

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SPECIAL MEETING

DATE: March 23, 1989 **PLACE:** Tye Motor Inn, Coho Annex, Tumwater,
TIME: 9:00 a.m. Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation Commission
Dr. Eliot Scull, Wenatchee George Volker, Alternate Designee, Dept. of Wildlife
Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver Stan Biles, Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ralph Mackey, Everett
Joe C. Jones, Seattle

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT

Carol Felton, Department of Fisheries

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: Chair Anne Cox called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., with the following quorum present: COX, SCULL, LORENZ, MACKEY, JONES, TVETEN, BILES, VOLKER.

The Chair welcomed the attendees and asked for individual introductions. (Jeff Lane was present representing the Attorney General's Office.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3-4, 1988: DR. SCULL MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3-4, 1988, INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA - MARCH 23, 1989: There were no additions or deletions to the March 23, 1989 agenda. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE MARCH 23, 1989, MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Wilder announced that **Ruth Ittner**, member of the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Advisory (NOVA) Committee, had been awarded the Governor's Volunteer Services Award.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "Director's Report - March 1989", reporting as follows:

1. **HERITAGE TRUST BILL (HR 876 - COMPANION S 370):** Explained the purpose of the bill, to create permanent trust accounts for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF). Both bills are receiving considerable support from many Congressional members, with the State of Washington's delegation in support as co-sponsors (Miller, McDermott, Chandler, Adams, Dicks, Gorton, Morrison) and as yet undeclared co-sponsors but in support of the bill - Foley, Unsoeld, and Swift.

2. **SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8005:** SJM 8005 memorializes Congress to implement a trust fund program, similar to that being proposed in the American Heritage Trust Fund proposal. It had passed the Senate.

3. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, HB 1354 AND SSB 5324:

These two bills would continue the IAC's responsibilities and programs. Each has passed its house of origin and is now in the opposite house for action. Committee members were urged to continue their support of the bills.

4. Work of the IAC challenges staff each day. Mention was made of:

- . Planning need - growing every day and holding a key to the future.
- . Funds for other than NOVA and boating facilities are meager.
- . Conversions on projects are growing in number and complexity.
- . Obligation and expenditure rates need full cooperation from the state and local clientele.
- . Considerable legislation concerning the IAC at this Session.
- . Federal legislation is promising, requiring continual efforts.
- . Funding efforts to project sponsors is high priority.
- . Program evolutions are growing (NOVA, NHR).
- . Provision of financial and planning assistance to state, local, and federal agencies (NOVA) needs to continue.

5. Attention was called to: Prairie Fire Update, re HB 4127 and S 2199 - (bills were reintroduced as HR 876 and S 370 in this Congressional Session), "Partners in Progress" poem, and Interest-Support Listing attached to the memorandum.

II. B. MANAGEMENT SERVICES - FUND SUMMARIES: Mr. Ray Baker, Financial Manager, referred to Fund Summary dated as of March 14, 1989. He explained the short-fall in Federal monies for the State agencies. The report includes 1989 Federal Fiscal Year apportionment of \$334,526. Project contracts are not signed unless funds are available. There are monies on the federal side waiting to be approved which are as yet uncommitted to contracts. Local agencies have a positive balance of Federal funds in the amount of \$28,907. Initiative 215 negative balance is a normal occurrence at this time. February receipts not indicated on the Fund Summary will "erase" this deficit.

Mr. Biles referred to the \$193,900 pending 215 balance for the Department of Natural Resources, stating he felt it should be less due to a contract having been signed recently. Mr. Baker acknowledged that the RFK Marine project contract had been recently signed and this had not as yet been taken into consideration since the fund summary had been sent out prior to the action.

In response to Mr. Mackey, Mr. Baker reported that all of Referenda 11, 18 and 28 monies had been committed. It was possible to commit these funds over a period of time; however, new laws now require monies from sale of bond issues to be totally committed within six months. It is difficult for local agencies to meet that time limit. Mr. Baker mentioned the Governor's Bond Bill SB 5462 which calls for HJR (IAC) monies totaling \$3,230,000 to be funded through the 057 State Building Construction Account. Mr. Ogden explained that this money is already committed to projects and is a reappropriation. Mr. Mackey then asked if all the Referenda monies were at "0" balance. Mr. Baker replied there were still a few projects using up the Referendum 28 monies.

Mr. Tveten asked if there was any possibility of receiving additional Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) monies as in the past. Mr. Baker reported additional monies had been received (approximately \$60,000) because the State of Washington

had proven its ability to make use of it in certain projects. However, nothing has been heard as to future additional funds. Mr. Wilder commented there had been a reapportionment of LWCF funds to Washington State (approximately \$8,700), due to projects "closing short". He cited the problem of getting those projects with federal funds in them under contract as quickly as possible. NPS has pointed out that the obligation and expenditure rates for the state have worked against it. He said staff would be working with state agencies to expedite the process. Ms. Cox asked if this could be addressed in the point system, and Mr. Wilder replied this could be included as "readiness to proceed". Mr. Fairleigh pointed out there had been this type of category at one time, but it had been dropped simply because it was not practical. Some projects become involved in obtaining permits (Corps of Engineers, Shorelines, etc.) which require considerable time. The National Park Service will not accept a project until required permits have been obtained; otherwise, the federal monies would remain uncommitted while permits and other matters were being worked out. Ms. Cox asked that if the Committee could assist in any "redtape" matters, or consider bonus points for certain requirements, that staff bring these to her attention for Committee consideration.

Mr. Tveten commented on the Fudge Point Acquisition project in the amount of \$247,460. Mr. Baker stated it was his understanding that this project would not be continued, but was awaiting official notice prior to removing it from the listing.

Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Fund Summary: Mr. Baker referred to the NOVA Fund Summary dated March 13, 1989, stating there were no outstanding matters to be brought to the Committee's attention. Balance in the fund currently is \$983,879.10, which is normal for this time.

On conclusion of the fund summaries reports, Mr. Mackey asked if there would be a parks and recreation bond issue. Mr. Wilder replied nothing at this session, but there would be a viable bond issue in 1990. Details were not available at the present time.

Introductions: Mr. Wilder introduced the following:

Jim Sheler, City of Lacey Parks and Recreation Director, who is working with the Washington Parks and Recreation Association (WRPA) on a bond issue proposal.

Carol Jensen, volunteer on the NOVA Committee, who had just received the Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive Association's Kathy Sterner Award.

II. C. PROJECT SERVICES STATUS REPORT: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Chief, Project Services, referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 23, 1989, "Project Services Division Report", citing the following:

1. Currently 54 local agencies projects and 21 local agencies aquatic lands projects are in various stages of completion. All are proceeding without serious difficulty.
2. Workshops to be held in Everett, Olympia, Longview, Yakima, Spokane, and Chelan in March, 1989:

Westside of the State: March 29, Walter Hall Park, Everett
March 30, Capital Mall Community Room, Olympia
March 31, Longview City Hall Council Chamber, Longview

Eastside of the State: March 29, Yakima County Youth Activities Park, Yakima
March 30, Manito Park, Manito Club Meeting Room, Spokane
March 31, City Golf Course Club House, Chelan

3. Application workshops to be held May 10, Moses Lake and May 11, Kirkland.
 4. Letters of Intent due May 1, 1989; all project applications due July 3, 1989.
 5. November 2-3, 1989, staff will bring to the committee several projects in each category: Traditional grant-in-aid, NOVA, and Initiative 215 (boating). There is considerable interest on the part of local agencies for funding.
 6. As discussed earlier, staff continues to emphasize working with both state and local sponsors to improve rate of obligation and expenditure of the LWCF monies allotted to the State of Washington. It is anticipated the difficulties will be resolved shortly with completion of agreements and contracts on three very large projects.
 7. State Agencies: Staff at present is working with 69 state agencies outdoor recreation projects and 11 aquatic lands projects.
 8. Listing of 1989 Grant Program Schedule was included for review. Committee members were invited to attend any or all of the forthcoming workshops, application workshops, TAC meetings, or evaluation meetings as listed on the attachment.
2. Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program Report: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff concerning the NOVA Program Report, dated March 23, 1989, noting the following:

1. Internal transfer of primary responsibility for the NOVA grant program from Planning Services to Projects Services is progressing satisfactorily. Planning Services will assume greater responsibility for action planning and related special studies and will continue to handle statewide planning and projects involving comprehensive planning. The Projects Services Division will handle all projects involving: Education/Enforcement, Management, Maintenance, Acquisition and Development.
2. 103 NOVA projects are currently being monitored. Of the 51 NOVA projects approved at the November 1988 IAC meeting, fifty are now under contract.
3. **Education/Enforcement:** A one day meeting (January 11, 1989) was held in Ellensburg with Education/Enforcement Program project sponsors to better familiarize sponsors with basic information and some of the difficult issues in the E/E program.
4. **Forest Service & National Park Service Meetings:** Similar meetings are to be held in the future with the Forest Service and NPS to accomplish the same goals of better understanding and identification of issues needing consideration.
5. **IAC Subcommittee Education/Enforcement Program:** Staff proposes to set up a subcommittee to review the E/E Program and draft program rules and project

review/evaluation criteria. Committee will be composed of 2 representatives each of ORV users, enforcement agencies, and education program "agencies".

6. **IAC Subcommittee Nonhighway Roads:** Report on this Committee's efforts follows as another agenda item.

Ms. Cox asked if the Committee members would like discussion or ratification of the proposed Subcommittee on Education/Enforcement Program. Mr. Biles suggested there be someone on the subcommittee other than one who had a vested interest in the respective programs. Ms. Cox then brought out the fact that it is difficult for people serving on committees to pay their expenses getting to and fro meeting places, as well as meet other expenses involved. Mr. Fairleigh stated there were a number of persons who had already expressed an interest in serving on the subcommittee and who do not appear to be influenced by the cost involved. Meetings could be held wherever convenient and agreed upon. Ms. Cox felt it was easy for the vested interest groups to send their people to a meeting, but the volunteers, such as Ms. Ruth Ittner, must meet all of their expenses themselves. Ms. Lorenz noted that the point of having the subcommittee was to enable a smaller group to review and discuss problems and come up with answers to be taken to the larger NOVA committee, and from there these would be brought to the Director and eventually the Committee. Ms. Cox said she was in favor of the subcommittee but wanted to ensure fairness for all. Mr. Wilder noted that meetings of various groups and advisory committees are held sometimes in the eastside of the state, sometimes in the westside, in order to aid those persons who travel. Dr. Scull said he would be in favor of the subcommittee since Mr. Fairleigh has stated there are persons willing to serve on it.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. MACKAY, THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT A NOVA SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENFORCEMENT/EDUCATION TO BE COMPOSED OF TWO REPRESENTATIVES EACH OF ORV USERS, ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, AND EDUCATION PROGRAM "AGENCIES".

Discussion followed. Mr. Jones shared Ms. Cox's concern about the expenses involved for volunteer persons, but felt since Mr. Fairleigh had persons interested, this was not a problem at the present time. Secondly, he asked for clarification of education and enforcement, since he felt there was an overlap from the functional standpoint. It was his feeling they work hand in hand. Mr. Fairleigh explained that (1) sheriffs' departments primarily are involved in enforcement, though some of the departments do have educational programs within them; (2) there are other education programs which require assistance to get the information out to the general public on safety, etc. Eastside counties claim the westside counties travel to their area (where the recreational opportunities are) for their recreation on ORV's, etc. The counties need enforcement monies to manage these areas; therefore, they feel they do not have the time to devote to educational programs, and the IAC should encourage the other counties to get into that field. The bulk of money in the E/E program goes for enforcement. Mr. Volker stated his department had also expressed some concern that the sub-committee would be made up of vested interests.

At this point, Mr. Tveten emphasized the prerogative of the NOVA Committee to do what it wants to do to obtain results, working through the IAC director. He felt it was not the IAC Committee's role to approve the subcommittee. This should be done by the Director of the IAC and the NOVA Committee itself. Mr. Fairleigh stated that the subcommittee would work with the director, staff, and NOVA on matters to be brought before the IAC Committee for official review.

Following further discussion, DR. SCULL WITHDREW HIS MOTION, MR. MACKEY WITHDREW THE SECOND TO THE MOTION. It was the consensus of the Committee that the NOVA Sub-Committee on Education/Enforcement Program be appointed by the Director with assistance of NOVA and staff.

II. D. PLANNING SERVICES STATUS REPORT: Mr. Greg Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff, "Planning Services Report", dated March 23, 1989, reporting as follows:

1. **Local Agencies Planning Assistance:** Eighty-nine (89) agencies have obtained planning eligibility for the IAC's Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program: 63 cities; 10 port districts, 4 special districts, 7 counties, 4 school districts, and one Indian Tribe.

Planning Services is actively working with six local agencies which have submitted Letters of Intent for the Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program, and thirty-three (33) other agencies in various stages of plan development. Another 70 agencies will be updating or developing their plans.

2. **Trails Directory:** Target date for distribution is Spring of 1989. The directory will include trail events planned in honor of the State's Centennial Celebration. The IAC has been working with the National Park Service since that agency is involved in a trails inventory. The IAC Directory had been postponed until such time as NPS was ready with their inventory.

3. **Washington State Trails Plan:** The National Park Service (NPS) approved \$27,975 (subject to availability of Federal funds) to assist in the development of a State Trails Plan as authorized in RCW 67.32.050. The tentative date for completion of the plan is December 1990.

Ms. Cox was very pleased with the fact that the state will be preparing a trails plan and asked that she be kept closely advised as to its status. Mr. Wilder commented on the trend regarding planning for trails, regional planning for recreation, forest planning, etc. A lot of good information will be coming out of these planning approaches which will be useful to the IAC, other state agencies, and interested people.

Mr. Mackey asked if there would be other agencies besides the 89 who have planning eligibility which might apply for grant-in-aid funding from the IAC. Mr. Lovelady replied this was not known at the present time, nor how many of the 89 would actually be applying for funding. However, he was aware there was a great deal of interest in making application.

4. **NOVA Project Amendments:** Two NOVA project extensions to December 31, 1989, were noted:

ORV-86-17P, Blue Lake Area Plan, Gifford Pinchot National Forest - to allow completion of a cost analysis and sign plan.

ORV-87-41E, ORV User Guide, Department of Natural Resources - extended in order to resolve production quality.

5. **Environment 2010:** Environment 2010 is an attempt to develop a systematic mechanism to assess the status of the Washington State environment: what are

the state's key resources, threats to them, and strategies for protecting them? The analytical phase of Environment 2010 is being underwritten by the Washington State Department of Ecology and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The final Environment 2010 report is expected to consist of three documents: A State of the Environment Report, a Preferred Futures Report, and an Action Plan. IAC is involved in the Preferred Futures and Action Plan.

6. Wetlands: Serving as a technical team to develop a methodology and criteria system re wetland sites are: IAC, Ecology, Natural Resources, Wildlife, Fisheries, and the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority. Ninety nomination questionnaires which sought information on sites worthy of preservation were returned. These sites under consideration come from the 12-county Puget Sound Trough Area and will address one of the two area types listed in the Washington Wetlands Priority Plan (December 1987). This area type (Upper Pacific Coast) includes the Puget Sound and adjacent wetlands. A listing of priority sites for wetlands preservation should be complete by April, 1990.

7. Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP):

IAC staff will continue its data collection, writing, and public review of the SCORP through this year and into early 1990. A public agencies' inventory collection is being completed and the IAC is also involved in an inventory of the private sector recreational facilities. A survey of issues and needs in recreation has been completed. Staff anticipates mailing the Seventh Edition of SCORP in February 1990 for final adoption consideration at its March 1990 meeting. An Action Plan covering the 1989-91 Biennium will also be submitted at this meeting.

Mr. Mackey asked if staff was working with the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority concerning the wetlands. Mr. Lovelady replied in the affirmative, stating that DNR and the Department of Ecology are also involved. Other agencies are: Wildlife and Fisheries. Mr. Biles was surprised at the number of agencies working on the wetlands aspect -- inventory, acquisition, management, etc. Besides state agencies he knew of the involvement of local agencies and the federal entities, as well. He was aware there was legislation pending concerning wetlands presently in the State Legislature (SHB 1392/cf SB 5378) and it was his hope that there would be a method of coordinating all of these efforts in order that everyone might have the same information and be going in the same direction. He suggested that the IAC might be able to play the role of coordinator as it has so successfully done in other instances. If there is not a coordinating agency, Mr. Biles felt there would then be several individual state agencies trying to satisfy their own directors and not looking at the overall picture. Mr. Mackey agreed, stating that he believed the citizens would want one agency coordinating the wetlands review. Mr. Tveten likewise agreed; however, he pointed out that all of the agencies have one thing in common - no funds with which to do the job. Mr. Mackey noted the wetlands bill (SHB 1392) was to a point of passing the Legislature, that it was almost too late to do any amending at this point.

Continued SCORP review: Mr. Lovelady reported on the National Park Service's granting of time extensions for submission of the wetlands update and the Action Plan for Washington State. The Action Plan responds to issues identified in SCORP. Due to the extensions, the new Action Plan will reflect the 1990 SCORP and be in effect for a longer period of time; and the updated Wetlands Priority Plan will need not be completed until later in 1990. The present plan (adopted November 1987) is acceptable for the April 1990 submission of SCORP.

The Chair called for a break at 10:15; the meeting reconvened at 10:25 a.m.

III OLD BUSINESS. A. PROJECT CHANGES:

1. **King County, Burke-Gilman/Sammamish River Trail, IAC #86-059A - Conversion:** Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "City of Bothell, 96th Avenue Widening Project King County, Burke-Gilman to Sammamish River "Final Link", IAC #86-059A. He explained that the King County Natural Resource and Parks Division had requested a conversion of a portion of its park land acquired in the Burke-Gilman Sammamish River Project. An approximate 3,230 square feet of land will be replaced by an approximate .98 acre site adjoining the City of Bothell's Blythe Park. Acquiring the property will permit access to the Burke-Gilman Trail System through Blythe Park and will extend King County's extensive Tolt River Trail System to the Bothell Community. The conversion is necessary in order to provide widening of 96th Avenue for betterment of traffic and safety in the area.

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

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE AND PARKS DIVISION ACQUIRED 0.57 ACRES OF PARK LAND IN KING COUNTY KNOWN AS THE CITIZENS SERVICE CORPORATION PROPERTY WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #86-059A), AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE AND PARKS DIVISION HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT APPROXIMATELY 3,230 SQUARE FEET OF THE CITIZENS SERVICE CORPORATION PARCEL FOR AN APPROXIMATE .98 ACRE SITE NEARBY ADJOINING THE CITY OF BOTHELL'S BLYTHE PARK AND THE KING COUNTY TOLT RIVER PIPELINE TRAIL, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE AND PARKS DIVISION PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND DOES MEET THE 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 HAS 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 REQUESTED IS APPROVED AS PROPOSED BY KING COUNTY REGARDING THE CITIZENS SERVICE CORPORATION PARCEL (IAC #86-059A) AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. NONHIGHWAY ROAD (NR) SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT - CRITERIA: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "NHR Subcommittee", reporting as follows:

1. The subcommittee appointed by the Chair in November 1988 was asked to review the Nonhighway Road (NHR) Grant Program and return to the March 1989 IAC meeting with recommendations concerning program rules and the project selection process.

2. **Matching Share:** Recommended that no mandatory matching share be required at this time for the NHR Grant Program.
3. **Winter Recreation:** Recommended that winter recreation projects remain eligible as part of the NHR Program, but **ONLY FOR PROJECT ELEMENTS NORMALLY DECLARED ELIGIBLE FOR NHR GRANT FUNDS.**
4. **Urban Projects:** Recommended that projects in urban/suburban areas **not** be made automatically ineligible solely on the basis of geographic location. Recommended that projects providing a back country experience be encouraged.
5. **Planning Projects:** Recommended that projects involving only planning or design be made ineligible for NHR funding. A limit of 10% of total construction cost was recommended as being the amount of reimbursable planning/design cost.
6. **Maintenance and Operation Projects:** Recommended that projects involving maintenance and operation, coordinators, education and enforcement, and equipment purchase be made **ineligible** for NHR grant funds.
7. **Project Selection Process:** Recommended a revised project review and evaluation process, similar to the Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program. Evaluation questions focus on project need, project benefits, and projects that meet NHR program direction and priority as established by the IAC Committee.
8. **NOVA Nonhighway Grant Manual** produced by staff and for review of the Committee at this meeting.
9. Thanked Stan Biles, Anne Cox, Ruth Ittner, Carol Jensen, and Cleve Pinnix for their service on the NHR Subcommittee.

Mr. Biles noted this had not been an easy process for the NHR Subcommittee. The recommendations before the Committee were adopted by the NHR Subcommittee in consensus. He recognized Ruth Ittner for her dedication of time and effort and also the IAC staff for their input. He mentioned there had been much discussion on the program and how it relates to backcountry experience. It is still possible to get a backcountry experience even though that location may be close to an urban area. He felt the monies should not be devoted to areas miles away from urban settings but to recognize there could be backcountry experience obtained near some of the cities. These projects should be encouraged. Though there are not many of these urban areas, it was the consensus of the committee that they be included.

Mr. Tveten mentioned the 1981 Legislative mandate that park and recreation areas be placed near urban areas since there is need for recreational outlets where people are congregated. He felt the NOVA legislation did not specify "backcountry experience" emphasis, so it is a policy decision of the agency and perhaps should be stressed in order to be consistent with the 1981 legislative mandate. He stated that his main interest was in item 3 "Winter Recreation". He felt there was nothing in the NOVA legislation which would prevent equipment from being purchased to better recreational areas for the people. He did not feel grooming equipment should be excluded.

Dr. Scull agreed with Mr. Biles' remarks concerning backcountry experience. The IAC ought to take advantage of providing these types of recreational facilities

where feasible. The concept of urban and sub-urban backcountry approaches are going to be more important as the state population grows. He felt it was crucial to provide funds for these projects. Ms. Cox commented on how some ski trails are impassable until equipment is moved in to clear them. She shared Mr. Tveten's concern that monies should be provided for snow grooming equipment.

At this point, Mr. Tveten acknowledged that the availability of funds in the program might have had something to do with the NHR discussions and the resulting recommendation for winter recreation, Item 3. Mr. Fairleigh agreed that as the program became more known to the eligible agencies, the demand would increase for the dollars. Mr. Biles stressed the need for monies to get projects on the ground -- to acquire, preserve, and develop sites, rather than focusing on planning and M&O.

Ms. Cox reminded the committee this could be further discussed at the time of review later on in the agenda of the NHR Grants Manual.

Mr. Tveten did not wish to belabor the point, but he wanted it understood that there would be some tremendous opportunities for recreation which could be opened up if funds could be made available for equipment.

III. C. NOVA Federal Agreement Recommendations: Memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "NOVA Program Federal Agreements", was referred to by Mr. Fairleigh. He noted this proposed action was being brought back to the Committee at its request for review and discussion. Staff recommended that the one year limitation on IAC approval of the NOVA Program agreements with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Park Service (NPS) be removed and that ongoing eligibility (subject to terms and conditions of the agreements) be approved for both agencies' participation in the NOVA program.

Ms. Cox commented some Committee members had felt the Federal entities should be using their federal dollars for projects. However, there is considerable federal land in the State of Washington available for recreational areas and facilities. Mr. Fairleigh pointed out that the legislation for the NOVA program does allow participation by federal agencies, following the usual review of applications and attendant procedures by the IAC staff, and the evaluation process. Dr. Scull stated he felt it was to the advantage of the IAC to fund federal projects because in the long run these areas will benefit the recreating public and will increase recreational opportunities. He said he was in favor of the two agencies participating through the two proposed agreements. DR. SCULL MOVED TO APPROVE THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDED MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. MACKAY.

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten wondered how many miles of trails were involved, and if the funds would be well used. Mr. Fairleigh said trails would be one element involved, but at this point projects are not completely defined. Mr. Tveten asked if the Committee would be creating an impossible situation for itself if it opened up federal funding as contemplated. Mr. Fairleigh reiterated the fact that the federal agencies are by law eligible under the program. The fact that the Forest Service has added monies to its budget for emphasis of trails and recreating places for the public was brought out by Mr. Tveten. Ms. Cox also felt that the federal agencies should be using their funds first for their own projects.

Mr. Fairleigh then noted that the program as set up would involve an evaluation process, and this would assure that only those projects deemed the best would be brought before the Committee for consideration. The Committee also has options

to fund or not fund a project and ensure that the monies are spent properly. Mr. Volker noted that Washington State is unique in its NOVA program; other states do not have this type of funding program and the federal agencies do their own funding of projects. Federal agencies may apply for assistance in the State of Washington.

Mr. Wilder mentioned the tremendous resource of possible recreational areas in the federal entities holdings. The two agreements would assist the IAC in locating these areas and increase its ability to propose for funding beneficial areas for the public.

Mr. Tveten agreed there was a resource "out there" and the IAC should take advantage of that resource. He said he did not take exception to the motion, but wanted it understood that the federal agencies do have funds available for their proposed projects. It was his opinion the IAC should send a message to the federal agencies that they are competing for the dollars.

Mr. Mackey shared Mr. Tveten's concern, but acknowledged that the federal agencies did have the lands for providing recreational opportunities. Ruth Ittner, NOVA member, stated that the same users who had lobbied and obtained the legislation for the NOVA funds are now lobbying to try to have those funds increased to be used for trails. Trails are available in the federal forests. Also, she said, there is federal legislation dealing with trail construction and trail maintenance -- two items in the federal budget -- which will help provide for recreational areas and facilities in Washington State and the other states. How the monies are allocated once they are received in Washington State is not known at this time. She felt there would need to be a priority system for the projects.

QUESTION ON THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS CALLED FOR:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IS DIRECTED AND AUTHORIZED BY CHAPTER 46.09 RCW TO OFFER AND ADMINISTER A PROGRAM OF RECREATIONAL NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) GRANTS, AND

WHEREAS, CHAPTER 46.09 RCW ALLOWS FEDERAL AGENCY PARTICIPATION IN THE NOVA GRANT PROGRAM; AND

WHEREAS, CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN THE NOVA GRANT PROGRAM BY THE NPS AND USFWS WILL PROVIDE INCREASED AND IMPROVED RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IAC APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ALLOWING THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE NOVA PROGRAM IS MADE WITHOUT RESERVATION EXCEPT FOR THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE AGREEMENTS NOW EXECUTED OR HEREAFTER AMENDED, BETWEEN THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III. THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK REPORT: Mr. Ron Taylor, Projects Manager, cited the following items for the Thurston County Sports Park:

1. The City of McCleary has entered into a contract with the IAC for removal of one-half of the lights and poles. The other half may

be purchased by the Olympia School District. The City of McCleary and the Olympia School District will work together toward removal of the poles in order to save expenses. Should the Olympia School District not wish to purchase the poles for some reason, there is the possibility that the City of McCleary may take the other half. Also the City of Kent has expressed interest should Olympia not purchase them.

2. The Thurston County Park and Recreation Department is contracting with a consulting firm to do design work on the track renovation at the Sports Park. A proposal for the project would then be submitted November 1989 for consideration at the IAC meeting.
3. Staff continues its work with the Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department on the debt problem at the Sports Park. Staff will review revenues and disbursements to ensure that all funds available are going towards payment of retiring the debt. There are additional revenues available to apply toward retirement of the debt.

Dr. Scull asked if there had been any feedback from some of the neighbors of the park. **Mr. Bill Willis, President of the ORV Impact Association, McCleary**, advised the Committee there had been no complaints from the neighbors of the park for the last couple of years.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. LEGISLATION:

Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "1989 Legislation - Status", noting the following:

1. Listing -- Sponsor-Monitor -- dated March 10, 1989, was included in kit material. This has since been updated, and a copy for March 23, 1989 was available at the meeting.
2. Cut-Off dates were reviewed. March 31 is last date for bills to pass out of committee in opposite house; April 14, pass opposite house (5:00 p.m.), and April 23, Regular Session will end, with possibility of Extraordinary Session if budget bills are not passed.
3. Bills of Interest included the budget bills: **SB 5352**, 1989-91 Operating Budget. ORA Account \$1,922,505, 18 FTEs.
SB 5521, 1989-91 Capital Budget - \$8.2 million and \$1.2 million carryforward. (Included is \$1.0 million 057 - State Building Construction Account - funds for grants.)

SB 5462 1989-91 Governor's Bond Bill - IAC - HJR \$3,230,000
In the present bill figure of \$3,135,000 was given; should have been \$3,230,000 and is being corrected through OFM which agency will recommend the change.

HB 1354 - IAC Continuation. Executive Request Bill. Will now go to floor of the Senate. Amended by Senate Environment and Natural Resource Committee to strike the provision that the director of the IAC be appointed by the Governor.

SSB 5324 - IAC Continuation. Executive Request Bill. Amended and sent to the House - Director to be appointed by the Committee. House may counter amend it, and call for Conference Committee. Even though there is disagreement about the director's appointment, there is agreement that the agency will survive.

HB 1498 & SB 5508 - Recreation Guide. Eliminate Cost Recovery. Both bills died. However, all bills in this Session will be alive next session and can be "picked up".

In response to Ms. Cox's questions, Mr. Wilder stated he was not upset with the fact that the Guide bills had died this session. This will not cause a hardship to the agency.

HB 1172 & SB 5404 - Natural Resource Conservation. Extends .06 real estate excise tax until 1993 to acquire conservation lands and appropriates funds.

Mr. Mackey commented on the House cut of the bill - deletion of the real estate excise tax. Mr. Biles replied that DNR is working with Ways and Means of the Senate to have the excise tax restored. Mr. Tveten asked even if the tax is not extended, the program would still be in place? Mr. Biles replied it would be; and there have been funds obtained from the source already to use, but now need to obtain the authority to expend that money.

SHB 1392 & SB 5378 - Wetlands Management Act of 1989 - Executive Request. Previously discussed.

SHB 1622 - Recreational boating law revisions. Funds for marine sewage pumpout stations. Funds appropriated to IAC for state/local government acquisition of boating sites. Boats under 16', no motor, exempt from registration.

SSB 5372 - Similar bill except boats 16 feet and under with up to 9.9 HP excluded from registration. IAC administers grant program.

Mr. Tveten explained the reasoning behind SSB 5372. In the boating program payment is made of one-half of one percent excise tax plus registration fees, but all of this money goes into the General Fund and is not being used in a fund for boating facilities purposes. At least part of that money should go back into the recreation element for boaters.

SHB 1291 - Scenic Rivers System. Adds additional streams to scenic legislation; acquisition to be done only with willing seller. (cf SB 5743)

SSB 5675 - Reuse of abandoned rail corridors.

HB 1564 - Marine Facility Fees - Public moorage facilities competing with private marinas to establish charges.

Senate Joint Resolution 8005 - Request dedicated fund source from Congress to provide funds for outdoor recreation grant program.

HB 1654 - Douglas Property Purchase - Goose Prairie. Public Memorial (cf SB 6042)

HB 1274 - Natural Resource Enforcement Office created 7-1-1990.

2SB 5697 - Heritage Commission - Centennial Plate Revenue 6-30-89 to Centennial Commission.

HB 1887 - State Trust Lands - Increases funds for transferring trust land to State Parks and Recreation Commission. Tax on lodging.

HB 1888 - State Trust Lands - same as above, but 10% excise tax on recreational vehicles into General Fund.

Mr. Tveten stated this was a similar problem to SHB 1622 - monies are not going back into the recreation program. HB 1888 would allow these monies to be used for recreational purposes.

SB 5407 - Watershed Lands/Recreational Use encouraged.

SB 5517 - Exhibit Center - \$5.2 million to DCD. Tacoma.
(cf HB 1696)

SSB 5644 - Milwaukee Road transfer portion from DNR to Parks & Recreation Commission

SSB 5843 - Metropolitan Parks Districts authorized to issue and sell revenue bonds, etc.

SSB 5867 - Natural Resource Restoration - establish account to restore damaged natural resources, etc.

Mr. Tveten referred to SSB 5655, Milwaukee Road Transfer, and explained the present status of the ownership of lands involved and the proposed transfer. Depending upon railroad negotiations, it may be possible to obtain the entire right-of-way of certain Burlington Northern lands through land banking.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (1) of the Legislation memorandum, Budget Bill SB 5352, stating in the past the total amount of grant monies given to local government had been included in the Operating Budget. Mr. Ogden said through OFM instructions this is now included in the Capital Budget. There followed discussion on the amount of monies in the grants program as a whole. Mr. Ogden reported the following:

Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Program	\$ 3.5 Million
Initiative 215, Marine Recreation Land Act	2.9 Million
Land and Water Conservation Fund - Federal	800,000
State Building Construction Account - 057	1.0 Million

Mr. Mackey asked Mr. Biles to explain SB 5404 and the .06 real estate excise tax to acquire conservation lands. Mr. Biles stated that DNR was very proud of its present program and hoped to see it continue. The program is often referred to as the Natural Resource Conservation Areas Program. Proceeds from the real estate tax (a very small surcharge) are dedicated towards purchase, acquisition, and management of conservation areas. Four areas were noted: Dishman Hills, near Spokane; Mount Si, near North Bend, Cyprus Island in the San Juans, and Woodward Bay, Olympia. DNR is looking for other sites to acquire. The department works with a citizen's advisory committee and has a management plan. There are other areas in the program involving access to recreational lands, also trails for people as well as trails only for animals. The department also helps save endangered plant species by making some areas "off limits" to humans.

Unfortunately, Mr. Biles said, the surcharge on real estate taxes terminates on June 30, 1989. Then DNR will have the program, but no money with which to manage it. Realtors are opposed to the tax stating it is another tax for services and is detrimental to the program. Actually, he said, it really does not have that much of an affect. The tax would amount to about \$60.00 on a \$100,000 transaction. 1172 has passed the House and is now in Senate Natural Resources. At this point Loren McGovern, NOVA member, advised the Committee it is a seller tax, not binding upon the buyer.

IV. NOVA PARTICIPATION MANUALS: Mr. Fairleigh announced there would be two NOVA Participation Manuals for review by the Committee: (1) NOVA Program Project Application Manual - Modifications; (2) Nonhighway Road Grant Manual.

1. **NOVA PROGRAM PROJECT APPLICATION MANUAL:** Memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, was briefly covered by Mr. Fairleigh, who noted that the new application manual consolidated various forms and the existing procedural manual into one manual with all the required forms and instructions. The revisions were approved by the NOVA Committee on March 17, 1989. The applications forms were for the following projects: Non-Capital, Federal Non-Capital, Land Acquisition, Capital, and Federal Capital.

By consensus the Committee agreed with the suggested modifications.

2. **NONHIGHWAY ROAD GRANT MANUAL:** Mr. Fairleigh explained that the draft copy of the revised manual for the Nonhighway Road Grant Program included:

- a. Recommendations of the NHR Subcommittee
 - b. Explanation of a revised project review and selection process
 - c. A revised project evaluation questionnaire
 - d. Expanded general program information
3. The inclusion of a number of previously unwritten administrative rules which had been unofficially applied to the program.

Mr. Fairleigh referred to page (2) of the manual, paragraphs 4. and 5, which dealt with Eligible Projects and Nonhighway Road Project Eligibility Criteria. **Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General**, stated that the definition of a nonhighway road in the manual did not follow that which is cited in the RCW. He suggested this be amended to conform to the RCW requirements. The criteria as presented in the manual appears to eliminate all "highways", and this is not the case in the law.

Ms. Cox referred to page (1) of the manual under paragraph 3. "The Nonhighway Road Grant Program". She asked that the last sentence be clarified in respect to the use of the words "user/user". This was confusing, she said. Mr. Fairleigh stated staff would amend that sentence.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (3), Item 6 B. "Ineligible Activities", Item 5. He suggested removing the word "including" "Projects involving permanent structures including- visitor centers, interpretive centers, employee residences, and shop buildings." Mr. Fairleigh suggested the words "such as" could be substituted. Staff will clarify this item also.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (3), Item 6 B. "Ineligible Activities", item 6. He questioned the "historic railroad" category, and asked did this refer to railroad trails

being converted? Mr. Fairleigh replied the reference was to commercial railroad activities, such as the Snoqualmie and North Bend railroad recreational programs available for the public.

Mr. Biles referred to the last item on page 4., 7. B. "Ineligible Activities", item 5, "Charges in excess of the lowest acceptable bid when competitive bidding is required, unless the IAC Director agrees in advance to the higher costs." He asked when a sponsor would have to obtain that approval from the director. Mr. Lane replied this would be prior to awarding of the IAC contract. This will be clarified by staff in the manual.

Mr. Fairleigh referred to page 5., Item 6. "Ineligible Costs", which dealt with equipment to be used for the development and maintenance of recreational facilities. There was no discussion on this item by the Committee at this point.

NHR Evaluation Questions, page 8 of the manual: Mr. Fairleigh briefly commented on the evaluation questions; five questions are subjectively scored by the evaluation team and three of them are staff pre-scored.

Discussion on the Manual: Mr. Tveten referred to page 3 B. "Ineligible Activities", 1. "Projects involving only planning and/or design", and noted there was also reference to planning costs under 7. A. "Eligible Costs", "1. Site specific master plans, survey and design, construction drawings and bid documents." Mr. Fairleigh emphasized this recommended only those costs related directly to the design of the facility. It did not relate to feasibility studies. Sponsors will take care of such studies themselves. A sponsor could not come in with a project for specific site master plan; there must be acquisition or development involved in the project.

Mr. Jones referred to page (2) of the manual, Item 5. "Nonhighway Road Project Eligibility Criteria", 1) "The road is owned or managed by a city, county, state agency, federal agency, Indian tribe, or other eligible municipal corporation." He asked what were "other municipal corporations?" Mr. Fairleigh replied there were port districts, public utility districts, park districts, etc., eligible to participate in the program. It was committee consensus that this be so stated in the manual.

Mr. Volker asked about eligibility of state agencies for 10% planning costs. He felt this was not a reasonable percentage for the state agencies and suggested it be changed if at all possible. Mr. Tveten agreed with Mr. Volker and pointed out the reasons why state agencies would have a very difficult time with only 10%. He opted for 15-16-or even 17 percent. Dr. Scull suggested a compromise at a limit of 15%. Mr. Tveten agreed; likewise Mr. Volker, the understanding being that the item would read "up to 15%". It was suggested that staff add this item to A. Eligible Costs as no. 6. Mr. Fairleigh said staff would make this change accordingly. Mr. Clark pointed out it is 10% for local agencies and there would be inconsistency with the two different percentages. Mr. Fairleigh did not feel this would impact local agencies since the program would be virtually a state and federal agency program. With the rules being proposed, it will be difficult for local agencies to produce eligible projects.

Ms. Lorenz commented on page (5), item 4., "Ineligible Costs", referring to liability insurance. Mr. Fairleigh stated this related to liability insurance for the operation of the facilities. Most agencies have their own liability insurance premiums.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT THE NONHIGHWAY ROAD GRANT MANUAL AS AMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The possibility of the need to amend the NOVA statutes was brought up by Mr. Biles. He felt it was necessary to go back to the Legislature and amend the statute for clarity and ease in administration. Mr. Fairleigh had mentioned during the discussion that there be a review of the manual in one year; therefore, Mr. Biles suggested this be done and further adjustments made to it if necessary. Mr. Tveten agreed this would be a good step, and noted that the 1990 State Legislature would not be reviewing biennial budgets, thus there will be more time for review of other bills.

IV. LOCAL AGENCIES' PARTICIPATION MANUAL #4 - MODIFICATIONS: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated March 23, 1989, "Proposed Revisions to Traditional Program Participation Manual #4, Guidelines for Development Projects", noting the following:

- A. Section 04.08 (15) of Manual #4 is proposed for revision as follows:
 1. Elimination of Section 04.08(15) and expansion through a New Section 04.08A entitled "Boating Facilities" to address wider range of issues.
 2. Clarification of ineligible uses of IAC assisted projects.
 3. Revision of guidelines on use of IAC assisted marine facilities to allow recreational use by primarily commercial vessels, in order to address the problems expressed by owners of small fishing boats.
 4. Addition of a restriction against the use of IAC floats for aquaculture and other non-boating activities.
 5. Strengthening of language regarding prohibition of permanent and seasonal moorage for recreational boats.
 6. Addition of language allowing long-term, off-season moorage for recreational boats.
- B. All changes were reviewed by the IAC Technical Advisory Committee.
- C. Reference was made to attachments: Section 04.08 (15) being deleted and New Section 04.08A.

Dr. Scull referred to Item 3, concerning commercial vessels and small fishing boats. He suggested this be rephrased to indicate that commercial fishing boats being used for recreation purposes may temporarily tie up at a recreational dock financed by IAC funds. Mr. Fairleigh explained why the issue had been raised. Certain small commercial fishing boats want to tie up for a short time at a dock, but are prohibited from doing so. Dr. Scull reiterated his concern that Item 3 be rewritten.

Mr. Tveten said the IAC should go on record and encourage boating sewage pumpout facilities in the projects for consideration of funding. Several marine-oriented projects funded in the last IAC funding session did not have provision for sewage pumpout facilities. Secondly, he pointed out that in the San Juans there are four vessels using the IAC-funded docks for a short time. He asked if this would still be allowed.

Mr. Fairleigh said this type of activity would be feasible, but not regularly

scheduled ferry service, etc. Mr. Tveten suggested the tour boats be allowed to continue their short interval mooring at the docks. Mr. Wilder agreed stating as long as there is not a lengthy moorage, such would be permissible. Mr. Lane interpreted the wording to prohibit even short tour boat moorage and suggested it be clarified. Dr. Scull felt if the IAC did not provide short moorage for tour boats and the like, there would be a lot of opposition from those using the moorage spaces for this purpose. These boats should be qualified to receive recreational moorage as well as the regular boaters.

Mr. Lane stated there has to be a rational basis to distinguish between these groups of boaters. Some are commercial, some are regular boaters, and others might be commercial but only use the facilities for a very short time and are engaged in recreational pursuits for their passengers. He felt the IAC would be opening itself up to a legal challenge if staff and the committee did not look deeper into the issue and come up with where to draw the line.

Mr. Jerry Pelton observed that on his trip to Sucia he had noticed several boats come in to discharge passengers for recreational purposes. The boats were there only about fifteen minutes and departed again. If this service were not provided, recreationists would not have the ability to visit Sucia.

Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries, brought out the needs of: (1) public boat launch ramps being used by small commercial boats, (2) fishing net pens and those who need to use the docks temporarily, and (3) tribal fishing rights. He also noted the use of the ramp at Ilwaco. All of these would be prohibited use the way the manual is written as of today.

Patti Miller-Crowley, Department of Community Development, suggested the following:

- (1) Define which boats may use the IAC-funded docks and which may not, then put a time limit on the use.
- (2) Would be best to find out about people's "travel rights" first.
- (3) If net pen activities are allowed, make sure they comply with all local requirements.

Heber Kennedy, Washington State Ports Association representative, Technical Advisory Committee:

- (1) In control of the marina at Eastbay, Olympia, which has IAC funds within it.
- (2) Felt staff should look at commercial boaters using IAC funded docks.
- (3) Suggested Committee accept staff's recommendations. It is a fresh approach. Can be amended according to Committee direction.
- (4) IAC mainly wants to assure recreational boaters are not thwarted in use of IAC-funded facilities.
- (5) If commercial boater wants to use the facilities temporarily, he should not do so at expense of the recreational boater. The recreational boater should have the priority.
- (6) A supervisor at the moorage facility could watch over this aspect.

Mr. Tveten asked if in the statute (Initiative 215) does it allow this type of prioritization? Mr. Lane replied he felt it did, but he would need to research this matter first. Mr. Biles asked that the matter of approval of Participation Manual #4, New Section 04.08A be delayed until the questions asked could be researched. Staff could then bring it back as an agenda item at the next meeting of the Committee. Mr. Jones thought the New Section 04.08A was a good start, that it should be adopted and then advise staff to continue its work of clarification.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. LORENZ, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT ACTION ON AGENDA ITEM C. LOCAL AGENCIES' PARTICIPATION MANUAL #4, NEW SECTION 04.08A, BE TABLED, THAT STAFF TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE AND PRESENT A REVISED NEW SECTION 04.08A AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE IAC COMMITTEE (MAY 18-19, 1989).

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IV. JULY 1989--IAC MEETING: Mr. Wilder noted the July meeting would be held on July 20-21, 1989, and staff had suggested the possibility of meeting in Wenatchee - and the Chelan area. Opportunities for a tour include Rocky Reach Dam, areas in Chelan, a fruit plant, and Columbia River Gorge.

Both Dr. Scull and Ms. Cox said they would not be available for the scheduled meeting July 20-21.

The Chair called for a break at 1:25, and the meeting reconvened at 1:40. The July 20-21, 1989 meeting was cancelled by the Committee. Dates of May 18-19, 1989 were suggested with the meeting to be held in the Seattle metropolitan area.

IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE NEXT MEETING TAKE PLACE IN THE SEATTLE METROPOLITAN AREA, MAY 18-19, 1989, LOCATION TO BE ANNOUNCED.

Mr. John Edwards, Department of Natural Resources, TAC member, stated there might be a problem with certain conversion requests of DNR which were to be presented in July to the IAC Committee. Mr. Tveten noted there would be the cost of another IAC meeting taking place in the 1987-89 Biennium. Mr. Wilder said this was not a problem.

Mr. Wilder announced that SSB 5324 had as of today (March 23, 1989) been voted out of the House State Government Committee with an amendment that the appointment of the director of the IAC will be by the Governor. Mr. Tveten asked if the bill included confirmation of the director by the Senate, and was told this was not a part of the bill.

The Committee adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

Anne B. Cox

ANNE COX, CHAIR

11-1-89

This Mtg. was cancelled by chair & Director 4-10-89 by notification of 800+ persons & 76 News outlets. #219-