289.00 | " |
| #36 | 87-024P | Swauk Corridor Preconstruction | USFS Wenatchee Nat'l Forest | | 5,000.00 | " |
| | ((87-040A)) | BNRR Republic-Fairgrounds Access | Ferry County Parks & Recreation Dis | 19,000.00 | 19,000.00 | - |

If this is not done he said the Park Department could lose the 5,090 acres of property.

Mr. Wayland asked that staff indicate during their presentation which projects are ongoing and which are new. Mr. Dovel replied this was noted following the project name on the resume.

Mason County Sheriff's Department, Mason County ORV Education/Enforcement 3 ORV-87-29E: Dr. Scull asked why there was a difference in cost between Mason Co. and Kittitas County #4 project (Education and Enforcement ORV-87-28E). Mr. Dovel replied that Kittitas County has had considerable ORV funds and recognizes the limitations on funding in this category. This is their tenth application in their continuing program. Whereas, Mason County is making its third application and requesting two deputies. The \$113,705 represents the amount needed to put these two deputies in the field and supply them with needed equipment. Mason County has identified the need, but needs to go one more step and recognize that there are limitations to this funding which is used by other counties as well. Ms. Cox reminded the Committee that staff is indicating the requests from the sponsors and will later on indicate staff recommendations for those projects.

Mr. Tveten explained that the Committee had adopted a standard for education/enforcement projects of \$40,000 which would allow sheriffs' departments to have a deputy. He asked if that was still in place. Mr. Lovelady replied it was, but that staff would discuss this later on in the recommendations. The standard was set at a maximum support level of \$40,000 per full-time employee equivalent and two full-time employees per IAC sponsored project.

ORV-87-30E, Ocean Shores Police Department, Damon Point/Protection Island Patrol I: Mr. Tveten pointed out the ownership of the land was the Department of Natural Resources, and protection is needed during the summer months to keep out ATV's and other 4X4 vehicles from this fragile area. Ocean Shores has the responsibility to enforce the law in that area. In response to Mr. Jones, Mr. Tveten suggested perhaps the three months (June, July and August) for this protection had something to do with the nesting season.

ORV-87-31E, Pierce County Sheriff, Pierce County ORV Education & Enforcement: Mr. Jones asked what the item "Advertising" meant. Mr. Dovel replied it was being suggested that a flyer be provided which could be placed in off-road vehicle shops and made available over a wide area. This flyer would denote where it is legal to ride, where it is illegal to be, and some safety tips, etc. Mr. Jones felt the term was misleading, and staff agreed it was a poor choice.

ORV-87-34E, Yakima County Sheriff's Department, Yakima County ORV Education & Enforcement: Mr. Jones asked for clarification on the advertising aspect of the project, and the fact that its goal is to "improve attitudes towards ORV recreation". He asked how all of this worked together in relation to communication. Mr. Steve Sutliff, Yakima County Sheriff's Department, replied the communications directly relate to the costs in the project. The County has a contract with Motorola to supply maintenance and operation for the car radio system. The advertising would be to give out specific information to the public. Mr. Jones asked if in terms of education the radio system supported that role. Mr. Sutliff replied the radio communications supply contact with the main office on any aspect of the education/enforcement program in the County. Mr. Lane clarified Mr. Jones' question: the stated goal is to improve attitudes towards ORV recreation; how do you do that?; how do you know if you succeed? Mr. Sutliff replied by the amount of complaints received. The County deals with

various spark arrestor violations, off-road vehicle tag violations, etc. He said there did not seem to be a problem in the use areas, but on other roads. The public needs to hear how to operate these vehicles in a safe and sane manner within the legal system.

Mr. Lovelady supported Mr. Sutliff's remarks stating that in those counties where IAC does not support an education/enforcement program there is a very high non-compliance rate. The counties with education/enforcement are able to control this and educate the public. He said that Yakima County has been one of the more active agencies in its education/enforcement program in working with local television and radio stations to get the message out to the people. Mr. Sutliff stated Yakima County had a Public Service Announcement this past summer (12-minute program) which had proved highly effective. Mr. Jones acknowledged this was a reasonable way to deal with the subject.

At this point, Mr. Lovelady asked Mr. Sutliff to distribute the "Yakima Co. Off-Road Vehicle Guide" map, revised, 1988, from the Yakima County Sheriff's Department. It was mentioned that almost all ORV users are interested in complying with the law and need to know where they may ride. This map details various areas giving miles, types of use, and limitations or other remarks about each area.

Mr. Ron Warren, Chief, Criminal Deputy, Yakima County, told the Committee the request of \$104,080 is mainly for capital expense. Yakima County has been in the program for nine years; there is need for some ORV machinery and equipment to replace those now in use.

Ms. Cox asked that in-depth discussion take place later in order that the projects could be reviewed by staff. Mr. Jones felt that some of his questions could best be answered at the time the project is reviewed. He said he was attempting to find out what is going on in each project, and why the monies are needed. He felt it would save time in the long run. He wanted assurance there were guidelines concerning the \$40,000 for each deputy. Mr. Lovelady explained the legislative mandate ceilings for the categories - Education/Enforcement not to exceed 20% of total receipts; ORV Recreation Facilities not to be less than the sum of ORV use and ORV Dealer Permit Fees, nor greater than 60% of the total receipts, Nonhighway and Off-Road Recreation Facilities not to exceed 20% of total receipts; and the administrative costs of the program not to exceed 10% of total receipts. The \$40,000 for education/enforcement was set as a guideline to maintain the cap. There are certain ways to make adjustments and staff attempts to keep the program in balance.

ORV-87-35E, Tacoma Metropolitan Pk. District, Tacoma ORV Education and Enforcement:

Mr. Ryan asked if there was substantial use of ORVs in this urban environment. Mr. Dovel stated their survey did demonstrate a need to provide an ORV education/awareness program for the users. As a result the Park District needs to provide activities for the users, including the pick-up and ride program. Mr. Dovel explained this program to Mr. Ryan as viewed on the slide presentation earlier.

ORV-87-36E, Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, ORV - Puyallup Fair Display:

Staff advised the Committee this had been a most successful program, and one which dispersed considerable information about ORVs, their use, etc.

Thurston County Parks Department, ORV Sports Park Safety Education ORV-87-37E:

Mr. Mackey asked if the previous problems in this project had been cleared up. Mr. Dovel stated they had been and there are no major problems in the project at this time. Mr. Pinnix was assured the three and four-wheel ATV machines are included in the education programs.

ORV-87-41E, Department of Natural Resources, ORV Guide Update and Reprint: Mr. Dovel explained the urgency of this project and the demand for the ORV Guide. He mentioned the letter from Jim Boltz, Owner/Manager of the Lynnwood Cycle Barn, Lynnwood, Washington, who considered this guide a "must" for all ORV users. Mr. Boltz had been instrumental in making this document available to virtually all ORV dealers in the state in his capacity as past-president of the Washington Motorcycle Dealers Association.

ORV RECREATION FACILITIES PROJECTS: Mr. Lovelady introduced the next category of projects noting there had been less controversy expressed by ORVers and hikers this past year. Six development projects; of these three dealt with intensive use sports park environments. Other projects dealt with signing, extension of trails system, etc.

City of Richland, Horn Rapids ORV Park Development, ORV-87-10D): Mr. Wayland and Mr. Pinnix questioned the fee situation in this park and fencing required to keep those who don't pay the fee out of the park. Mr. Dovel explained the liability factors to consider. The City of Richland does not want people using the park without supervision. A City of Richland spokesman said the situation was critical and the city is being faced with having to screen the people who have not paid from those who have, and ensuring payment is received from all.

ORV-87-14D, USDA FS, Lake Wenatchee R.D., Nason Ridge Trailhead & Trail Relocation: In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Lovelady stated he was not sure how the park use tied in with the snowmobiling trail, but the cross-country skiing trail was acceptable to the project. Mr. Wayland then asked how the ORV Park Development "hooked up with the currently used trail". Mr. Tveten stated a conflict may be built-in because it appeared from the slide shown that the trail would go right into the park. Mr. Wayland felt the trail as shown did not hook up properly at all. Mr. Lovelady said this had already been coordinated closely with State Parks. Mr. Ken Wilcox, Equestrian, then demonstrated on the slide exactly where the trails would connect. Mr. Lovelady noted the new trailhead on the slide also. Dr. Scull said he, too, was concerned about a conflict in this project and the cross-country skiing trail in the area. Mr. Wayland asked Mr. Wilcox if he was supporting the project, and Mr. Wilcox replied in the affirmative.

ORV 87-16-P, Wenatchee National Forest, Treadlightly Update 1988: Mr. Tveten asked why this project was not included in the Education/Enforcement category. Mr. Lovelady replied staff had at first thought it should be in that category but felt the planning element was large enough to place it in the ORV Recreation Facilities Projects.

ORV-87-21M, Grant County Sheriff, ORV Operation & Maintenance: Mr. Mackey asked the total cost of the requested funds. The resume was changed from \$5,600 to \$8,780. The landowners were noted as being the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Wildlife.

ORV-87-22M, City of Richland, 1988-89 Horn Rapids ORV Park Maintenance & Operations: There was considerable discussion about park fees to help cover maintenance and operation. Mr. Wayland asked if surveys had been made to consider increasing the fee for use of the park. Mr. Barry Peters, Recreation Supervisor, City of Richland, stated the fees charged for use of the park would not make a dent in the overall maintenance and operating costs. There are just not enough people in the area using the facilities to justify increasing the fee. Further, Mr. Dovel pointed out that \$2.00 is a nominal charge when compared to \$5.00 for a camping fee. Also, ORV users feel they are already paying for their facilities through the NOVA legislation requirements (permit fees, etc.). The fee of \$2.00 has been charged for the use of this park the past fifteen years. Cost of running the park has increased (utilities, salaries, etc.).

ORV-87-39P, Everett Parks Department, Riverfront Park ORV Feasibility Study: Mr. Ryan asked what kind of consultant would be doing the work required for the ORV study. Mr. Dovel replied there were several consultants in the state doing land use and recreational land use planning. There would be usual bidding process. Some of the land use planners do have expertise in ORV facilities. Mr. Tveten thought the sum of \$20,000 for the feasibility study could better be used toward purchase of the property, ending up at some point in time with recreational use property. Mr. Lovelady said it was impossible to buy a piece of property and allow ORV use on the site, without careful consideration of benefits and costs. Staff and the Committee agreed it was a good site for both purposes. However, staff mentioned that the large sand pile being used by the ATVers is the type of "facility" they enjoy. Mr. Tveten maintained there were all sorts of sites available for this type of activity while waterfront park sites were not as plentiful. It was noted that the entire site is heavily impacted by noise from Interstate 5.

ORV-87-40A, Ferry County Parks and Recreation District, Burlington Northern Railroad Acquisition: Mr. Wayland asked if the BNRR sanctioned use of the trail by ORVers. Mr. Larry Beardsley, Chairman, Ferry County Parks and Recreation District, replied that all present users are illegally using the site at the present time. This includes hikers, bikers, joggers, etc. That is the reason for acquisition.

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 11:04 AND RECONVENED AT 11:15 A.M.

The next category of projects for Committee review: NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS.

NHR-87-04D, Parks and Recreation Commission, Mt. Spokane, Picnic/Warming Shelter: Mr. Tveten advised the Committee there were 14-to 16,000 acres in Mt. Spokane State Park. Use of the park has increased considerably and there is a need for the picnic/warming shelter. He noted the considerable amount of cooperation received from local groups and volunteers and wanted to recognize their efforts.

NHR-87-08P, USDA Forest Service, Middle Fork Trail #1003 - Reconstruction Planning: Mr. Lovelady informed Mr. Ryan that this project ranked high receiving fifteen out of a total of twenty-two points.

NHR-87-17D, Cle Elum Ranger District, USDA Forest Service, Haney Meadows Camp-ground Development: In response to questions as to scoring, Mr. Lovelady stated the ranking system had not changed very much since the last funding session. The nonhighway road criteria is the same as that presented to the Committee, but has not as yet been finalized. This will be before the Committee in final form later.

NHR-87-18D, Washington Dept. of Wildlife, Similkameen River Trail Development, Phase 2: Dr. Scull asked about the cooperation of Canada and the International

Trail System. Mr. Lovelady stated the project can potentially extend 100+ miles into an international trail system through to Canada. The Department of Wildlife is still working with the railroad and the PUD to acquire a very critical portion of the right-of-way. After acquisition is accomplished, staff will be working toward development of the trail.

NHR-87-24P, Cle Elum Ranger District, USDA Forest Service, Swauk Corridor Preconstruction: Mr. Lovelady mentioned the combined funding sources - Sno-Park, Snomobile, IAC, and USFS. The snomobile funds of \$5,000 were not approved, however users are permitted in the area. Management controls will be through the Forest Service. Dr. Scull pointed out this area is heavily used by skiers, snomobilers, and non-snow recreationists following winter. He said it could be used as a model for good separation of uses thus preventing conflicts.

1987 NOVA PROJECTS STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommendations were distributed to the Committee and the attendees. (PAGE 39 OF THESE MINUTES)

Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff reporting as follows:

- (1) Additional letters were distributed concerning certain projects;
- (2) Recommendations were based on guidelines which included:
 - (a) Allowing slow and conservative program evolution;
 - (b) Maintaining education and enforcement projects as a high priority;
 - (c) Ensuring due process is followed in assessing environmental impacts; and
 - (d) Promoting planning for the long-term success of the program.
- (3) Each development project had undergone an environmental analysis and public hearing. Some have environmental impact review.

- (4) Current legal caps were cited:

| | Request | Minimum Permitted | Maximum Permitted |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Educ/Enforcement Projs. | \$ 848,906 | \$ 123,552.72* | \$ 680,003.99 |
| ORV Education Projects | 1,204,214 | 201,049.28** | 1,720,044.82 |
| Nonhighway Road Projs. | 368,028 | -0- | 711,331.27 |

* This amount must be allocated to law enforcement agencies in those counties where DNR maintains ORV facilities (Mason, Pierce, Yakima, Grant, Skagit, Clallam, Thurston, Clark, Wahkiakum) (RCW 46.09.170(v)). This amount equals the DNR transfer since the last funding meeting.

** This amount is the total of the ORV use and dealer permit fees received since the last funding meeting, RCW 46.09.170(d) (ii).

Mr. Lovelady proceeded with explanations of funding for each project. Those projects receiving comments from the Committee were as follows:

ORV-87-3E, State Parks & Recreation Commission, Squak ORV Barriers: Mr. Wayland did not understand the proposed staff funding. The project had been removed from education/enforcement and placed under nonhighway road category, with addition of interpretive signs. Yet, the project involved barriers to prohibit illegal use of the park. He felt the cost of the interpretive signs should also

| Project / Sponsor Name Number | Project Name | Sponsor Request | STAFF Recommend. | Staff Notes |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS | | | | |
| 87- 3e State Parks | Squak ORV Barriers | \$ 20,350 | \$ -.00 | fund w/ <u>NHR</u> monies; see 87-3d, below |
| 25e Chelan Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 9 | 76,717 | 76,717 | |
| 27e Grant Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 5 | 95,229 | 88,000 | |
| 28e Kittitas Co Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 85,502 | 85,502 | |
| 29e Mason Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 113,705 | 44,000 | |
| 30e Ocean Shores Polic | ORV Ed/Enf 1 | 6,000 | 3,000 | funding for signs & brochure only |
| 31e Pierce Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 118,408 | 88,000 | |
| 32e Richland, City of | ORV Ed/Enf 6 | 39,487 | 39,487 | |
| 33e Thurston Co Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 2 | 52,012 | -.00 | |
| 34e Yakima Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 104,080 | 88,000 | |
| 35e Tacoma Metro Parks | ORV Safety/Ed 3 | 51,400 | 51,400 | 1.25 FTE |
| 36e Tacoma Metro Parks | ORV Puyallup Fair | 11,116 | 15,100 | added amt is for travel & per diem for existing E&E psni |
| 37e Thurston Co. Parks | ORV Safety/Ed 9 | 6,000 | 2,000 | |
| 41e DNR | ORV Guide Reprint | 68,900 | 68,900 | |
| | Subtotal = | \$ 848,906 | \$650,106 | |
| ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS | | | | |
| 87- 6p USFS Wenat. Entiat | Mad Riv Trl Monit | \$ 9,844 | \$ -.00 | proposal not seen as a solution to the hiker/ORV conflict issue. |
| 7p Ferry Co. P&R Dist | Republic ORV Site | 39,000 | 39,000 | |
| 10d Richland, City of | Horn Rapids Ph #5 | 52,674 | 52,674 | |
| 11d Thurston Co. P&R | Sports Park Ph #8 | 28,600 | 28,600 | |
| 12d USFS Wenat. Natchs | Divide Ridge Signs | 7,011 | 7,011 | |
| 13d USFS Colville Col | Li'l Pend Tri Seg4 | 91,250 | 91,250 | |
| 14d USFS Wenat. Lk Wen | Nason Rdg Trl Relo | 11,485 | 11,485 | |
| 15d Spokane Co Parks | Airway Hts Ph. #2 | 531,488 | 531,488 | |
| 16p USFS, Wenatc - SO | Trdlightly Update | 38,992 | 38,992 | |
| 20a Spokane Co Parks | Airway Hts Acquis | 63,700 | 63,700 | |
| 21a Grant Co Sheriff | Mgt Fac. - 6 Sites | 8,780 | 8,780 | |
| 22a Richland, City of | ORV Pk M&O-'88-89 | 240,828 | 240,828 | |
| 23a USFS Wenat - SO | Tris Log-Out, 1988 | 4,045 | 4,045 | |
| 38p Snohomish Co P&R | ORV Awareness & Ed | 20,000 | 20,000 | |
| 39p Everett P&R Dept | Riverft Pk Feasibi | 39,750 | 39,750 | |
| 40a Ferry Co P&R Dist | Abandon RR Access | 19,000 | 20,000 | funding to be used for developing a site & management plan, construction costs estimates, an appraisal & property acquisition option. |
| | Subtotal = | \$1,206,447 | \$1,197,603 | |
| NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS | | | | |
| 87- 4d State Parks | Picnic/Wrming Shlt | 37,400 | 37,400 | |
| 5d State Parks | Beacn Rk Horse Fac | 90,660 | 50,000 | delete water system in this construction phase |
| 8p USFS Mt.Bkr-Snoq | Middle Fork Trail | 13,945 | 13,945 | |
| 17d USFS Wenat CleElum | Haney Meadow Capgdi | 44,890 | 44,890 | |
| 18d Wildlife, Dept of | Similk Trl Dev PhI | 147,289 | 147,289 | proceed only if provisions in <u>acquisition</u> contract are <u>completed</u> by 12/88 |
| 24p USFS Wenat CleElum | Swauk Corid Access | 5,000 | 5,000 | |
| ((3d State Parks | Squak ORV Barriers | 20,350 | 20,350 | fund w/ <u>NHR</u> monies; add interpretive signs)) |
| ((6p USFS | Mad River | 9,844 | -.00 | see 87- 6p above)) |
| ((40a Ferry Co | RR Access | 19,000 | -.00 | see 87-40a above)) |
| | Subtotal = | \$388,378 | \$318,874 | |

| Project / Sponsor Name Number | Project Name | Sponsor Request | NOVA Recommend. | NOVA Advisory Committee Notes | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS | | | | | |
| 87- 3e State Parks | Squak ORV Barriers | \$ 20,350 | \$ -000 | NOTE: A max. of \$40,000 per FTE (Full-Time Equivalent), and two FTEs per agency are recommended. Below, in most instances where the request differs significantly from the recommendation, the recommendation represents the 1986 expenditure and/or funding level. | |
| 25e Chelan Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 9 | 76,717 | 76,717 | | |
| 23e Grant Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 5 | 95,229 | 80,000 | | |
| 24e Kittitas Co Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 85,502 | 80,000 | | |
| 25e Mason Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 113,705 | 40,000 | | |
| 30e Ocean Shores Police | ORV Ed/Enf 1 | 6,000 | 500 | | funding for signs & brochure |
| 31e Pierce Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 118,408 | 40,000 | | |
| 32e Richland, City of | ORV Ed/Enf 6 | 39,487 | 39,487 | | |
| 33e Thurston Co Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 2 | 52,012 | -000 | | |
| 34e Yakima Co. Sheriff | ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 104,080 | 80,000 | | |
| 35e Tacoma Metro Parks | ORV Safety/Ed 3 | 51,400 | 51,400 | | 1.25 FTE |
| 36e Tacoma Metro Parks | ORV Puyallup Fair | 11,116 | 15,100 | | added amt is for travel & per diem for existing E&E psnl |
| 37e Thurston Co. Parks | ORV Safety/Ed 9 | 6,000 | 2,000 | | |
| 41e DNR | ORV Guide Reprint | 68,900 | 68,900 | | |
| | Subtotal = | \$ 848,906 | \$574,104 | | |
| ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS | | | | | |
| 87- 6p USFS Wenat. Entiat | Mad Riv Trl Monit | \$ 9,844 | \$ 9,844 | see 87-6p below; total cost (\$19,688) divided equally among ORV and NHR fund sources | |
| 7p Ferry Co. P&R Dist | Republic ORV Site | 39,000 | 39,000 | | |
| 10d Richland, City of | Horn Rapids Ph #5 | 52,674 | 52,674 | | |
| 11d Thurston Co. P&R | Sports Park Ph #8 | 28,600 | 28,600 | | |
| 12d USFS Wenat. Natche | Divide Ridge Signs | 7,011 | 7,011 | | |
| 13d USFS Colville Col | Li'l Pend Trl Seg4 | 91,250 | 91,250 | | |
| 14d USFS Wenat. Lk Wenat | Nason Rdg Trl Reloc | 11,485 | 11,485 | | |
| 15d Spokane Co Parks | Airway Hts Ph. #2 | 531,488 | 531,488 | | |
| 16p USFS, Wenatc - SO | Trdlightly Update | 38,992 | 38,992 | | |
| 20a Spokane Co Parks | Airway Hts Acquis | 63,700 | 63,700 | | |
| 21a Grant Co Sheriff | Mgt Fac. - 6 Sites | 8,780 | 8,780 | see 87-40a below; total cost (\$38,000) divided equally among ORV & NHR fund sources | |
| 22a Richland, City of | ORV Pk M&O-'88-'89 | 240,828 | 240,828 | | |
| 23a USFS Wenat - SO | Trls Log-Out, 1988 | 4,045 | 4,045 | | |
| 38p Snohomish Co P&R | ORV Awareness & Ed | 20,000 | 20,000 | | |
| 39p Everett P&R Dept | Riverft Pk Feasibi | 39,750 | 39,750 | | |
| 40a Ferry Co P&R Dist | Abandon RR Access | 19,000 | 19,000 | | |
| | Subtotal = | \$1,206,447 | \$1,206,447 | | |
| NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS | | | | | |
| 87- 4d State Parks | Picnic/Wrming Shlt | 37,400 | 37,400 | | delete water system in this construction phase |
| 5d State Parks | Beacn Rk Horse Fac | 90,660 | 50,000 | | |
| 8p USFS Mt.Bkr-Snoq | Middle Fork Trail | 13,945 | 13,945 | proceed only on completion of provisions in acq contract | |
| 17d USFS Wenat CleElum | Haney Meadow Capgd | 44,890 | 44,890 | | |
| 18d Wildlife, Dept of | Similk Trl Dev Ph | 147,289 | 147,289 | | |
| 24p USFS Wenat CleElum | Swauk Corid Access | 5,000 | -000 | | questionable eligibility |
| ((6p USFS | Mad River | 9,844 | 9,844 | | see 87- 6p above)) |
| ((40a Ferry Co | RR Access | 19,000 | 19,000 | see 87-40a above)) | |
| | Subtotal = | \$368,028 | \$322,368 | | |

* Note: asterisked projects are those agreed upon per RCN 46.09.280, *Only representatives of organized ORV groups may be voting members of the (NOVA Advisory) committee with respect to expenditure of funds received under RCN 46.09.110. (ORV permit 10/13/87 870411 by L.C.)

be included in the project. If the project is worthy whatever it takes to support it should be considered by the Committee. Mr. Lovelady felt support for the project could be better justified by use of nonhighway funds. Mr. Wayland said he agreed with that, but the project should contain sufficient monies to provide the interpretive signing. In response to questions, Mr. Tveten stated the signs would cost approximately \$1,500. Mr. Pinnix agreed that funds to cover the signing should be added to the project.

Mr. Lovelady continued with funding recommendations, noting that the staff and Committee had been committed to the \$40,000 standard for funding deputies in the education/enforcement program. Staff was now recommending more support than the \$40,000 guidelines since there are sufficient monies to fund the documented needs beyond the historical level of support. Staff suggested that for 1987 funding there be added an additional ten percent to certain of the education/enforcement projects: Grant County, Mason County, Yakima County (23E, 25E and 34E, respectively). ~~Staff felt Kittitas County's request would be sufficient to meet the needs.~~ Project 31E, Pierce County - staff recommended support be increased by addition of one person. Project 30E, Ocean Shores, rather than support the full equivalent, staff and NOVA Advisory Committee recommended that interpretive signs be installed; with staff recommending \$3,000 for this purpose.

33E, Thurston County, both staff and NOVA felt the proposal should not be recommended as there are other sources for the education and enforcement program for Thurston County.

Project 37E, Thurston County Parks, reduced to \$2,000 as this represents what the County has been actually spending in the program.

The recommendations for education/enforcement, Mr. Lovelady stated, would leave a \$30,000 reserve for emergency requests.

Mr. Mackey asked if the Committee should move on approval for each category or withhold voting until entire listing of projects had been reviewed. Mr. Pinnix opted to view the entire listing due to the Treadlightly Program in which he had an interest. He felt this was not a recreation facility program, but should fit in with the education/enforcement category. Ms. Cox polled the Committee. IT WAS THE CONSENSUS TO REVIEW THE ENTIRE LISTING OF PROJECTS AND VOTE ON THEM AS A WHOLE.

Mr. Wayland questioned the setting of 10% additional in the education/enforcement program. Mr. Lovelady stated this was due to the extra dollars available and the critical need for the monies. This would be only for the 1987 funding program. All of the counties could use funding beyond this, but it is necessary to screen each program. Every county involved could ask for more money, but that is not the issue in reviewing them. A standard had to be set and adhered to.

Mr. Pinnix asked why Thurston County, Project 33E, E&E, was not being recommended for funding. Mr. Lovelady replied there were several reasons. Mainly, the use factor in Thurston County did not compare with other use levels in the state.

Further, it was felt that the Dept. of Natural Resources dealt very well with ORV use in the Capitol Forest area. There are also other education efforts already being undertaken in Thurston County. Mr. Lovelady also stated the Thurston County ORV program only operates a few months out of the year and The Capitol Forest is only open half of the year.

Mr. Pinnix expressed his concern about the safety efforts in the DNR Capitol Forest area. DNR is not a law enforcement agency and does require the services of the Thurston County Sheriff's Office. He was not aware that Thurston County had a lower need for this service, and wondered if staff had looked at the level of funding given to the various counties and whether there was need to increase law enforcement. Mr. Lovelady replied there is no formal evaluation system for these programs. Staff has analyzed each county's needs in relation to the state as a whole regarding ORV use and facilities. Mr. Pinnix asked why \$30,000 was needed as a reserve when the funds could be used in the projects. Mr. Lovelady mentioned the need to assist counties perhaps with outmoded equipment -- emergencies that arise for transportation equipment and so forth.

Mr. Wilder noted staff's efforts in looking at the overall needs of the counties. A contingency fund is needed to assist from time to time. He mentioned the competition for the dollars. Mr. Lovelady said the IAC had adopted property management guidelines; agencies contact the IAC if they wish to dispose of property purchased through NOVA funds. Equipment no longer used by one county may be transferred for use to another.

Mr. Lovelady continued with review of the NOVA projects, reviewing the category ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS. Those projects receiving comments from the Committee were as follows:

ORV-87-06P, Entiat Ranger Dist., USDA Forest Service, Mad River/Blue Creek Area Trail Monitoring: Mr. Lovelady made reference to the letters received concerning this project. Staff had recommended against the funding of this project; whereas the NOVA Advisory Committee had recommended it be funded. Mr. Lovelady stated staff felt there will continue to be conflicts, but there is not a need to monitor and have an interviewing program as proposed by the Forest Service. The Forest Service felt the project should be submitted because there had been keen interest in the area by the Committee. However, staff could not see any request on the part of the Committee for this particular type of project. The Forest Service was trying to be cooperative. The hikers felt there were conflicts; the Forest Service did not feel there were any, but they were willing to look into the issue. Complaints did not come in since most hikers had left the area open to ORV use and were in other areas. Regardless of the issue of conflicts the Forest Service currently is going to allow ORV use in the area. However, due to new supervision of this area, there will be a review on trail use and matters could change. Mr. Lovelady stated of all backcountry trails open to activities in the state only 19 percent (19%) are open to trail motorcycles; the rest are open for hikers.

Dr. Scull felt the Forest Service should continue seasonal closures to help reduce conflicts. In this way hikers would not be pushed out of the entire area. Mr. Pete Peterson Chelan County Sheriff's Office, commented on the closures and the relation of the trail conditions to the closures.

ORV-87-40A, Ferry County Parks & Recreation District, BNRR Trail Acquisition: Mr. Lovelady expressed staff's concern about this project. He asked that there be assurance a reasonable and ongoing management plan will be available after the acquisition is accomplished. Presently the trail combines motorized and

nonmotorized activities. Prior to authorizing the project, he suggested the Committee include the necessity for the development of a site and management plan with construction costs estimates, an appraisal, and property acquisition option.

ORV-87-14D, USFS Wenatchee, Lake Wenatchee, Nason Ridge Trail Relocation: Mr. Tveten asked that staff go back to Project 87-14D which had been previously discussed. He stated his staff had had opportunity to look at the plans and he felt the trail relocation was not in the best interests of the park and those who will use it. The proposed trailhead is located close to the camp grounds and this, he felt, would cause conflict. He asked if the Forest Service could move the trail further back. Mr. Lovelady acknowledged Mr. Tveten's request was reasonable, and staff could require that the Forest Service coordinate with State Parks on relocation of the trail. Mr. Wayland also expressed his concerns. Mr. Mackey suggested that Mr. Tveten and Mr. Wayland meet with the Forest Service considering the location of the trail and the needed concurrence of both departments (Parks & Recreation Commission and Wildlife). Mr. Tveten asked that there be a proviso in the project as presented by staff that the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Department of Wildlife concur in any contemplated location. Mr. Higgins, Forest Service, stated he had no problem with this and would be pleased to meet on the issue. Mr. Lane, Asst. Attorney General, stated if this were done, it should be made very clear in the approval of the project that this would be a condition which must be met prior to funding.

ORV-87-16P, U. S. Forest Service, Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Chelan County, Treadlightly Update 1988: Mr. Pinnix questioned whether the Treadlightly program was in the right category. He stated it was not a facility program and should be considered an education program related to ORV use. Mr. Lovelady replied staff had noted there were some development elements in the project (erection of signs). The Committee could move it to E&E if so desired. Mr. Dovel noted that the Treadlightly program would meet the needs of ORVers through the brochure, but that also Public Service Announcements and video would be made available.

The program will address needs that the Forest Service has. Ms. Cox thought perhaps staff could reconsider the 10% additional in the E & E programs and use some of this money for Treadlightly, still leaving some funds for emergency purposes. Mr. Ryan agreed the project should be considered as an education project. He wondered if staff could offer the Committee a choice within the caps of each program. Or, would it be better to look at the 10% increase as a means to provide some funding. Mr. Wilder felt it was reasonable to put the project within the E&E category. Mr. Lane advised it was possible to consider other funding alternatives but final decisions ought not to be made until the Committee has resolved all project actions at the same time.

Mr. Ryan agreed that the Committee could help with the funding as well as language which might apply to descriptions of projects. Mr. Wayland expressed his concern about dealing with the appropriations within the project categories. He did not want to approve projects which would "dump" more on law enforcement and education. Further, the program seems to be increasing and the funds become tighter. He felt staff and the NOVA Advisory Committee were trying to accommodate funding matters. He said he was comfortable with accepting the staff recommendation but yet was uncomfortable with the flexibility within the categories which would allow the Committee to increase education and enforcement responsibilities and yet not provide enough funding for this category. With increasing population he felt the situation for law enforcement would not get any better.

ORV-87-15D, Spokane County Parks, Airway Heights ORV Park Development: Dr. Scull

referred to the Spokane Airway Heights ORV Park Development project. His concern was that in developing more ORV park areas, there would then be a continuing problem of the operation and maintenance costs. The Committee may be asked to maintain these facilities. He suggested a user fee be considered. The ORV users have a right to expect trails and low maintenance facilities available for their use provided from the NOVA funds, but the highly developed areas with elements within them are entirely different. He felt in the future considerable funds would be used to maintain and operate these facilities. Mr. Sam Angove, Director, Spokane County Parks Department, stated the County had given this serious consideration. There will be a nominal fee for use of the park. The park, however, is considered within the overall County park system and will therefore receive some funding through that program.

ORV-87-40A, Ferry County Parks and Recreation District, BNRR Acquisition: Ms. Cox stated she was not convinced there needed to be a "full-blown" study of this proposal. She felt the community and those using the trail would cooperate as they appear to be doing now, and funds would therefore not be required for the study. She felt there would be little conflict on the use of the trail. Mr. Dovel said there might be some conflict and the IAC did not want to be in a position of somewhere "down the road" without a valid, well-managed, quality trail. The study would answer many questions and set up a program use for the trail. Mr. Wilder agreed a proper plan would be needed for this project. First, the property must be acquired, then recommendations made to meet the objectives for the trail. There are too many unanswered questions at this point.

ORV-87-16P, Wenatchee National Forest, Treadlightly Update 1988: Ms. Cox asked the Committee's option concerning the Treadlightly project. Mr. Baker brought out the following figures:

\$33,500 - amount added to the E&E projects by staff for
the 10% consideration
28,898 - difference between the cap on the E&E and the staff's
recommendation of projects to be funded by E&
(\$680,004, cap - \$650,106 staff recommendation = \$28,898)

Thus, \$28,898 was available to the Committee for funding, plus the 10% increase suggested by staff, or \$62,398.

There followed discussion on how to place funds for the Treadlightly project in E&E when a portion of it was actually development. Ms. Ruth Ittner, NOVA member, suggested funding the development portion within the ORV Recreation Facility Projects and the education aspect under the E&E Projects. Mr. Wayland objected to moving the funds to E&E since this would cause cutting of a portion of the 10% for law enforcement which is needed. Mr. Lovelady was asked the cost involved for the signs. He stated approximately \$6,000. Mr. Wayland suggested another option would be not to fund the program at all and place those funds in the E&E program. Mr. Baker brought out there would be additional monies in the E&E cap received during October which were not yet included in the Fund Summary. These could be considered and added to the funding program today. Both Mr. Wilder and Mr. Lovelady stated this would then decrease funds for the next funding session.

At 12:45, the Committee opted to continue review of the NOVA projects...category NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS:

ORV-05D, State Parks and Recreation Commission, Beacon Rock State Park, Equestrian Facilities:

Both staff and NOVA recommended the water system in this construction phase of the project be deleted. Mr. Tveten accepted the recommendation.

ORV-87-18D, Washington Department of Wildlife, Similkameen River Trail Development: Mr. Wayland noted the qualification in the project to "proceed only if provisions in the acquisition project are completed by December 1988" and accepted staff's and the NOVA Committee's recommendation.

At the conclusion of the project funding recommendations, Ms. Cox asked that each person desiring to testify before the Committee complete a Participation Card.

NOVA PUBLIC TESTIMONY included:

Kenneth White, Trails Coordinator, U.S. Forest Service - Project 87-8P, Middle Fork Trail: Approved of the recommendation; available for questions.

Larry Hively, Undersheriff, Grant County, Project E & E 27-E: Reported that funding request was for \$95,229; funding being recommended was \$88,000. Grant County would be unable with this amount of funding to purchase the new vehicle for the ORV program. However, with rearrangement of priorities can continue its program.

Ken Wilcox, Washington Backcountry Horsemen - Project NHR 87-17D, Cle Elum Ranger District, Haney Meadows Campground Development: Strongly supported this project. Backcountry Horsemen have been working with the Forest Service on this project; invested many hours of time; volunteer work.

Chris Anderson, Deputy, Thurston County Sheriff's Office - Project 87-33E, Thurston County E & E: Requested Thurston County receive funding as requested \$52,012. Though DNR does a good job in the Capitol Forest area, their personnel are not law enforcement. Referred to Gene Neilsen, DNR, letter of November 3, 1987, in full support of the ORV Deputy position which stated in part "...my field people cannot cover all the recreation activity in Thurston County."

(2) Complaints reflect the need. (Gary P. Edwards, Sheriff listing distributed to Committee members.)

Mr. Pinnix asked what kind of complaints were received as noted on the listing. Mr. Anderson stated they had not computed these by category so there was no way to give this information. However, some related to juveniles in residential areas; others to the Capitol Forest.

Richard Peterson, Lt., ORV Coordinator, Chelan County Sheriff's Office - ORV-16P, Treadlightly Program, USFS, Wenatchee Natl. Forest:

(1) Involved with NOVA; on School Board and involved with Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction;

(2) Concerned that the Treadlightly Program was only being brought in to the state to help the Forest Service, although it may possibly get into the school system also;

(3) Did not know if it was appropriate to be funded through ORV funding. SPI as well as the Forest Service have not offered funds to assist with it;

(4) Felt there were already programs safety oriented as well as environmentally oriented for the public.

Mr. Pinnix asked if NOVA had a criteria which would determine the level of funding for the various sheriff's departments. Mr. Peterson replied the funding varies because of the activities. Sheriffs' departments request more than the standard set and there are not enough monies to go around, so NOVA considers each county's program and needs carefully. Mr. Peterson felt the funding program for the E&E program was dealt with fairly by staff and the NOVA Advisory Committee.

Joe Higgins, U. S. Forest Service - ORV-16P, Treadlightly Update Project: Explained Treadlightly was a national program having the support of not only the Forest Service but many user groups. Attempting to focus the message in the State of Washington by notifying them some of the national material is available to them.

(2) There is concern of user groups as to the amount of money which goes into law enforcement as opposed to development. Not enough funds are placed in project facilities.

Ms. Cox asked if the Forest Service would be willing to put monies into the program. Mr. Higgins replied they probably would be willing to do so.

Mr. Jim Eychaner, Executive Director, Washington Trails Association - NHR - 87-3D: Supported staff's recommendation to fund this project: (Swauk Corridor Access)

Mr. Ron Ward, Chief Criminal Deputy, Yakima County Sheriff's Office - ORV 87-34E, Yakima County E&E: Appreciated the 10% increase to Yakima County. Difficult to obtain personnel and equipment at \$40,000 level. Takes about \$93,000 for two officers, deleting the capital expense and equipment.

Mr. Wayland pointed out there would be differences in budgets submitted by the various counties; each has different needs. He was concerned that there would be additional NOVA projects from time to time and thus there would be an increase for law enforcement and for education. There is an investment in the projects once they are on the ground. It was brought out that the Yakima ORV Park did close down, but there are several miles of Forest and reservation areas to cover by law enforcement. The different salary ranges for deputies was also mentioned.

Ms. Ruth Ittner, Citizen, and NOVA Advisory Committee Member - ORV-16P, Treadlightly Update Project: (1) Considered this a very good program and needed for Washington State;

(2) Can be most useful because it addresses the problem of the generic aspect. Same material can be circulated and used for everybody.

(3) Will be attending a National Conference on Outdoor Ethics soon.

Mr. Wayland asked that she share with him information from Outdoor Ethics conference upon her return.

Mr. Pinnix asked Ms. Ittner if she had any further information on the Mad River conflict situation. Ms. Ittner replied she had been working on this and having discussions with those involved. The results are to look at the entire situation as a much broader scope, and Ms. Ittner will be working in this direction with her group.

Mr. Larry Beardslee, Chairman, Ferry County Parks and Recreation Department - Noted the Forest Service in its Draft Environmental Statement had suggested the closure of two ORV areas in the Colville National Forest. He thought the Committee might want to look into this matter.

Ms. Cox suggested he discuss this with the Forest Service. Mr. Joe Higgins, USFS, stated there was a conflict between the plan recommendation and what is in existence. He will be conferring with FS staff to obtain agreement on how the Forest Service will manage these trails.

Mr. David Whitener, Mason County Sheriff's Department - ORV-33E Thurston County E&E Project: (1) Mason County is new in the E&E program funded through NOVA, and would like to have assistance of Thurston County in consultations, etc. Felt it necessary that Thurston County's project receive funding.

(2) Presently works alone in ORV law enforcement field for Mason County; needs to have Thurston County deputies assist whenever they can.

(3) Investment in ORV facilities does affect monies going into the E&E program, and felt Committee should look at this problem.

Mr. Howard Armfield, Mason County Sheriff's Department - ORV-33E Thurston County E&E Project: (1) Corroborated Mr. Whitener's remarks maintaining that there was a high-use area in Mason and Thurston Counties.

Ms. Mary Szabo, Conservation Chair, Intermountain Alpine Club) 87-06P - USFS, Wenatchee Entiat, Mad River Trail Monitoring: (1) Have 150 members - high-climbing and cross-country skiing. Very concerned about usage of the trails in the Mad River.

(2) Extremely noisy area used by ORV recreationists; fragile mountain; flowering meadows.

(3) Trails are rutted by the bikers making hiking difficult.

(4) Trail damage also evident in other ways; support keeping it as hiking area; there is a need for quiet hiking trails;

(5) Safety is a concern of many; hikers feel vulnerable.

Mr. Pinnix asked if Ms. Szabo agreed that the project in the Mad River should not be funded. She replied yes, stating she would not go back there again as it was not an area for hikers. Further, she felt IAC had already granted ORV use in the Mad River and excluded hikers.

Mr. Tveten questioned staff as to why the monitoring study was not being recommended. Mr. Lovelady said the study would cost \$20,000 and staff felt it would not accomplish anything. The Forest Service states they have not been receiving any complaints concerning that area; and apparently the hikers feel they do not wish to participate there any more. Mr. Wayland agreed that \$20,000 could be spent on discovering something that is already known, and it turns out to be a needless effort.

Mr. Jim Eychaner, WTA, said the Trails Association was opposed to the survey also since the Wenatchee National Forest will be reviewing its entire trail system. Mr. Higgins, FS, stated the money was not critical at this time.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY MR. WAYLAND, THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS WITH THE ADDITION OF FUNDING FOR ORV-87-33E, THURSTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, E&E, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$28,500, AND ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TEN PERCENT (10%) ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE OTHER E&E PROJECTS OF SPECIFIC COUNTIES.

Mr. Wayland expressed his support for the NOVA and staff recommendations to fund the E&E projects, but objected to moving the Treadlightly program into that category. As a compromise he suggested that staff be instructed to look into the Treadlightly concept and determine whether it is a program which the Committee should get involved in, then handle it in the same manner as the Recreation Trails Directory, approved earlier. Mr. Baker reminded Mr. Wayland and Committee members that the \$28,500 represented the amount of money available before reaching the cap. Mr. Pinnix understood that when the motion is moved that the Treadlightly project would be dropped and staff would then come back later to the Committee for directions. Mr. Wilder said this could be done, but it was intention of staff to help reduce conflicts in the NOVA program through this type of education. Mr. Wayland thought more could be done for the project - perhaps the Forest Service could assist in funding it. At this point, Mr. Pinnix AMENDED THE MOTION, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE COMMITTEE ADD AN ADDITIONAL PROJECT TO THE E&E CATEGORY - ORV-16P, TREADLIGHTLY PROGRAM, AT A LEVEL OF \$33,000, USING \$6,000 OF THE ORIGINAL FUNDING PROPOSAL OF STAFF FOR THE PLANNING ELEMENTS.

MR. RYAN SUGGESTED HIS MOTION BE REMOVED, OPTING TO RECONSIDER AND USE MR. PINNIX'S AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AS THE COMMITTEE MOTION, AND INCLUDE PROJECT 33-E, THURSTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, E&E, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$28,500.

Mr. Ryan referred to ORV 87-41E, DNR, ORV Guide Reprint project, which was indicated at staff recommendation of \$68,900. He asked what this would produce by way of copies. Mr. Dovel replied this would provide for 50,000 copies. Mr. Ryan suggested taking half of that and using those funds for the Treadlightly project. Mr. Wayland asked concerning the final production of Treadlightly -- what would it look like and who would be receiving the credits. Mr. Higgins, FS, stated the Forest Service would give proper credit to all those involved in the program.

MR. PINNIX THEN CLARIFIED THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORV EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS, with THE FOLLOWING FUNDING CHANGES:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Project ORV-33-E Thurston County E&E | \$ 28,500 |
| 2. Project ORV-41-E DNR ORV Guide Reprint | 35,900 |
| 3. Project ORV-87-16P USFS, Wenatchee, Treadlightly Program | 33,000 |

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 48 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAYLAND, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT THE INTERAGENCY

| Project / Sponsor Name Number | Project Name | Amount Approved | Notes |
|---|---|--------------------|---|
| <u>EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS</u> | | | |
| 87-16a | USFS, Wenatc - SO : Trdlightly Update | 33,000 | see 16e, below |
| 25e | Chelan Co. Sheriff: ORV Ed/Enf 9 | 76,717 | |
| 27e | Grant Co. Sheriff : ORV Ed/Enf 5 | 83,000 | |
| 28e | Kittitas Co Sheriff: ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 85,502 | |
| 29e | Mason Co. Sheriff : ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 44,000 | |
| 30e | Ocean Shores Polic: ORV Ed/Enf 1 | 3,000 | |
| 31e | Pierce Co. Sheriff: ORV Ed/Enf 3 | 88,000 | |
| 32e | Richland, City of : ORV Ed/Enf 6 | 39,487 | |
| 33e | Thurston Co Sheriff: ORV Ed/Enf 2 | 28,500 | |
| 34e | Yakima Co. Sheriff: ORV Ed/Enf 10 | 88,000 | |
| 35e | Tacoma Metro Parks: ORV Safety/Ed 3 | 51,400 | |
| 36e | Tacoma Metro Parks: ORV Puyallup Fair | 15,100 | |
| 37e | Thurston Co. Parks: ORV Safety/Ed 9 | 2,000 | |
| 41e | DNR : ORV Guide Reprint | 35,900 | |
| | Subtotal = \$ | 678,606 | |
| <u>ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS</u> | | | |
| 87- 7p | Ferry Co. P&R Dist: Republic ORV Site | 39,000 | |
| 10d | Richland, City of : Horn Rapids Ph #5 | 52,674 | |
| 11d | Thurston Co. P&R : Sports Park Ph #8 | 28,600 | |
| 12d | USFS Wenat. Natchs: Divide Ridge Signs | 7,011 | |
| 13d | USFS Colville Col: Li'l Pend Trl Seq4 | 91,250 | |
| 14d | USFS Wenat. Lk Wen: Nason Rdg Trl Relo | 11,485 | subj to further spons coord w/ St Pks. & Dept of Wildlife |
| 15d | Spokane Co Parks : Airway Hts Ph. #2 | 531,488 | |
| (16e) | USFS, Wenatc - SO : Trdlightly Update | 6,000 | this amt. for signs only; see 16e, above) |
| 20a | Spokane Co Parks : Airway Hts Acquis | 63,700 | |
| 21a | Grant Co Sheriff : Mgt Fac. - 6 Sites | 3,780 | |
| 22a | Richland, City of : ORV Pk M&O-'88-89 | 240,828 | |
| 23a | USFS Wenat - SO : Tris Log-Out, 1988 | 4,045 | |
| 33p | Snohomish Co P&R : ORV Awareness & Ed | 20,000 | |
| 39p | Everett P&R Dept : Riverft Pk Feasibi | 39,750 | |
| 40p | Ferry Co P&R Dist : Abandon RR Access | 20,000 | funding to be used for developing a site & management plan, construction costs estimates, an appraisal & property acquisition option. |
| | Subtotal = \$ | 1,164,611 | |
| <u>NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS</u> | | | |
| 87- 4d | State Parks : Picnic/Wrming Shlt | 37,400 | |
| 5d | State Parks : Beach RK Horse Fac | 50,000 | delete water system in this construction phase |
| 8p | USFS Mt.Bkr-Snoq : Middle Fork Trail | 13,945 | |
| 17d | USFS Wenat CleElum: Haney Meadow Campgd | 44,890 | |
| 18d | Wildlife, Dept of : Similk Trl Dev Ph | 147,289 | proceed only if provisions in acquisit contract are done by 12/89 |
| 24p | USFS Wenat CleElum: Swauk Corid Access | 5,000 | |
| 3d | State Parks : Squak ORV Barriers | 22,000 | add interpretive signs |
| | Subtotal = \$ | 320,524 | |

source or sources for parks and recreation. Mr. Wayland suggested contacting the Parks and Recreation Commission members to ensure their presence as invited by the sub-committee. Mr. Mackey suggested perhaps some of the advisory committee members of DNR might be helpful.

PROGRAM CONCEPTS: A listing of Program Concepts and Parameters for Progress was distributed by Mr. Wilder. He outlined the purpose behind each title to create interest in park and recreation concepts and funding programs. The Committee discussed the need to meet prior to the Legislative Session on funding matters and a concerted effort on an Action Program. A workshop-type meeting was suggested. There was some discussion on meeting with the sub-committees of the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Tveten felt it would be best to stay with the Sub-committee on Parks since that is the thrust of the IAC program, and Representative Karla Wilson has indicated an interest in being of assistance. The reorganization issue and "termination" of the IAC was also mentioned for workshop discussion. Mr. Wilder suggested January 8, 1988, Friday as a tentative date, subject to staff talking to the IAC members and discussing their schedules. The Chair asked the Committee members to send Bob topics they wished to have covered at the meeting. Mr. Tveten suggested a bond program similar to those of the past; a lottery game for parks and recreation. Mr. Wilder was asked to make the plans for this meeting and confirm place, time, and date.

(APPENDIX "E" - CONCEPTS/PARAMETERS FOR PROGRESS)

IV. F. WASHINGTON STATE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PLAN - 1987: Mr. Dovel referred to memorandum of staff dated November 5, 1987, "1987 Washington State Off-Road Vehicle Plan", noting the following:

(1) Letters were received in regard to the Plan (SEE APPENDIX "F" TO THESE MINUTES). Mr. Tveten's suggestion to hold public meetings had been adhered to and public meetings were held in Moses Lake, Seattle, and Olympia. Very positive comments were received; some were basic philosophical differences.

(2) Map demonstration - indicating various areas of the state used in the planning guidelines. Have identified areas where no new trails are needed and where they are critically needed.

(3) Plan sources were: NOVA, independent citizens, Mountaineers, Washington Trails Association, Pacific NW Four-Wheel Drive Association, Northwest Motorcycle Association, Eastern Washington Trail Riders Association, Washington State ORV Law Enforcement Association, Blue Ribbon Coalition, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Department of Natural Resources, and the Department of Wildlife.

(4) The plan contains information about the E&E projects. Main objective is: how will we face the future in meeting these decisions. Guidelines will be necessary - adopted by the Committee - and this will need to be a scoring system.

Ms. Ruth Ittner, NOVA, stated: (1) Attended two meetings relating to the plan. Referred to Chapter III - pg. 15 "Lost Opportunity - Reduced Inventory" stating there had been a reduction of 690 miles (28 percent) from the 1981 inventory which had indicated 2,470 miles of trail open to ORV use. She felt that there were numerous reasons for loss to trails. Among them were: new wilderness boundaries, logging, road building, and other forest management activity.

(2) Presently there is no way to know who are the users of off-road vehicle backcountry areas. So, it is not possible to mail them any material or have any communication with them concerning the rules, regulations, etc., governing ORVs.

She suggested every motorcyclist using the backcountry areas somehow be placed on a mailing list to receive information.

Mr. Lovelady said staff had taken note of this suggestion earlier but had not yet had the opportunity to investigate the possibilities of such a mailing list. He felt it was an excellent idea and worthy of consideration. He indicated that staff would coordinate with Ms. Ittner to include her comments on items (1) and (2) above in the final plan document.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT

WHEREAS, CHAPTER RCW 46.09 REQUIRES THAT A STATEWIDE PLAN BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS UNDER THIS CHAPTER, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS PREPARED A 1987 WASHINGTON STATE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PLAN TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THIS DIRECTIVE, AND

WHEREAS, THERE HAS BEEN WIDESPREAD PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE PLAN INVOLVEMENT PROCESS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY APPROVE AND ADOPT THE THIRD DRAFT OF THE 1987 WASHINGTON STATE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATED PROVISOS:

1. THE COMMITTEE ACKNOWLEDGES THE NEED IN THE FUTURE TO INCLUDE IN THE STATISTICS CONCERNING REDUCED INVENTORY OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLE TRAILS (CHAPTER III-15 OF THE PLAN), THE LOSS OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE DUE TO LOGGING ROADS; AND
2. THERE IS A NEED TO PURSUE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MAILING LIST OF BACK-COUNTRY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USERS IN ORDER THAT THE NECESSARY INFORMATION ON RULES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING OFF-ROAD VEHICLES MAY BE DISTRIBUTED TO THESE USERS;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THIS SECOND EDITION OF THE PLAN WILL BE CONSIDERED AS AN OFFICIAL ADDENDUM TO THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN.

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten referred to Chapter II-5, citing "...when relative levels of use are light, many types of ORV and Nonhighway Road Recreation projects fit well within the multiple use concept." He felt this was a very important statement - "when relative use is light". Somewhere along the line, he said, the IAC is going to have to respond to projects with built in conflicts. If the IAC continues to fund the "conflict projects" it will be doing more harm than good to the people it serves. He concurred with the statement acknowledging that where relative use is light, it is feasible to fund a project. That is the only time he would find it acceptable.

Mr. Pinnix wanted an opportunity to give the document further review and asked how trails were going to relate to ATV use. Could the plan be approved in March?

Mr. Lovelady responded stating there is a legal requirement that the plan be updated every six years. This being the sixth year, it is necessary to adopt the plan prior to December 31st. Dr. Scull stated he had no problem accepting the plan the way it was written with the additions to the motion as suggested by Ms. Ittner.

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

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY THAT THE IAC MEETING ADJOURN. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN AND PASSED.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:32 P.M.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

3-25-88

DATE

Anne B. Cox

ANNE COX, CHAIR