



**RECOGNITIONS:** Mr. Wilder presented Certificates of Appreciation and Resolutions for consideration of the Committee.

(1) IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT

WHEREAS, RAYMOND RYAN, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AS A DESIGNEE MEMBER IN BEHALF OF THE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, AND IN THIS CAPACITY HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HIS SUPPORT AND SERVICES RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE DURING HIS TENURE, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE ENDEAVORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF RAYMOND RYAN'S ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A DESIGNEE TO THE COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO HIM,

AND RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO JOSEPH R. BLUM, DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO RAYMOND RYAN.

RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED.

(2) IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT

WHEREAS, GLEN SACHET (NOVA REPRESENTATIVE - DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE) AND SAM REED (NOVA REPRESENTATIVE - PEDESTRIAN) HAVE SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ADVISORY (NOVA) COMMITTEE, AND IN THAT CAPACITY HAVE ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, RENOVATION, PLANNING, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION, AND EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT NOVA PROGRAMS, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE THEIR SUPPORT AND SERVICES RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE DURING THEIR TERMS ON THE NOVA COMMITTEE, AND WISH THEM WELL IN FUTURE ENDEAVORS.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS MEMBERS OF NOVA, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO GLEN SACHET AND SAM REED, AND,

RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO GLEN SACHET AND SAM REED, WITH A LETTER OF APPRECIATION, AND

FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO CURT SMITCH, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE, IN RECOGNITION OF GLEN SACHET'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WHILE SERVING ON THE NOVA COMMITTEE.

RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED.

(3) Certificate of Appreciation - Roger Dovel: Mr. Wilder announced the transfer of Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, to the Department of Natural Resources,

effective November 7, 1988. A Certificate of Appreciation for his service to the IAC and to the NOVA Committee was prepared for presentation to him.

**Ms. Ruth Ittner**, NOVA representative, was introduced to the Committee by Mr. Wilder.

NASORLO Governor's Award: Mr. Wilder exhibited an award from the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers' given to The Honorable Booth Gardner, Governor of Washington. The award was accepted by Mr. Wilder at the group's meeting recently in September, and will be presented to the Governor at an appropriate time. It recognizes the outstanding services of Governor Gardner to parks, recreation, and conservation:

**"NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE OUTDOOR RECREATION LIAISON OFFICERS GOVERNOR'S AWARD - TO GOVERNOR BOOTH GARDNER FOR HIS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA'S OUTDOOR RECREATION PROGRAM AND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND. 1988"**

Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum dated November 3, 1988, "Director's Report - November 1988", highlighting the following items:

1. **IAC STUDY: Fred Hellberg, Policy Analyst, OFM**, has not as yet completed the Study, but assures the Committee it will be forthcoming sometime in November. Mr. Hellberg had taken exception to the Director's statement "it appears" that the study is not getting the time and attention it deserves." He was assured this was not to imply he was not doing the work required, but merely to note that both agencies are involved in various other work activities and that studies do take time and effort. A meeting has been arranged for November 10th with Mr. Hellberg and certain staff to go over the status of the report, and the draft which will be forthcoming for review of staff and the Committee. Mr. Wilder wanted it understood that Mr. Hellberg is doing all he can at this point to bring the study to completion, that in no way had the comment above been intended to be derogatory. Mr. Hellberg informed Mr. Wilder there is no question that the IAC will continue; the question is how it will be continuing.

2. **AGENCY SUPPORT:** Letters of support, resolutions on the part of various agencies and associations, were referred to in the Director's Report:

- Washington Association of Cities - resolution to continue IAC & funding program
- Washington Recreation and Park Association - vote of confidence in IAC
- Washington Association of Counties', Park Affiliates - vote of confidence and legislative platform.
- Washington Public Ports Association - exhibits support and commitment to IAC
- Washington State Sportsmen's Council - voices continued support

3. **AMERICAN HERITAGE TRUST:** The bill has been withdrawn (September 27, 1988) due to technical objection to scheduling full House consideration. Because of limited time remaining to resolve questions in this year's session, Congressman Morris Udall agreed to withhold further action on the bill this year. It will be reintroduced next year. (September 20, HR 4127 had 233 House co-sponsors; Companion bill S 2199, had 41 co-sponsors.)

4. **PUBLIC LAW 100-446:** Reported signed by the President September 27, 1988. The bill provided \$20 million for the Land and Water Grants Program, including \$16,700,000 for grants to states and \$3,300,000 for administration. States should receive their official apportionment notifications by mid-November.

5. **NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM:** IAC is involved in three funding programs: (1) Education and Enforcement, (2) ORV Areas and Programs/Facilities, and (3) Nonhighway Roads. Committee to view these during November 3-4 meeting. Several facets of the NOVA program now need streamlining and direction from the Committee. Effective for the 1989 Funding Session, all NOVA program land acquisition, development, education and enforcement (E/E), maintenance and operation (M&O) projects will be transferred to the Projects Services Division. Planning Services will have responsibility for the NOVA Planning projects (comprehensive studies, publications, etc.).

6. **COALITION BUILDING:** A special meeting was called by legislative staff on July 14, 1988 - to meet with Ms. Esther Feldman, staff member of the planning team responsible for the \$776 million California Bond Issue which passed in June 1988. The group attending this meeting has continued to meet and a Steering Committee has been appointed. The group exhibits an interest and concern to acquire, develop, and preserve, **park, wildlife, and natural areas** before they are lost or destroyed. IAC will continue to provide information upon request.

((7. **NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION (NRPA):** Included in the Director's Report was an item regarding the NRPA Board of Trustees meeting in 1989 (May 15-19), but this was not addressed by Mr. Wilder during the meeting.))

II. B. **MANAGEMENT SERVICES: FUND SUMMARIES** - Mr. Ray Baker, Financial Manager, was called upon to present the Financial Status Reports. Mr. Baker referred to:

1. Fund Summary - Grant-in-Aid - October 25, 1988: Reported that the negative balances were normal for the period. The second year's apportionment of federal funds have not yet been received. Net result will be an additional \$160,000 available for locals; and \$160,000 for State Parks and the Department of Fisheries. Corrected footnote on the second page to read "Initiative 215 proceeds from unclaimed refundable marine fuel tax, transferred thru September 1988" rather than February. Mr. Tveten pointed out the program reduction due to less federal funds.

"Projects Still Shown as Pending" listing: Three local projects on the listing have since moved to approved column. One local project, Squaxin Indian Tribe, withdrew (\$25,000 Init. 215), and those funds will be moved to the available funding column.

2. Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Fund Summary: Reported that the receipts are through September 1988. All major user groups are within their legal "caps" as mandated by law. The fund status is basically normal for this funding session. Current status: \$3,073,502.85.

II. C. **PROJECTS SERVICES:** Mr. Fairleigh introduced **Bill Hutsinpiller** from King County, then referred to memorandum of staff, "Project Services Division Report", dated November 3, 1988, as follows:

1. Only Initiative 215 projects will be funded at this session. Seventeen applications were received from local agencies sponsors for consideration. Five were withdrawn, leaving twelve projects to be reviewed for funding.

2. Technical Advisory Committee: Met to review each application. IAC staff and local project sponsors appreciate the time and effort of the TAC Committee in reviewing these applications.

3. Evaluation Team: Reviewed and scored the projects on October 17-18.  
Team composed of:

**Jon Aarstad**, Skagit County - Association of Washington Counties Representative  
**Bill Bush**, State Parks - representing state agencies TAC members  
**Steve Colby**, City of Anacortes - representing Association of Washington Cities  
**Byron Elmendorf**, City of Bellingham - representing Washington Recreation  
and Parks Association  
**Heber Kennedy**, Port of Olympia - representing Washington Public Ports  
Association  
**Barney Wilson**, City of Kent - representing local agencies TAC members.

4. **Steve Colby**, thanked for hosting the meeting in Anacortes.

5. Noted that 1987 session there were 75 applications received with 53 coming before the committee for funding consideration.

6. Approved Project Administration: Eighty-three (83) local and 91 state agencies projects are being assisted by IAC. Project staff will also be taking on NOVA projects.

7. **Squaxin Indian Tribe, Public Boat Ramp** project withdrawn (\$25,000 215 funds), due to unwillingness to waive tribal immunity.

8. State Agencies Master List Approval:

State Parks, Keystone Spit #88-507A \$ 85,000 STATE FUNDS  
Acquire approximately 6.9 acres with 660 lineal feet of waterfront  
on Keystone Spit, Whidbey Island.

9. Aquatic Land Enhancement Account - Department of Natural Resources:

- . City of **Cashmere**, Riverside Pk. #87-19AL \$ 59,000 STATE ALEA  
Construct river access to Wenatchee River for cartop boats.
- . Port of **Skamania**, Recreation Area #87-21AL 50,000 STATE ALEA  
Improve public access and recreational use along 3,500  
feet of Columbia River frontage.
- . City of **Spokane**, W. Riverside Pk. #87-02AL 46,400 ALEA  
Acquire 12 lots adjacent to City park on Spokane River for  
further development.
- . City of **Seattle**, Waterway #19, #87-26AL 27,500 ALEA  
Develop waterfront access site on Lake Union for hand-carried  
watercraft.

At conclusion of the report, Mr. Biles asked staff if later on they would be able to inform him as to the criteria used for evaluating and ranking the local agencies' projects. In response to Dr. Scull's question, Mr. Fairleigh explained that the Squaxin Indian Tribe did not feel it could waive its immunity from prosecution, and thus the IAC would have an unenforceable contract. Therefore, the project was withdrawn.

**II. D. PLANNING SERVICES:** Mr. Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "Planning Services Status Reports", noting the following:

1. Forest Service Planning Review Process: Continued participation in a team review of forest plans for the seven National Forests was explained. The Governor's Office has directed a state agencies' team to review each of the forests. Now completed are: Colville, Olympic, Okanogan, Wenatchee, Gifford Pinchot, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie, and the Umatilla. The next step will be to develop a state position on the cumulative impacts of forest management activities on state resources and programs. The Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) has been emphasized in the review; it provides broad guidelines within which recreational priorities for resources and dollars can be established.

2. Local Agencies - Planning Assistance: A total of 111 agencies now have planning eligibility for the IAC's Traditional Grants Program. This includes 73 cities, 10 counties, 15 port districts, 6 special districts (park and recreation and public utility districts), 6 school districts, and 1 Indian tribe. Three agencies were granted interim eligibility in order to participate in the 1988 Grants-in-Aid program.

Planning Services actively assists approximately 33 local agencies in various stages of plan development. Another 70 have expressed interest in updating or developing a park and recreation plan.

3. Planning Services Staff Changes: **Charles Butler** resigned in July. **Jim Eychaner** was selected in September to fill the position of Recreation Resource Planner. **Lois Shye**, a South Puget Sound Community College student, is interning for approximately six months, entering inventory data for the SCORP program. **Roger Davel** transferring to DNR, November 7, 1988.

*Winter*  
4. Trails Directory: A new target date for the Trails Directory has been set for ~~Spring~~, 1989. The delay is due to the need to coordinate data collection with the National Park Service and USDA, Forest Service.

5. STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) PROGRAM: Briefly mentioned the need for SCORP and its uses. The next edition is scheduled for adoption by the Committee in April of 1990. The plan is based on three major elements or assessments: (1) Demand, (2) Opportunities, and (3) Issues. Public workshops will provide a forum for user groups and the general public to define issues, opportunities and concerns.

6. Rivers: The IAC is participating with other state agencies and counties in the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission's Committee of Participating Agencies concerning the State Scenic Rivers Program. State Parks will be proposing its recommendations for additional rivers under the state's scenic rivers system to the 1989 State Legislature. A Statewide Assessment Report of the 18 recommended as scenic rivers has been published and distributed to the public.

The Skykomish Scenic River Advisory Board reported to the Skykomish Scenic River Council on its goals and objectives for management and conservation of this river in late September. A conservation plan is to be developed for management of the river which will reflect local concerns and public input.

7. Wetlands: The Washington Wetlands Priority Plan (1987) was prepared in compliance with federal requirement in the SCORP program. The selection process of that requirement continues as IAC staff works with the Departments of Ecology, Natural Resources, Wildlife, and Fisheries in development of a methodology and criteria system for the selection of wetland sites for state preservation. A questionnaire is being used to gather information. The nomination process for wetlands will begin this fall. All nominated sites will be subject to a two-step selection procedure which will result in the creation of a preservation list. The resultant list will be studied by the IAC.

8. Rivers Conference: Announced there would be a conference on rivers (Northwest Rivers Conference) in Seattle in mid-November, sponsored by various agencies and organizations (Ecology, State Parks, IAC, etc.).

Mr. Tveten asked about the federal regional trails directory, whether it would be practical to carry around while hiking. Mr. Lovelady replied this would need to be looked at and evaluated.

Mr. Tveten then asked whether, as a part of the procedure staff used in forming the Washington Wetlands Priority Plan, specific wetlands sites were recommended for preservation. He was informed the Priority Plan only dealt with identifying wetland types ... those which met the federal requirement. Mr. Tveten suggested that at the next meeting of the IAC there should be a report from staff as to how many wetlands nominated through DOE fall into the types which were identified in the Priority Plan.

#### **II. D. PLANNING SERVICES - NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ACTIVITIES (NOVA)**

**REPORT**: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, "Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report, dated November 3, 1988, and reported as follows:

1. Project Status: NOVA is in the tenth year of its program. Through June of 1988, IAC has approved 257 NOVA Program projects. Currently, 63 are active, with 40 scheduled to close by the end of the year. Since March 1978, 193 projects have been completed.

2. Off-Road Vehicle Plan: Copies of the Off-Road Vehicle Plan were distributed to Committee members. The Plan provides consistent direction for the state relative to ORV recreation. It was adopted by the IAC November 1987, and offers goals, objectives, and specific recommendations for the achievement of those goals. The Plan will be distributed throughout the state to program sponsors, land managers, and other interested parties to assist in ORV grant-in-aid programs.

#### 3. NOVA Administrative Project Changes:

- . Wenatchee National Forest, ORV #86-13P, Kaner Flat Campground and  
Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, ORV #86-01P, Tinkham Trails Area Survey

Time extensions were given to December, 1989 to allow for coordination of work schedules of various project environmental and forest specialists.

- . Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma, ORV #86-46P, Tacoma Area Site Search - sponsor authorized to use an "opinion of value" rather than a full appraisal on properties under construction for acquisition.

- . City of Richland, ORV #87-10D, Horn Rapids ORV Park V  
Sponsor authorized to perform repairs - no additional cost to the project.

**III. OLD BUSINESS - A. PROJECT CHANGES:**

**1. Department of Wildlife, L. T. Murray, High Valley, IAC #69-609A - Land Exchange:**

Ms. Marguerite Austin, Recreation Projects Manager, referred to memorandum of staff, "Department of Wildlife, L. T. Murray, WRA #69-609A, High Valley Property Conversion", dated November 3, 1988, citing the following:

1. The L. T. Murray Wildlife Recreation Area (north of Yakima) was acquired during the period from 1969 to 1971. The acquisition at that time included a narrow parcel of 226.07 acres along the eastern edge of the north unit of the L. T. Murray Wildlife Area (8 miles west of Ellensburg). Habitat is such that wildlife is limited.

2. The Department of Wildlife requests an exchange of the 226.07 acres for 159.28 acres owned by High Valley, Inc., Ellensburg. The High Valley, Inc. parcel is an inholding of private land completely surrounded by public land. It is a habitat for wildlife, and development would adversely impact this use.

3. Appraisals:	High Valley parcel	\$ 23,900	159.28 acres
	Dept. of Wildlife	22,600	226.07 acres

4. Despite net loss of acreage, property of higher habitat value and per acre value will be acquired.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE ACQUIRED 77,000 ACRES OF WILDLIFE HABITAT IN YAKIMA COUNTY KNOWN AS L. T. MURRAY WRA WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #69-609A), AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT AN APPROXIMATE 226 ACRE PARCEL OF THE L. T. MURRAY WRA FOR AN APPROXIMATE 159 ACRE SITE NEARBY ADJOINING DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE PROPERTY, AND

WHEREAS, IAC STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION WILL CONSOLIDATE AND PROTECT VALUABLE HABITAT FROM DEVELOPMENT WHILE RELEASING MARGINAL HABITAT OF LESSER VALUE, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND DOES MEET CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PROCEDURAL MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

1. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF ALL PARCELS OF LAND HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCEL CONVERTED.
2. THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF AT LEAST EQUAL OR GREATER RECREATION UTILITY TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE CONVERSION

REQUEST PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE REGARDING L. T. MURRAY, HIGH VALLEY, WRA (IAC #69-609A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

Dr. Scull asked the type of development planned for that area by the private owner. Ms. Austin stated the land will be divided up and used for retirement mobile home development.

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

**2. STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, SACAJAWEA BOAT LAUNCH, IAC #85-505D,**

**COST INCREASE REQUEST:** Mr. Don Clark, Recreation Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Sacajawea Boat Launch, IAC #85-505D, Request for Cost Increase", noting the following:

1. Sacajawea Boat Launch was approved July 25, 1985; \$91,000; total cost increased later to \$101,000 with addition of \$10,000 LWCF funds.

2. Bids recently opened indicate total cost of the project will exceed the contract by \$46,000. Unanticipated environmental constraints during construction were placed on the project (design change requirements regarding the dredge spoils, diking of hydraulic spoils, and extensive cofferdam work in the basin area).

3. Total amended cost now \$147,000.

4. Monies to come from State Parks, Illahee Breakwater Project, #86-501D, which had closed short leaving unexpended balance in Initiative 215 funds.

Dr. Scull asked why there seemed to be so little interest in bidding on this project from contractors. Mr. Tveten replied it could possibly be due to the additional paperwork involved in the project. Some of the smaller projects don't receive as much attention from the smaller contractors who probably feel it is not worth the effort. The larger contractors are able to handle the required paperwork.

In reply to Ms. Lorenz, Mr. Tveten stated the problem causing the cost increase request concerned drainage and disposal of drainage due to the nearby wetlands. Further explanation involved preliminary design of the project, the permit process, and the various elements which need to be considered in getting the project in the budget process. Many times estimated costs do not provide for unforeseen needed changes in the project. Mr. Wilder noted it was possible for the Director of the IAC to approve cost increases up to ten percent; this had exceeded that amount and it was necessary to secure Committee approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY MR. BILES, THAT WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION SACAJAWEA BOAT LAUNCH PROJECT, IAC #85-505D, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$101,000 AS AMENDED, (90 PERCENT I-215/10% LWCF), AND

WHEREAS, THE WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$46,000 TO COVER CONSTRUCTION BIDS HIGHER THAN

THE PROJECT ESTIMATES DUE TO UNANTICIPATED ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS, AND

WHEREAS, STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS COMPLETED THE ILLAHEE BREAK-WATER PROJECT, IAC #86-501D, BELOW AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURE LEVEL AND FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THAT PROJECT TO COVER THE COST INCREASE IN THE SACAJAWEA BOAT LAUNCH PROJECT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT A COST INCREASE VIA THE TRANSFER OF UNEXPENDED FUNDS FROM THE COMPLETED ILLAHEE PROJECT (IAC #86-501D) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$46,000 (31%) IN INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS BE USED TO INCREASE THE TOTAL COST OF THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION SACAJAWEA BOAT LAUNCH PROJECT TO \$147,000, AND THAT THE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE APPROPRIATE PROJECT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS - IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 - ACQUISITION POLICY AND**

**PROCEDURE - REVISIONS:** Mr. Ron Taylor, Recreation Projects Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "IAC Participation Manual Modifications - Appraisal/Relocation", and explained the proposed revisions:

1. Recent amendments to federal Public Law 91-646 and State RCW 8.26.010 dealing with federal and state uniform relocation and acquisition policies required modifications be made to Manual #3. Several other "housekeeping" changes were also made to the manual. All modifications will bring the manual in compliance with federal and state laws.

2. Appraisal Review Process: Special reference was made to 03.29C **Appraisal Reviews.**

"All project sponsors are responsible for having Formal and Short Form Narrative appraisal reports reviewed by either the State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Appraisal Review Section or by a permanent agency employee who meets the appraiser qualifications specified in Sect. 03.30 or as a minimum has four years active experience in the real estate field compiling appraisal reports for the purpose of determining fair market value. The project sponsor must provide the IAC with a certification of the staff appraisers qualifications in meeting these requirements. This function cannot be subdelegated to any firm or party other than WSDOT.

"All appraisal reviews must be accomplished in accord with the standard set forth in Appendix H (Manual #3).

"The project sponsor's offer of just compensation to the property owner will not be less than the fair market value concluded by the review appraiser."

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten was informed IAC will not require an MAI, only either a certification or four years experience in doing the kinds of appraisals to determine fair market value for the property concerned.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT

WHEREAS, RECENT AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL PUBLIC LAW 91-646 AND STATE RCW 8.26.010 DEALING WITH FEDERAL AND STATE UNIFORM RELOCATION AND ACQUISITION POLICIES REQUIRE MODIFICATIONS TO PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 - ACQUISITION PROJECT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AND

WHEREAS, OTHER CHANGES/REVISIONS IN WORDING FOR CLARIFICATION ARE NEEDED IN SEVERAL OTHER SECTIONS OF MANUAL #3, AND

WHEREAS, THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE RELATES TO 03.29C APPRAISAL REVIEWS TO CONFORM TO FEDERAL PUBLIC LAW 91-646 AND STATE RCW 8.26.010, AND

WHEREAS, ALL MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE IAC, THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AND THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND WERE FOUND TO BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH FEDERAL PUBLIC LAW 91-646 AND STATE RCW 8.26.010,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES AND ADOPTS THE MODIFICATIONS MADE TO PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 ACQUISITION PROJECT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AS INDICATED IN APPENDIX "A" OF THESE MINUTES.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#### IV. B. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS:

At 10:10 a.m. the Chair called for Local Agencies' Projects Considerations. Mr. Larry Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "Local Agencies Project Funding" and Table I enclosed, which listed the twelve local agencies' projects to be considered for funding at the November meeting. He noted the following:

1. Table I represented the relative ranking of each project application as recommended by the Evaluation Team. Initiative 215 funds can only be used for recreational boating and related projects.
2. Sponsors were informed, as a suggested guideline, that the funding levels of 50% IAC, 50% local participation applied, with \$150,000 maximum amount of match funds any one sponsor might expect to receive.
3. Letters in regard to specific projects had been sent to each IAC member prior to the meeting (APPENDIX "B" TO THESE MINUTES).
4. For the record, 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 12 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 the Committee members while being reviewed were as follows:

Port of Chelan, Repair/Replace Docks, #89-012D: Ms. Lorenz asked how long it had been since docks had been repaired, and was informed repairs were being made to the docks all summer, but they require more extensive work. Dr. Scull was informed

LOCAL AGENCIES' GRANTS-IN-AID REQUESTED FUNDING

Projects Requesting Funding - 1988

Table Number 1

Rank	Project Name	RG	Sponsor	Score	LMCF	Bonds	Init. 215	IAC Total	Local Share	Total Cost	%
1	Lake Chelan Docks	07	Chelan County, Port of	136.2	0	0	150,000	150,000	243,500	393,500	38
2	Guest Moorage	03	Bellingham, Port of	121.7	0	0	150,000	150,000	170,000	320,000	47
3	Guest Moorage	04	Brenerton, Port of	116.5	0	0	150,000	150,000	968,217	1,118,217	13
4	Magnuson Park	04	Seattle, City of	116.4	0	0	150,000	150,000	232,055	382,055	39
5	Maltby Land Acq.	04	Everett, City of	113.4	0	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	50
6	Flintstone Park	03	Oak Harbor, City of	109.4	0	0	54,160	54,160	54,161	108,321	50
7	Acquistion	04	Edmonds, Port of	107.4	0	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
8	Guest Moorage	04	Edmonds, Port of	105.0	0	0	102,555	102,555	102,556	205,111	50
9	Boat Launch Imp.	09	Moses Lake Irrig./Rehab.	104.2	0	0	84,795	84,795	84,795	169,590	50
10	Ruston Way Moorage	04	Tacoma, City of	102.8	0	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
11	Columbia Pt. Park III	10	Richland, City of	100.6	0	0	150,000	150,000	169,827	319,827	47
12	Transient Boat Fac.	13	Clarkston, Port of	94.6	0	0	36,195	36,195	36,195	72,390	50
TOTALS							1,427,705	1,427,705	2,461,306	3,889,011	

the floats would be extended further into the water to permit access during the winter during variable tides. Mr. Tveten asked if there would be provision for dumping of wastes. Mr. Clark replied there would not be, but the problem was being addressed already by the National Park Service and the USDA Forest Service. in the provision of other locations at Lake Chelan for the dumping of wastes. Mr. Biles asked if an agency would be assuming responsibility for maintaining the docks following their repair. Mr. Clark replied that Chelan County and the Forest Service will enter into a contract for maintenance. Dr. Scull testified to the need of the project in that area. Use of Lake Chelan facilities has increased considerably and the docks are inadequate to meet the use of boaters.

Mr. Tveten also favored the project and noted its close proximity to Lake Chelan State Park and the Twenty-Five Mile Camp facility. There is tremendous use of the two parks by boaters. He wanted to ensure that provision for dumping of wastes was made a part of the project since maintaining water quality is very necessary. He asked about parking facilities. Mr. Clark stated there were none in the project; that historically people have parked at the State Park facilities. **Ms. Joan Ziegltrum, USDA, Forest Service, Chelan,** reported that the Forest Service was in its second phase development at Fields Point for a public boat launch, and there would eventually be additional parking at that site.

**Port of Bellingham, Guest Moorage Project, #89-005D:** In reply to Dr. Scull's question, **Mr. Victor S. McCaleb, Harbor Manager, Blaine, Port of Bellingham,** stated the fees for the first night docking is free; following that, a charge is made of 15¢ per foot. Dr. Scull was also informed that about forty percent of the boats using the moorage are Canadian.

**Port of Bremerton, Guest Moorage Project, #89-009D:** Ms. Lorenz was assured the moorage as proposed would not restrict entrance to the port's other facilities. Mr. Tveten reiterated his concern with provision of pumpout stations. He encouraged all sponsors who may propose locating boating facilities on Puget Sound and on the lakes in Washington State to give consideration to the water quality and include provision for pumpout stations. A Port official stated there was a pumpout station already existing at the regular marina. Ms. Marguerite Austin, Project Manager, explained there would be adequate space for both fishing and boating, that these proposals are being worked out.

**City of Seattle, Magnuson Park, #89-014D:** Ms. Cox stated she was in favor of this project having first-hand knowledge of its use by the public. Her observation was the site could be used much more efficiently and that this project would provide this goal.

**City of Everett Parks and Recreation, Maltby Land Acquisition, #89-013A:** Dr. Scull questioned the high price of the land - \$200,000. Mr. Clark replied this was the figure given to staff through appraisal. It was brought out that the area has been zoned as "light industrial". Questions were asked concerning lands further up from the Maltby site; these also, as pointed out by **Mr. Jim Shields,** Everett Parks & Recreation Department, were zoned "light industrial". He indicated the city was also considering other acquisition possibilities and has a 75' public access across Simpson land to an approximate 3,000 feet of waterfront in an area further up the waterway. Ms. Cox encouraged the city to check the zoning along the waterway and take action on that zoning in its planning recommendations to the public.

**Port of Edmonds, Acquisition for Future Marina Development, #89-010A:** Dr. Scull asked the life span of concrete floats. It was determined by staff this could be approximately thirty to forty years.

**Port of Edmonds, Guest Moorage, #89-011D:** Brackett's Landing Park was located on the slide for Ms. Cox, who stated there were very few parks for people in the Edmonds area and there should be more access to the water.

**Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District, Boat Launch Improvement, #89-007D:** Dr. Scull pointed out the definite need to develop transient boating facilities in that area.

**City of Tacoma, Ruston Way Transient Moorage, #89-015D:** Access to the area was pointed out on the slide for Ms. Lorenz. Mr. Biles was informed this was not the area involved in the Indian land settlement.

**City of Richland, Columbia Point Marina Park - Ph. 3, #89-008D:** Ms. Cox stated she had personal knowledge of this quality park project. It is well designed and expansion is desirable to meet the needs in the area.

**Port of Clarkston, Transient Boat Facilities, #89-002D:** Ms. Cox noted the low cost of \$72,390. Mr. Tveten asked if it would be possible to set aside some upland storage space for boats since there have been many inquiries for this type of parking. **Mr. Darrell Russell, Washington Public Ports Association,** stated he was representing Mr. Gary Neal, Manager, Port of Clarkston who was unable to be present. To his knowledge, there was no intent on the part of the Port of Clarkston to provide upland boat storage at this time. However, Mr. Tveten's point was "well taken" and the suggestion might be worthwhile to look into.

Presentation of the Local Agencies' Projects concluded at 10:55 a.m.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "Local Agencies Project Funding Recommendations", which was distributed to the members of the Committee and attendees (FUNDING RECOMMENDATION, PAGE 15 of these minutes). The following points were noted:

1. Funding recommendations were formulated as a result of five basic criteria:
  - a. Amount of available funding for local projects.
  - b. Source of funding and fund source restrictions - Initiative 215 funds, Marine Recreation Gas Tax, may only be used for boating related projects.
  - c. Relative ranking of the projects as determined through the Evaluation System.
  - d. Suggested funding guidelines of a maximum of 50 percent IAC participation, with \$150,000 ceiling for projects.
  - e. The attempt to fund as many worthy projects as possible.

2. SOURCE OF FUNDS was then given:

(See page 16 of these minutes)

1988 STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Table Number 2

Rank	Project Name	RG	Sponsor	Score	LWCF	Bonds	Init. 215	IAC Total	Local Share	Total Cost	%
1	Lake Chelan Docks	07	Chelan County, Port of	136.2	0	0	150,000	150,000	243,500	393,500	38
2	Guest Moorage	03	Bellingham, Port of	121.7	0	0	150,000	150,000	170,000	320,000	47
3	Guest Moorage	04	Bremerton, Port of	116.5	0	0	150,000	150,000	968,217	1,118,217	13
4	Magnuson Park	04	Seattle, City of	116.4	0	0	150,000	150,000	232,055	382,055	39
5	Maltby Land Acq.	04	Everett, City of	113.4	0	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	50
6	Flintstone Park	03	Oak Harbor, City of	109.4	0	0	54,160	54,160	54,161	108,321	50
7	Acquistion	04	Edmonds, Port of	107.4	0	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
8	Guest Moorage	04	Edmonds, Port of	105.0	0	0	102,555	102,555	102,556	205,111	50
9	Boat Launch Imp.	09	Moses Lake Irrig./Rehab.	104.2	0	0	84,795	84,795	84,795	169,590	50
10	Ruston Way Moorage	04	Tacoma, City of	102.8	0	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
11	Columbia Pt. Park III	10	Richland, City of	100.6	0	0	150,000	150,000	169,827	319,827	47
12	Transient Boat Fac.	13	Clarkston, Port of	94.6	0	0	36,195	36,195	36,195	72,390	50
<b>TOTALS</b>								<b>1,427,705</b>	<b>2,461,306</b>	<b>3,889,011</b>	

**SOURCE OF FUNDS - NOVEMBER 3-4, 1988 IAC MEETING**  
**TRADITIONAL LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS**

	TOTAL COST	LWCF	INIT. 215	BONDS
Cash on Hand (Fund Summary)	\$ 549,629	\$ - 147,089	\$ 691,015	\$ 5,703
Project Withdrawn (Squaxin Tribe)	25,000	-	25,000	-
Projected Receipts:				
Estimated Apportionment	160,250	160,250	-	-
Estimated Reapportionment	8,732	8,732	-	-
Estimated Receipts from DOL	1,050,000	-	1,050,000	-
<b><u>TOTAL ESTIMATED AVAILABLE</u></b>	<b>\$ 1,793,611</b>	<b>\$ 21,893</b>	<b>\$ 1,766,015</b>	<b>\$ 5,703</b>

3. Technical Advisory Committee and Evaluation Team scoring process were taken into consideration in the funding recommendations.
4. First time funding for Port of Chelan, Port of Clarkston and the Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District.
5. Two projects are for the Port of Edmonds due to need to have guest moorage improvements in that heavily used port.

Ms. Fenton questioned the remaining funds. Mr. Fairleigh stated it is not unusual to have remaining Initiative 215 funds. It depends on the projects received and amounts of funding in each which reach a given total. Last year there were some 215 funds left available, and perhaps next year all of the funds could be used. Ms. Cox stated she hoped this would be the last time there would be "negative funding". She encouraged those present to work with their boards, commissions, and representatives of the Legislature, etc., to help in securing additional funding for parks, recreation, and conservation projects, so that in addition to Initiative 215, the continuing fund source, there would be other dollars available.

Mr. Biles asked how the the Evaluation Team and staff arrived at the scores; what was the process? Mr. Fairleigh replied briefly explaining the scoring process. Mr. Tveten stated he felt very good in that it was possible to fund all twelve of the Initiative 215 projects. However, this might, he said, give a false sense of security. There are many projects which were not able to come in for funding consideration due to lack of funds, and also the \$150,000 limit. The cost of land far exceeds that amount, thus some worthwhile projects end up being "put on the shelf". The projects funded are only a small portion of projects which could have been reviewed by staff and funded through the Committee process.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS BE FUNDED BY THE COMMITTEE AS PROPOSED BY STAFF.

Mr. Biles referred to the various percentages - some at 50%, but others at 38, 47, 13, etc. (less than 50%). Mr. Wilder gave a brief past history of the staff and Committee's position in funding the 50% and viewing projects at other percentages. Staff recommendations develop these taking into account the overall

project scorings and evaluations. Modifications are made to ensure the best projects are before the Committee. It is staff's responsibility to review the projects and within parameters of the funds recommend matching funds as well as IAC funds.

The following motion was then considered as MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 18 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATE WIDE 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;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 18 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

(There was no audience response to the motion prior to its being carried.)

**RESPONSE FOLLOWING MOTION:**

**Mr. Ron Pretti, Manager, Port of Bremerton - Project #89-009D - Guest Moorage:**

Expressed appreciation on behalf of the Port of Bremerton for the Committee's support and level of funding for the project. Funding will aid in expanding the marina which is very necessary to handle increased use.

**Mr. Jim Walls, Pacific R C & D (Aberdeen):** Shared concern expressed by certain Committee members regarding the 50% limit. Is difficult for depressed areas to meet this challenge.

Mr. Tveten pointed out that within the twelve projects funded there was only one acquisition project. It was his opinion that acquisition of lands for parks and recreation purposes is essential and should have top priority in the next few years. Land will be lost if it is not secured for these purposes. Mr. Fairleigh stated if there had been a normal funding session (other funds available besides Initiative 215) the Committee would have seen other acquisition projects. Mr. Tveten felt the \$150,000 limit might well put acquiring shorelands entirely out of reach.

**Mr. Barney Wilson, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Kent,** agreed that \$150,000 would not begin to procure shorelands. He felt this question would apply also to fast growing urban areas where acquisition is very important for parks and recreation. Mr. Wilder pointed out staff's work in encouraging projects for acquisition. He noted the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Program (ALEA) of the Department of Natural Resources which had aided in acquisition projects.

LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS APPROVED - NOVEMBER 3, 1988

PROJECT NAME	SPONSOR	INITIATIVE 215 IAC SHARE	SPONSOR	TOTAL
Lake Chelan Docks	Port of Chelan County	\$ 150,000	\$ 243,500	\$ 393,500
Guest Moorage	Port of Bellingham	150,000	170,000	320,000
Guest Moorage	Port of Bremerton	150,000	968,217	1,118,217
Magnuson Park	City of Seattle	150,000	232,055	382,055
Maltby Land Acq.	City of Everett	100,000	100,000	200,000
Flintstone Park	City of Oak Harbor	54,160	54,161	108,321
Acquisition Project	Port of Edmonds	150,000	150,000	300,000
Guest Moorage	Port of Edmonds	102,555	102,556	205,111
Boat Launch Imp.	Moses Lake Irrig/Rehab.	84,795	84,795	169,590
Ruston Way Moorage	City of Tacoma	150,000	150,000	300,000
Columbia Pt. Pk. III	City of Richland	150,000	169,827	319,827
Transient Boat Fac.	Port of Clarkston	36,195	36,195	72,390
		\$1,427,705	\$2,461,306	\$3,889,001

INITIATIVE 215  
OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT: \$1,427,705

12 Projects

Acquisition  
Development

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
REGULAR MEETING  
AGENDA

DATE: November 2-3, 1989  
TIME: 9:00 a.m. each day

PLACE: Governor House Hotel & Conference Center  
621 Capitol Way South, Olympia, Washington

THURSDAY 9:00 a.m., NOVEMBER 2, 1989

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

- A. Determination of a Quorum
- B. Introduction of Officials, Guests, and Designees
- C. Approval of IAC Minutes, March 23, 1989
- D. Additions or deletions to the Agenda - November 2, 1989
- E. Approval of the November 2-3, 1989, IAC Meeting Agenda

**II. STATUS REPORTS**

- A. Director's Report
- B. Management Services
  1. Fund Summary - Grant-in-Aid Traditional Projects - State/Local
  2. Fund Summary - Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle (NOVA) Projects
- C. Projects Services
  1. Administrative Actions - Project Status Report
- D. Planning Services
  1. Planning Services Report
  2. Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) Report

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Project Changes
  1. Extension NOVA E&E, M&O, and Coordinator Projects
  2. King County, Whitney Bridge, East Green River I, IAC #69-006A
  3. DNR, Conversion Request - Recreation Evaluation & Review  
Statewide (R.E.A.R.S)
- B. Participation Manual #4, Grants-in-Aid - Modifications - Report

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. 1990 IAC Proposed Legislation
- B. NOVA - E&E Participation Manual
- C. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS - 10:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 2, THURSDAY
- D. NOVA - NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS - 2:00 P.M., NOVEMBER 2, THURSDAY

=====

FRIDAY, 9:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 3, 1989

- E. NOVA - OFF-ROAD VEHICLE CAPITAL AND PLANNING PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS
- F. 1989-91 IAC State Agencies' Capital Budget Projects' Master List
- G. IAC 1990 Proposed Meeting Schedule

**V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS**

Adjourn

He stated acquisition has been and will continue to be a highly important aspect of the funding program for the staff and Committee.

Mr. Fairleigh pointed out had there been additional resources available for this funding session, there would have been more acquisition projects to review.

The Committee recessed at 11:15 in order to have the opportunity to review the added agenda item, "Revisions in IAC Manuals - #8, #9, and #7" - memorandum dated November 3, 1988, as well as for lunch; to reconvene at 1:00 p.m.

**RECONVENED : 1:00 P.M.**

**REVISIONS IN IAC MANUALS - #8 (PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT); #9 (STATE AGENCIES' POLICIES AND PROCEDURES; AND #7 (NOVA PROGRAM BILLINGS AND REIMBURSEMENTS):** Mr. Baker referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 3, 1988, concerning IAC Manuals #8, #9, and NOVA Manual #7, noting the following:

1. The agency needs to adjust its manual requirements to meet certain criteria as stipulated by the State Auditor in order to be in conformance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).
2. Auditor's Letter, October 4, 1988, suggested the need to properly reflect financial activity of the agency. Recommendation was made that IAC establish a procedure which would require state and local projects funded by IAC sources to submit at least one billing in each fiscal year until the project is completed which identifies expenditures incurred through the state's fiscal year ending June 30th.
3. Further, Federal regulations also have changed, and it is incumbent upon sponsors who receive \$25,000 or more from the IAC in Federal grant assistance during the State's fiscal year to submit a copy of the auditor's report covering that period to the IAC.
4. Suggested changes were as noted in APPENDIX "C" TO THESE MINUTES.

Ms. Fenton asked that Manual #7, NOVA Program Billings and Reimbursements, 4. Invoice Voucher, paragraph 3 be changed to wording "should" rather than "must" "submit the year-ending billing to the IAC not later than July 15th of each year".

MS. LORENZ MOVED, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDED MOTION. Discussion followed. It was determined that year-ending billing to the IAC should be submitted not later than August 30th of each year, rather than July 30th as noted in Manual #9 - State Agencies Policies and Procedures, 09.06 Billing Procedure.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MR. BILES, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE THE WORDING "NO LATER THAN AUGUST 30TH" IN MANUAL #9 - STATE AGENCIES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, 09.06 BILLING PROCEDURE, AND FURTHER, TO CHANGE MANUAL #7, NOVA PROGRAM BILLINGS AND REIMBURSEMENT, 4. INVOICE VOUCHER, PARAGRAPH 3 TO INDICATE "SHOULD" RATHER THAN "MUST" REGARDING SUBMISSION OF YEAR-ENDING BILLINGS TO THE IAC.

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

The Chair then called for the question on the following motion as MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, AND SECONDED BY DR. SCULL:

WHEREAS, THE FOLLOWING PARTICIPATION MANUALS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION REQUIRE MODIFICATION IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE AGENCY TO COMPLY WITH ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING STANDARDS,

- MANUAL #8 - PROJECT REIMBURSEMENTS
- MANUAL #9 - STATE AGENCIES' POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
- MANUAL #7 - NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM BILLINGS AND REIMBURSEMENTS;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THAT THE MODIFICATIONS TO THE ABOVE-REFERENCED MANUALS BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND THE REVISED MANUALS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL THOSE RECEIVING ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE IAC'S GRANTS-IN-AID PROGRAMS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED. (SEE APPENDIX "C" TO THESE MINUTES)

**IV. C. NOVA - EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS:** At 1:15 p.m. the Chair called for staff presentation of the NOVA, Education and Enforcement projects. Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "1988 Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Project Proposals" in order to give an overall brief review of what the Committee would be reviewing in the NOVA projects over the next day and a half.

1. A total of 67 projects had been received for consideration of funding. There were twenty-five different agencies involved.
2. Set three new NOVA (ORV) Program "records":
  - a. The most project applications ever processed by the staff.
  - b. Highest dollar amount - \$3.9 million
  - c. Highest dollar amount as proposed by sponsors as matching - approximately \$1 million
3. Staff has worked with sponsors and NOVA Advisory Committee. Sixty-three projects remained at \$3.9 million in the three categories:
  - a. Education and Enforcement
  - b. ORV Facilities
  - c. Nonhighway
4. All projects reviewed today and Friday, November 4, are eligible to be funded.
5. Nearly \$4 million represented in requests with \$3.3 million available to distribute.
6. All projects to be presented in order as established in the kit material.

Mr. Larry Fairleigh referred to the Education and Enforcement project resumes and reported the following:

1. A total of 17 E&E projects to be presented.
2. Slides to be shown of each following usual presentation procedures.
3. Committee input, followed by attendees input.
4. Staff Recommendations to be distributed for consideration.

Mr. Fairleigh noted that the E&E NOVA Program is very competitive; all projects were reviewed by the NOVA Committee. He expressed staff's thanks for their assistance. He also thanked the Planning Services staff for their support during the transition process regarding the NOVA projects. Mr. Taylor gave a short history of the E&E Program from its inception, highlighting purposes and use of the funds. Project Staff presented the slide program on the education/enforcement programs, using slides and verbal summaries. (SEE PAGE 21-A for listing of E&E Projects.)

Comments from the Committee and various attendees on certain individual projects were as follows:

**Grant County, ORV Education and Enforcement 6, ORV 88-16E:** Ms. Fenton asked what the deputies were able to do in the program during the winter season. Mr. Taylor replied most of the educational aspects of the program are met at that time -- visiting schools, putting on workshops, etc. **Karl Shultz, Grant County Sheriff's Office,** stated it is also necessary to patrol the ORV area, keep trespassers away from the area, etc.

**Chelan County, Sheriff, ORV Education/Enforcement 10, ORV 88-21E:** Mr. Biles noted though some counties request two deputies the cost involved varies from county to county. Mr. Taylor replied there are salary differences throughout the state in the various counties. Also some of the counties include in their programs support monies for publishing materials, travel costs, etc.

**Snohomish County, Sheriff, ORV Education/Enforcement, ORV 88-24E:** Dr. Scull asked why the county needed two motorcycles when only requesting one deputy. Mr. Dovel explained there are two deputies in the program, and there are also reserve deputies available who make use of the motorcycles when trained.

**Tacoma Metropolitan Parks, ORV Puyallup Fair Project, ORV 88-29E:** Ms. Lorenz asked if this project had been funded previously in the same amount, at 100%. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative.

**Wenatchee National Forest - Cle Elum, ORV Trail Ranger, ORV 88-30E:** Mr. Tveten asked whether there might be a reduction in requests emanating from the Forest Service since they have increased their emphasis on recreation in forest areas and will have their own funds to expend through their Challenge Grants. Mr. Wilder felt there would still need to be IAC NOVA assistance, that it would take both the Forest Service trail program and the NOVA program to get the needed projects on the ground. He was unable to answer Mr. Tveten's question and there was no one from the Forest Service to respond among the attendees.

**Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, ORV Safety/Education, ORV 88-31E:** The fact that King County has been an exception to an ORV user safety and ethics education program was discussed. Many users of the ORV sites are from King County (Seattle) area and they are in need of the proper education and safety programs. Ms. Lorenz asked why the County had not had this type of program before, and was informed by Mr. Lovelady over the years the County has not been interested in the program since it did not have any actual ORV areas. At one time early in the program King County returned its All-Terrain Vehicle funds to the IAC since it could not come up with uses for it.

Mr. Biles asked what was meant by "Ethics Recreation". Mr. Taylor replied ethics involve how to use an ORV machine properly and get along with other

EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS AS REVIEWED 11-3-88

<u>Project / Sponsor Name</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Sponsor</u> <u>Request</u>
<u>EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS</u>		
88-16e Thurston Co. Shrf	ORV Ed/Enf 4	\$ 44,725
17e Mason Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 1	104,066
18e Richland, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 7	39,995
19e Grant Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 6	98,910
20e Snohomish Co. Park	ORV Awareness 2	48,620
21e Chelan Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 10	72,736
22e Yakima Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 11	121,897
23e Pierce Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 4	90,300
24e Snohomish Co. Shrf	ORV Ed/Enf 1	78,405
25e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 3	53,200
26e Ferry Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 1	72,000
27e Whatcom Co. Sherif	ORV Ed/Enf 1	61,965
28e Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 10	2,000
29e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Puyallup Fair	15,100
30e Wenat N.F.-Cle Elm	ORV Trail Ranger	6,000
31e Mt Bkr/Snoq. N.F.	ORV Safety/Ed 1	16,940
68e Kittitas Co. Sherf	ORV Ed/Enf 11	<u>100,000</u>
	Subtotal =	\$1,026,859

recreationists (hikers, bicyclists, equestrians, etc.) in the field. Also the environmental aspect is taught. Mr. Dovel stated Ken White of the Forest Service has felt that the Service provides a great many number of opportunities for people who come from King County. King County on the other hand has taken no initiative in this respect. Mr. White feels it is time for someone to address the issue of proper behavior and thus it is a Forest Service Project to modify the behavior of ORV users.

**Kittitas County, Sheriff, ORV Education/Enforcement II, ORV 68E:** Mr. Taylor advised Ms. Cox that the 100,000 would cover two deputies, plus one seasonal position, and replacement of a motorcycle. The part-time individual would be for one year.

Ms. Fenton asked if there had been criteria used in the evaluation process of the projects. Mr. Taylor stated there is no specific criteria such as an evaluation system. However, Mr. Lovelady pointed out that staff does go through an evaluation of each one of the E&E projects. A more formal evaluation system will be established but it was not available for use at this funding session. Staff will bring this matter to the Committee's attention later on. Mr. Lovelady also pointed out the similarity in the programs over the years. The last few years has seen an increase in the number of sponsors so there will be need for a more formal point-oriented evaluation system.

Dr. Scull referred to the Puyallup Fair Project, stating he would like to see this type of activity taking place at other fairs throughout the state. Mr. Lovelady said this does occur now in Ellensburg and Yakima.

Mr. Biles asked if there had been any guideline to consider matching funds for the programs. Mr. Taylor stated there is no required match in the E&E program. Mr. Lovelady pointed out there could be extra points given for matching funds, and this would be considered at the time an evaluation system is drafted. Ms. Lorenz felt her complaint was that programs are funded for one year and then the same program must come back the following year for consideration, and there might not be funds to cover it. She asked if there was any overall plan to have the counties take over certain projects if the Forest Service can't do them. Mr. Taylor said each project is treated as a one-year project, but when the evaluation system is in place, perhaps alternatives could be worked out.

The fact that certain monthly reports must be submitted by the counties was discussed. Staff monitors each project, each having various stipulations which must be met. There are also quarterly reports which must be filed and acted upon by staff. All are reviewed to ensure that the sponsors are meeting their contract requirements.

Mr. Page asked if there was a breakdown of budget requests and project elements as listed under the IAC funding portion on the resume. Would it be possible to have project reports on the preceding year's accomplishments to find out if the sponsor was meeting his contract? Mr. Lovelady stated these sorts of matters were dealt with at the NOVA Committee level, but all are available for the IAC to review prior to any IAC meeting if the Committee wishes to do so. Mr. Page suggested the dollars for certain elements could readily be added to the resume, rather than making it a separate activity for the Committee. Ms. Cox said she would prefer to leave the monthly, quarterly reports up to staff to work with, that she was not interested in being unduly involved in the day-to-day operations of the sheriff projects.

Mr. Wilder noted that as a part of the project management procedure staff must travel to the project sites from time-to-time to ensure that contract requirements are being met. This is in addition to monthly/quarterly reports and other material received on the projects. Staff closely monitors all NOVA projects.

**NOVA EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS:**

NOVA Advisory Committee Recommendations (Table IIA) and Staff Funding Recommendations on the E&E projects were then distributed to the Committee members and attendees. Mr. Fairleigh referred to Table II A - NOVA Advisory Committee Recommendations and Table III A, Staff Funding Recommendations E&E. (SEE PAGE 24 & 24A OF THESE MINUTES.) He referred to each project on Table III A and its funding recommendation. In response to Ms. Lorenz, Mr. Taylor stated the current operating level of funding was being recommended by staff in the Sheriff programs -- the same as the previous year. Limitation of funds to \$40,000 per FTE was discussed. Mr. Biles asked if the elements asked for in the projects then would have to be deferred. Mr. Dovel replied another option would be for the County to pick up the cost of those elements.

Ms. Fenton asked the reason for the difference in funding of the **Yakima County Sheriff's Department E&E Project (ORV 89-22E)**. Mr. Fairleigh replied that NOVA in recommending \$80,000 had not included the vehicles.

**Ferry County Sheriff Department, ORV E&E, (89-26E):** Dr. Scull was concerned about Ferry County not receiving a recommendation for funding. He felt the need must be high in that area even though it is a very rural county and there is less population in the area. Mr. Dovel noted that staff has recommended funding for other Ferry County projects under the ORV Facilities Development Program.

Ms. Lorenz asked why **Whatcom County Sheriff's Department, ORV E&E, 89-27E** was not being recommended by staff for funding. She was informed this was due to the availability of dollars in the program and need for other facilities to have use of the monies. There are no ORV facilities in Whatcom County at the present time.

Mr. Biles asked what was the justification for staff's recommendations -- what was the logic behind funding certain Sheriff's Departments and not the others? Mr. Lovelady replied in funding projects it is important to know that in many cases there are not only ORV facilities in use, but the use is heavy and the need for those facilities is enhanced. It is recommended that IAC dollars be placed in those areas that IAC has funded in the past and where there is heavy use. Mr. Dovel pointed out that Chelan, Yakima, and Kittitas counties receive many recreationists from Puget Sound; whereas, Ferry County has 2,491 population and there is little pressure for access to ORV opportunities within that county.

Project funding recommendations were completed at 2:15 p.m.

Ms. Lorenz was informed that the exhibit at the Puyallup Fair received a blue ribbon for its excellent display and that interest in the exhibit itself was good.

TABLE II A

NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE - 1988 NOVA PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	NOVA Recommend.	NOVA Advisory Committee Notes
				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 a figure which approximates agency's 1987 grant level.
<u>EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS</u>				
88-16e Thurston Co. Shrf	ORV Ed/Enf 4	\$ 44,725	\$ 20,000	
17e Mason Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 1	104,066	40,000	
18e Richland, City of	ORV Ed/Enf 7	39,995	39,995	
19e Grant Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 6	98,910	80,000	
20e Snohomish Co. Parks	ORV Awareness 2	48,620	40,000	
21e Chelan Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 10	72,736	72,736	
22e Yakima Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 11	121,897	80,000	
23e Pierce Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 4	90,300	40,000	
24e Snohomish Co. Shrf	ORV Ed/Enf 1	78,405	-.00	
25e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 3	53,200	40,000	
26e Ferry Co. Sheriff	ORV Ed/Enf 1	72,000	-.00	
27e Whatcom Co. Sherif	ORV Ed/Enf 1	61,965	-.00	
28e Thurston Co. Parks	ORV Safety/Ed 10	2,000	2,000	
29e Tacoma Metro Parks	ORV Puyallup Fair	15,100	15,000	
30e Wenat N.F.-Cle Elm	ORV Trail Ranger	6,000	6,000	
31e Mt Bkr/Snoq. N.F.	ORV Safety/Ed 1	16,940	16,940	
68e Kittitas Co. Sherf	ORV Ed/Enf 11	<u>100,000</u>	<u>80,000</u>	
		Subtotal = \$1,026,859	\$572,671	

NOTE: \$640,000 (available) - \$572,671 = \$67,329 available to carry forward.

TABLE III A

STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

Project	IAC \$ Requested	Staff Recommendation		
		IAC \$	Sponsor	Total
Thurston County E & E	44,725	23,500	5,650	29,150
Mason County E & E	104,066	40,000	0	40,000
Benton-Franklin E & E	39,995	40,000	0	40,000
Grant County E & E	98,910	80,000	8,000	88,000
Sno. Co. Aware. & Ed.	48,620	40,000	0	40,000
Chelan County E & E	72,736	72,736	10,690	83,426
Yakima County E & E	121,897	93,000	0	93,000
Pierce County E & E	90,300	40,000	12,000	52,000
Sno. County E & E	78,405	0	0	0
Tacoma Educ. & Training	53,200	53,200	9,951	63,151
Ferry County E & E	72,000	0	0	0
Whatcom County E & E	61,965	0	0	0
Thurston Co. Park Safety	2,000	2,000	0	2,000
Puyallup Fair	15,100	15,100	0	15,100
USFS Trail Ranger	6,000	6,000	2,405	8,405
USFS Ethics/Safety	16,940	16,940	4,000	20,940
Kittitas County E & E	100,000	83,200	0	83,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,026,859</b>	<b>605,676</b>	<b>52,696</b>	<b>658,372</b>
Funding Cap	\$640,000			
IAC Funds Recommended	<u>605,676</u>			

\$34,324 available for carry  
forward.

In reply to Mr. Tveten's questions, **Mr. John Edwards, DNR**, stated the Department of Natural Resources' Education Program had been transferred through legislation to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. DNR, however, is still interested in publishing the ORV Guide.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILES, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORV EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF, AND

FURTHER, 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 26A OF THESE MINUTES.)

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

COMMENTS FROM THE ATTENDEES:

**Karl Schultz, Sergeant, Grant County Sheriff's Office - 89-19E:**

- (1) Accept staff recommendation for \$80,000 funding.
- (2) Will now be able to purchase two motorcycles.

**Fred Slyfield, ORV Deputy, Kittitas County Sheriff's Office - ORV 68-E:**

- (1) Accept staff recommendation for funding - \$80,000.
- (2) Thanked the Committee for interest in the program.

**Howard Armfield, Lieutenant, Mason County Sheriff's Department - ORV 89-17E:**

- (1) Understand limitations in funding is necessary to assist other grant recipients.
- (2) Fastest growing county in the state, and asked that Committee be aware Mason County may need additional help.
- (3) Appreciate approval of the funding request - \$40,000.

**Pete Peterson, Captain, Chief Criminal Deputy, Chelan County Sheriff's Office - ORV ORV 21E:**

- (1) Appreciated funding - \$72,736.
- (2) County does not have a need for funding of \$40,000 FTE, and do not need vehicle replacement.
- (3) In NOVA deliberations the recommendations were based on a lower limit of funding; apparently this was changed by staff upwards.

Mr. Lovelady stated that at the time of NOVA deliberations, staff did not realize there would be as much money to allocate, and so kept within a certain dollar limit. When it became apparent there would be additional funds these were allocated to those counties in need of equipment.

**Ron Martin, Director, Parks and Recreation, Snohomish County - ORV 24E:**

(Did not file Participation Card.)

- (1) Hesitated to speak for the County Sheriff's Office, but knew program would be for education only; the \$40,000 would not reflect any FTE.
- (2) Hoped the program could be addressed next year by the Committee and funded.

1988 NOVA Projects as Approved  
 by the Interagency Committee November 3, 1988  
EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

Project	IAC \$	Sponsor	Total
Thurston County E & E	23,500	5,650	29,150
Mason County E & E	40,000	0	40,000
Benton-Franklin E & E	40,000	0	40,000
Grant County E & E	80,000	8,000	88,000
Sno. Co. Aware. & Ed.	40,000	0	40,000
Chelan County E & E	72,736	10,690	83,426
Yakima County E & E	93,000	0	93,000
Pierce County E & E	40,000	12,000	52,000
Tacoma Educ. & Training	53,200	9,951	63,151
Thurston Co. Park Safety	2,000	0	2,000
Puyallup Fair	15,100	0	15,100
USFS Trail Ranger	6,000	2,405	8,405
USFS Ethics/Safety	16,940	4,000	20,940
Kittitas County E & E	83,200	0	83,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>605,676</b>	<b>52,696</b>	<b>658,372</b>

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION.

Mr. Biles asked whether there was any kind of general theme which prompted the staff to make the recommendations. Did they have any guidelines -- and what did they want to achieve? Mr. Taylor replied the common guidelines initially were to recognize the funding limitations and to maintain the current level of operations as opposed to expanding them to new areas. Mr. Fairleigh stated the \$40,000 FTE limit is one of the primary guidelines.

Mr. Tveten asked if there is a lot of ORV use in Ferry County, is it taking place on Forest Service land? Mr. Dovel replied this was the case. Many people use Forest Service land as well as private timber company land. This use occurs in an informal way with a lot of enforcement. However, the pressure is not as keen to the extent that there is a real problem there. Mr. Tveten then asked if possible funding of the Ferry County projects at tomorrow's session would increase the problem of education and enforcement? Mr. Fairleigh stated one of the Ferry County projects includes a coordinator request. His duties would include coordination of Ferry County Parks and Recreation District, consultants, citizen groups, etc. in order to begin an ORV program for education there.

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

-----  
Mr. Tveten asked if it was legally permissible to move the two items on the agenda as proposed by staff earlier. Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, affirmed that it was since the Committee had met all requirements for setting up the meeting through the Washington State Register and it is a Regular Meeting of the Committee.

**IV. E. 1989 PROPOSED LEGISLATION:** Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "IAC Proposed Agency Request Legislation - 1989 Legislative Session". He reported to date OFM has not responded to the proposed request legislation as sent on September 23, 1988. Word should be received by November 18th. Letter of transmittal was included in the kit material. The Committee will be advised when decision is made.

**F. NOVA FEDERAL AGENCY AGREEMENT:** Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff "Federal Agency NOVA Agreement", dated November 3, 1988, and reported as follows:

- (1) Agreement with the USDA, Forest Service, has been in existence for some time; two more federal agencies (National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service - under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior) have asked for a similar agreement.
- (2) The agreement has been reviewed by the State Attorney General's Office and the Federal Office of the General Counsel. Both have signed the agreement. It specifies terms and conditions under which the IAC will consider making individual grants to projects proposed by these agencies.
- (3) Seven projects involving these agencies will be reviewed by the Committee November 4, 1988, for possible funding.
- (4) Staff recommended approval of the Agreement.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Lovelady stated these federal agencies are at this time only requesting funds out of the Nonhighway Program. This category is 20% of the total monies in the program. Mr. Tveten asked if IAC was not opening itself to enormous competition far beyond that which it can hope to fund. Staff agreed it would be necessary to set some stringent standards. Mr. Tveten suggested asking for a match from the Federal agencies as is done in the traditional Local Agencies' funding program. Mr. Wilder noted there would be competition but that through staff and NOVA evaluations only the "top" projects would be considered for funding. There was discussion about sponsor and staff time and effort in putting together an application and going through the process prior to its coming before the Committee. Mr. Fairleigh pointed out that some agencies may submit two or three projects, but through staff discussion these are cut back to one. This solves some of the time element problem. Mr. Tveten also noted the projects are being given 100% in many cases.

Mr. Dovel cited the fact that the legislation was to provide backcountry recreational opportunities and to locate those unique areas in primitive settings which could be used. The Interagency Committee has the potential to put parameters on what it will fund, and whether or not a matching grant may be required. Mr. Wilder stated it was necessary to determine who has the resources; where can the greatest amount of service be provided for the ORV recreationist? It became paramount that the Forest Service was the largest provider in the program. Thus, a Federal Master Agreement was initiated with them, and now there is need for the same type of agreement with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

**John Edwards, DNR**, pointed out the NOVA program differed from the traditional local agencies' funding program in that it is necessary to have a public hearing and there is considerable time devoted to that and other procedures.

Ms. Fenton agreed with Mr. Tveten that the Federal agencies should have to include a matching amount in their projects. Mr. Biles noted it might be that the best projects could very well come from these federal agencies and the Committee ought to consider this otherwise opportunities could be lost.

Ms. Cox felt the Committee should make a statement to the Federal agencies that the Committee feels they should solve their own projects. The Committee can assist them, but they should be helping in the program. Dr. Scull felt there would be missed opportunities if the agreement was not in force. He also agreed there should be matching funds provided, and that this should be written into the agreement. At this point Mr. Wilder suggested the agreement be accepted by the Committee for one year, and allow staff to evaluate Committee comments and come up with a solution at the March 1989 IAC meeting. Mr. Lovelady outlined what the agreement would actually do, and stated actually it was a framework document from which the Committee (through staff) could accept federal applications from the two agencies and follow through on the usual project procedures. He agreed there could be matching funds and this could be added to the agreement.

Dr. Scull noted the fact that there is a great deal of recreational activity on forest land and this should be recognized. An agreement is necessary to

ensure that needs are being met. Ms. Fenton assumed that the federal agencies were not aware of the Committee's discussion on federal matching monies, that perhaps it should be explained to them at the November 4, 1988 IAC session.

At this point Mr. Lovelady quoted the Federal assistance presently in the seven projects to be considered at the November 4th session. He also noted there is an evaluation process in place at the present time which gives points for certain elements. The Committee had approved the criteria at a previous meeting. Mr. Fairleigh noted that the Local Agencies' funding recommendations do include the points under the Evaluation System in that funding program. Mr. Lovelady stated it would be possible to mail the NOVA recommendations earlier to the Committee if it so desired.

Mr. Lovelady also noted: (1) Staff presently ensures that the NOVA recommendations are considered prior to the Director's final recommendations:

(2) Once the NOVA/staff recommendations are issued to sponsors and NOVA members the Committee members begin to receive letters, phone calls, etc., concerning them.

(3) Actual staff recommendations are not ready until a day or so before the IAC meeting and are at that time distributed to Committee members.

Ms. Cox said she would like to get the NOVA recommendations at the same time they are mailed to sponsors and the NOVA Committee.

Ms. Lorenz suggested tabling action on the Federal Agreement until it is possible to consult with the Federal agencies' officials on November 4th. Ms. Cox felt it would be better to have the matter resolved since there is pressure on the Committee for funding of these types of projects already. Mr. Lovelady pointed out the federal agencies had been advised the agreement would come before the Committee and that Committee action would take precedence. They were willing to take that risk. He also noted that the Committee already has a similar agreement in force for the USDA Forest Service projects, and it is working very well.

Ms. Lorenz said she had not had time to read the agreement and she did not feel comfortable taking action on it. Ms. Cox also felt it should be postponed. Whereupon Mr. Tveten brought up the option to approve it for one year, and have staff come back at the next IAC meeting with recommendations as to matching requirements, changes in languages necessary, etc. Mr. Biles suggested at that time the Committee discuss some minimal threshold of federal agencies -- include if matching funds are given, their points and ranking would be increased.

Mr. Lovelady stated staff, too, approved of the matching requirement, and it could be accomplished. Either place it within the agreement, or have staff consider the matter and come back to the Committee with its recommendations. Mr. Fairleigh asked if it was possible to "discriminate" against the federal agencies in this manner. Mr. Lane replied the law discusses "may" and "must" in various places. He felt "may" could be considered in this instance for federal agencies, and that IAC staff was given leeway in the law to take this step. He also felt that how staff would characterize the project would then determine the percentage of contribution which might be imposed. He stressed that federal agencies are on an equal balance with other agencies, so it would be necessary to justify the matching requirement.

Mr. Fairleigh reiterated the suggestion that the Committee approve the document for one year, allowing the projects to be considered for funding. Staff

could come back to the Committee for guidance and resolve the questions.

In response to Ms. Lorenz' question, Mr. Lane stated if the agreement were approved today, it would then be fixed for consideration of the projects to be funded on November 4th.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE FEDERAL AGENCY AGREEMENT AS PRESENTED BY STAFF FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR, DURING WHICH TIME STAFF WILL REVIEW THE AGREEMENT, MAKE NECESSARY RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO MATCHING REQUIREMENTS, AND RETURN TO THE COMMITTEE AT ITS NEXT REGULAR MEETING IN MARCH, 1989.

Mr. Lovelady was asked to continue his review of the percentages being funded by the Federal agencies in the projects being considered. Mr. Biles expressed his concern at approving the agreement prior to consultation with the federal agencies representatives. Mr. Lane reiterated his comments, noting that the statute notes the federal agencies are eligible to submit projects. The effect of the motion as he understood would be to consider the projects on November 4th in the same manner as the Committee would consider any of the other grant-in-aid projects. Any future changes in the system or agreement would apply to projects submitted later by the federal agencies.

Mr. Lane then read 46.09.240 to the Committee members:

"(1) After deducting administrative expenses and the expense of any programs conducted under this chapter, the interagency committee for outdoor recreation shall, at least once each year, distribute the funds it receives under RCW 46.09.110 and 46.09.170 to state agencies, counties, municipalities, **federal agencies**, and Indian tribes.

"The committee shall adopt rules governing applications for funds administered by the agency under this chapter and shall determine the amount of money distributed to each applicant....."

Ms. Cox asked if the Committee has to take applications from them, why was it voting on an agreement stating it will continue to do so? Mr. Wilder stated the Committee must accept the applications, but it does not necessarily have to fund them. The Committee through staff has the responsibility to establish rules for the program. Mr. Lane further explained that as of today federal agencies are entitled to compete on the same basis as other projects for funding because the IAC as of this moment has not set up any other system. Any changes the Committee makes must be for good reasons, and so stipulated. Ms. Lorenz asked why the Committee had to review the agreement and make a determination. Mr. Wilder pointed out federal agencies are eligible; the committee has the authority and prerogative to set down the terms in order for ultimate funding to take place. Mr. Lane also noted that the agreement is not any part of the contract; it is an agreement whereby staff and the Committee can enter into contracts with the federal agencies and set parameters of funding requirements. The document is used as a base.

Mr. Lovelady noted the fact that the federal agencies control lands throughout the state in various regions. A master agreement is therefore needed. The main regional office signs the agreement; individual contracts when a project is funded are signed by the specific sponsor. The Committee needs to approve the agreement to work with the federal agencies. Terms and conditions are required. Mr. Tveten felt it was to the benefit of the agency to have the

master agreement setting forth the terms and conditions. Based on the work staff and the federal agencies have done, he suggested the motion on the table be approved by the Committee for the one year as stipulated in the motion. Mr. Biles objected to approving the document today, stating he would rather have the opportunity to discuss it with the federal agencies. Mr. Page stated he was familiar with these kinds of agreements, and he would vote in favor of the motion, based on page 7, Item (1) - that the agreement may be terminated by either party upon furnishing sixty days written notice to the other party, etc. Ms. Lorenz did not wish to vote in favor of the motion, feeling she should have the benefit of federal agency input, and she required more time to study the agreement itself. Ms. Fenton stated she felt it could be voted upon today without any problem.

Mr. Wilder explained it really was a matter of professional courtesy to the federal agencies, and staff and the agencies have given it considerable thought and time already.

Signatures on the document were mentioned, as well as dates of the signatures. Dr. Scull restated the motion, affirming he was in favor of approving the agreement at this time. Mr. Tveten stressed that staff review of the agreement must specifically address the federal matching requirements. Mr. Biles stated he would be voting against the motion, that in his opinion it was against procedure.

The following complete motion as prepared by staff and as proposed by the Committee was:

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

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION IS DIRECTED BY RCW CHAPTER 46.09 TO ADMINISTER A PROGRAM OF RECREATIONAL NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITY GRANTS; AND

WHEREAS, THE IAC IS EMPOWERED BY THE SAME STATUTE TO ENTER INTO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES IN ORDER TO MEET THE RECREATIONAL FACILITY OBJECTIVES OF THIS STATUTE; AND

WHEREAS, DUE TO THE LARGE LAND BASE MANAGED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE USDA FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, SUCH AGREEMENTS HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO ASSIST IN THE MANAGEMENT OF KEY NATURAL RESOURCES WHILE INCREASING THE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WASHINGTON'S CITIZENS, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS HAVING REVIEWED THE AGREEMENT ARE SATISFIED BOTH WASHINGTON STATE AND IAC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THIS MATTER ARE BEING MET, APPROVES THE AGREEMENT FOR ONE YEAR WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATIONS:

- (1) THE FEDERAL PROJECTS UNDER THIS AGREEMENT TO COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1988, WILL BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING BY THE COMMITTEE;
- (2) THE STAFF IS INSTRUCTED TO REVIEW THE AGREEMENT TO ADDRESS FEDERAL PARTICIPATION (MATCHING SHARE) FROM THE FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

TO COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE (AT 25% OR WHATEVER RECOMMENDATION STAFF MAY MAKE);

- (3) STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MATCHING SHARE FROM THE FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR THE PROJECTS WILL BE BROUGHT TO THE COMMITTEE'S ATTENTION AT THE MARCH 1989 IAC MEETING FOR FINAL DECISION ON THE AGREEMENT.

FOUR MEMBERS VOTED AFFIRMATIVELY FOR THE MOTION; TWO IN THE NEGATIVE. THE CHAIR ABSTAINED FROM VOTING.

MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

**IV. G. FUNDING CYCLES - REVISION:** Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, "Funding Cycles", pointing out the need to arrive at new funding cycles.

- (1) There is a need to continue the one annual funding meeting for the local agencies (traditional) grants-in-aid program, while at the same time recognizing the need to consider funding for the various NOVA categories.
- (2) Workload has grown considerably and there is a need to distribute the workload more evenly, and have some funding at another time on the agenda.
- (3) Sponsor confusion on specific letter of intent and application due dates needs correcting.
- (4) The Department of Wildlife requires review of NOVA project applications, and the time for this review has increased.
- (5) Management of the NOVA projects relating to all but planning has been transferred to the Project Services Division, resulting in leveling out of staff workload.

**Staff proposal:**

**November Funding Cycle:**

- March-April - NOVA Project sponsors contact DOW to begin Wildlife Review process.
- April - IAC Staff workshops statewide
- May 1 - Letter of Intent Due
- July 1 - All applications due
- Nov. - Funding Session (traditional GIA; nonhighway, ORV capital and planning projects)

**March Funding Cycle:**

- Nov. 1 - Letter of Intent Due
- Dec. 1 - Applications Due
- March 1990 - Funding Session (ORV Education/enforcement and Maintenance and Operation projects)

Mr. Fairleigh cited the advantages of the above funding cycles; (a) standardize application procedure; distribute/coordinate workload over the year; provide adequate working time; coordinate projects/funding sources for efficiency, effectiveness and service; and allow for adequate notice and review of NOVA projects by the Department of Wildlife (DOW).

Ms. Fenton asked if the notification date for beginning of wildlife review process could be moved to April 1.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, TO APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION WITH THE SUBSTITUTION OF "APRIL 1" AS THE BEGINNING REVIEW DATE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE INSTEAD OF "MARCH - APRIL". MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (SEE APPENDIX "D" TO THESE MINUTES FOR FUNDING CYCLES AS APPROVED.)

**IV. H. IAC 1989 PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE:** The Committee was referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1988, indicating a proposed meeting schedule for 1989, to be inserted in the Washington State Register in December. Following discussion, IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE FOLLOWING MEETING SCHEDULE BE ADHERED TO FOR PUBLICATION IN THE WASHINGTON STATE REGISTER IN DECEMBER:

MARCH 23-24	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	OLYMPIA
JULY 20-21	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	SITE TO BE DETERMINED
NOV. 2-3	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	OLYMPIA

**NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION CONGRESS OCTOBER 1988:** Ms. Cox reported on her attendance at the October 1988 National Recreation and Parks Association Congress in Indianapolis, Indiana. She commented on the various workshops she had attended and thanked the Committee for the privilege of being able to be in attendance. She felt Washington State's program of funding through the Committee was unique and in her opinion the best way to handle LWCF.

The Committee recessed at 4:15 p.m.

=====

**FRIDAY - NOVEMBER 4, 1988 IAC MEETING**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m with the following quorum: COX, SCULL, TVETEN, LORENZ, BILES, PAGE, AND FENTON  
Attendees were welcomed and asked for individual introductions.

Mr. Lovelady acknowledged that a packet of letters concerning certain NOVA projects had been received by staff and copies mailed to the Committee members for review prior to the meeting. In addition, a smaller packet of letters received a few days prior to the IAC meeting was distributed to the Committee members. (**APPENDIX "E" TO THESE MINUTES.**)

Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff distributed to the Committee, dated November 3, 1988, "NOVA Projects - 1988 Funding Recommendations", citing the following:

1. All projects were eligible under the program; all were reviewed and ranked by the NOVA Advisory Committee. All projects were numerically in order for reference (top right of each page).
2. Each development project and land acquisition underwent an environmental analysis and public hearing. Some planning projects were subjected to environmental impact review.
3. Distribution of funding is in accordance with the mandates of RCW 46.09.240:

- a. A maximum of 20%, plus DNR transfers, to ORV education, information and enforcement programs;
- b. An amount equal to fund transfers from DOL, but not to exceed 60% of the IAC's NOVA funds to ORV recreation facilities; and
- c. A maximum of 20% to NHR facilities.

The following allocation limits were cited:

**ALLOCATION LIMITS**

Project Type	Sponsor Amounts Requested	Minimum Permitted Allocation	Maximum Permitted Allocation
Ed/Enf. Projects	\$ 1,026,859	\$ 153,000 *	\$ 640,000
ORV Projects	1,478,338	212,000 **	1,830,000
NHR Projects	1,421,118	-0-	831,000
	\$ 3,926,315		\$ 3,301,000

\* At the very least, \$153,000 must be allocated to enforcement agencies in those counties where the DNR maintains ORV facilities:  
 Clallam, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Mason, Pierce, Skagit  
 Thurston, Wahkiakum, and Yakima.

RCW 46.09.17D(v). This equals the DNR transfer since the last funding meeting.

\*\* \$212,000 is the total of the ORV use and dealer permit fees received since the last funding meeting. RCW 46.09.170(d) (ii).

4. There will be money left in the ORV category to carry forward. There are sufficient funds for these projects.

**ORV RECREATION FACILITIES PROJECTS:** A slide presentation was then given of the ORV Recreation Facilities Projects. The following ORV Projects received comments from the Committee and attendees: **(PAGE 34 OF THESE MINUTES)**

**USFS, Wenatchee, Cle Elum, Buck Meadows Study, ORV 88-04P:** Mr. Biles said he had recently been in that area and the slides did not show the true level of damage in the entire site.

**USFS, Colville, Pend Oreille Trail, ORV 88-05P:** Mr. Dovel advised Ms. Lorenz that the project entailed location, survey and design of a connecting loop trail -- no development at this time in this particular project.

**USFS, Wenatchee, Naches, Naches ORV Plan, ORV 88-06P:** Dr. Scull was informed by Mr. Dovel this was a phased request, that in the following year the USFS, Naches N.F., will return for further funding to rehabilitate or develop the sites which will have been studied.

**USFS, Wenatchee, Supervisor's Office, 4-Wheel Drive Symposium, ORV 88-07D:** Ms. Cox asked what type of professional gathering would the symposium represent. Mr. Dovel replied it would include knowledgeable users, Forest Service personnel, persons from state and federal level involved in ORV issues. Mr. Lovelady stated it was a work-related activity, not recreational. **Mr. Mike Dolfay,**

1988 ORV RECREATION FACILITIES PROJECTS AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE

<u>ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS</u>		
88-02p USFS Olympic	Olympic ORV Plan	\$ 40,000
03p Ferry Co. P&R Dist	Republic ORV Site	36,500
04p USFS Wenat. Cle El	Buck Meadows study	6,358
05p USFS Colville	Pend Oreille Trail	3,475
06p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Naches ORV Plan	28,387
07d USFS Wenat. SD	4 Whl Dr Symposium	32,985
09d Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts Ph. #3	539,465
10d USFS Wenat. Natchs	Kaner ORV camp	177,507
11d USFS Colvl, Newpt	Batey Bould trlhd	81,360
12d Richland, City of	ORV Park improvmt	71,207
13m Thurston Co P&R	ORV park M&O	320,000
14m Ferry Co P&R	ORV Coordinator	25,000
15m Grant Co Sheriff	Sand Dunes sanitn	5,600
66m Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts M&O	40,994
67a Ferry Co P&R	BNRR acquisition	<u>69,500</u>
	Subtotal	= \$1,478,338

Forest Trail Coordinator, USFS, S.O. Wenatchee, stated there would be professional leaders in attendance to listen to the concerns regarding 4-wheel drive activities in the forest. Problems will be identified as well as impacts and non-impacts of four-wheel drive vehicles in the forest. There will be a section addressing user conflict - land management, environmental concerns, etc. Ms. Cox asked if the agenda could include the possibility of having this type of recreational activity on certain required areas rather than being dispersed throughout the forest. Mr. Dolfay said this could be addressed. It was also brought out that the Department of Wildlife personnel would be in attendance as well as other state personnel who deal with the impact of ORVs on forests. Primarily Washington State people will be involved, but there will also be some out-of-state people who will help coordinate the symposium. It is planned to produce a booklet which can be used for management of four-wheel drive impacts. Ms. Lorenz asked if there would be a fee for the symposium; Mr. Dolfay replied this was still being discussed. The symposium is in the planning stages only.

The \$122,495 being contributed by the sponsor was discussed. ORV funds requested were \$32,985. Ms. Cox asked if there were volunteer hours involved, that she felt it was necessary to know this factor. **Ms. Ruth Ittner** agreed with her, stating that as a member of the Volunteers of Washington she felt it was incumbent upon the Forest Service to keep track of its volunteer hours. Mr. Lovelady said it appeared the Committee wanted to know what the sponsor match is composed of and that staff could come up with that information. Mr. Biles in his questioning read the Project Elements in the resume. Mr. Tveten then read the six categories in which grants are given in the program and asked if when the symposium is over would there be emanating from it a planning report which could be useful to four-wheel drive recreationists. Mr. Dolfay replied that that is the intent of the symposium.

Spokane County Parks, Phase 3, Spokane County ORV Park, ORV 88-09D: In reply to Dr. Scull's questions, **Mr. Sam Angove, Director, Spokane County Parks and Recreation Department**, reported there had been "zero complaints" on the development of this ORV Park, that, in fact, the community has been backing it extremely well. Staff also reported there had been no controversy over the project and no letters of complaint had been received. Mr. Tveten was informed there would be one more phase to the project to complete camping facilities and add one more restroom. In reply to Mr. Biles' question, Mr. Angove stated that Spokane County Parks is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the park.

USFS, Wenatchee Naches Ranger Dist., Kaner Flat ORV, ORV 88-10D: Mr. Tveten was informed this was an existing campground which receives little use at present but offers the potential of being an active area through better management. Users who make use of the facility feel it can be an interesting and most useful site. Ms. Cox asked why "State Audit" was listed as one of the Project Elements. Mr. Lovelady replied it is necessary to pay the State Auditor's Office to check the books. Ms. Cox asked if it would be possible once the study was done, and sites developed, that dispersed sites would no longer be used as ORV sites. **Mr. Dolfay** replied this was a possibility. Mr. Dovel stated the intent was to designate the site, design it, audit it for use, and keep it an informal camping area in a dispersed way. However, he noted there was no guarantee this would be the result. Ms. Lorenz asked if in looking at these various ORV areas, was there some overlapping? Mr. Lovelady outlined the parameters but noted that there is no duplication in planning efforts occurring.

USFS, Colville, Newport Ranger Dist., Batey Boulder Trailhead, ORV 88-11D: Mr. Dovel indicated on the map where the camp ground would be for overnight campers. He also brought out the type of area serviced by the trail; hikers would not use it since it is a more challenging route for motorcyclists -- a highly skilled, technical type of trail.

Thurston County Parks & Recreation, ORV Sports Park - M&O, ORV 88-13M: Mr. Biles recalled the study which had been proposed for this park and asked if it had been completed. (THURSTON COUNTY DEVELOPMENT, ORV 88-01P--Planning and Engineering study.) Mr. Lovelady replied this study involved an extensive planning and engineering study concerning the need for track redevelopment; whereas the project before the Committee was for the cost of maintenance and operation of the park for the next two years. Historically the ORV funds have supported M&O for the park. Mr. Biles asked if the County would be submitting some type of matching funds. Mr. Lovelady explained the debt retirement in which the County is involved for the park, and the fact that fees are being used to offset that debt. Dr. Scull asked Mr. Angove if there would be any fees generated in the Spokane ORV Park. Mr. Angove said it is anticipated that the park will generate monies from user fees and the Spokane ORV Park will benefit from those funds.

There followed considerable discussion about the Thurston County Park and Recreation, ORV Sports Park's debt clearance policy. Also the difference in the Spokane ORV Park proposal and that presently maintained by Thurston County was discussed. Mr. Lovelady stated there is sufficient money to fund the M&O for Thurston County; the park is extensively used by a very avid recreational population; and there is a need for it to continue operating. **Mr. Charles Groth, ORV Thurston County Sports Park Manager**, in reply to Ms. Lorenz, reported the pay back program for the debt amounts to about \$27,000 per year and there are about six years left to pay. Revenue is being generated for this year at approximately \$50,000, so it will be possible to meet the payment and use other funds for the park. Mr. Wilder briefly explained how the debt had been incurred, and stated the park was the first highly intensive ORV area in the state and over the years had seen increased use. Mr. Groth stated people come from all over the state to the park; there is even interest from Canada and Oregon. It is more a regional facility than just a county facility. He pointed out the park adjoins forest lands which are closed in the winter so that people are using the park track at that time. The impact is not seasonal but year-round.

Mr. Wilder noted the three existing ORV parks are serving different population levels: Horn Rapids, Thurston County ORV Park, and Spokane. Mr. Groth commented on the good working relationship he had with the neighbors and though he had inherited the debt problem, he felt the park was doing very well. He also reported that the lights are being removed very soon as requested by the Committee.

Mr. Dovel explained NOVA funds are being placed in facilities such as Kaner Flats, in studies and plans, in law enforcement, etc. and none of these "run" at a profit. The three ORV parks absorb the existing, most intensive, strenuous impact from the most intensive users and are doing a good job. Mr. Biles suggested raising the fees. Mr. Dovel agreed this could be done, since \$2.00 is an extremely low charge. Mr. Groth pointed out that the monies being used for the park are actually ORV users funds and they do, in that manner, help support the park. Ms. Lorenz asked where M&O funds would come from in the future. Ms. Cox noted it is gas tax money from the users which is supporting ORV projects. Mr. Groth pointed out that the M&O has been increased to \$320,000 since it had not been increased for the last six years and there is need for these dollars.

Mr. Tveten asked if the additional revenue generated by the park was being used to retire the debt. **Mr. Mike Welter** replied it was. Mr. Biles asked why the IAC could not pay off the debt from ORV funds. Following discussion, Mr. Jeff Lane informed the Committee that there may be Attorney General's Opinion stating the IAC could not pay the debt for the county. Mr. Tveten suggested that staff meet with the County officials to discuss the indebtedness - DETERMINE THE PAY PERIODS, AMOUNTS NEEDED TO PAY OFF THE DEBT, AND WHAT THE OPTIONS MIGHT BE. HE SUGGESTED THIS REPORT BE GIVEN AT THE MARCH 1989 IAC MEETING. COMMITTEE MEMBERS APPROVED AND THE CHAIR DIRECTED STAFF TO TAKE ON THIS ASSIGNMENT.

**Ferry County Parks & Recreation, BNRR Acquisition, ORV 88-67A:** Mr. Dovel explained the project would provide for the acquisition of Burlington Northern abandoned railroad right-of-way. Dr. Scull approved of the project stating these lands would become scarce in the next ten years and should be acquired for the public's use. Mr. Tveten also mentioned the interest of State Parks in abandoned railroad rights-of-way because they are the best potential for making significant improvement in the provision of trails for the public.

Recess was called for at 10:15. Reconvened at 10:30 a.m.

Ms. Cox asked that anyone desiring to address the Committee on any subject or project to complete a Participant Registration Card available on the information table. Staff distributed TABLE III, Staff Funding Recommendations for ORV Recreation Facility Projects (green) and NOVA Advisory Committee - 1988 Project Recommendations TABLE II-B (yellow). Ms. Fenton asked if **USFS Olympic, Project Olympic ORV Plan included an additional \$2,500.** This was added into that project's request.

Mr. Lovelady noted that staff recommendations were the same as recommended by the NOVA Advisory Committee. Staff was asked to define the elements in **Project 88-67A, Ferry County Park and Recreation, BNRR Acquisition.** Jim Eychaner, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to the slides and explained the necessity for an appraisal or opinion of value for the property. Mr. Tveten asked if the project sponsor was within the 180 day period in which recreation agencies may make recommendations, and was informed a letter from Glacier Park stipulates their option until June 1989.

**T. Shawn Parsons, Consultant, Landscape Architect, Ferry County, ORV 88-67A:** commented on the acquisition of easements necessary in the project. Mr. Tveten explained land banking whereby interest is still maintained in the property by the railroad, and subsequent liability. Burlington Northern does not favor land banking and prefers to relinquish all interest in the property.

Continuing with staff recommendations, Mr. Lovelady noted that:

- (1) Thurston County funding would be for one year - \$160,000.
- (2) Some of the projects' scheduling has been changed, but staff is supporting all of the projects -- some at a different period on a different funding level.

Mr. Fairleigh explained that the request for Thurston County would extend an additional three months to get the project onto a new schedule; then it would be funded from March to March.

**COMMENTS FROM ATTENDEES:**

TABLE III B

STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	Staff Recommendation			IAC Percent
			IAC Amount	Sponsor Amount	Total Amount	
88-02p USFS Olympic	Olympic ORV Plan	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ - .00	\$ 40,000	100
03p Ferry Co. P&R Dist	Republic ORV Site	36,500	36,500	- .00	36,500	100
04p USFS Wenat. Cle El	Buck Meadows study	6,358	6,358	1,250	7,608	83.57
05p USFS Colville	Pend Oreille Trail	3,475	3,475	275	3,750	92.67
06p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Naches ORV Plan	28,387	28,387	6,750	35,137	80.79
07d USFS Wenat. SO	4 Whl Dr Symposium	32,985	32,985	122,495	155,480	21.21
09d Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts Ph. #3	539,465	539,465	- .00	539,465	100
10d USFS Wenat. Natchs	Kaner ORV camp	177,507	177,507	4,800	182,307	97.37
11d USFS Colvi, Newpt	Batey Bould trlhd	81,360	81,360	- .00	81,360	100
12d Richland, City of	ORV Park improvmt	71,207	71,207	- .00	71,207	100
13m Thurston Co P&R	ORV park M&O	320,000	160,000	- .00	160,000	100
14m Ferry Co P&R	ORV Coordinator	25,000	25,000	2,000	27,000	92.59
15m Grant Co Sheriff	Sand Dunes sanitn	5,600	5,600	- .00	5,600	100
66m Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts M&O	40,994	40,994	- .00	40,994	100
67a Ferry Co P&R	BNRR acqisition	<u>69,500</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>- .00</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>100</u>

Subtotal = \$1,478,338 \$1,272,838

NOTE #1: Funding Cap \$ 1,830,000  
 Staff Recommendation -1,272,838  
 \$ 557,162 available to carry forward.

NOTE #2: Staff recommendations are the same as those made by the NOVA Advisory Committee, except in the case of project ORV-88-67a, Ferry County's BNRR Acquisition. Subsequent to the Advisory Committee's evaluation meeting, Ferry County reduced the amount of its request for for this project. Staff has since further defined the eligible elements of the project and recommends funding at the level indicated (\$24,000). This project relates closely to ORV-88-03p and 14m.

TABLE II B

NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE - 1988 PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	NOVA Recommend	NOVA Advisory Committee Notes
<u>ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS</u>				
88-02p USFS Olympic	Olympic ORV Plan	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	+2,500
03p Ferry Co. P&R Dist	Republic ORV Site	36,500	36,500	
04p USFS Wenat. Cle El	Buck Meadows study	6,358	6,358	
05p USFS Colville	Pend Oreille Trail	3,475	3,475	
06p USFS Wenat. Natchs	Naches ORV Plan	28,387	28,387	
07d USFS Wenat. SO	4 Whl Dr Symposium	32,985	32,985	
09d Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts Ph. #3	539,465	539,465	
10d USFS Wenat. Natchs	Kaner ORV camp	177,507	177,507	Request USFS to consider lowest possible fee
11d USFS Colvl, Newpt	Batey Bould trlhd	81,360	81,360	
12d Richland, City of	ORV Park improvant	71,207	71,207	
13m Thurston Co P&R	ORV park M&D	320,000	320,000	NOVA Advisory Committee suggests more in-park emphasis
14m Ferry Co P&R	ORV Coordinator	25,000	25,000	
15m Grant Co Sheriff	Sand Dunes sanitn	5,600	5,600	
66m Spokane Co Parks	Airway Hts M&D	40,994	40,994	
67a Ferry Co P&R	BNRR acquisition	<u>69,500</u>	<u>69,500</u>	Originally presented at \$97,500, later reduced by sponsor to \$69,500.
	Subtotal	=\$1,506,338	\$1,506,338	

NOTE #1: In accordance with RCW 46.09.280, the marked (\*) projects were selected by the NOVA Advisory Committee's organized ORV group representatives for recommendation to the IAC.

NOTE #2: \$1,830,000 (available) - \$1,506,338 = \$323,662 available to be carried forward.

**T. Shawn Parsons, Consultant for Ferry County, Landscape Architect - Ferry County Projects (88-03P and 88-67A):** Though Ferry County has a small population, it receives an enormous amount of ORV activity. Glad to see the projects being approved.

**Mike Dolfay, USFS, Forest Trail Coordinator - Kaner Flat ORV 88-10D):** No further comments. (Filed Participant Registration Card)

**David Johnson, USFS, Olympic National Forest, Fire-Recreation-Lands Assistant - ORV 88-02P - Olympic ORV Plan:** No further comments. (Filed Participant Registration Card)

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE WITH THE ADDITION OF \$2,500 TO THE **OLYMPIC ORV PLAN, USFS OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST PROJECT, #88-02P,** FOR A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$42,500.

Discussion followed. Mr. Page referred to the Thurston County M&O project and asked that there be some consideration given to raising user fees to \$3.00 or \$4.00 and that a discussion on that subject by the Committee would be a part of any future funding grants. He suggested this be part of the approval. Mr. Wilder suggested meeting with Thurston County and ironing out any difficulties as proposed earlier, but not to tie this understanding to the motion. Ms. Cox agreed. **Mike Welter** pointed out that Thurston County will be making a major review of the ORV Sports Park's operations including revenue generating aspects. At this point, Ms. Cox instructed staff to pursue Mr. Page's request.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE FOLLOWING MOTION:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED THE ORV RECREATION FACILITIES PROJECTS AND APPROVES STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS, WITH THE ADDITION OF \$2,500 TO THE **OLYMPIC ORV PLAN, USFS OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST PROJECT, #88-02P,** FOR A TOTAL OF \$42,500 IN THAT PROJECT, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE DIRECTOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSOR AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUT-DOOR 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 39 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

**Sam Angove, Director, Parks and Recreation, Spokane County,** thanked the Committee for funding the Spokane ORV Park project, and expressed his sincere appreciation to Roger Dovel, IAC staff, who has worked diligently along with Mr. Lovelady to see that this ORV Park becomes a reality. He wished him well and commended him for his excellent work.

**NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS:** Staff presented slides and explanations of the Nonhighway Road Projects. The following Nonhighway Projects received comments from the Committee and the attendees:

**Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Ravenroost Trailhead, NHR-88-35P:** Dr. Scull asked how the road would be closed to the public. Mr. Eychaner said it would be barricaded

1988 NOVA Projects as Approved  
by the Interagency Committee November 4, 1988  
ORV RECREATION FACILITY PROJECTS

Project	Sponsor	IAC \$	Sponsor \$	Total
Olympic ORV Plan	USFS Olympic	\$ 42,500	\$ 0	\$ 42,500
Republic ORV Site	Ferry County P & R	36,500	0	36,500
Buck Meadows Study	USFS Wenatchee	6,358	1,250	7,608
Pend Oreille Trail	USFS Colville	3,475	275	3,750
Naches ORV Plan	USFS Wenatchee	28,387	6,750	35,137
4 Wheel Drive Symp.	USFS Wenatchee	32,985	122,495	155,480
Airway Heights Ph. 3	Spokane County Parks	539,465	0	539,465
Kaner ORV Camp	USFS Wenatchee	177,507	4,800	182,307
Batey Blvd Trlhd.	USFS Colville	81,360	0	81,360
ORV Park Improve.	Richland, City of	71,207	0	71,207
ORV Park M & O	Thurston County P & R	160,000	0	160,000
ORV Coordinator	Ferry County P & R	25,000	2,000	27,000
Sand Dunes Sanit.	Grant County Sheriff	5,600	0	5,600
Airway Heights M & O	Spokane County Parks	40,994	0	40,994
BNRR Acquisition	Ferry County P & R	24,000	0	24,000
TOTAL		\$ 1,275,338	\$ 137,570	\$ 1,412,908

by large boulders or other earth work; eventually nature would take its course. The project involves doing a study of the necessary preconstruction work to move the Trailhead from its current location to near Ravenroost on the Naches Ranger District.

**Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Lake Chelan Cross-Country Ski Trails, NHR-88-36P:** Dr. Scull questioned the statement "reduce existing conflicts with snowmobilers" -- how would this be done? **Joan Ziegltrum, USFS, Resource Assistant,** stated snowmobilers were using these types of trails long before cross-country skiing recreationists. They are using same routes the cross-country skier has discovered are excellent routes to use for that type of recreation. They are aware it is necessary to cooperate with the skiers and are interested in a planning process. Dr. Scull noted he had a letter from a manager of a privately owned cross-country ski development who expressed interest in the project and was in favor of it.

**USFS, Wenatchee - Naches, Clear Lake Disabled, NHR-88-37P:** Ms. Lorenz asked why it was called "disabled". Mr. Eychaner replied the site would be designed to provide barrier-free facilities for the disabled recreationist, i.e., water-oriented camping, fishing, nature trails, etc. The grant will be used to plan, survey and do the construction design at this point. Ms. Cox asked if the site could be kept only for disabled? Mr. Eychaner stated this could be considered in the management plan...(provision for parking areas, accessible areas, etc.).

**USFS, Wenatchee Natl. Forest - Naches, Telemark Ski Area, NHR-88-39P:** Mr. Eychaner informed Dr. Scull that the study would be completed in approximately two years (December 1990) at the cost of \$10,214.

**USFS, Wenatchee - Naches, Bumping Cross-Country Ski Trail, NHR 88-40P:** Ms. Cox asked how far Bumping Lake was from a highway maintained in the winter. Mr. Eychaner responded that the road is plowed to the dam site to allow technicians into the area. Ms. Cox asked if the proposed trail was back-country groomed or ungroomed. Mr. Eychaner was uncertain. Ms. Cox felt if there was already a road there, she was not sure whether it would be necessary to do a study for back-country skiing. In response to Mr. Page's question, Mr. Baker stated there was considerable camping provided in the lower areas of the site in the summer.

**USFS, Wenatchee - Naches, MJB Trailhead, NHR-88-41P:** Mr. Tveten noted that if the IAC were to approve all of the Forest Service projects before it today, it would be approving over \$115,000 for additional staffing for that entity. ..(salaries and supplies). He asked if the Forest Service would be using current staff on the projects or would it be hiring over and above staff to do them. **Mike Dolfay** stated most would be done with current staff, not all would require additional staff. Mr. Lovelady stated IAC staff did not allow the Forest Service to "free up" its monies to use elsewhere while it received ORV funding. A full-time salaried staff professional is used in the project, but provision is made for another person (an underfill) to do the job. In other words, someone else does the job which could be otherwise completed by the Forest Service.

Additionally, Mr. Lovelady stated that the IAC keeps a close eye upon how the funds are spent once they are allocated. **Ms. Joan Ziegltrum** noted that \$27,000 had been requested for their project with \$7,500 of that amount to be used to look at new areas for winter recreation.

1988 NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request
<u>NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS</u>		
88-33p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Rattlesnake trlhd	\$ 3,824
34p USFS Wenat, Lvnwr :	Tumwater Mtn plan	49,905
35p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Ravenroost trlhd	5,028
36p USFS Wenat, Chelan:	Lk Chelan x/c trls:	20,000
37p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Clear Lk Disabled	12,713
38p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Goat Crk trlhd	5,140
39p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Telemark ski area	10,214
40p USFS Wenat, Naches:	Bumping Lk x/c trl:	9,500
41p USFS Wenat, Naches:	MJB trlhd	3,824
42p San Juan Co.	Old Military Rd	75,000
43p USFS Okanogan, Tsp:	Loup Loup rec area:	37,200
44p State Parks	Skykomish access	24,600
45p DNR	Tiger Mtn trails	67,995
46p USFS Bkr/Sng-Darr :	Mt. Pilchuck trls	8,000
47d NPS, N. Cascades :	Thunder Basin ps2	30,200
48d NPS, Kettle Falls :	Falls Nature trl	9,700
49d NPS, N. Cascades :	McAlester Crk trl	13,200
50d USF&W Columbia NWR:	Black Lk bridge	10,740
51d USF&W Columbia NWR:	Soda Lk campground:	22,340
52d USF&W Columbia NWR:	Interpret. trl	17,200
53d USF&W Turnbull NWR:	Interpret. facil.	130,635
54d Leavenworth, City :	Waterfront Park	150,000
57d State Parks	Cabin Crk facil.	10,000
58d State Parks	Squak Mtn devel.	90,700
59d State Parks	Keystone Spit dev.:	149,000
60d State Parks	Iron Horse, Easton:	79,600
61d Long Beach, City :	Ocean Beach bdwlk	150,000
62d State Parks	I-90 x/c ski dev.	70,000
63d State Parks	Mt Spokane x/c dv	70,000
64d State Parks	Lk Wenatchee x/c	70,000
65e USFS Bkr/Sng SO	Hiker Education	<u>14,860</u>
	Subtotal	= \$1,421,118

**San Juan County, Old Military Road, NHR-88-42P:** Ms. Cox asked if state land only was involved. **Mr. Ron Loewen, Public Works Director/County Engineer, San Juan County,** said DNR land was in the project and an easement for that can be obtained. However, there is considerable private ownership and the County needs to determine the exact lines of the trail. Ms. Cox felt since there was so much private land ownership on San Juan Island, perhaps it might not be worthwhile to spend NHR funds on the project. Dr. Scull asked if Mr. Loewen thought the land-owners would be amenable to having estimates made of their holdings. Mr. Loewen replied there is a reasonable potential, but discussions have been held with some of the property owners and they realize there is a need to establish the trail lines. Other areas are wooded and not fenced. He agreed it would be a sensitive study.

Ms. Cox noted the need for sanitation facilities on the island since it becomes overcrowded. If the trail were opened, this would put more stress on that aspect. Mr. Loewen felt this was an opportunity to provide a trail on the island for the benefit of both islanders and those who visit the island for recreation. Mr. Lane asked what type of maintenance would be provided once the trail was opened. Mr. Loewen replied there are National Park Service areas provided which are maintained, and this project when developed from the planning aspect could provide linkups with the National Parks Service trails. During the summer there would be litter cans available. One of the major objections, Mr. Lane felt, would be litter - people dropping litter and not picking it up. Mr. Loewen stated the planning study was needed so that the very things being discussed could be looked into.

**Mr. Loren McGovern, NOVA Member,** acknowledged this would be only one phase of a trail project. There should be planning effort first to see if the trail would be of use and of benefit to equestrians in that area. Mr. Loewen noted this would not be an entire trail for horseback riding, but only a portion, which would link up with other areas for recreation.

**Washington Parks and Recreation Commission, Skykomish Scenic River Access Study, NHR-88-44P:** Mr. Tveten expressed the need for this project. There is need to provide public access to Washington's scenic rivers. This is the first river so designated and there will be others should a proposed legislative bill be passed by the State Legislature. Therefore, this project would be a study to identify access sites to open up the scenic river to the general public. He commented on the legislative bill concerning rivers, stating it was also necessary to work with the departments of Fisheries, Wildlife, and other agencies to develop criteria for additions to the scenic rivers system. The new legislation will propose adding eighteen (18) rivers to the system. State Parks started with a study of fifty (50) rivers and screened this down to 18. Missing from the legislation, however, was a funding source to carry out the program. In order to protect these rivers and maintain them as scenic, it is necessary to start now. **Mr. Steve Starlund, State Parks & Recreation Commission employee,** corroborated Mr. Tveten's statements, adding that the addition of the 18 rivers is being supported by all participating agencies.

Dr. Scull asked if State Parks in providing public access to the rivers would then assume liability for any accidents occurring on them. Mr. Tveten replied every recreational user has to assume some liability on his own for taking part in the type of recreation he enjoys. There will be no fees for going on the river once there is access. Recreationists are also educated to the extent possible by pamphlets, etc.

**Department of Natural Resources, Tiger Mountain Trail Planning, NHR-88-45P:** Mr. Tveten spoke in favor of this project noting that Tiger, Squak and Cougar mountains provide beautiful scenery for many recreational users. Tiger Mountain has easy access from the Seattle area. The mountain can accommodate many, many users.

**Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Natl. Forest, Mt. Pilchuck Trails, NHR-88-46P:** Mr. Tveten noted that the trail system on Mt. Pilchuck also has possibilities of tying into other trails under the Forest Service and DNR management.

**North Cascades Natl. Park, Thunder Basin Phse.II, NHR 88-47D:** Mr. Eychaner explained it was necessary to hike overnight to get to this area.

**North Cascades Natl. Park, McAlester Creek Trail Rehab/Relocation, NHR 88-49D:** Ms. Cox was informed this project does not connect with the Pacific Crest Trail. Location was given as being seven miles from the parking area on Highway 20.

**USFWS, Columbia NWR, Interpretive Trail Development, NHR-88-52D:** Mr. Tveten asked if Interpretive Trails could be qualified under Education Projects, since there was \$35,000 left "on the table" in the E&E program during yesterday's session. Mr. Lovelady said that by law E&E projects must be directed toward ORV users only.

**USFWS Turnbull Interpretive Facilities, NHR 88-53D:** Ms. Lorenz asked if this project could be completed in stages. Susan Saul, USFWS, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Oregon-Washington Wildlife Refuges, replied the interpretive facilities will be done by one contractor and there will be no guarantee that the same contractor could be found to do all the interpretive panels to ensure consistency throughout the project, thus the total amount is being requested. The panels cost \$5,000 a piece; there are nineteen (19) of them in the total project.

**City of Leavenworth, Waterfront Park, NHR-88-43P:** Questions were asked concerning the road, its paving, and length. Further, questions were asked as to the proximity to the golf course trail. Ms. Cox asked if there would be fees involved, and was informed the only fee would be determined by the Nordic Washington Ski Club which handles all trail crossing maintenance. There are about three kilometers of added trail to this particular site.

**Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Squak Mountain, NHR-88-58D:** In response to Dr. Scull, Ms. Lori Flemm stated State Parks is currently negotiating with the Burlington Northern Railroad to acquire additional lands. Mr. Tveten referred to the slide, indicating the lands in question. He explained the present difficulty in the negotiations -- BNRR would like to be able to use part of State Parks' land, but this would not be allowed due to the deed State Parks presently has specifically donating the land to be set aside for recreation purposes only.

**Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Fort Casey - Keystone Spit, NHR-88-59D:** Mr. Tveten advised at present there is no public access to the saltwater beach. The public is using the area but there are no park facilities nor sanitary facilities. State Parks acquired the land through a land exchange with the National Park Service.

**City of Long Beach, Ocean Beach Boardwalk, NHR 88-61D:** Ms. Cox asked, considering the fact that most people prefer to walk along the beach itself, how many people would actually use this type of facility. Ms. Flemm explained there would be squall shelters, picnic sites, and a boardwalk which would be used by those people who might not be able to enjoy the beach or get to it because of infirmities. **Mr. Nabil Shawa, City Administrator, City of Long Beach,** described the project stating this was the most heavily used section of the beach and the boardwalk would be along the dunes, offering a view of the ocean. There will be down ramps to the beach for those who are able to walk there, plus the picnic sites. The weather in the area is severe at times, but the structures have been designed to hold up in the winds. Structures have been designed for a thirty year life span. One objective is to help reduce impact on the dunal vegetation.

Ms. Lorenz and Dr. Scull suggested the project might be done in phases. Mr. Shawa said it would be possible to cut back on the project if that was necessary. However, there had already been cuts in the project, i.e., lighting, picnic tables less than at first planned, etc. Mr. Tveten pointed out that the beach in this area is accreting, moving westward. The ordinary high tide line in 1889 was pointed out compared to the tide line of the present day. Between 1970 and 1980, he said, the tide moved westward about 200 feet. The dunes are mostly in private ownership except those in front of Long Beach which are owned by the City and by State Parks. State Parks will entertain an agreement with the City to allow them to put their structures on State Park land. The Department of Ecology is also involved from an environmental point of view.

**Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission - Projects NHR-88-62D; NHR-88-63D; and NHR-88-62D:** Ms. Flemm noted the need for three snow cats in the State Parks and Recreation Commission's snow grooming program: I-90 Corridor - Mt. Spokane - and Lake Wenatchee Area - cross-country skiing. Ms. Lorenz reported all of the members had received considerable mail in favor of these projects. The grooming is being done at the present time, but on a volunteer basis. Volunteers have put in many, many hours of work. Ms. Flemm noted that State Parks does provide for fuel. Mr. Tveten mentioned as a part of the Sno Park Winter Recreation Program cross-country skiers and others agreed to charge themselves permits for parking. State Parks sells parking permits with the funds being used to provide recreation opportunities for cross-country skiers -- and grooming of trails. State Parks works with volunteers who provide the manpower to operate equipment. **Mr. James Horan, State Parks and Recreation Commission employee,** noted the following:

- (1) The budget for the program is about \$180,000, all of the funds being derived from permits; \$10.00 permit per vehicle per season.
- (2) Fifty percent of the value of what State Parks provides are the additional free services from the cross-country skiers who are involved in the program.
- (3) In early 1980's the Alpine Nordic Club provided grooming and there were not sufficient funds to assist that group. In 1984 the Inland Nordic Club asked for snow park permit funds to support costs of the program.
- (4) There has since been additional construction of trails in part provided by the volunteer activity. Lately the volunteers are experiencing difficulty in keeping up with the grooming responsibilities. Their contract now is \$10,000 plus. It is time for State Parks to assist in the program in order to improve and expand services for the cross-country skier.

In response to Ms. Cox's question, **Mr. Carl Miller, member, Inland Empire Nordic Club.** said the group had built approximately twenty kilometers of trail for the Cross-Country skiers. There were approximately 600 volunteer hours put in on the project contracted through State Parks. Ms. Cox asked how many hours had the volunteers put in during the last ten years. Mr. Miller replied using 1987 as a base, there had been 1,245 documented hours of work. So far in 1988 850 volunteer hours have been documented. Therefore, approximately 1,300 to 1,400 hours per year are being volunteered for the program. In response to Ms. Lorenz' and Mr. Biles' questions, Mr. Miller stated it might be possible to drop the price of the equipment down from \$70,000, but the plan was to purchase three new grooming machines for \$210,000. Mr. Tveten clarified this issue stating State Parks might be able to secure three machines at \$155,000, though they might not be new ones. Mr. Tveten predicted about 100,000 users a year for cross-country skiing at these sites and the machines are of great benefit to the recreationists. Mr. Flemm noted there had been a winter recreation survey, with over 4,000 people responding. Eighty-nine percent (89%) said their priority was skiing on a groomed trail. In response to Ms. Cox's questions, Ms. Flemm stated the ski trails are marked "easy", "normal", and "difficult".

At 12:35 p.m. Staff Recommendations for Funding of the Nonhighway Road Projects were distributed to the Committee members.

The Committee recessed at 12:38 p.m., and reconvened at 1:40 p.m.

Planning staff distributed the Staff Recommendations for funding of the Nonhighway Road Projects to attendees. Mr. Biles asked that staff provide criteria on how the projects were recommended for funding. Also he asked that in the discussions the NOVA Committee members should report their conclusions on the projects.

Mr. Lovelady referred to:

TABLE II C - NOVA Advisory Committee - 1988 NOVA Project Recommendations  
(yellow) (PAGE 44A OF THESE MINUTES)

TABLE III C - Staff Funding Recommendations for Nonhighway Road Projects  
(green) (PAGE 44B OF THESE MINUTES)

- (1) The main intent of staff's recommendations was to be consistent, not drop out or add into any project without doing the same thing for all other like projects.
- (2) Staff reviewed the most important aspect, the ranking of the project as established by the NOVA Advisory Committee. Staff adhered to that ranking in most of the projects. Most of the projects recommended by staff for funding are at the upper end of the ranking score.
- (3) Adjustments were necessary in some of the projects not recommended by the NOVA Committee. Staff recommended that USFWS project, **88-53D, Interpretive Facility (Turnbull)** be funded but at reduced amount. Likewise **the City of Leavenworth's Waterfront Park, 88-54D,** was recommended by staff at a reduced amount.
- (4) Staff looked at sponsor's priorities. Some had submitted more than one project. Some highest priority projects had been ranked low by the NOVA Advisory Committee. Example: **State Parks and Recreation Commission, Keystone Spit Dec., 88-59D,** with **Iron Horse - Easton, 88-60D** being State Parks' #1 priority project.
- (5) The **San Juan County, Old Military Road, 88-42P,** was recommended at a reduced level; sponsor has agreed to this reduction.

TABLE III C

STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR NON HIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS

Rank	Project Name	Sponsor	NOVA Committee Eval. Score	Sponsor Request	Staff Recommendation			Support %
					IAC \$	Sponsor \$	Total	
1	Tiger Mtn. Trails	DNR	71	\$ 67,995	\$ 67,995	\$ 35,000	\$ 102,995	66
2	Clear Lake Disabled	USFS Wenatchee	68	12,713	12,713	680	13,393	95
2	Waterfront Park	Leavenworth, City of	68	150,000	132,375	313,373	445,748	29
3	Loup Loup Rec. Area	USFS Okanogan	58	37,200	37,200	49,500	86,700	43
4	Soda Lake Campground	USFWS Columbia	57	22,340	22,340	7,856	30,196	74
5	Thunder Basin Ph. 2	NPS, N. Cascades	56	30,200	30,200	5,000	35,200	86
6	Falls Nature Trail	NPS, Kettle Falls	55	9,700	9,700	1,319	11,019	88
6	Ocean Beach Boardwalk	Long Beach, City of	55	150,000	150,000	170,246	320,246	47
7	Interpretive Facil.	USFWS Turnbull	54	130,635	76,200	120,657	196,857	30
8	Tumwater Mtn. Plan	USFS Wenatchee	53	49,905	0	0	0	0
8	Squak Mtn. Devel.	State Parks	53	90,700	90,700	0	90,700	100
8	Keystone Spitt Dev.	State Parks	53	149,000	0	0	0	0
9	MJB Trailhead	USFS Wenatchee	51	3,824	3,824	300	4,124	93
9	Interpret. Trail	USFWS Columbia	51	17,200	17,200	5,039	22,239	77
10	Black Lake Bridge	USFWS Columbia	49	10,740	10,740	2,225	12,965	81
11	Goat Creek Trlhd	USFS Wenatchee	47	5,140	5,140	580	5,720	90
11	McAlester Creek Trl.	NPS N. Cascades	47	13,200	13,200	3,000	16,200	91
12	Lake Chelan x/c Ski	USFS Wenatchee	46	20,000	20,000	11,700	31,700	63
13	Mt. Pilchuck Trails	USFS Baker/Snoq.	45	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	100
14	Rattlesnake Trlhd.	USFS Wenatchee	44	3,824	3,824	300	4,124	93
15	Cabin Creek Facil.	State Parks	43	10,000	10,000	2,000	12,000	83
16	I-90 x/c Ski Dev.	State Parks	42	70,000	0	0	0	0
16	Mt. Spokane x/c Dev.	State Parks	42	70,000	0	0	0	0
16	Lake Wenatchee x/c	State Parks	41	70,000	0	0	0	0
17	Ravenroost Trlhd	USFS Wenatchee	41	5,028	5,028	1,258	6,286	80
18	Iron Horse, Easton	State Parks	38	79,600	79,600	0	79,600	100
19	Skykomish River	State Parks	27	24,600	0	0	0	0
20	Old Military Road	San Juan County	26	75,000	25,021	0	25,021	33
21	Hiker Education	USFS Baker/Snoq.	18	14,860	0	0	0	0
21	Telemark Ski Area	USFS Wenatchee	18	10,214	0	0	0	0
21	Bumping Lake x/c Ski	USFS Wenatchee	18	9,500	0	0	0	0
TOTAL				\$1,421,118	\$831,000	\$730,033	\$1,561,033	

NOTE: Staff recommendation based on the following criteria, in order of importance: 1. Nova Advisory Committee's ranking. 2. NOVA Committee's recommendation. (Although funding is reduced; #54d Leavenworth, 61d Long Beach, and 53d Turnbull remain due to high ranking.) 3. Sponsoring agency's project priority. State Parks' #59d Keystone (Parks' 3rd priority) deleted in favor of Parks' 1 priority (#60d Iron Horse).

#34p Tumwater Mountain is deleted because the USFS has funding to complete planning for this trail project.

#42p San Juan County's Military Road is included, even though it ranks below Parks' 62d, 63d, 64d (cross-country machine purchase) and 44p Parks' Skykomish River access since (a) this is San Juan County's only submittal, and (b) 3 other State Parks NFR projects totaling \$180,300 are recommended for funding.

\$831,000 (available) - \$831,000 = \$-0- Carryover

Ms. Lorenz asked about **USFS, Tumwater Mountain Planning, 88-34P**. Mr. Lovelady stated at the time staff recommendations were being put together it was the understanding that preliminary funding had been approved by the Forest Service to finance the planning, so it was not recommended at this time.

Mr. Wilder reported on the philosophy of the NOVA program for the benefit of the new members on the Committee. Directions have been given to the staff in the NOVA program from the Committee, and staff has been following those directions through this funding session. Mr. Tveten commented on the criteria adopted by the Committee some time ago. Mr. Lovelady referred to a chart outlining definitions of NHR's and explained each step. Mr. Tveten commented on the Keystone Spit project and stated he agreed with staff not to fund the project at this time.

At this point, staff distributed to the Committee members NOVA Manual #2 - NOVA Program, Nonhighway Road Projects, which gave general information on the objectives of the program, the funding overview, eligibility, types of projects, and eligibility criteria/project evaluation criteria.

Ms. Cox asked for specific details on the **City of Leavenworth's** project. Questions were referred to **Michael Cecka, City Administrator, City of Leavenworth**. There followed a discussion about the City's project, whether it could be termed a non-highway road project, how it fitted in with the projects already funded in the City, and length of the road in the project. Mr. Biles noted that one of the major mandates in these types of projects was to encourage projects in remote back country areas. He did not consider this a remote area.

**Loren McGovern, NOVA Advisory Committee member**, stated there was more to the project than this consideration. NOVA made its decision because it felt the project did not meet the intent -- that of back country experience with funds coming from nonhighway road use. He did not see any off-road use which would generate funds for the project. Even some of the skiing will take place on a golf course, within the City. The NOVA Advisory Committee did not want to set a precedent whereby other cities could come in for like funds which actually were to help develop a city park. **Ms. Ittner** noted there was some feeling on the NOVA Advisory Committee that the project did meet the backcountry skiing requirements.

Ms. Lorenz referred to the ski grooming projects of the **State Parks and Recreation Commission**, stating she felt a kinship with the volunteers who had given so much of their time and effort to ensure cross-country skiing opportunities. She felt the projects should be funded. She referred to TABLE IIC - NOVA Advisory Committee 1988 NOVA Project Recommendations, and the fact that if these projects were funded there is sufficient monies to fund them. She objected to the fact that the IAC staff recommended nothing for the ski grooming projects. Following discussion, Dr. Scull agreed with the need to fund the ski grooming projects. He suggested that \$155,000 be allocated to those projects. He also recommended the Leavenworth project receive funding since that project would benefit a great many people. He suggested scaling back the Long Beach project and not recommending the funding of the USF&W Turnbull NWR, Interpretive Facility project. These monies could be used in the grooming projects.

Mr. Biles asked that some of the NOVA Advisory Committee members speak to the situation, as well as staff and the sponsors of the projects. Ms. Lorenz wanted to be fair, but at the same time give the Committee the prerogative of shifting the projects around where it felt there was greater need. Ms. Fenton observed

there were two differences of opinion: The NOVA Advisory Committee stating the projects should be backcountry; staff looking at the criteria as set by the Committee previously. She suggested the staff and the NOVA Advisory Committee need to have Committee advice on this matter. At this point, Mr. Tveten read the criteria as approved by the Committee November 7, 1986, APPENDIX #4 to the minutes:

"Intent: It is the intent of the IAC that Nonhighway Road Programs benefit the recreational users of nonhighway roads and encourage cooperation among recreationists.

"Projects must be accessible by a nonhighway road and can be classified as: DAY-USE AREAS, CAMPGROUNDS, TRAIL HEADS, TRAILS, HORSE CAMPS....."

He suggested staff and NOVA look at the criteria presently being used by staff and come up with recommended changes. **Mr. Loren McGovern** questioned the ranking system also, stating it was important that NOVA ranking received priority. Ms. Flemm assured him this had been taken into consideration and that the projects were in the same ranking order as determined by NOVA. Mr. McGovern felt it was important that the Committee realize the hours devoted to evaluation of projects and their ultimate ranking. However, he further stated the point system as established did not meet the intent of the nonhighway road projects. He remarked that he was surprised that the snow grooming problem was not being taken care of through funds other than the IAC. Lastly, he stated nowhere does it state the IAC must spend all of its funds at a session. The NOVA Advisory Committee felt there were certain projects being recommended by staff which do not meet the criteria NOVA feels is necessary.

Mr. Dovel stated he respected NOVA's judgment, but that the members of NOVA had directed staff to come up with a numerical ranking system which would allow decision-making on a good level. The numerical ranking essentially represents what staff tried to recommend to the Committee. Virtually 90% of staff's recommendations are of a rural nature. He pointed out the need for certain of the projects for the various recreational activities. He noted that Leavenworth did have the right set of circumstances to be eligible for funding. The intent of staff, he said, was only to support those projects which were technically eligible and to follow the numerical ranking.

Mr. Page asked why the **USFS, Wenatchee, Tumwater Mountain Plan, 88-34P**, was not being recommended by staff. Mr. Dovel replied the Forest Service had identified funding for that project and so it was removed from the recommendations. **Mr. Joe Higgins, USDA, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon**, replied this was no longer the case; though it had been placed in the Forest Service budget, it did not receive favorable action upon budget review. Mr. Eychaner stated he had consulted with the Forest Service and learned they are re-evaluating their priorities and the project might possibly be funded. **Ms. Ittner** felt the point system had been tried out and now was the time to re-evaluate it and perhaps come up with something better.

**Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General**, referred to the fact that the statute setting up the nonhighway and off-road vehicle funding program (RCW 46.09) did not limit funding to "backcountry" or any other kind of experience. The authority gives the Committee a wide range of projects to consider. Ms. Cox felt it was going to be necessary to more closely define the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program. She felt there were some projects which

should come under the Traditional Local Agencies' Funding Program, rather than making application for NOVA funds. Ms. Ittner felt the fact that there was no traditional funding for this session influenced the City of Leavenworth to apply for NOVA monies.

Mr. Tveten suggested staff be directed to look into the entire funding program of the nonhighway and off-road vehicle projects, and come back to the Committee in March with some direction. Mr. Wilder stated staff had been instructed by the Committee to come up with the criteria as used at this session, and if the members would now like to have that criteria re-evaluated, staff will do so. Mr. Fairleigh agreed with Mr. Wilder, noting that there had been an Evaluation System in the Traditional Funding Program for the past twenty-four years; it had been refined from time to time and is considered to be an excellent program.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the sponsors be given the opportunity to respond to their project recommendations:

**NOVA SPONSOR COMMENTS:**

**Joan Ziegltrum, USDA Forest Service, Resource Assistant, Chelan:  
(USFS, Wenatchee, Chelan, NHR-36P, Lake Chelan Cross-country Trails)**

Wanted to ensure that the Committee was aware the snowmobilers were in favor of the project.

**Mr. Ron Loewen, Public Works Director/County Engineer:  
(San Juan County, Old Military Road, 88-42P)**

Felt this was a viable project and should receive funding consideration.

Mr. Biles noted the staff only recommended \$25,000 of the \$75,000 request, and asked what would be in the project at that amount. Mr. Loewen replied the County will reduce the scope as asked. This would cover a feasibility study and plans to purchase the property. This gives the opportunity to consult with property owners, etc.

**Mr. Keith Rowland, USFS - Okanogan National Forest, Resource Assistant:  
(USFS, Okanogan, Twisp, Loup Loup Recreational Area, 88-43P)**

Area has lots of opportunities for cross-country skiing, camping, scenic views, snowmobiling, etc.

Number of letters received by Committee members support this project  
School districts are in support of it.

**Mr. Kurt Danison, Director, Okanogan Valley Nordic Ski Association:  
(Loup Loup Project - above)**

Highest elevation, provides excellent snow for skiing and recreation.  
Interested in the grooming projects; should be funded if possible.

Also interested in the **Skykomish River Access Project** of State Parks,  
as is a heavily used area.

It is very important that local snow equipment be provided to maintain trails.

**Jan Hollenbeek, USFS, Recreation Forester:  
(USFS Baker-Snoqualmie, Darrington, Mt. Pilchuck Trails, 88-46P)**

Eventually will provide tie-in to DNR trails, Forest Service lands,  
and has benefits to recreating public.

**Ms. Susan Anderson, Director, Washington Trails Association:**

**(Comments re USFS Pilchuck, Tiger, and Squak Mtn. projects)**

Designated by WTA in conjunction with the State Centennial Commission to work with the State's twenty-five Centennial trails so that they will have historic interest.

Both Pilchuck and Tiger mountain trails are heavily used.

Also in support of the Squak Mountain project.

**Mr. David Goeke, Refuge Manager, U . S. Fish and Wildlife Service:**

**(USFWS four projects)**

Appreciate consideration of the Committee of the four Fish and Wildlife Service projects.

Available for questions if any.

In response to Mr. Biles, Mr. Lovelady gave the priority listings for the four projects: Interpretive Trail #1; Soda Lake campground #2; Interpretive Facility (Turnbull) #3; and Black Lake Bridge #4.

He was also asked for the priorities for the State Parks' projects: Iron Horse #1; Squak Mtn. #2; Keystone Spit #3; Cabin Creek #4; Skykomish River #5; I-90 Corridor #6; Mt. Spokane #7, and Lake Wenatchee #8.

Ms. Cox asked why Keystone Spit was rated #3 and yet not being recommended by State Parks. Mr. Tveten explained it is a questionable project for receipt of funds from the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program, but it is a high priority of State Parks. Ms. Cox said she did not want to be a party to evaluating the projects at this point in time. Mr. Biles stated he was interested in this facet of the overall staff funding recommendations and he felt it was necessary information. He said if no one else was interested, he would defer the matter. Staff was asked to provide this information to Mr. Biles and Mr. Page, who had also expressed interest.

**Ms. Susan Saul, USFW, Outdoor Recreation Planner:**

**(USFS Turnbull, Interpretive Facility, 88-53D)**

Project received a high ranking using the objective criteria as established.

Is a rural project; not urban such as Leavenworth and Long Beach.

Is unique as it offers access for wildlife observation.

The interpretive facility would be a trail head for hiking trails in the summer and ski trails in the winter.

IAC funding reduces the amount requested. NOVA Advisory Committee thought the facility cost too much.

Feel good facilities can still be provided with the reduced figure.

Urged Committee's acceptance of \$76,200 recommended funding.

In response to Mr. Biles, Ms. Saul stated the recommended funding would provide the kiosk at the entrance and ten interpretive panels. **Mr. McGovern** stated NOVA did not consider it a backcountry experience in the true sense since visitors drive to the site and park. He felt other funds could be used in this project.

**Michael Cecka, City Administrator, City of Leavenworth:**

**(City of Leavenworth, Waterfront Park, 88-54D)**

Apologized for project being the subject of controversy.

Backcountry "theme" did not come up in discussions with staff on the project.

Felt project was well-qualified and eligible for nonhighway funding. Leavenworth has within its area many backcountry experiences - especially for recreationists. It is very much of a nature area. Trails travel from town to hilly areas. Planning has been done; no planning dollars in the request for funding. Other funding sources have been pursued. Read dollar figures of one-third total cost from other sources. Would be a year-round project; there is access for fishing as well as whitewater river rafting, walking for pleasure, and other seasonal recreational activities. Urged Committee fund the project. Felt the criteria system would always be in a state of flux, but can be revised when necessary. Could reduce request by \$17,600; staff so advised.

**Glenn Eades, Cross-country Skier, Redmond, Washington:  
(Trail Grooming Projects - State Parks)**

Involved in cross-country skiing for past ten years, and member of the Sno Park Committee. Heavy use of I-90 Corridor; in some instances must turn people away as there is no room. Referenced the Sno Park Permit Program, and how it has helped in the grooming problem. However, need dollars for good equipment to continue providing this recreation.

Mr. Biles asked if the projects would be eligible for Sno Park funds and was advised they were eligible, but the funds are not sufficient in that program to provide for the needed, expensive equipment. Mr. Biles stated he had two items which he found a bit difficult: (1) NOVA and staff have disagreements in certain of the projects; they did agree not to fund the three grooming projects. What was the logic? (2) The criteria the Committee approved for the nonhighway program stipulated certain projects were eligible. How did these fit into that criteria?

**Joe Higgins, NOVA Committee member (USFS, Portland Oregon)**, agreed it was NOVA's contention that the three projects did not fit into the categories. They were in his judgment M&O projects. Mr. Lovelady noted that staff had felt the projects were ranked low by NOVA and the priorities placed on the projects by State Parks was taken into consideration. Mr. Page felt the Committee should be rewarding the people involved in these types of projects. They may not fit into the categories, but they are essential to that type of recreation. The IAC Committee should be promoting and commending the projects. He supported all three grooming projects. **Mr. McGovern** said it should not be necessary to reward anyone for what has been a necessity for some time. He felt the projects were strictly M&O. Mr. Page felt because it was a project keenly desired by many users, it should be considered and funded.

**Mr. Higgins** pointed out that the tracks are there for skiers; they are used over and over, and it is really not necessary to keep them groomed. Without any groomed trails at all, he said he had cross-country skied for many years.

Mr. Tveten asked the Forest Service if in the seven or eight projects which included planning would the Service be using its staff or would they be using consultants. He was informed planning work would be under contract.

**Victor Woo, Seattle President of Kongsbergen Ski Club:  
(State Parks' cross-Country Ski Grooming Projects)**

Supported the three grooming projects. The past thirty-four years

the ski club has been assisting in maintaining the ski trails.  
5,000 to 7,000 manhours per year is being expended just to maintain some of these trails.  
Have received some funds from the Sno Park Program, but insufficient amount to do a good job.  
Costs are rising and it is becoming more and more difficult to maintain the trails.

**Carl Miller, Sno Park Advisory Committee, Inland Empire Nordic Club, Area 3:  
(I-90, Mt. Spokane, Lake Wenatchee Trail, Grooming Programs)**

Try to use Sno Park Funds throughout the state.  
Quality of trails attracts more use.  
Can't keep up the program of grooming unless good equipment is obtained.

**Nabiel Shawa, City Administrator, City of Long Beach:  
(City of Long Beach, Ocean Beach Boardwalk, 88-61D)**

Thank the staff and Committee for considering the project.  
Did not anticipate any controversy being generated by this project.  
Worked on this project for 2 and a half years -- well organized and planning is in place.  
If Committee will be introducing more criteria, this needs to be further discussed with those applying for funds.  
Project will meet needs of the handicapped.

**Ruth Ittner, NOVA Committee member, Pedestrian Representative:**

Speaking to all projects, felt the discussion indicated the need to having recreation close to home as well as in backcountry areas.  
There is a need for a source of funds to assist this category of projects.  
Information presented at this meeting has brought out several matters which need to be clarified and defined.

**Ira Spring, Edmonds, Washington citizen:**

Spoke in regard to all of the projects as presented.  
Grants are being given from a fund created through driving off of the highways in the state; therefore, money should be spent on those areas only.  
Referred to his letter of October 24, 1988, directed to all Committee members which indicated his opinions in regard to the criteria needed and which included statistics on various aspects of the nonhighway and off-road vehicle fund use.  
Suggested perhaps a fee of \$15.00 to help pay for the grooming equipment.  
Charge a permit per person instead of per car.

Ms. Cox thanked Mr. Spring for his letter and his input. She acknowledged his thought and work on the philosophical evaluation he had submitted to the Committee. Mr. Biles mentioned that Mr. Spring was recommending the **Iron Horse** project and **Squak Mountain**. Mr. Tveten explained the reasoning for placing the Iron Horse project as #1 priority. Management problems evolve because there is no provision for litter control, sanitary facilities, etc. There is a need for parking and loading ramps as well. State Parks has been working with adjacent property owners and must indicate to them that the site will be properly managed.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT TABLE IIC OF THE NOVA ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS BE ADOPTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

88-54D	CITY OF LEAVENWORTH, WATERFRONT PARK	\$ 132,375
88-61D	CITY OF LONG BEACH, OCEAN BEACH BOARDWALK	41,000
	STATE PARKS PROJECTS 88-62D, 88-63D, & 88-64D SNOW GROOMING PROJECTS	155,000

DELETE IN ADDITION TO THOSE REMAINING DELETED:

88-34P	USFS TUMWATER MTN. PLAN	( \$ 49,905)
88-41P	USFS WENATCHEE MJB TRAILHEAD	( 3,824)
88-35P	USFS RAVENSROOST TRAILHEAD	( 5,028)
88-65E	USFS BKR/SNOQUALMIE HIKER EDUCATION	( 14,860)
88-40P	USFS WENATCHEE BUMPING LAKE	( 9,500)

Discussion followed. **Nabiel Shawa, City of Long Beach**, said the \$41,000 would not help the **Ocean Beach Boardwalk Project**. At least \$125,000 would be required. At this point the Chair called for a ten minute recess.

The meeting reconvened at 4:03 P.M.

MS. LORENZ AMENDED THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

88-54D	CITY OF LEAVENWORTH, WATERFRONT PARK	\$ 122,375
88-61D	CITY OF LONG BEACH, OCEAN BEACH BOARDWALK	80,513
	STATE PARKS PROJECTS 88-62D, 88-63D, & 88-64D SNOW GROOMING PROJECTS	140,000

DELETE THE SAME DELETIONS AS ABOVE LISTED

Mr. Page said he was concerned about the **USFS, Tumwater Mtn. Plan 88-34P**. It was the first priority of the USFS and the NOVA Advisory Committee had wanted it to be included. He felt the Forest Service had been asked to drop quite a few of their projects and this one should be considered. Ms. Lorenz suggested he then make his own adjustments and arrive at the total figure required for the funding. Ms. Lorenz said she had reviewed the projects with a view toward funding the Long Beach, Leavenworth and Snow Grooming Projects, that if changes were to be made, the monies would have to be found elsewhere. **Ms Ittner** said she was mainly interested in seeing that the dollars go for projects which will be carried out. Mr. Tveten felt the Forest Service should indicate commitment to their projects and fund the planning for them themselves. The Committee ought to concentrate on acquisition of land and development of facilities. Dr. Scull agreed with Mr. Tveten's comments. Projects should be funded where there is a lot of recreational activity and where the need is great.

Ms. Cox said she looked at the population base in the state and liked to see the monies dispersed in various areas. Mr. Biles asked if it would be possible to get snow grooming machines at \$140,000 as proposed by Ms. Lorenz. Mr. Tveten stated his department will try to secure them at that price, but if he is unsuccessful he will come back to the Committee. Probably two machines will be purchased rather than three. Ms. Cox felt the snow grooming projects were very important and she did not want them to be lost. She mentioned a letter she had received from **Joe C. Jones, Committee member**, who had been unable to attend the meeting due to an out-of-state seminar conflict. In his letter he had suggested overriding the NOVA Advisory Committee's decision to deny funding on the Trail Grooming projects, and had asked that she so advise the

Committee members. Ms. Fenton pointed out there is a system in place for cross-country skiing activities and there should be some adjustments made to the projects in order to assist this group of recreationists. She agreed with Mr. Tveten in reducing the scope of the projects and at least getting them on the ground with some assistance. Mr. Fairleigh reminded the Committee it was possible to request cost increases in projects, that the Director had the authority from the Committee to approve cost increases up to 10%; those exceeding that are brought back to the Committee for review and decision.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. **Mr. McGovern** said it was evident the Committee was funding the three grooming projects by "throwing out" others. He did not feel it was a good way in which to handle the matter, and suggested the Committee cut some of the others down to provide funding for the Forest Service projects also.

Ms. Cox pointed out that the sponsor had stated it would be possible to wait on the projects and get the trailheads before the Committee at another time. Mr. McGovern was unaware the sponsor had made this statement.

Mr. Tveten again raised the question of the Challenge Grants available to the Forest Service. Why could not some of that money be placed into their projects? The reply was there would not be nearly as much money coming into that program as had been anticipated. There is \$2.3 million available for general distribution this year, but the trailhead and trails work exceeds that amount.

**Ms. Ittner** was pleased with the Committee's funding decision and thought it should continue the motion process.

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

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE MAIN MOTION TO FUND THE PROJECTS AS INDICATED ON PAGE 53 OF THESE MINUTES.

The Forest Service asked that its **MJB Trailhead Project, USFS Wenatchee, 88-41P**, be funded rather than the **Goat Creek Trailhead Project, 88-38P**.

With this understanding the Committee considered the following motion:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED THE NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS AS PRESENTED BY NOVA AND THE STAFF OF THE IAC, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE HAS APPROVED FUNDING OF THE NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 53 OF THESE MINUTES,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY 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 53 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

1988 NOVA Projects as Approved  
by the Interagency Committee November 4, 1988  
**NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS**

Project Name	Sponsor	IAC \$	Sponsor \$	Total
Tiger Mtn. Trails	DNR	\$ 67,995	\$ 35,000	\$ 102,995
Clear Lake Access	USFS Wenatchee	12,713	680	13,393
Waterfront Park	Leavenworth, City of	122,375	323,373	445,748
Loup Loup Rec. Area	USFS Okanogan	37,200	49,500	86,700
Soda Lake Campground	USFWS Columbia	22,340	7,856	30,196
Thunder Basin Ph. 2	NPS, N. Cascades	30,200	5,000	35,200
Falls Nature Trail	NPS, Kettle Falls	9,700	1,319	11,019
Ocean Beach Boardwalk	Long Beach, City of	80,513	239,733	320,246
Squak Mtn. Devel.	State Parks	90,700	0	90,700
MJB Trailhead	USFS Wenatchee	3,824	300	4,124
Interpret. Trail	USFWS Columbia	17,200	5,039	22,239
Black Lake Bridge	USFWS Columbia	10,740	2,225	12,965
McAlester Creek Trl.	NPS N. Cascades	13,200	3,000	16,200
Lake Chelan x/c Ski	USFS Wenatchee	20,000	11,700	31,700
Mt. Pilchuck Trails	USFS Baker/Snoq.	8,000	0	8,000
Rattlesnake Trlhd.	USFS Wenatchee	3,824	300	4,124
Cabin Creek Facil.	State Parks	10,000	2,000	12,000
3 Ski Grooming Proj.	State Parks	140,000	0	140,000
I-90 x/c Ski Dev.				
Mt. Spokane x/c Dev.				
Lake Wenatchee x/c				
Iron Horse, Easton	State Parks	79,600	0	79,600
Skykomish River	State Parks	24,600	0	24,600
Old Military Road	San Juan County	25,000	0	25,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 829,724</b>	<b>\$ 687,025</b>	<b>\$ 1,516,749</b>

Mr. Biles reiterated the need to have criteria on which to judge the projects so that sponsors, staff and the IAC could know the logic in funding the various categories in the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program. He wanted to see the clarification of this matter at the next IAC meeting (March, 1989). He suggested a sub-committee be appointed to work with the staff. Mr. Tveten agreed with Mr. Biles' proposal. His personal opinion was that in the future, with limited amount of dollars coming into the program, the planning process funding should be taken out of the process. Agencies should do their own planning. Ms. Cox said she would like to see the Committee not accept projects in the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program which could be adequately funded in the Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program. She felt there had been projects in the funding just approved which had belonged in the traditional funding program. She also wanted to be able to consider funding of winter recreational projects. Mr. Tveten suggested projects be limited to \$5,000, thus alleviating paperwork on smaller projects. Mr. Biles said clarification is needed on the term "back country". How should that be defined? Both Ms. Lorenz and Ms. Fenton agreed there needed to be further clarification on the criteria.

Ms. Fenton noted that the local projects funded with NOVA funds did not belong in the program, but they did meet the criteria as set by the Committee and staff some time ago. Staff may need to come back with recommendations as to how these projects should be separated.

**Mr. McGovern** stated there was no doubt that the funds were coming from nonhighway use, yet had been placed in areas where they probably should not have been.

Mr. Dovel said it was very difficult to answer questions about the amount of gasoline consumed on the highway and off the highway. There is a fine line to determine this. One percent of the dollars come from nonhighway use.

**Mr. Joe Higgins** felt it would be a serious mistake to eliminate planning entirely from the projects. The Committee should first find out the impact of that step on the total program.

There was no motion to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 4:35 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE:

3-23-1989

Anne B. Cox

CHAIR ANNE COX, Chair

## APPENDICES

NOTE: Only Appendix "D", FUNDING CYCLES  
is included in these minutes.

Appendices "A", "B", "C", and "E" are  
included with Official Minutes only.

If you desire a copy, please contact the IAC  
206-753-7140.

APPENDIX "D"

ADOPTED FUNDING CYCLES IAC

November 3-4, 1988

NOVEMBER FUNDING CYCLE:

- APRIL 1 - NOVA PROJECT SPONSORS CONTACT DEPT. OF WILDLIFE  
TO BEGIN WILDLIFE REVIEW PROCESS
- APRIL - IAC STAFF WORKSHOPS - STATEWIDE
- MAY 1 - LETTER OF INTENT DUE
- JULY 1 - ALL APPLICATIONS DUE
- NOVEMBER - FUNDING SESSION (Traditional GIA; Nonhighway,  
ORV Capital, and Planning Projects)

MARCH FUNDING CYCLE:

- NOVEMBER 1 - LETTER OF INTENT DUE
- DEC. 1 - APPLICATIONS DUE
- MARCH 1990 - FUNDING SESSION (ORV Education/Enforcement and NOVA  
Maintenance and Operation Projects)