

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

DATE: March 21, 1991

PLACE: Lacey Council Chambers
Lacey, Washington

TIME: 9:00 A.M.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Eliot Scull, Chair, Wenatchee
James R. Fox, Friday Harbor
William S. Fearn, Spokane
Joe C. Jones, Seattle
Stan Biles, Designee for The Honorable Brian J. Boyle, Commissioner of
Public Lands, Dept. Natural Resources
Richard Costello, Designee for Joseph R. Blum, Director, Department
of Fisheries
Jenene Fenton, Designee for Curt Smitch, Director, Department of
Wildlife
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission (Aftn. Session)

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS:

Chairman Eliot Scull called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with five members present representing a quorum. Mr. Costello and Mr. Jones arrived later. Quorum: SCULL, FOX, FEARN, BILES, FENTON, COSTELLO, JONES.

Dr. Scull welcomed the attendees and introductions were made by the Committee members, IAC staff, and the audience. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 8-9, 1990: The following correction to the minutes of November 8-9, 1990 was cited:

Page 55, Last Paragraph: "In this connection, Mr. Fox presented three policy actions of the Committee at this meeting which had not been formally adopted: (1) the \$1 million cap; (2) no ~~development~~ indoor recreational projects would be considered for funding, and (3) only acquisition projects would be funded and no development projects."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MR. FOX, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 8-9, 1990 MEETING BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON PAGE 55 AS NOTED ABOVE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS, CORRECTIONS, OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA FOR MARCH 21, 1991: Robert L. Wilder, Director, IAC, requested the following additions to the March 21, 1991 meeting agenda:

III. OLD BUSINESS A. 3 - City of Bellingham, Burlington Northern Trail Acquisition, IAC #83-051A - Conversion

IV. NEW BUSINESS G. Local Government Initiative 215 Program

Identify remaining NEW BUSINESS Items as H., I., and J.

Mr. Fox asked if there would be a report on the status of the Thurston County Sports Park project as requested by the Committee at the November 1990 meeting. Mr. Wilder noted this would be an item for discussion during the proposed funding of the Maintenance and Operations Projects (Item IV. NEW BUSINESS B.).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FOX, SECONDED BY MR. BILES THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE MARCH 21, 1991 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. A. STATUS REPORT - DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum dated March 21, 1991, reporting as follows:

1. **Management:** The Management Services Division of the agency continues to oversee and assist the IAC to operate efficiently and effectively. Currently it is preparing projections for the State Finance Committee to use for the sale of bonds. This Division deserves recognition as well as the Planning and Projects Services. It maintains personnel actions, budgeting programs, property accounting, billings, contracts, auditing, etc.

2. **Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund:** Current LWCF figure is \$200 million which could translate into \$3.8 million for the State of Washington. These funds when apportioned to the state would help leverage the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program funds for both state and local agencies. Work continues with the National Association of Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO), the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), Congressional staff and the Office of the Governor.

This year the theme for working toward sufficient Land and Water Conservation Funds is "The Conservation Alternative". Over twenty national organizations are putting forth this effort.

LWCF APPORTIONMENT: \$572,000 for the State of Washington compared to \$312,000 for FY 90.

3. **Operation and Maintenance Study:** Following the IAC report on O&M, legislation was prepared and introduced in the House as an agency request - **House Bill #1916 - State Lands Stewardship Act**. Representatives Belcher, Fraser, Wang, Anderson, and Phillips sponsored it. A joint referral was made to the House Natural Resources & Parks and the House Revenue committees. Originally there were three principle fund sources: Real Estate Tax, Camper-Trailer Excise Tax, and a special tax on Recreational Equipment. The bill was amended to delete the special tax on Recreational Equipment prior

to its passage out of committee. Possibility now is that the bill may become a part of the overall budget package. Mr. Wilder expressed his appreciation to the state agencies for their support at the hearings and for their assistance in the bill's preparation.

4. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WRRP) - Project 53 - Status: As of February 19, 1991, over thirty (30) project acquisitions have been completed totally or in part, and others are progressing well. State agencies have had difficulty in certain acquisitions due to unwilling sellers and other factors, but in spite of this are making good progress. Challenges in these projects are many: Land speculation, no condemnation tool on the part of the state, unwilling sellers, no sponsor, matching funds not available (for local government), environmental concerns, failure to move expeditiously, competing interests, property owners' opposition, law suits, insufficient funding, and permits/regulations.

5. Legislative Liaison: Legislative liaison has been good; working closely with Bob Nichols, Office of Financial Management, and other members of the Executive Team. The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition (WWRC) have been helpful to the IAC. Presently staff is involved in the budgetary process and the projects listed therein.

6. 1991-93 IAC Capital Budget: Hearing was held before the Capital Facilities and Financing Committee. Various individuals and organizations throughout the state testified in favor of the Governor's \$95 million WWRP proposal. The IAC is in the range of \$45 million or \$90 to \$95 million depending upon the possibility of the State Debt Limit being raised.

7. Washington Administrative Code 286 - IAC: Administrative Codes for the WWRP program are underway, to be presented to the Committee at its July 1991 IAC meeting. Interim guidelines are necessary and will be adopted during the present meeting so that project sponsors will know the rules being followed by the IAC. Workshops and review sessions are to be held for the WWRP program also.

8. Project Statistics Status Report: A Project Statistics Status Report was distributed to each Committee member for review. It indicated that as of February 28, 1991, the IAC has administered 2,324 projects amounting to \$379,238,305 (including local share). (APPENDIX "A")

Dr. Scull remarked on the current situation in eastern Washington in his area concerning parks and recreational facilities. He felt that through the IAC's program, available park areas had increased and that this reflected what the IAC is accomplishing. He complimented the IAC staff on their impressive efforts.

II. STATUS REPORTS - MANAGEMENT SERVICES - FUND SUMMARIES: Mr. Ray Baker, Financial Manager, referred to four fund summary reports, reporting as follows:

1. **Grant-in-Aid Traditional Projects:** Represented receipts through January, 1991. Negative numbers in the Federal monies for state agencies reflect the shortfall in actual receipts of federal funding compared to the allotted amount. Since the November funding session, the state agencies have placed several projects under contract. \$576,000 plus in federal funds received have been added to the balance on the Fund Summary. Pending projects listing, dated March 11, 1991, attached to the fund summary was explained.

2. **Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Projects:** Current fund status was \$755,998.90 as of March 11, 1991. Since that time a project closed affecting the dollar amount concerning the E&E columns: \$55,377 was added to the fund total. All necessary corrections were made to the fund summary pertaining to the Department of Licensing's discrepancy reported earlier to the Committee.

3. **Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP):** It was noted that this is a new program and because of the size of some of the projects within it, there are considerable "percentage shifts" caused by the closing or withdrawal of a single project. Due to the desire to maintain as much flexibility as possible, a number of contracts have been written to the state agencies which cover many projects -- usually more than the funding allows. This provides the IAC with the opportunity to substitute in a timely manner another project for one which cannot be completed. Trails: At present the trails category is below the legal floor amount. Flexibility is allowed per the law, but since there are no such projects awaiting funding, the deficit must be made up either this year through cost increases in existing projects or next year utilizing more trail projects. This will balance out as the list for next year contains an apparently adequate trails listing to make up the deficit.

In response to Mr. Biles, Mr. Baker stated the law does not specify a period of time for making up the deficit, but the IAC is operating under the intention that deficits in categories will be made up as quickly as possible.

4. **Firearms Range Facilities Projects:** A balance of \$359,102.62 was reported in the Firearms Range Facilities Account. Revenues reported represented thirty-two months of collections, which will not occur again. The revenue for FY 90 would suggest an annual program of \$120,000. However, the annual amount based on the average receipts over the life of the program is almost \$140,000. This may vary slightly depending upon the amount of FRAC travel charged against the grant.

II. STATUS REPORTS - PROJECT SERVICES - ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS:
Mr. Larry Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, "Project Services Division Report", dated March 21, 1991, reporting the following:

1. The Division is currently assisting 69 local projects, 121 state, 30 Local WWRP, 54 State WWRP, 39 NOVA Nonhighway, 48 NOVA Off-Road Vehicle, and 16 NOVA E&E projects - a total of 376.

2. Letters of Intent received for the WWRP Local funding program number 175, representing a total of approximately \$50 million (not including local share). At the September 19-20, 1991, IAC meeting those projects evaluated and ranked will be considered for funding. A listing will be sent to the Governor by October 1, 1991.

3. IAC Workshops: Workshops were held January 15 (Longview & Kennewick), January 16 (Auburn & Cheney), and 17 January (Mt. Vernon & Wenatchee) to notify potential sponsors of the 1991 funding opportunities.

4. March 21, 1991 Funding: A total of 66 letters of intent were received for the E&E, M&O, and Firearms Range Facilities projects. Following evaluation meetings and required processing, forty-seven (47) projects became eligible for funding consideration March 21.

5. Wetlands: The IAC, along with other agencies, has been meeting with the Department of Ecology on a regular basis to develop a wetlands definition for use in IAC proposed wetlands policies and procedures. DOE has not yet finalized its varied definitions (rating system, mitigation, buffers, restoration, etc.) in order to provide opportunity for public input. When all information is available the IAC staff will bring before the Committee its proposed wetlands policies and procedures for approval.

6. Hazardous Substances: IAC will bring to the Committee in either July or November its proposed policies concerning hazardous substances.

7. Grant County - Moses Lake Sand Dunes Projects: The Committee was advised that the two projects it had funded with a value of \$803,000 were valid projects and proceeding on schedule. The Grant County Sheriff's Office has received the completed appraisal for the sand dunes property, and it has been forwarded to DOT for review. The landowner is a willing seller, thus purchase could be completed soon. The Department of Natural Resources will complete an appraisal for the 25-year lease of the 570 acres of DNR lands in the Moses Lake Dunes ORV riding area. The IAC provided funding for this acquisition at the November 1989 meeting.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS:

| | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-------|
| <u>Fisheries - Towhead Is. Launch Renovate</u> | #92-800D | \$191,000 | (215) |
| Renovate boat launch, Pierce County. | | | |
| <u>Wildlife - Matoon Lake, Fish. Access</u> | #91-604D | 121,515 | (215) |
| Redevelop 5 acres/Matoon Lake, Kittitas County | | | |
| <u>Wildlife - Daybreak Park Boat Launch</u> | #91-605D | 136,000 | (215) |
| Develop boating facilities, Clark County | | | |

| | | |
|--|------------------|--|
| <u>Wildlife - Loomis Lake, Fishing Access</u> | #91-606D | 67,150 (215) |
| Redevelop two acres fishing access, Pacific County | | |
| <u>Wildlife - Shillapoo Fishing Access</u> | #91-607D | \$ 51,940 (215) |
| Redevelop fishing access, Clark County | | |
| <u>State Parks - Ocean Beach Accesses</u> | \$303,000 (LWCF) | 303,000 (State Building Construction Fund) |
| Twelve sites along ocean beaches Grays Harbor and Pacific counties. #91-510D | | |
| <u>Jefferson Co. - Olympic Discovery Trail</u> | | 100,000 (WWRP) |
| Acquire trail corridor Port Townsend to Discovery Bay #91-050A | | |
| <u>King County - Lake Desire Acquisition</u> | #91-232A | 1,200,000 (WWRP) |
| Acquire approx. 290 acres east of Renton | | |
| <u>City of Spokane - Fish Lake Trail</u> | #91-112A | 200,000 (WWRP) |
| Acquire 11 miles RR right-of-way | | |
| <u>Spokane Co.- Fish Lake Acq.</u> | #91-064A | 300,000 (WWRP) |
| Acquire 14 acre resort on Fish Lake | | |
| <u>Skagit County - Centennial Trail Hiway 9</u> | | 325,000 (WWRP) |
| Acquire segments of abandoned RR right-of-way, Snohomish County line/ City of Sedro Woolley #91-157A | | |

Mitigation Costs: Mr. Biles asked if staff had as yet answered the questions previously discussed by the committee as to mitigation costs on wetlands eligible for IAC projects. Mr. Fairleigh explained this was a pending matter in connection with the DOE proposed regulations and their adoption of standardized WACS on wetlands. When that has taken place, the IAC will be in a better position to present a policy on mitigation costs to the Committee.

In response to Dr. Scull, Mr. Fairleigh stated the **Moses Lake Sand Dunes** projects should be completed within the next six weeks.

II STATUS REPORTS - PLANNING SERVICES: Memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "Project Services Status Report", was referred to by Mr. Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services. Information included the following:

1. **Local Agencies Technical Assistance:** One hundred twenty (120) agencies have met planning requirements for the Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program: 78 cities, 14 counties, 14 port districts, 8 special districts, 4 school districts, and 2 Indian Tribes. An additional fifteen agencies with projects approved at the September 28, 1990 meeting will soon be finalizing and adopting their plans.

2. **Extended Eligibility Program:** Under the IAC's program, local agencies' desiring to participate in the traditional grant-in-aid program must complete and have approved an comprehensive park and recreation plan. The legislatively mandated Growth Management Act (Chapter 17, Laws 90) calls for certain counties to prepare comprehensive plans with an optional park and recreation element by July 1, 1993. Agencies planning under the GMA may not meet IAC planning requirements for submittal of grant applications in

1991, 1992, and/or 1993; therefore, local agencies who integrate park and recreation planning into the comprehensive plan required under the Growth Management Act will be allowed by the IAC to compete for IAC grants under a special planning eligibility program. This "extended eligibility program" will permit participating agencies to request extended interim eligibility through three grant cycles, or until their plan is adopted. The policy will be in effect from March 1, 1991 through December 31 1993. Reference was made to Attachment 1 of the memorandum, "EXTENDED ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM, MARCH, 1991".

3. Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area:

a. The National Scenic Area (NSA) includes portions of three counties: Clark, Klickitat, Skamania. The NSA is divided into three types of Management Areas: Special, General and Urban.

b. Draft Management Plan for the GMAs, those areas that will be managed by the Columbia River Gorge Commission, has been released. IAC has reviewed and commented on the plan in conjunction with the Governor's Interagency Coordination Team.

c. The proposed recreation development plan does little to alleviate a severe shortage of facilities (campgrounds/windsurfing access, etc.). The National Scenic Act mandates that recreational access to the Columbia River and its tributaries be increased. Few sites are available for river access and these have not been proposed for recreation development.

d. Local and state agencies were encouraged to contact the Columbia River Gorge Commission to review the draft management plan and policies.

4. Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Projects - Planning Division:

a. Colville Tribe ORV Comprehensive Planning Project, #90-142P: Draft ordinances have been developed by the Colville Confederated Tribes to manage law enforcement of off-road vehicle use on Reservation lands. ORV recreation site inventory and evaluation will soon begin.

b. IAC Trail Directory, NHR #87-42P: Extended until December 31, 1991, to facilitate distribution.

c. San Juan Military Road Plan, NHR #88-42P: Contract extended to June 30, 1991 (allow County time to review consultant's recommendations).

d. Wenatchee National Forest, North Cle Elum Ridge, Buck Meadows ORV Plan, ORV #88-40P: May be withdrawn as progress has been hindered by unusual management challenges (fire suppression/spotted owl mapping/etc.).

5. **Washington Trails Plan:** The Washington Trails Plan has been adopted by the Governor and the National Park Service. "Celebrate Trails" event will take place June 1-9, 1991, at which time the Trails Plan will be formally introduced. Sponsors and organizers of this event include: Washington Trails Association, The Mountaineers, Volunteers for Outdoor Washington, Recreational Equipment Incorporated, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Washington State Parks, Cascade Bicycle Club, and Snohomish County Parks.

6. **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC):** IAC Planning staff continue to review the recreation components of hydroelectric projects seeking licenses from FERC. Eight FERC projects were reviewed since the November 1990 IAC meeting.

In response to Dr. Scull's question, Mr. Lovelady stated there is ability on the part of state agencies to request changes to FERC plans, but the IAC is advisory only relating to recreation components.

7. **Wetlands:** Progress has been made on wetlands inventories, identification, and assessment by federal and state agencies. The IAC is working closely with these agencies in addressing the issues. Preliminary lists have been prepared designating priority wetland sites for protection. An amendment to the IAC's Wetlands Priority Plan will be proposed by staff for IAC consideration sometime in 1992 which will include the most current priority wetlands sites.

III. OLD BUSINESS A. PROJECT CHANGES AND LOCAL PROJECT FUNDING:

1. **Liberty Lake County Park (Miller Ranch), Spokane County Parks and Recreation - Conversion - IAC #66-005A/NPS #53-00021 and IAC #72-039D:** Mr. Eric Johnson, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "Spokane County Parks and Recreation - Liberty Lake County Park (Miller Ranch) Conversion, IAC #66-005A/NPS #53-00021, IAC #72-039D", reporting as follows:

. Spokane County acquired the site (2,930) acres in 1966 assisted by IAC funds, and in 1972 developed a portion of it into Liberty Lake County Park.

. A conversion was requested to trade land involving 375 acres of undeveloped forest at the park for 31 acres and approximately 5,600 lineal feet on the Spokane River at Myrtle Point. A one mile public trail easement through the property to be converted will be retained. The land trade will not adversely impact the developed portion of the park nor the watershed of Liberty Lake.

. Replacement property will serve to provide a land base for a bridge across the Spokane River to connect two terminus points of the **Centennial Trail**. The replacement land base will allow the State Parks and Recreation Commission and Spokane County to make the bridge

connection to complete the thirty-nine mile trail for outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

. Appraisals: 375 acres, Liberty Lake \$ 338,000
31 acres, Myrtle Point 338,000

. Staff proposal meets criteria set forth in IAC Participation Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted.

Dr. Scull asked if there was any time limit for construction of the trail. Mr. Sam Angove, Director, Spokane County Parks and Recreation, replied construction would begin when the IAC conversion process had been met and amendment signed. The County is ready to proceed.

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

WHEREAS, SPOKANE COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION ACQUIRED APPROXIMATELY 2,940 ACRES OF LAND KNOWN AS LIBERTY LAKE COUNTY PARK WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #66-005A, NPS #53-00021), AND

WHEREAS, SPOKANE COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEVELOPED A PORTION OF LIBERTY LAKE COUNTY PARK WITH IAC ASSISTANCE IN 1972 (IAC #72-039D), AND

WHEREAS, SPOKANE COUNTY HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT 375 ACRES OF LIBERTY LAKE PARK FOR 31 ACRES AT MYRTLE POINT TO SUPPORT THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE CENTENNIAL TRAIL, AND

WHEREAS, SPOKANE COUNTY'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND MEETS THE CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF BOTH THE TAKE AND EXCHANGE PARCELS HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF EQUAL VALUE WITH THE PARCEL BEING CONVERTED;

THE SUBSTITUTION PARCELS ARE OF AT LEAST EQUAL OR GREATER RECREATION UTILITY TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST PROPOSED BY SPOKANE COUNTY REGARDING LIBERTY LAKE COUNTY PARK IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Whatcom County, Lake Whatcom Acquisition Project, IAC #72-064A, Conversion: Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 21, 1991, "Whatcom County Parks and Recreation - Lake Whatcom Acquisition, IAC #72-064A", noting the following:

. The IAC assisted Whatcom County in the acquisition of approximately 293 acres of uplands and 23 acres of submerged lands in May 1972 (including approximately 5 miles of lake frontage along the east shore of Lake Whatcom).

. Land issues arose over the years and there is a need to convert certain parcels and replace them with others in other locations. The County requested conversion of approximately 6.59 acres of the Lake Whatcom Acquisition for an approximate 3.85 acres adjoining the park and an additional 47.6 acres of second class tidelands adjoining Whatcom County Birch Bay Trail in Birch Bay.

. Take Parcels Value:

| | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|
| A North Shore Road | 4.25 acres | \$ 42,500 |
| B Section of RR right-of-way | 1.22 acres | 56,000 |
| C Blue Canyon City right-of-way easement | <u>1.12 acres</u> | <u>7,462</u> |
| Total | 6.59 acres | \$105,962 |

. Replacement Parcels Value:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Three lots mouth of Smith River | 1.10 acres | (Part of pkg. but ineligible) |
| 2. Scott Paper Co. easement | 2.75 acres | \$ 15,480 |
| 3. Tidelands in Birch Bay | <u>47.6 acres</u> | <u>95,200</u> |
| Total | 51.45 acres | \$110,680 |

. Staff proposal meets criteria as set forth in IAC Participation Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted.

Discussion followed. Dr. Scull was assured by Mr. Clark that the trail within the project would remain intact and usable by the public. In response to Mr. Fox's question about possible further loss due to the railroad right-of-way, Mr. Roger DeSpain, Director, Whatcom County Parks and Recreation, explained there had been over a considerable period of time three different negotiation cases with the railroad which had been lost by the County. However, eventually the property reverted back to private ownership and it was possible to obtain an easement from the private property owners. The railroad is no longer involved in the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COSTELLO, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT

WHEREAS, WHATCOM COUNTY ACQUIRED 339 ACRES OF PARK LAND IN WHATCOM COUNTY KNOWN AS THE LAKE WHATCOM ACQUISITION PROPERTY WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #72-064A), AND

WHEREAS, WHATCOM COUNTY HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT APPROXIMATELY 6.59 ACRES OF THE LAKE WHATCOM ACQUISITION FOR AN

APPROXIMATE 3.85 ACRES ADJOINING THE PARK AND AN ADDITIONAL 47.5 ACRES OF SECOND CLASS TIDELANDS ADJOINING WHATCOM COUNTY BIRCH BAY TRAIL IN BIRCH BAY, AND

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

THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF ALL PARCELS OF LAND HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCELS ARE OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCELS CONVERTED.

THE SUBSTITUTION PARCELS ARE OF AT LEAST EQUAL OR GREATER RECREATION UTILITY TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST AS PROPOSED BY WHATCOM COUNTY REGARDING LAKE WHATCOM ACQUISITION (IAC #71-064A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. City of Bellingham, Burlington Northern Trail Acquisition, IAC #83-051A: Mr. Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "City of Bellingham, Burlington Northern Trail Acquisition, IAC #83-051A", giving explanation of the conversion request as follows:

. The City of Bellingham, in March 1983, was assisted by the IAC in acquiring approximately 3.3 miles of Burlington Northern Railroad Company right-of-way in northeast Bellingham (from near Bloedel-Donovan Park to Interstate 5).

. The City has identified a parcel of land (approximately fourteen acres) suitable for the provision of low-cost, planned unit development. The parcel is divided longitudinally by the Burlington Northern Trail.

. The conversion proposal calls for a trade of 2.64 acres of Burlington Northern Trail acquisition for a similar 2.64 acres which would reroute the trail south of, and continuous with, the existing right-of-way.

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| . <u>Appraisals:</u> | Existing trail | \$ 189,500 |
| | Replacement trail property | 202,400 |

. Staff proposal meets criteria set forth in IAC Participation Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted.

Mr. Rick Fackler, Planner, City of Bellingham, responded to questions from Dr. Scull and Mr. Fox in regard to the trail's surface and whether fencing was involved in the plan. He stated the trail

consists of a compacted gravel surface and is essentially a trail on an old road bed of the railroad. Fencing is not necessarily required as there will be fifteen feet of landscaping on either side of the trail, and an additional 25 feet on each side as well. Mr. Biles agreed fencing would not be necessary since the additional 25 feet on each side would be an area where no buildings could or would be constructed.

Mr. Fackler also noted for Mr. Fox that there are some portions of the trail that are concrete, and that the trail does not follow any natural features such as a stream.

MR. COSTELLO MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BILES, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM ACQUIRED APPROXIMATELY 3.3 MILES OF BURLINGTON NORTHERN COMPANY RIGHT-OF-WAY IN NORTHEASTERN BELLINGHAM WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #83-051A), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT 2.64 ACRES OF BURLINGTON NORTHERN TRAIL ACQUISITION FOR A SIMILAR 2.64 ACRES TO REROUTE THE TRAIL SOUTH OF, AND CONTINUOUS WITH, THE EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND MEETS THE CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF BOTH THE TAKE AND EXCHANGE PARCELS HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTE PARCEL IS OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCEL BEING CONVERTED.

THE SUBSTITUTE PARCEL IS OF AT LEAST EQUAL OR GREATER RECREATION VALUE TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST PROPOSED BY THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM REGARDING THE BURLINGTON NORTHERN TRAIL ACQUISITION IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 10:00 a.m. and reconvened at 10:07 a.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - NOVA - EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT (E&E) PROJECTS CONSIDERATION:

Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, "NOVA Enforcement and Education Project Funding" and Table 1 listing the funding requests, followed by project resumes. He noted there were 18 E&E projects for consideration with score ranking, funding requests, and matching

funds as indicated on Table 1. (Table 1 - Page 14)

He expressed thanks to the NOVA Committee members who had participated in a project review meeting in Ephrata January 31-February 1, and a project evaluation meeting on February 21-22 in Tacoma.

Mr. Biles asked how much money was available for allocation. Mr. Fairleigh replied approximately \$685,000 for the E&E category.

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

Only one project was questioned during the slide presentations:

Wenatchee/Okanogan National Forest, Sawtooth E&E Ranger, IAC #92-019E: In response to Dr. Scull, Mr. Scott Chapman, Project Manager, explained the working schedule of the E&E Ranger.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS - E&E PROJECTS (Table 2 - Page 16)

Table 2, Education and Enforcement Projects Staff Recommendation, dated March 21, 1991, was distributed to the Committee and audience.

Mr. Fairleigh cited the four basic criteria used in formulating the funding recommendation and the available funding for the projects:

- (1) All projects had met all legal and procedural requirements for funding consideration by the IAC.
- (2) The relative ranking of projects as determined by the project review and evaluation process followed established criteria.
- (3) Source of funding and fund source restrictions had been considered by staff.
- (4) An attempt was made to fund as many projects as possible.

(5) Available funding:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Current balance 20% of NOVA FUNDS 4/90-3/91 | \$ 474,828 |
| DNR Transfer 4/90-3/91 | 161,540 |
| LESS accounting correction | (57,619) |
| LESS 20% Administrative costs | (21,060) |
| Subtotal | <u>557,689</u> |
| Plus funds from proj. svgs. & closing short | 84,941 |
| Plus carry-forward from funds not committed at 3/90 IAC meeting | <u>42,442</u> |
| Total Available funding | \$ 685,072 |

**TABLE 1 - NOVA ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATION FUNDING REQUESTS
MARCH 1991**

1991 Education & Enforcement Projects
In Ranked Order with Scores

| Rank | Total | ProjName | SponName | Request\$ | Match\$ | Total\$ |
|------|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 1 | 108.6 | Chelan E&E | USFS Wenatchee NF | 7,890 | 5,483 | 13,373 |
| 2 | 105.4 | Blue Lake E&E | USFS Gifford Pinchot | 3,240 | 3,942 | 7,182 |
| 3 | 103.6 | Leavenworth E&E | USFS Wenatchee NF | 27,745 | 9,240 | 36,985 |
| 4 | 102.4 | Naches E&E | USFS Wenatchee NF | 20,014 | 2,641 | 22,655 |
| 5 | 99.4 | Cle Elum E&E | USFS Wenatchee NF | 13,540 | 4,513 | 18,053 |
| 6 | 98.4 | Education & Enforcement | Grant County Sheriff | 71,529 | 7,948 | 79,477 |
| 7 | 97.8 | Education & Enforcement | Kittitas County Sher | 102,303 | 0 | 102,303 |
| 8 | 94.4 | ORV Curriculum | Tacoma MPD | 6,675 | 0 | 6,675 |
| 9 | 93.0 | Education & Enforcement | Chelan County Sheriff | 76,050 | 15,586 | 91,636 |
| 10 | 89.1 | ORV E&E | Snohomish County | 50,160 | 13,682 | 63,842 |
| 11 | 85.4 | Education & Enforcement | Richland | 49,483 | 6,825 | 56,308 |
| 12 | 82.8 | Education & Enforcement | Yakima County Sheriff | 90,000 | 0 | 90,000 |
| 13 | 81.8 | Education & Awareness | Tacoma MPD | 61,353 | 13,795 | 75,148 |
| 14 | 80.6 | Colville E&E | USFS Colville NF | 19,996 | 3,529 | 23,525 |
| 15 | 78.8 | Education & Enforcement | Pierce County Sheriff | 36,438 | 42,157 | 78,595 |
| 16 | 74.2 | Education & Enforcement | Mason County Sheriff | 61,385 | 6,971 | 68,356 |
| 17 | 71.0 | ORV - Puyallup Fair | Tacoma MPD | 12,962 | 4,865 | 17,827 |
| 18 | 68.2 | Park Safety Education | Thurston County Park | 2,000 | 0 | 2,000 |
| | | <TOTAL> | | 712,763 | 141,177 | 853,940 |

Mr. Fairleigh cautioned that next year the IAC would continue to have less dollars to meet the demand. He commended the sponsors for their assistance in providing a match for their projects wherever possible. An approximate 17% matching by sponsors was noted. Project funding included Projects #1 through #16, with Project #16, **Mason County Sheriff's Office, E&E, IAC #92-064E**, receiving \$48,656 rather than the \$61,385 requested. Mason County accepted staff's recommendation and will defer purchase of a vehicle to operate at this reduced cost.

Mr. Costello mentioned the monies collected by counties for ORV violations and asked where this is eventually deposited. **Larry Gibbs, Lt., Pierce County Sheriff's Office**, replied these funds are placed in the County's General Fund and that none are directed toward ORV use. The Yakima County representative also noted that the revenue from this source amounts to only three to five percent -- a very small amount.

There were a number of vehicles being purchased in various E&E projects, and Mr. Fox asked what happens to those vehicles when the ORV funding programs expire. Do they remain in the ORV program elsewhere? Mr. Fairleigh replied if a sponsor's program was terminated it is then the IAC's responsibility to see that the equipment is used elsewhere. The recipient would use a trade in value to reduce the cost of purchasing another vehicle. Mr. Wilder noted the IAC does ensure that the equipment is moved into another area where it can be used. Mr. Lovelady stated there are property guidelines which have been adopted by the Committee to cover this situation.

Mr. Fearn asked what the major criteria was for evaluating the E&E projects. Mr. Fairleigh briefly noted some of the evaluation criteria in the NOVA manuals adopted by the Committee, i.e., needs, activity of the program of ORVS in the county, sponsor match availability, etc.

The Chairman asked that those desiring to present testimony on any project complete a Participant Registration Card.

TESTIMONY - AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

John Hodgson, Associate Director of Recreation, Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma, E&E Programs:

- (1) Spoke on behalf of three projects:
#92-026E, ORV Curriculum Program
#92-025E, ORV Education and Awareness
#92-027E, ORV Puyallup Fair
- (2) The object of the ORV Curriculum Program is to ensure that the information being given to the public is the same. An educational program for ORV awareness and education will be developed to be used statewide by E&E personnel, as well as other groups (schools, clubs, etc.).
- (3) A representative from the Superintendent of Public Instruction has been put on the ORV Committee to ensure that it will be possible to get the information into the schools.

1991 Education and Enforcement
Staff Recommendation

**TABLE 2 - EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS - MARCH 1991**

| <u>RANK</u> | <u>SCORE</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>PROJECT</u> | <u>IAC</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1 | 108.6 | USFS Wenatchee NF | Chelan E&E | 7,890 | 5,483 | 13,373 |
| 2 | 105.4 | USFS Gifford Pinchot NF | Blue Lake E&E | 3,240 | 3,942 | 7,182 |
| 3 | 103.6 | USFS Wenatchee NF | Leavenworth E&E | 27,745 | 9,240 | 36,985 |
| 4 | 102.4 | USFS Wenatchee NF | Naches E&E | 20,014 | 2,641 | 22,655 |
| 5 | 99.4 | USFS Wenatchee NF | Cle Elum E&E | 13,540 | 4,513 | 18,053 |
| 6 | 98.4 | Grant County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 71,529 | 7,948 | 79,477 |
| 7 | 97.8 | Kittitas County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 102,303 | -0- | 102,303 |
| 8 | 94.4 | Tacoma MPD | ORV Curriculum | 6,675 | -0- | 6,675 |
| 9 | 93.0 | Chelan County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 76,050 | 15,586 | 91,636 |
| 10 | 89.1 | Snohomish County | ORV E&E | 50,160 | 13,682 | 63,842 |
| 11 | 85.4 | Richland | Education & Enforcement | 49,483 | 6,825 | 56,308 |
| 12 | 82.8 | Yakima County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 90,000 | -0- | 90,000 |
| 13 | 81.8 | Tacoma MPD | Education & Awareness | 61,353 | 13,795 | 75,148 |
| 14 | 80.6 | USFS Colville NF | Colville E&E | 19,996 | 3,529 | 23,525 |
| 15 | 78.8 | Pierce County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 36,438 | 42,157 | 78,595 |
| 16 | 74.2 | Mason County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 48,656 | 6,971 | 55,627 |
| 17 | 71.0 | Tacoma MPD | ORV - Puyallup Fair | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| 18 | 68.2 | Thurston County Parks | Park Safety Education | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| | | | TOTAL | 685,072 | 136,312 | 821,384 |

Education & Enforcement Funds Available \$685,072

Staff Recommendation 685,072

Balance \$ -0-

- (4) Urged the Committee to reconsider the funding for #92-027E, ORV Puyallup Fair Project. Felt it was a missed opportunity to provide educational information to the public if not funded. Many people attend the fair and pick up materials, ask questions concerning the program, etc. Would hope that the project could be funded next year if not this year. Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive members participate in the operation of the booth.

In response to Dr. Scull, Mr. Hodgson stated it might be possible to have some type of activity booth at the fair without the funding, but it would be necessary to consult someone else who might be able to share space, since the project is mainly for rental of the facilities.

- (5) Mr. Hodgson pointed out the need for an educational program concerning ORVs. The Tacoma-Pierce County area has many persons participating in ORV riding and these people use riding areas throughout the state. Getting information to them before they use the riding areas is critical.

Larry Gibbs, Pierce County Sheriff's Department, filed Participant Registration Card but declined opportunity to give testimony.

Jon Melvin, ORV Deputy Coordinator, Grant County Sheriff's Office, was available for answering questions if needed.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COSTELLO, SECONDED BY MR. BILES THAT THE EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF BE APPROVED, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN. (PROJECTS APPROVED AS INDICATED ON PAGE 18 OF THESE MINUTES.)

Mr. Biles, stating he was speaking on matters which ordinarily Mr. Tveten would do if he were present, mentioned the top five ranking projects were on federal land and monies were being allotted to federal agencies. This has been discussed by the Committee previously, the majority being "comfortable" with the funding of federal agencies since that is where the land opportunities are and where the ORV recreation mainly takes place. Secondly, he referred to the many individual projects on E&E and the difficulty he had over the years he has served as a member in determining whether they were doing the job, having an impact on decreasing ORV violations, and teaching ORV recreationists how to use their vehicles properly. He suggested that perhaps staff could prepare a report detailing how provision of the E&E program has benefited the State of Washington in the overall ORV program. Mr. Fairleigh said staff could prepare such a report if the Committee desired it.

EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS APPROVED - MARCH 1991

NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT

PROJECT FUNDING - MARCH 21, 1991

| <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>PROJECT</u> | <u>IAC</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| USFS Wenatchee NF | Chelan E&E | 7,890 | 5,483 | 13,373 |
| USFS Gifford Pinchot NF | Blue Lake E&E | 3,240 | 3,942 | 7,182 |
| USFS Wenatchee NF | Leavenworth E&E | 27,745 | 9,240 | 36,985 |
| USFS Wenatchee NF | Naches E&E | 20,014 | 2,641 | 22,655 |
| USFS Wenatchee NF | Cle Elum E&E | 13,540 | 4,513 | 18,053 |
| Grant County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 71,529 | 7,948 | 79,477 |
| Kittitas County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 102,303 | -0- | 102,303 |
| Tacoma MPD | ORV Curriculum | 6,675 | -0- | 6,675 |
| Chelan County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 76,050 | 15,586 | 91,636 |
| Snohomish County | ORV E&E | 50,160 | 13,682 | 63,842 |
| Richland | Education & Enforcement | 49,483 | 6,825 | 56,308 |
| Yakima County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 90,000 | -0- | 90,000 |
| Tacoma MPD | Education & Awareness | 61,353 | 13,795 | 75,148 |
| USFS Colville NF | Colville E&E | 19,996 | 3,529 | 23,525 |
| Pierce County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 36,438 | 42,157 | 78,595 |
| Mason County Sheriff | Education & Enforcement | 48,656 | 6,971 | 55,627 |
| | TOTAL | 685,072 | 136,312 | 821,384 |

Mr. Fearn had questions also relating to how the IAC tied the proposed ORV projects into the needs of areas and sections of the state. How does the IAC staff judge the ability of the sponsor to meet the needs in a specific area? Mr. Wilder pointed out that at one time the IAC did develop a computer card to use for evaluation. He felt the project recommendations needed to be based on the available information through the evaluation process. The process has been working effectively, but at times it is very difficult to make certain determinations. At the present time, the staff with assistance of the NOVA Committee judge the sponsors' needs.

Dr. Scull said there seemed to him to be less controversy and less complaints being sent to the Committee on the ORV program, and this was a sign that progress is being made through the public education and awareness programs. Mr. Wilder affirmed that the concerns of the Committee in the E&E program would be taken into consideration.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE E&E PROJECTS.
MOTION WAS CARRIED.

INTRODUCTION: The Chairman introduced Mr. Ralph Mackey, former IAC member and former member of the Parks & Recreation Commission.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - B. NOVA MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROJECTS

CONSIDERATIONS: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "NOVA Maintenance and Operation Project Funding", and Table I listing the funding requests, followed by project resumes. (Table 1 - Page 20)

The Committee was reminded of the \$300,000 set aside for this program which had been approved by the Committee in November 1990. The project sponsors and NOVA Advisory Committee were thanked for their efforts in this competitive program. Each of the eight projects were presented to the Committee by Project Services staff using slides and verbal summaries.

Only one project was questioned during the slide presentations:

USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Evans Creek ORV Area, IAC #92-030M: Dr. Scull questioned the high salary (\$39,170) for one ORV coordinator in view of the volunteer efforts in the project. Ms. Marguerite Austin, Recreation Project Manager, replied the funding besides providing for a Coordinator included a trails crew, equipment, supplies, travel, etc. Dr. Scull asked how much trail work needed to be done. Dale Luhman, Recreation Forester, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, replied there are forty miles of trails requiring general maintenance and volunteers are needed to work with Forestry staff to bring these up to good standards.

**TABLE 1 - MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROJECTS AS REQUESTED
MARCH 1991**

1991 Maintenance & Operation Projects
In Ranked Order with Scores

| Rank | Total | ProjName | SponName | Request\$ | Match\$ | Totals\$ |
|------|-------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|----------|
| 1 | 120.2 | Horn Rapids M&O | Richland | 101,336 | 47,265 | 148,601 |
| 2 | 111.4 | Maintenance & Operation | Kittitas County | 5,500 | 0 | 5,500 |
| 3 | 111.0 | Airway Heights M&O | Spokane County | 61,704 | 15,340 | 77,044 |
| 4 | 106.4 | ORV Coordinator | Grant County | 42,486 | 0 | 42,486 |
| 5 | 105.6 | Maintenance & Operations | USFS Mt. Bkr-Snoq NF | 24,770 | 14,400 | 39,170 |
| 6 | 103.8 | ORV M&O | Ferry County | 23,000 | 7,800 | 30,800 |
| 7 | 90.2 | Maintenance & Operations | USFS Wenatchee NF | 13,831 | 5,928 | 19,759 |
| 8 | 39.4 | Sports Park M&O | Thurston County | 98,000 | 10,000 | 108,000 |
| | | TOTAL | | 370,627 | 100,733 | 471,360 |

Table 2, Maintenance and Operation Projects Staff Recommendation, dated March 21, 1991, was distributed to the Committee and audience. Mr. Fairleigh cited the five basic criteria used in formulating the funding recommendation and the available fund for the projects:

- (1) All projects met all eligibility, legal and procedural requirements for funding consideration.
- (2) The relative ranking of projects as determined by the project review and evaluation process.
- (3) Source of funding.
- (4) Desire to limit M&O funding to ensure adequate funds for capital project requests.
- (5) An attempt was made to fund as many projects as possible.
- (6) Available funding:
Per Interagency direction from the November 1990 meeting, the set aside for this program was \$300,000.
- (7) It was noted that the ORV category includes planning, acquisition, development, and M&O projects, thus funds awarded by the Committee at the March meeting will reduce the balance available in November 1991 for acquisition, development, and planning projects.

Mr. Fairleigh noted there would be a considerable competition for ORV funds at the November 1991 Funding Session. Staff recommendation included funding for projects #1 through #7. The **Thurston County ORV Sports Park M&O Project (IAC #92-032M), \$98,000**, was not recommended for funding. Staff met with Thurston County concerning their low ranking and explained the situation. A letter was received from the County indicating that they could not continue to operate at the \$27,000 M&O level as approved by the Committee at the November 1990 meeting. Mr. Fearn asked if there would be an interim status report on the Thurston County Sports Park study as recommended and approved by the Committee at the November 1990 meeting. Mr. Fairleigh reported the contract had been written and is ready to go for the \$27,000 M&O and the \$40,000 study, but the County has not yet accepted this funding. Thus, a study has not yet been undertaken. Mr. Fearn felt the Committee was being asked to make a decision on the March M&O \$98,000 project -- to not approve it due to its ranking and to close that project -- before it has a study report. He did not feel comfortable with that situation.

Mr. Wilder said the evaluation ranking was done by the users and other interested evaluation team members. It was not possible to do the interim study, but staff has been closely monitoring the situation. Staff now is bringing the project back to the Committee for policy direction. In response to Mr. Biles, Mr. Fairleigh stated

**1991 MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS PROJECTS
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

**TABLE 2 - MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION PROJECTS
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS - MARCH 1991**

| Rank | Score | Sponsor | Project | IAC | SPONSOR | TOTAL |
|---|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | 120.2 | Richland | Horn Rapids M&O | \$ 101,336 | \$ 47,265 | \$ 148,601 |
| 2 | 111.4 | Kittitas County | Maintenance & Operation | 5,500 | -0- | 5,500 |
| 3 | 111.0 | Spokane County | Airway Heights M&O | 61,704 | 15,340 | 77,044 |
| 4 | 106.4 | Grant County | ORV Coordinator | 42,486 | -0- | 42,486 |
| 5 | 105.6 | USFS Mt. Baker-Sno NF | Maintenance & Operation | 24,770 | 14,400 | 39,170 |
| 6 | 103.8 | Ferry County | ORV M&O | 23,000 | 7,800 | 30,800 |
| 7 | 90.2 | USFS Wenatchee NF | Maintenance & Operations | 13,831 | 5,928 | 19,759 |
| 8 | 89.4 | Thurston County | Sports Park M&O | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| TOTAL | | | | \$ 272,627 | \$ 90,733 | \$ 363,360 |
| Maintenance & Operation Funds Available | | | | \$300,000 | | |
| Staff Recommendation | | | | <u>272,627</u> | | |
| Balance | | | | <u>\$ 27,373</u> | | |

the IAC has a letter from Thurston County that the park would be closed if there is no funding from the IAC for it to continue.

Mr. Fearn asked if the usage of the park was below that of other major, similar, high-intensive use areas. Mr. Wilder said he did not think so, but the usage had dropped 48% over the year before. The operators sponsored a lot of paid events to generate the funds they needed. Mr. Fairleigh noted that the County has stated it will return the \$40,000 allocated to them for the study.

TESTIMONY -AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Ron Morgenthaler, Northwest Motorcycle Association, Land Use Representative:

- (1) Involved in and interested in this project from its infancy. Speaking for a lot of users.
- (2) Is one of the most intensively used facilities for ORV recreationists in the state. The users support it and want to have it continue to be available.
- (3) Believed the problems now have been poor management. The administrative costs are excessive and don't necessarily need to be.
- (4) There is considerable volunteer effort in this facility. The users have been of great assistance.
- (5) Felt the NOVA Committee followed the proper process in evaluating and ranking the project as it was presented, but they were not presented with an accurate financial picture.
- (6) Users have agreed to increased participation and entry fees.
- (7) Concerned with the County possibly converting it to some other use. It is a vital project and should not be closed.

Mr. Biles asked Mr. Morgenthaler if there had been any efforts made to locate somebody who would be interested in taking over the facility. Mr. Morgenthaler replied his Association had been working with the County to look at the possibility of a concessionaire to lease the facility and an agency who would want to operate it. He noted there were possibilities of raising over \$60,000 in revenue to aid in operation and maintenance. There is need for the facility and many dollars invested in it over the past years. Mr. Morgenthaler suggested staff continue working with the County on this site so that it can remain open for public use.

Angela Marek, Pacific NW Four-Wheel Drive Association, Region II Director:

- (1) Supported funding for the project. It is the only facility for ORV use this side of the mountains, and it receives a lot of use.
- (2) Have had volunteers spend many hours maintaining and improving the facility, i.e., planting trees, repairing benches, and anything else which might be required to be completed by volunteer help.

- (3) If closed, there would be a great impact on the 4,852 members of the Association. Competitions are held in the facility each year. Money is invested in it from users and a loss of funds would incur.
- (4) There were many volunteer hours which should have been taken into consideration in this project; there are, in fact, thousands.
- (5) IAC has over \$3 million invested in the project. Urged that this not "go to waste". With proper management feel that the park can survive.
- (6) Believe in this park and will continue to support it.

Randy Tipps ,Regional President, Thurston County Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive Association:

- (1) Seven events this year are scheduled for the Thurston County ORV Park. Some events have not been scheduled due to the uncertainty of the park's future.
- (2) Association is attempting to look into being of assistance in getting proper management at the park.
- (3) At one time the motorcyclists and four-wheel drive recreationists worked apart. Now, they are working together and want this facility open. This is the highest use ORV park in the state. There are no records kept of the usage and there should be.
- (4) Many volunteer hours have been put in on this park. Groups volunteer hours before and after events, and assist with clean up. These hours should be considered in evaluating the project.
- (5) This is only facility this side of the mountains and receives extensive use. Oregon ORV areas have closed down and there are only two remaining that can be used for ORV activities in that state. There are fewer areas now for ORV recreation.
- (6) Felt the facility had been mismanaged. Urged that it remain open for use.

Mr. Fearn noted staff had stated the ORV Study could not be begun, and the ORV park was not being used. The first event for the ORV users will occur in April from the previous discussions. Yet the Committee is saying that the project can't be considered unless there is use going on and a study completed. Mr. Tipps agreed that the management of the park needed to be studied because that seemed to be the major problem. The users definitely need the facility. If it is not in use, he said the Committee will be causing ORV users perhaps to go to private lands, and that creates problems.

Dr. Scull asked if the users would accept an increase in fees and a management concept where the park could become self-sufficient. Mr. Tipps replied fees have already been increased by 50% and this has been accepted by the users. They do not want the park to close; there are countless volunteer hours which have gone into its maintenance; and the decrease in use has been directly related to the management.

Mr. Wilder said that the figures given him for the 48% total decrease were 1988 to 1990. Mr. Tipps concluded by stating it was difficult to do a good maintenance job on the park when you are not allowed to use the equipment.

Robert Seeley, Thurston County ORV User, Olympia:

- (1) Wanted to keep the park open for users. Was a member of the original search team looking for an ORV site.
- (2) The park is not being closed because it is not being used. It is being closed because of a "questionnaire" and the users can't answer it. The questions relate to "what is the IAC Committee going to contribute?" In the beginning, there was never any question of having to meet percent of gross, etc. Confused at direction being given now.
- (3) Agreed with Mr. Morgenthaler, and felt that there are only three major, intensive use areas for ORVs in the state. The Thurston County facility has outgrown the idea that it should be under the Thurston County Commissioners' authority. It is more than a County facility and could belong to the Parks and Recreation Department or the IAC.
- (4) All three areas are multi-use facilities. People using them pay their way through fees and taxes. There should be some state control of these facilities.
- (5) Recalled use by ORV recreationists of an area along side a highway which was unsafe. If this park is closed, ORV recreationists will go to similar unsafe areas. Keeping the park open is critical.

Mr. Wilder asked if Mr. Seeley had conveyed to the County Commissioners the need to keep the park open. Mr. Seeley said he had done this, but it was his honest opinion that the park had outgrown the County Commissioners' authority and should be under some other entity.

Bob Lindsey, Event Coordinator, Tacoma Motorcycle Club:

- (1) Very upset with the idea of losing the ORV Park. The Tacoma Motorcycle Club spent over \$8,000 building a flat track race course, which is the only one in this particular area of the state. This was donated to the park. Also approximately 1,500 volunteer hours have been put into the park.
- (2) None of these items were mentioned at the NOVA meetings; none of the extra efforts put out by groups was discussed.
- (3) The Thurston County Commissioners don't feel there is much use of the park on the part of Thurston County residents. However, when the race is run about one-third of the participants are from the Olympia/Lacey area.
- (4) Agreed with Ron Morgenthaler that perhaps the park should be run by a concessionaire or a state agency.

Mack Ennis, President, Greater Seattle Motorcycle Club:

- (1) Committee should realize this is the only site in western Washington for ORV recreationists to use.

- (2) Mr. Wilder's comment in regard to the drop in use was incorrect due to the fact that the park in 1990 was run on a part-time basis. This would account for the decrease in usage.
- (3) Did not feel the Northwest Motorcycle Association actually represent the Motocross users who ride cross country and in the woods. Motocross users are not represented on the NOVA Committee.
- (4) Mentioned the Jolly Roger Raceway and its unavailability for public use.
- (5) Felt the management at the Thurston County Sports Park was good, and users are willing to pay the increased fees in order to use the facility.
- (6) Did question the budget and tried to work it out satisfactorily. Felt that the \$27,000 would provide additional use for the park.
- (7) Agreed with foregoing speakers in regard to taxpaying people using the park, etc., and the need to keep it open.

Steve Zimmerman, Deputy Chief, Administrative Officer, Thurston County:

- (1) Appreciated opportunity to present the County's perspective.
- (2) After reviewing the park situation, felt it should be seasonal operation only. Advised the park officials that they should increase their fees to provide additional support, as well as receive IAC monies.
- (3) A committee was set up to discuss the Park. There was positive discussion, and the users expressed a willingness to increase their fees (up 50%).
- (4) Decision was made to pull out the budgetary item regarding administrative overhead for the director, etc. This was being charged to the ORV facility project and was inappropriate.
- (5) The project now under consideration incorporated items (2), (3), and (4) as mentioned above -- (\$98,000 with \$10,000 sponsor match).
- (6) Recognize the Committee has limited funds and a need to set priorities. Committee should consider that the County also needs to set priorities in its limited funding. Now faced with a need to provide considerable funding for this park in order to keep it open.
- (7) Consideration needs to be given to the taxpayers paying for a facility used for a specific type of recreation.
- (8) Felt the park is a regional state facility, not many people use it from Thurston County in comparison to other counties and must look at use of local tax dollars against a regional state use park.
- (9) Do not believe it is possible to operate the park with the \$27,000 approved for it without putting in general tax monies. It has been indicated by the Board that their priorities for the use of the tax dollars does not include the operating expenses for this facility.

- (10) Position at this point is that there is no other alternative given the current situation but to close the park. This decision was not reached hastily.
- (11) Will continue to work with the Committee and staff to see if there are some other alternatives relative to use of the park.

Dr. Scull asked if the \$27,000 would provide enough money to keep the park open while other possibilities for its continuation were explored. Mr. Zimmerman was unsure. He said other possibilities had been discussed, but nothing had as yet been decided. He felt there was reluctance on the part of IAC to get involved in this type of action. Mr. Wilder said it would be possible to continue to work with the County in regard to this matter and how to resolve it and get the job done. Dr. Scull asked if the \$27,000 would allow the park to remain open two or three months to enable enough time to locate a concessionaire. Mr. Mike Welter, Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department replied this would be possible, but there is still the "stumbling block" of county support.

Mr. Fearn asked if the park was closed, what would the County use to pay off the existing loan. Mr. Zimmerman replied the County would need to take action on that, and it would be a County problem. Mr. Fearn observed that the reason there is such a low match is because the revenue generated by the park is taken off the top to pay the loan. Mr. Zimmerman agreed. Mr. Fearn asked if a private lease was entered into, would the County expect the leasee to pay also? Mr. Zimmerman said he had not given this any thought at this time.

Mr. Biles acknowledged there was \$27,000 "on the table", but he had also heard the users say they were willing to pay additional fees in order to keep the park open. Would the \$27,000 plus the expected revenue allow the park to extend the time it could remain open? Mr. Zimmerman said he was not aware of events being scheduled nor the expected revenues from those events, but he agreed it might be a possibility and something to look into.

Mr. Welter stated (1) the increase was based on the support level which could be obtained from the IAC. The advisory committee stated they were willing to accept the \$27,000. He felt there should be more consideration given to the administrative costs required to keep the facility open. There are overhead costs which were not being discussed. There is liability insurance to deal with and a need to decide whether that should be paid from IAC funds or other means. (2) It is possible to take the revenues from events and place them into the park for operation and maintenance, but this would not in any way cover the rest of the operation costs of the park. Countless hours have been spent to review and try to resolve these questions. (3) Users have complained that the park has not been maintained properly. The County has been trying to live within the dollar amounts allocated to the project. Even though \$160,000 was given to this project, still it was not enough to cover the needs. (4) In regard to Mr. Wilder's statement, the drop off in use was due to the fact that there were ten events scheduled which the park was unable to accommodate. (5) Funding was requested for the project in

November, but was not adequately covered. (6) Alternatives have been reviewed with the County and with staff to attempt to resolve the funding problems. (7) A study was requested and approved by the IAC, but nothing has been done and the money has not been used. The user is more concerned about having the facility open and the other requirements needed in which to operate it.

Dr. Scull asked Mr. Welter if with the 50% raise in fees and a return to normal usage of the park, would it be able to function and be kept open? Mr. Welter replied there had been countless hours discussing the alternatives -- cut down maintenance -- cut down services provided, etc. Projections on the revenue were made and these may be optimistic, but do reflect all possible revenue. He said that \$100,000 a year could be generated by the park. But, those dollars did not come in during the past year. Mr. Fairleigh stated the staff had worked with the Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department in looking at the alternatives. The increase in fees would be of assistance, but not enough. Ms. Fenton asked what fees were charged in the other two ORV sports parks. Mr. Barry Peters, City of Richland, replied \$3.00 per person for the Horn Rapids Sports Park; and the Airway Heights Sports Park was \$3.00. There are also other charges for certain events.

Mack Ennis, Greater Seattle Motorcycle Club President

- (1) Pointed out that the users fees and other costs are a major contribution to the park. The fee for the Thurston County Sports Park has been increased from \$2.00 to \$5.00, and accepted by the users.
- (2) Any proposals that would eliminate day-use will affect the park's revenue.
- (3) Felt the track is now in much better condition and usable.

Randy Tipp advised the Committee that he was a member of the ORV advisory board with Thurston County and had been involved in the budget discussion and review. He noted that it is \$60,000 less than proposed the previous year. There had been a \$2.00 fee, but it was not collected routinely, therefore a part-time person was hired to collect those fees. He stated in order to make the debt payment, user fees have been used and there is not much going toward maintenance and operation. He asked that the IAC support the park and allocate enough funds so that it can continue to operate.

Mr. Fairleigh explained that the park would be open weekends only and this was incidental to the programmed events. Mr. Welter said day-use would be only on Saturday and Sunday.

Mr. Biles asked two questions of Mr. Zimmerman. (1) Would he respond to the allegations that the facility was not being properly managed by Thurston County, and the statements that not enough fees were collected (which could have been), and that apparently there were less volunteer efforts being made. Mr. Zimmerman replied:

- (a) There have been problems over the years in collecting the fees, but unable to state reasons.

- (b) When there is a crisis, however, the groups involved in the park "pull together" and work to be of help.
- (c) Over the years, there has been a lot of effort and strong commitment on the part of users and Thurston County in keeping this park going. An advisory committee was established to help identify the problems, look into the budget and address problems, and ensure that there would be fees charged and that the management problems would be considered.
- (d) There have been considerable volunteer efforts to see that the park is maintained, improved, etc. Whether this has been considered in the application process was not known.
- (e) A meeting with citizens last August was encouraging. There was a willingness to help to keep the park open.

(2) Mr. Biles asked if from Mr. Zimmerman's perspective, did he know of any possibility of waiving on the part of the Thurston County Commissioners to allow tax proceeds to go into this project. Mr. Zimmerman replied in the negative. He brought out the fact that there had been conversations/meetings with the IAC staff and with Mr. Wilder to discuss the debt situation. There is a \$150,000 current debt. It was asked if the County could pay off the debt and thus not affect the revenues coming in which could be applied toward maintenance and operation of the park. However, Mr. Zimmerman did not know if there had been any follow up.

Mr. Tipps stated there was a part of the user revenues which did go into the operations. He urged that the debt be paid off. He felt that Thurston County did not want to be put in the position of guaranteeing any amount of funds for the park. Mr. Wilder asked that the Committee and sponsors not lose sight of the fact that the IAC has been very supportive of the park and has tried to help make it succeed.

Mr. Tipps agreed that the Committee has tried to keep the park open despite possible mismanagement. He stated the facility was critically needed by ORV recreationists in the state and tax dollars to fund the park should be taken into consideration. He noted that a lot of money flows into the IAC from ORV users for ORV projects.

Loren McGovern, Member, Backcountry Horsemen, and member of NOVA Advisory Committee (IAC):

- 1) Pointed out that the NOVA Advisory Committee must follow the guidelines as approved by the Committee in evaluating projects and must also keep within the available dollars for Maintenance and Operation projects. If Thurston County had been funded, there would be another project not funded making the same demands for funding.
- (2) There were only three M&O facilities when first became a member of NOVA Advisory Committee, now there are eight projects to consider. Yet the dollar amount is capped at \$300,000. Maybe there should be different source to handle M&O funding.

- (3) Raising of the fees is necessary. However, the \$27,000 allocated to the project in November was not very much with which to work. Now, a \$98,000 project is being reviewed. This project is urgently needed by the users.

Mr. Ennis pointed out that the park had not as yet been opened to benefit from the raised fee. He noted that in California fees are as high as twenty dollars for day-use. Also, he felt the E&E funds were disproportionate to the M&O funds. **Angela Marek** stressed an attempt has been made to keep the fees reasonable and not cost prohibitive for the users. She asked that there be another fund source in order for events to be scheduled. **Ron Morgenthaler** commented on the history of the fee schedule and the monies taken in by the park over time. He felt the project had been placed before the Committee with unrealistic figures.

Mr. Seeley noted the tremendous amount of money going in to the E&E program when M&O should have more of the ORV allocations. **Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General**, replied that: (1) there are statutory limitations on the ORV funding sources and it is the IAC's responsibility to ensure that each category receive the proper percentage allocation as mandated by the law. (2) The IAC is not the promoter of any project. They assist in generating the project proposal and only react to what is proposed.

Mr. Seeley countered that the IAC approves a project as ongoing and if the Committee feels it is worthy enough then that means to him it is going to be funded in its category when it comes up again. He objected to the fact that the project was being closed out. **Mr. Tipps** asked if the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission charged fees and made a profit, and if that money helped pay for the day-use of their facilities. **Mr. Wilder** replied a lot of the state parks do not make a profit, but they do retain operation costs and they set realistic rates for their facilities. **Mr. Lane** asked that it be kept in mind a county park was being discussed -- not a state park. Also, the project had been combined with other M&O projects for the Committee's funding consideration.

There followed discussion on the gas tax and how it would or would not apply to the NOVA program. None of the gas tax money was allocated to the ORV program by the State Legislature. **Mr. Morgenthaler** said it was the users' responsibility to generate the funds; the IAC monies are legislatively available and there is a NOVA Committee evaluating the projects. He felt the IAC did a "good job" in administering the NOVA funds.

Ruth Ittner, NOVA member:

- (1) The users believe the Thurston County Project should be kept open because it is a needed ORV facility.
- (2) Was a member of the Snowmobile Advisory Committee prior to IAC. Their fees were raised from \$5.00 to \$15.00, with the monies going into a special fund which is in addition to other dollars which come from the gas tax.

- (3) Is there potential of these user fees being increased and then devoted to maintenance and operation of the park facilities to benefit all users?

Mr. Fearn asked if there were any new projects being recommended by staff for funding from M&O. Mr. Fairleigh replied: (1) Kittitas County Sheriff's Office, Maintenance & Operation, IAC #92-015M, and (2) USFS, Wenatchee National Forest, Cle Elum RD, ORV Trail Repair, IAC #92-017M. Mr. Fearn stated one of the difficulties regarding M&O projects is once they are started, the requirement for support never leaves. Then the IAC is faced with additional requests and it is not possible to help everyone. As a policy matter, the Committee needs to decide how best to spend the M&O funds. There are different operating requests being considered, and of the eight projects, Thurston County was given a low score. He was unsure of the criteria used to evaluate the projects, but the greatest need had apparently been indicated.

Mr. Costello asked what would happen if the state opted to discontinue its support for the federal projects. Why are there so few trails if they have monies available to help fund them?

Mr. Jim Bannister, USFS, replied the Forest Service has come to the IAC before for funding of trails and now needs to continue to have trails available for the public and maintain them, both federal and state funded. If no funds are allotted, those trails will not shut down, but will deteriorate. (The project called for repairs to trails in the Taneum area.)

Mr. Fairleigh noted that in July the IAC staff will be proposing some changes in the NOVA program. Essentially there are now four intensive use areas, and the Committee is spending approximately twenty-five percent (25%) of capital funds on M&O. A decision needs to be made whether the Committee wants to spend more or less on that category. Mr. Wilder pointed out that in the staff recommendation, the cap of \$300,000 was being addressed.

Mr. Biles noted the following:

- (1) The management of the Thurston County facility is in question.
- (2) Total investment has been made to date in the park of over \$3 million. Allocating another \$98,000 would not be a good step.
- (3) Has never seen the level of commitment from the County which he felt it deserved.
- (4) Should close the facility and find a source willing to operate it, either the private sector or a governmental agency.
- (5) Supportive of the increased fees and impressed by the users' willingness to accept the fees.
- (6) Suggested allocating a small amount of monies to keep the facility open awhile and at the same time work toward finding other management.

- (7) If that doesn't work, DNR is willing to "cut the cord" and possibly place the facility in a county which would have stronger commitment.

Mr. Fearn asked what type of hold the IAC had on the property and could the County sell the property outright. Mr. Fairleigh replied there are both "old" All-Terrain (ATV) funds in the project as well as ORV funds. Staff would need to research the ramifications and determine what type of hold IAC would have on the property should the ORV use terminate.

Mr. Tipps stated that the users of the park are deeply involved in its maintenance and want to see it continue. He asked that the Committee give the park "one more chance". With the \$40,000 for the study and the \$98,000 funding, the Committee would be able to have a solid view of the park's situation. If the Committee does not do this, the scheduled events will have to go somewhere else.

Mr. Fox asked if Thurston County really wanted to have the park closed or in someone else's hands. Mr. Zimmerman replied he could not give the Committee an absolute commitment. He was only able to say there had been discussions about all of the concerns expressed at the meeting and the County Commissioners had expressed an interest in sale of the park if this was a possibility. The possibility of a private concessionaire taking over has not been fully explored. He was concerned about the practicality of finding a private concessionaire interested in taking over the park.

Mr. Fairleigh questioned the users on the need for total funding as opposed to partial funding. His feeling was that the users must support partial funding and increased fees, and make a greater effort to help. Mr. Tipps said the users are behind the partial funding since this would aid in the likelihood of having the events take place. However, he did not feel that the park could survive with continued partial funding. Ms. Angela Marek pointed out there have been commitments made for events to take place, one occurring on April 4th.

Mr. Jones asked if there was a marketing or management plan for the park. Mike Welter replied there was no comprehensive marketing plan, mainly because there have not been sufficient funds to set it up. From the administrative standpoint, the special events are not marketed activities; that is left up to the user groups.

MR. FEARN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. COSTELLO, THAT THE M&O PROJECTS BE FUNDED BY DELETING PROJECTS #5 USFS, MT. BAKER SNOQUALMIE NATIONAL FOREST, EVANS CREEK ORV AREA, IAC #92-030M, \$24,770 AND #7 USFS WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST, ORV TRAIL REPAIR PROJECT, IAC #92-017M, \$13,831, APPLYING THE BALANCE OF FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$27,373, AND ALLOCATING THE RESULTING TOTAL OF \$65,974 TO THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK PROJECT #92-032M,

CONTINGENT UPON THE THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OFFERING AGAIN TO UTILIZE THE \$50,000 OFFERED AT THE NOVEMBER 9, 1990 IAC MEETING TO PAY THE NECESSARY 1991 BOND DEBT SERVICE; IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT

ALL REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE PARK ARE TO BE ADDED TO THESE AMOUNTS EARMARKED FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK.

Mr. Biles noted that Project #5, **Mount Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, Evans Creek ORV Area Project**, was ranked higher than the Thurston County Sports Park Project. He asked if staff could give the key considerations as to why it had scored higher. Mr. Fairleigh replied he could not presume to know the thinking of the NOVA Evaluation Committee in their evaluation scorings. Ms. Marguerite Austin, Project Manager, cited the considerable volunteer support in that project. Also she asked it be kept in mind that a portion of the evaluation procedure is to look at environmental impacts on the site. The Evans Creek Project is also a three-phase project.

Mr. Fearn agreed that it made sense to help the federal projects if this was possible. He had reviewed the proposed M&O projects and had observed the tremendous amount which has gone into the federal projects. In view of the lack of funds, he thought it prudent to fund the locals first prior to funding the federal projects.

Loren McGovern referred to Project #7, **USFS, Evans Creek ORV Area** stating there was a four-wheel drive unit included in the sponsor's share of \$14,400. This is a well-used Off-road Vehicle area, well-maintained and supported by the ORV users. He was troubled by the discussion of the fact that it is a federal project and should not be funded.

Ms. Ittner stated the facility is in an intensive-use area presenting opportunities for people to ride their vehicles. It is also trail related and there was discussion during the first review of this project when she had served with the reviewing group that environmental considerations be met and yet meet the ORV users' needs.

At this point, Mr. Biles said he was **against the motion**. He was impressed with the needs and the evident support of the users. He felt the facility was significant to the westside of the state. However, it is being managed by a local government which is not committed to it. He suggested the Committee not single out the Forest Service for they are providing opportunities for the citizens of Washington. Further, by singling out one sponsor and deleting projects, the Committee is not following its evaluation process (ranked order). Also, the \$27,000 will keep the facility in operation for three months - presumably April, May and June. He asked what would the Committee receive under the proposal to fund the extra monies being discussed?

Mr. Welter stated the actual amount needed for the Sports Park is \$98,000. This would enable the park to continue for some time, but he did not know just when it would be necessary to curtail operations. Mr. Fearn stressed the need for the \$50,000 from the County to be in the project. With that commitment, the amount for the park would be enhanced. He did not feel that there would be much

money collected through fees and that the park would need tax dollars to support it.

Mr. Lane pointed out that (1) the Committee had adopted NOVA rules and at the November meeting had set a \$300,000 limit. The Committee has the right to use the same criteria to override the NOVA Committee and staff's recommendations if it so desires. The Committee may apply its judgment to the process, but should be careful in changing the criteria since this has already been established. (2) Also, under the law the federal agencies are eligible. He did not know if the NOVA criteria treated them differently from the others applying for NOVA funds, but if it did not, then the federal agencies must be treated accordingly.

Mr. Biles said he would feel more comfortable starting at the bottom of the listing taking funds from those projects of lower priority and continuing up to reach the level of funding desired. He AMENDED THE MOTION: DELETE PROJECT #7, USFS, WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST, M&O, \$13,831, AND PROJECT #6, FERRY COUNTY, M&O, \$23,000 AND TAKE \$1,000 FROM PROJECT #5, USFS, MT. BAKER-SNOQUALMIE NF, M&O, LEAVING A BALANCE OF \$23,770 IN THAT PROJECT AND PLACING THOSE FUNDS (\$37,831) IN THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK M&O #92-032M PROJECT.

MR. FEARN SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION STATING THE NEED ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL IS LESS AND THE FOREST SERVICE DOES HAVE OPPORTUNITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS IN ITS PROJECTS.

THE COMMITTEE OPTED TO VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND THE MOTION AT THE SAME TIME. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AS AMENDED BY MR. BILES. MR. BILES AND MR. FEARN VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE; THE REMAINDER OF THE COMMITTEE IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION AND AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A MAJORITY VOTE.

MR. BILES THEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE FUNDING FOR THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK PROJECT, IAC #92-032M, AT \$64,204 USING THE \$27,373 BALANCE OF EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT (E&E) PROJECT FUNDS INDICATED ON THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY, ELIMINATING RANKED PROJECT #7, USFS WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST \$13,831 AND RANKED PROJECT #6, FERRY COUNTY, \$23,000, AND PLACING THOSE FUNDS INTO THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK M&O #92-032M PROJECT: CONTINGENT UPON THE THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OFFERING AGAIN TO UTILIZE THE \$50,000 OFFERED AT THE NOVEMBER 9, 1990 IAC MEETING TO PAY THE NECESSARY 1991 BOND DEBT SERVICE; IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT ALL REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE PARK ARE TO BE ADDED TO THESE AMOUNTS EARMARKED FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK.

MS. FENTON AMENDED THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT THE THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS BE GIVEN A THIRTY-DAY LIMIT FOR RESPONSE TO THE IAC CONCERNING THE AVAILABILITY OF THE \$50,000 IN ORDER TO ENABLE THE COMMITTEE TO MAKE MODIFICATIONS TO THE FUNDING OF THE EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT (E&E) PROJECTS IF NECESSARY.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Biles if there were any other reasons for his motion to approve the project as stated. Mr. Biles said he was attempting to maintain the integrity of the ranking system. Mr. Fox asked if the private sector would be excluded from any negotiations to take over the park. Mr. Wilder stated this would include both private and nonprofit and asked that the minutes reflect this understanding: that the County explore the possibility of a nonprofit organization or a for-profit concessionaire assuming operation of the park.

Mr. Jones felt there should be a management plan developed -- an action plan which would help the park in solutions for its management and operations. Mr. Fairleigh stated staff would be looking into this situation and mentioned that this type of language is in the project contract.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. MR. JONES VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION PRESENTED BY MR. BILES. MR. JONES ABSTAINED. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Dr. Scull stated the Committee was giving a clear message to the County that the members have gone far beyond expectations in order to assist them in resolving the issues. Mr. Jones wanted this to be made very specific. Mr. Lane felt the Committee's action did convey a message to the County that if efforts weren't made to clear up these issues, the Committee members would not continue to fund the project.

MR. FEARN MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT IF THE THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS DO NOT AGREE TO UTILIZE THE \$50,000 OFFERED AT THE NOVEMBER 9, 1990 IAC MEETING, THAT THE EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT (E&E) PROJECTS BE FUNDED FOLLOWING THE IAC STAFF ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECTS #1 THROUGH #7.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FOX, SECONDED BY MR. BILES, THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS (M&O) PROJECT FUNDING AS AMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE IN ITS PREVIOUS MOTIONS CONCERNING THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK PROJECT, IAC #92-032M, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN. (PROJECTS APPROVED AS INDICATED ON PAGE 36 OF THESE MINUTES.)

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. JONES ABSTAINED. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROJECTS APPROVED
MARCH 1991

NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS

PROJECT FUNDING - MARCH 21, 1991

| <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>PROJECT</u> | <u>IAC</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| Richland | Horn Rapids H&O | \$ 101,336 | \$ 47,265 | \$ 148,601 |
| Killitas County | Maintenance & Operation | 5,500 | -0- | 5,500 |
| Spokane County | Airway Heights H&O | 61,704 | 15,340 | 77,044 |
| Grant County | ORV Coordinator | 42,486 | -0- | 42,486 |
| USFS Mt. Baker-Snoq. Forest | Maintenance & Operation | 24,770 | 14,400 | 39,170 |
| Hurston County | Sports Park H&O | 64,204 | 50,000 | 114,204 |
| | | \$ 300,000 | \$ 127,005 | \$ 427,005 |

One of the interested persons in the audience asked what would be the best advice the Committee could give to him and others to keep this same situation from happening again. Dr. Scull advised him the first option would be abolish the debt so that revenues coming into the park could be used for maintenance and operation. Secondly, maintain relationships to explore ways to manage the park more efficiently. Also, demonstrate interest by increased volunteerism to continue to exhibit interest in the park. He felt the park should be made more self-supporting in terms of increasing fees. Mr. Fearn advised of the need to increase the score next year and being knowledgeable of the criteria used to rank projects. Mr. Biles suggested there be evidence of improvement in management of the facility, and development of a long-range management plan for it; a multi-year planning element. He also asked that there be better identification to the Committee of volunteer activities/hours.

The Committee recessed at 1:15 p.m. and reconvened at 1:21 p.m.

III. OLD BUSINESS, A. 4. CITY OF ODESSA, SWIMMING POOL - TOWN OF WINTHROP, WINTHROP PARK: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "LWCF LOCAL PROJECT RECOMMENDATION", concerning consideration for funding of two local agencies' projects from the November, 1989 listing. The Committee at that meeting had requested the IAC to apply any Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) received in the fall of 1990 to the next highest projects on the November 1989 listing. Due to federal budget delays, the 1991 federal apportionment was not confirmed until January 16, 1991. The apportionment was \$576,424 (to be split 50-50 local/state), making \$288,212 available to local agencies.

Approval was requested for two local agencies' projects:

1. **TOWN OF ODESSA, SWIMMING POOL CONSTRUCTION, IAC #90-019D:**

The Town passed a bond issue (\$250,000), completed plans/specifications/bid process, and is prepared to begin construction immediately.

Funding request: IAC Share \$150,000; Local \$180,000 - Total Project Cost of \$330,000.

2. **TOWN OF WINTHROP, WINTHROP PARK, IAC #90-046D:**

For renovation/expansion of the Winthrop Park in Winthrop along the Methow River. Several parcels of donated land are included.

Funding request: IAC share \$128,767; Local \$128,767 - Total Project Cost of \$257,534.

Mr. Fairleigh stated it should be understood that staff is not setting a precedent in bringing these projects to the Committee for consideration in this manner, but is striving to clear up old business transactions. Further, there is a need to obligate LWCF monies, and both projects are ready to proceed. Though there are

WWRP projects on a listing, the IAC currently does not have a logical mechanism to distribute these funds among projects in the various categories.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT

WHEREAS, AT THE NOVEMBER, 1989 IAC MEETING THE IAC, IN ANTICIPATION OF INSUFFICIENT LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS (LWCF) TO JUSTIFY A NEW "TRADITIONAL PROGRAM" PROJECT SELECTION CYCLE IN 1990, GRANTED THE DIRECTOR AUTHORITY TO USE AVAILABLE LWCF MONIES TO FUND PROJECTS FROM THE 1989 PROJECT LIST UNTIL NOVEMBER, 1990, AND,

WHEREAS, THE DIRECTOR WAS UNABLE TO DO THIS DUE TO DELAYS IN RECEIPT OF NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABLE LWCF MONIES, AND

WHEREAS, LWCF MONIES IN A LIMITED QUANTITY ARE NOW AVAILABLE, AND

WHEREAS, THE TOWN OF ODESSA AND THE TOWN OF WINTHROP HAVE VIABLE PROJECTS FROM THE 1989 LIST READY TO PROCEED,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS WITH THE TOWN OF ODESSA WHICH WILL INCLUDE \$150,000 LWCF MONIES AND THE TOWN OF WINTHROP INCLUDING \$128,767 AS FOLLOWS:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| TOWN OF ODESSA | IAC \$150,000 | LOCAL \$180,000 | TOTAL: \$330,000 |
| TOWN OF WINTHROP | IAC \$128,767 | LOCAL \$128,767 | TOTAL; 257,534 |
| TOTAL LWCF COMMITTED: | | | \$ 278,767 |

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 1:25 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m.. JAN TVETEN, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission, arrived at 2:00 p.m.. QUORUM: SCULL, FOX, FEARN, JONES, BILES, COSTELLO, FENTON, AND TVETEN. Introductions were made by the Committee members, IAC staff, and audience.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - C. FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS

CONSIDERATIONS: Memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "Firearms Range (FRP) Funding", was referred to by Mr. Fairleigh. There were twenty-one (21) Firearms Range Program projects presented for funding consideration. (TABLE 1 - FIREARMS RANGE PROJECTS, PAGE 39) Mr. Fairleigh expressed his appreciation to the newly formed Firearms Range Committee for the members' assistance and to the project sponsors who had submitted projects for the first time to staff and the Committee. He noted that by procedural guidelines, grants of up to a maximum of \$50,000 IAC share per project are allowed within the Firearms Range Program.

Each project was then presented to the Committee by Project Services staff using slides and verbal summaries. There were no comments made by the Committee members as the projects were reviewed.

**TABLE 1 - FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS
AS REQUESTED - MARCH 1991**

| Rank | Score | Proj No. | Sponsor Name | Project Name | Request | Match | Total | Request Cua. |
|---------------|-------|----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 169.2 | 92-044D | Whatcom County | Range Control Facilities | 47,940 | 47,941 | 95,881 | 47,940 |
| 2 | 168.9 | 92-053A | Ferry County | Firearms Range Acquisition | 15,100 | 23,500 | 38,600 | 57,040 |
| 3 | 163.0 | 92-048D | Central Wash. Range Conserv. | Sun Valley Shooting Park | 50,000 | 75,410 | 125,410 | 117,040 |
| 4 | 159.4 | 92-041D | Cascade Rifle & Pistol | Range Renovation | 32,150 | 32,150 | 64,300 | 145,190 |
| 5 | 159.0 | 92-040D | Issaquah Sportsmen | Renovate/Relocate | 50,000 | 132,733 | 182,733 | 195,190 |
| 6 | 158.9 | 92-050D | Custer Sportsmen | Range Improvements | 50,000 | 90,531 | 140,531 | 245,190 |
| 7 | 152.1 | 92-014D | Seattle Parks | Westcrest Park Archery | 12,973 | 12,973 | 25,946 | 232,163 |
| 8 | 147.2 | 92-037D | Skookum Archers | Indoor Range | 30,220 | 30,220 | 60,440 | 288,383 |
| 9 | 144.2 | 92-045D | Tri-Cities Shooting Assoc. | Rattlesnake Mountain | 50,000 | 62,100 | 112,100 | 336,383 |
| 10 | 142.3 | 92-030D | West Seattle Sportsmen | Dahl Range Upgrade | 12,217 | 12,217 | 24,434 | 350,600 |
| 11 | 141.6 | 92-047D | Fire Mountain Archers | Range Upgrading | 10,378 | 12,176 | 22,554 | 360,978 |
| 12 | 137.5 | 92-035D | KBH Archers | Firearms Range Development | 44,644 | 44,645 | 89,289 | 405,622 |
| 13 | 132.2 | 92-042D | Wildlife Committee of Wash. | Kenmore Ranges | 50,000 | 51,000 | 101,000 | 455,622 |
| 14 | 131.4 | 92-037D | Coulee City Sportsmen's Club | Automatic Trap | 18,750 | 35,360 | 54,110 | 474,372 |
| 15 | 130.2 | 92-045D | Wenatchee Gun Club | Steel Field Improvements | 4,300 | 4,300 | 8,600 | 478,672 |
| 16 | 126.9 | 92-054D | Evergreen Sportsmen | Range Improvements | 30,029 | 30,029 | 60,058 | 502,701 |
| 17 | 124.9 | 92-043D | Interlake Rod & Gun Club | Upgrade Club Facilities | 37,150 | 91,100 | 128,250 | 545,851 |
| 18 | 122.3 | 92-033D | Cedar River Bowmen | Target Butts | 18,275 | 18,275 | 36,550 | 564,126 |
| 19 | 121.5 | 92-036D | Spokane Gun Club | Lighting & Trap Improvements | 8,141 | 8,142 | 16,283 | 572,267 |
| 20 | 113.9 | 92-034D | Vancouver Trap & Gun Club | Firearms Range Development | 10,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 582,267 |
| 21 | 112.5 | 92-033D | Sumner Sportsmen | Trap Replacement | 15,587 | 15,588 | 31,175 | 597,854 |
| Totals | | | | | 597,854 | 840,390 | 1,438,244 | |

Firearms Range Program - Table 1

In response to Mr. Biles' question, Mr. Eric Johnson, Project Manager, stated liability insurance was a reimbursable item. Mr. Wilder noted there is a requirement in the project contract that liability insurance be provided. Mr. Fairleigh noted that the law requires a commitment to operate the facility for ten years. Other questions and answers were made in this program:

1. Some of the ranges are Olympic type shooting ranges; others are more of a general type shooting range.
2. Some of the facilities may be in close proximity to neighbors; others located in wooded areas away from homes, etc. It may be that some people are upset that a range is located in their area, but most of these facilities are already grandfathered in.
3. There appear to be no conflicts at this time concerning the ranges.
4. Liability insurance rates were discussed.

Mike Krei, National Rifle Association Field Representative, informed the Committee that accidents are few and may only involve an employee or someone being injured in a non-gun related incident.

5. Some of the range project requests are from public agencies, but most are nonprofit groups. It was specifically pointed out that the Whatcom County project was for a Park and Recreation Department.
6. Explanation of the term "baffle" was given and slides shown of this item. (To keep ammunition on the range and prevent it from leaving the area.) Explanation was given of a "beo mat" - American skeet trap.
7. Semi-automatic weapons are allowed; competitive sporting weapons; military firearms.
8. The general public is accommodated at all ranges and public access is required in order to submit a project to the IAC.
9. Handicapped persons can use the facilities, and the National Rifle Association is working to include information on this opportunity in its manual.

Tri-Cities Shooting Association, Rattlesnake Mountain Shooting Area, #92-046D: In response to Mr. Fox, Ms. Austin stated the shooting range would be located across the road from a County park. The construction of a campground in the park will be of use to the shooting range recreationists. The Association has been working closely with Benton County on this matter.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Fairleigh stressed that the Firearms Range Funding Program is heavily under-funded. Approximately \$374,000 is available (\$597,854 requested from the IAC). A number of Letters of Intent did not make it through the process because of the time element. The \$374,000 represents a 32-month collection and

current annual accumulation is estimated to be \$130,000 only. The funding source is the \$3.00 charge for concealed weapons permit.

Gary Kasowski, Member, Firearms Range Committee, answered questions concerning funding sources for the program:

1. Firearms groups went through the legislative process to obtain the present firearms range funding program.
2. Suggested to Dept. of Wildlife that it might be possible to use some funds from the Pittman/Robertson program. They had already used it in other projects.
3. Felt using Pittman/Robertson funds for firearms ranges was a legal use of that money. Will continue to talk to the Department of Wildlife about this.
4. There will be an opportunity in the next Legislative Session to go back to the Legislature with a report and a recommendation where other funds might be obtained. Will be working with the Director of the IAC on this matter.
5. Suggested the two departments (IAC/Wildlife) might be able to help in providing additional funding for the program.

The Committee was advised that the present fee of \$3.00 for a concealed weapons permit is for a period of four years.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS - FIREARMS RANGE PROJECTS (Table 2, Page 42)

Table 2, Firearms Range Projects Recommendations, dated March 21, 1991, was distributed to the Committee and audience.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Roger DeSpain, Director, Whatcom County Parks and Recreation Director:

1. Publicly thanked the Committee for taking the leadership on the new Firearms Range Facilities Program.
2. The Firearms Advisory Group is to be congratulated for their work and specialized activities concerning the processing of applications.
3. Staff of the IAC took on the processing of these applications along with their normal funding programs, and working with small amount of money came through with good projects.
4. Proud of the IAC staff for their abilities in exploring the process, coming up with guidelines, etc. They did a fantastic job.

Tom Mechler, Director and Club Agent, Issaquah Sportsmen's Club: Was present to answer any questions the Committee might have in regard to the Issaquah project.

William Brereton, Member Firearms Range Advisory Committee and Skookum Archer: Enjoyed serving on the Firearms Range Advisory Committee and looked forward to continuing to be of assistance to staff and the Committee.

**TABLE 2 - FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS - MARCH 1991**

STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

| <u>RANK</u> | <u>SCORE</u> | <u>PROJECT NUMBER</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>PROJECT</u> | <u>IAC</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>CUMM. TOTAL</u> |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 169.2 | 92-0440 | Whatcom County | Range Control Facilities | 47,940 | 47,941 | 95,881 | 47,940 |
| 2 | 168.9 | 92-053A | Ferry County | Firearms Range Acquisition | 15,100 | 23,500 | 38,600 | 63,040 |
| 3 | 163.0 | 92-048D | Central WA Range Con. | Sun Valley Shooting Park | 50,000 | 75,410 | 125,410 | 113,040 |
| 4 | 159.4 | 92-041D | Cascade Rifle & Pistol | Range Renovation | 32,150 | 32,150 | 64,300 | 145,190 |
| 5 | 159.0 | 92-040D | Issaquah Sportsmen | Renovate/Relocate | 50,000 | 132,733 | 182,733 | 195,190 |
| 6 | 158.9 | 92-050D | Custer Sportsmen | Range Improvements | 50,000 | 90,531 | 140,531 | 245,190 |
| 7 | 152.1 | 92-014D | Seattle Parks | Westcrest Park Archery | 12,973 | 12,973 | 25,946 | 258,163 |
| 8 | 147.2 | 92-039D | Skookum Archers | Indoor Range | 30,220 | 30,220 | 60,440 | 288,383 |
| 9 | 144.2 | 92-046D | Tri-Cities Shooting Assn. | Rattlesnake Mountain | 50,000 | 62,100 | 112,100 | 338,383 |
| 10 | 142.3 | 90-038D | West Seattle Sportsmen | Dahl Range Upgrade | 12,217 | 12,217 | 24,434 | 350,600 |
| 11 | 141.8 | 92-047D | Fire Mountain Archers | Range Upgrading | 10,378 | 12,176 | 22,554 | 360,978 |
| 12 | 137.5 | 92-035D | KBH Archers | Firearms Range Development | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 13 | 132.2 | 92-042D | Wildlife Committee of WA | Kenmore Ranges | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 14 | 131.4 | 92-057D | Coulee City Sportsmen | Automatic Trap | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 15 | 130.2 | 92-045D | Wenatchee Gun Club | Skeet Field Improvements | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 16 | 128.9 | 92-054D | Evergreen Sportsmen | Range Improvements | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 17 | 124.9 | 92-043D | Interlake Rod & Gun | Upgrade Club Facilities | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 18 | 122.3 | 92-023D | Cedar River Bowmen | Target Butts | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 19 | 121.5 | 92-036D | Spokane Gun Club | Lighting & Trap Improvements | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 20 | 113.9 | 92-034D | Vancouver Trap & Gun Club | Firearms Range Development | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| 21 | 112.5 | 92-033D | Summer Sportsmen | Trap Replacement | -0- | -0- | -0- | 360,978 |
| Totals | | | | | 360,978 | 531,951 | 892,929 | 360,978 |

FRP Funds Available **\$373,921**

Staff Recommendation **360,978**

Balance **\$ 12,943**

Tom Galbraith, Assistant Director, National Guard: Stated it was a pleasure to work with staff and note how projects are handled. Felt staff was well-organized and efficient.

Mike Krei, National Rifle Association, Field Representative: Acknowledged the good work of staff and expressed his appreciation. The funding program is handled differently in various states, and Washington's is one of the best ideas because it is a program of shooters paying for their facilities. Anticipate continuing the program and broadening it to obtain additional funding. Encouraged with the results so far.

Jody Dickey, KBH Archers (Secretary): Thanked Don Clark for his assistance. The KBH Archers, Firearms Range Development project was not funded (Project #12). She now needed to advise her group of the reasons why the project did not receive funding yet staff had left a balance of \$12,943.

Mr. Wilder replied staff had struggled with this new program to come up with the figures which would meet funding levels and fund the best projects. It is also necessary to retain some contingency monies should there be a need coming from those project sponsors whose projects are already funded.

Gary Kasowski, Member, Firearms Range Advisory Committee:

1. Added to the accolades being given to the staff. They were sensitive to the sponsors.
2. Hoped this would be the beginning of many years of grants from the IAC. The need is great, and this funding session has only scraped the surface.
3. Law enforcement also benefits from the use of these ranges.
4. There are very few places where firearms ranges can be placed; need cooperation of those in and around the proposed area.
5. This is a form of recreation that gets very little support from government, and glad to see that it is going to continue through the IAC.

Rose Iris Toburg, President, Tri-Cities Shooting Association: Stated it was a "dream come true" to have this funding for Firearms Ranges. She had been trying to find funding for some time and had even asked if park rangers could offer assistance somehow. Thanked the Committee, the IAC staff, and the Firearms Range Committee for all of their work, and especially Marguerite Austin for her help.

J. K. Johnson, Member, Firearms Range Advisory Committee (Did not file a Participation Card): Commented that the projects which had come in totaled over \$600,000. Therefore, with three years' accumulation of funds, only 60% is given. Also, will be short next year for funding.

Mr. Wilder reminded him that at the next funding session, only twelve months of revenue will be available. Mr. Fox pointed out that this is the only IAC funding program directly available to nonprofits and

he would like to see this type of funding extended some day. He felt the matching funds also were commendable.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MR. COSTELLO THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS FUNDING; AND

FURTHER, THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCIES OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN. (PROJECTS APPROVED AS INDICATED ON PAGE 45 OF THESE MINUTES.)

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

RESOLUTION - PEGGY M. FRAZIER, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Dr. Scull read the following resolution:

WHEREAS, PEGGY M. FRAZIER, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT FOR THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, HAS WORKED FOR THIRTY-SIX YEARS FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, THE PAST TWENTY-TWO YEARS OF WHICH FOR THE IAC, AND

WHEREAS, HER CONTRIBUTION OF TIME AND TALENT, LOYALTY AND COMMITMENT HAVE BEEN AN EXAMPLE FOR ALL TO EMULATE, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE THE TALENT, DEDICATION, COMMITMENT AND SUPPORT SHE HAS RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE DURING HER STATE EMPLOYMENT AND AS A KEY MEMBER OF THE IAC TEAM, AND WISH HER WELL IN FUTURE ENDEAVORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF PEGGY M. FRAZIER'S PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HER RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION, AND CONGRATULATIONS FOR A JOB WELL DONE,

AND RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE HONORABLE BOOTH GARDNER, GOVERNOR OF WASHINGTON, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO PEGGY M. FRAZIER.

RESOLUTION WAS MOVED, SECONDED, AND CARRIED.

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Scull presented Ms. Frazier with an honorary plaque for her twenty-two years of service with the IAC. Ms. Frazier thanked the Committee for passing the resolution in her honor and for the honorary plaque. She thanked the staff and Director Wilder for their part in the presentations and stated it had been a great pleasure to work for the Committee these past years.

The Committee recessed at 3:18 p.m. for refreshments and reconvened at 3:30 p.m..

FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS APPROVED
MARCH 1991

FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES - FUNDING MARCH 21, 1991

| <u>PROJECT NUMBER</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>PROJECT</u> | <u>JAC</u> | <u>SPONSOR</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 92-0440 | Whatcom County | Range Control Facilities | 47,940 | 47,941 | 95,881 |
| 92-053A | Ferry County | Firearms Range Acquisition | 15,100 | 23,500 | 38,600 |
| 92-048D | Central WA Range Con. | Sun Valley Shooting Park | 50,000 | 75,410 | 125,410 |
| 92-041D | Cascade Rifle & Pistol | Range Renovation | 32,150 | 32,150 | 64,300 |
| 92-040D | Issaquah Sportsmen | Renovate/Relocate | 50,000 | 132,733 | 182,733 |
| 92-050D | Custer Sportsmen | Range Improvements | 50,000 | 90,531 | 140,531 |
| 92-014D | Seattle Parks | Westcrest Park Archery | 12,973 | 12,973 | 25,946 |
| 92-039D | Skookum Archers | Indoor Range | 30,220 | 30,220 | 60,440 |
| 92-046D | Tri-Cities Shooting Assn. | Rattlesnake Mountain | 50,000 | 62,100 | 112,100 |
| 90-038D | West Seattle Sportsmen | Dahl Range Upgrade | 12,217 | 12,217 | 24,434 |
| 92-047D | Fire Mountain Archers | Range Upgrading | 10,378 | 12,176 | 22,554 |
| | | | 360,978 | 531,951 | 892,929 |

IV. NEW BUSINESS - F. WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (WACS)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS: Mr. Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 21, 1991, "WWRP WAC Status Report":

1. A set of clear and functional program operating procedures are required for the Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP). An advisory committee was appointed in December 1990 to assist in developing criteria.
2. Corrected last name on the listing of the WAC Advisory Committee to indicate Arden Olson as the designee from the Department of Natural Resources rather than Sheri Yonker.
3. Draft WACs were written based on two rules: Avoid readopting RCWs as rules and avoid adopting material that is merely informative or advisory.
4. WACs will be considered for adoption at the July 26 IAC meeting.

Mr. Tveten referred to 1 a., Page 2 "After July 1, 1992: Before considering an eligible project, the committee must have on file from the local agency applicant a plan completed in accordance with committee guidelines. The plan must include, etc. etc." He asked whether the IAC should not prepare the plan and the local and state agencies applications would have to be consistent with that state plan rather than have everyone prepare their own. Could this be an element of SCORP? Both Mr. Tveten and Ms. Fenton were concerned about plans for state agencies also as in 2 a., Page 2. Mr. Tveten gave some examples of projects his agency would not be able to pick up if it was going to be necessary to have a plan for each one, i.e., Ledbetter Point, Rookery/Birch Bay Park, etc.

There followed discussion on the need for submittal of plans and adopted six-year capital improvement programs, as well as inventory of managed lands as cited in the DRAFT WACs. Mr. Wilder stated the IAC staff was sensitive to required paperwork and would try to work over these requirements with the state agencies representatives. Mr. Costello said the Department of Fisheries does do a lot of six-year planning, but very little of that relates to acquisition of lands and facilities. Ms. Fenton stated the Department of Wildlife does not have six-year conservation plans, but develops priorities for the habitat proposals and focuses on lands. This type of long-range plan can't be adopted until later and then it will be necessary to work out the necessary funding factors. Mr. Lovelady pointed out that the state plans were not necessary until July 1, 1993, and that it would be impractical for the IAC to do the planning since the level of detail would be individual-agency-specific. He stressed that the section under discussion was placed in the WACs to ensure that IAC works closely with state and local agencies on the planning efforts.

Mr. Tveten said if the plan system becomes cumbersome, then he is very concerned about it. Projects outside the boundaries of state

parks would require a plan, and this would be difficult to do. Mr. Fred Wert, Washington Wildlife & Recreation Coalition, agreed with Mr. Tveten's observations throughout the discussion. The intent, he said, is to acquire land and submit applications to do so. Mr. Wilder appreciated the comments made by the state agencies' representatives and others assuring them these would be taken into consideration in further deliberations with agency staffs on the proposed WACs and participation manuals.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - E. PARTICIPATION MANUALS - 1. NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS MANUAL CHANGES: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 21, 1991, "NHR Program Manual Change", reporting as follows:

1. In order to manage and "stretch" NHR funds, staff considered (a) lowering the maximum IAC share and (b) requiring a sponsor matching share.
2. Currently the maximum share is limited to \$150,000; staff recommended reducing this to \$100,000.
3. Currently there is no required sponsor share in the NHR program, but because of incentives and heavy competition for funds, sponsors have been providing a 37% matching share on an overall basis. Staff recommended that evaluation points credit be expanded to those sponsors who can provide lesser matching share. Question C-1 in the manual was proposed to be changed accordingly.

Mr. Tveten stated he had brought this matter to the attention of the Committee because state agencies were not able to provide matching monies and thus were unable to compete fairly in the program. Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, pointed out that State Parks does use a lot of volunteer help in its projects and this will make them more competitive in that particular area. Mr. Tveten said volunteer projects do need staff for coordination purposes. He wanted the Committee to be aware of this staff proposal stating State Parks would work with the IAC, but it is inconvenient to do so in the matter of providing matching shares.

Mr. Fearn asked if the volunteer help in the projects was audited in any way to ensure that it was in actual fact being provided in the project. Mr. Clark replied volunteer assistance becomes a part of the local match and has to be indicated on the voucher submitted to the IAC for reimbursement. There is a record kept of volunteer hours in each project. Mr. Fearn felt perhaps this would influence projects being recommended - the ability of an agency who has the most money locally would get their project approved; whereas, a project not having matching, and yet might be a better project, would not score as high and thus not receive approval.

Loren McGovern, Member, NOVA Committee: Stated he was strongly opposed to putting a match on the NHR funding program. Good projects are not being funded which should be. He was opposed to putting caps

on projects funding. The Evaluation groups need to evaluate each project on its own merits. He did not want to have a \$110,000 project turned down because of a \$100,000 limit. He suggested perhaps additional points for volunteer work might help the situation.

Mr. Fairleigh noted that the proposed manual changes being reviewed were passed by the NOVA Committee. Because of the funds coming into the program, it was felt that there needed to be a balance somewhere. Mr. Lovelady reminded the Committee that the IAC had always had a policy of attempting to spread the funds around as much as possible, and through various areas of the state as well. Mr. Wilder said the object was to fund more projects.

Mr. Tveten suggested the Committee vote on the matter and make its decision. MR. TVETEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN THAT THE NHR PROGRAM MANUAL CHANGES AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF BE APPROVED:

LOWER THE MAXIMUM IAC SHARE FROM \$150,000 TO \$100,000.

EVALUATION POINTS CREDIT BE EXPANDED TO THOSE SPONSORS WHO CAN PROVIDE LESSER MATCHING SHARE AS FOLLOWS:

NHR QUESTION C-1:

| | <u>POINTS</u> | |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| 0% - 9% | 0 | NEW |
| 10+ - 19% | 3 | NEW |
| 20+ - 30% | 5 | No change |
| 30% - 40% | 10 | " " |
| 40% - 50% | 15 | " " |
| 50% - 60% | 20 | " " |
| 60+% | 25 | " " |

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. COSTELLO AND MR. TVETEN VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

2. FIREARMS RANGE PROGRAM - LIABILITY INSURANCE: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 21, 1991, "Firearms Range Program Insurance Issues", noting the following:

1. Since the November 1990 meeting, staff discussed the liability insurance issue with both Ms. Shannon Smith, Assistant Attorney General, and the Firearms Range Advisory Committee. IAC has been advised that the IAC members suffer no greater liability exposure for their actions related to the Firearms Range Program than for any of the other grant programs.
2. Staff recommended a new section to be added to the Firearms Range Program Participation Manual #1:

"Liability Insurance: All project sponsors must, for the life of the IAC Project Agreement (minimum of ten years by statute), carry at all times an adequate amount of liability insurance at either their own expense or

through Firearms Range Program grant funds. If FRP funds are used, a new application for funding must be made each year as liability insurance grants are for one year only."

Mr. Lane felt staff's recommendation for the liability insurance was generally acceptable. However, he said the insurance issue was actually from a management point of view and there may be a different level and range of protection varying from facility to facility. He suggested the term "adequate amount" be changed to either (1) indicate an amount which would be a minimum or (2) decide on the amount at the time the contract is written and leave it up to staff to make the decision. The Committee does need to protect itself and this is done through the liability insurance -- it allows for protection of the public and protection of the Committee. The Committee is already protected by public doctrine against liability, but co-insurance would ensure that requirement. He pointed out the costs involved in a defense case.

Mr. Tveten was informed that many of the firearms range applicants funded today were carrying \$1 million liability policies. It was also noted that insurance companies do increase the premium under the co-insurance policies. Mr. Fox suggested adding language in the paragraph dealing with Liability Insurance:

"All project sponsors must, for the life of the IAC Project Agreement, (minimum of ten years by statute), carry at all times an adequate amount of liability insurance the amount and extent of coverage to be determined by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation"

Discussion followed on the amount of liability insurance, action required of the IAC, authority of the IAC to request liability insurance, funding used for same, etc. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. JONES, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT A MINIMUM OF \$1 MILLION LIABILITY INSURANCE BE REQUIRED FOR FIREARMS RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS AND AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT AS DETERMINED APPROPRIATE BY THE SPONSORING ENTITY.

Mr. Fairleigh said whatever requirements are adopted by the Committee could be included in the project contracts. Mr. Clark asked if there might be a conflict with municipalities which are self-insured. Mr. Lane agreed this was a good point citing that the State of Washington does not carry liability insurance. The sponsor could not meet the requirements under discussion unless a statement were provided stating they were self-insured.

MS. FENTON AMENDED THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT AN EXCEPTION WOULD BE PROVIDED FOR A GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY WHICH COULD PROVIDE A STATEMENT OF SELF-INSURANCE; THAT THE STATE AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION BE INCLUDED ON THE POLICY AS BEING INSURED AS WELL; AND THAT THE SPONSOR MAY ADD WHATEVER IS DEEMED NECESSARY ABOVE THE \$1 MILLION DOLLAR LEVEL.

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

Mr. Costello asked that this subject continue to be monitored by staff and that there be further opportunity to discuss it.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - F. WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM

INTERIM GUIDELINES: Memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "Interim Guidelines for Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Projects", was referred to by Mr. Fairleigh, noting the following:

1. Proposed interim guidelines related to (a) reallocation of WWRP funds and (2) interim guidelines for 1991 local WWRP projects.
2. SEE APPENDIX "B" FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

Ms. Fenton referred to page (1), item 2. under "Staff Recommendations:

"2. Statutory minimums for allocation and expenditure of funds required by 43.98A by category will be maintained on a biennial basis."

She referred to Mr. Baker's remarks during the Financial Summaries reports and the fact that the Trails category is unbalanced. Yet, this requirement states, "will be maintained on a biennial basis". Mr. Fairleigh replied this recommendation was for the long-term program and that the Trails category is a short-term problem which will be resolved soon. Ms. Fenton stated the Urban Wildlife category appeared for a time to have the same problem, and she suggested changing the wording to state, "within the following year" so that agencies don't get locked into a biennium. Mr. Wilder said this was an item for the recordkeeping system, and asked Mr. Baker if it could not be handled in this way. Mr. Baker replied the outcome would depend on projects submitted, etc. The law outlines guidelines and gives flexibility, but, it is necessary to abide by the rules outlined in the law. The staff recommendation is more restrictive than existing law, but staff can make every effort to stay within the percentages and the law. Mr. Wilder suggested stating "within the next two years". Mr. Costello wondered what advantage there was in setting a "biennial" basis.

Mr. Tveten pointed out the "pitfall" in setting this guideline -- once it is adopted and used, then an audit is made against the adopted guideline. The IAC has placed another difficult requirement on itself. He suggested staff could relate the grants to the overall formula and see how the program is moving along but not have this stipulation in the guidelines. If categories don't balance out, staff would need to take appropriate action.

Interim Guidelines for 1991 Local WWRP Projects: Mr. Fairleigh explained the Interim Guidelines for the 1991 Local WWRP Program. To provide clarification, interim guidelines were written on (a) grant

limits, (b) eligible/ineligible activities, and (c) clarification of urban wildlife habitat projects. (SEE APPENDIX "B")

Mr. Fox referred to page (3) ineligible projects, and asked if "interpretive centers" would include kiosks. Mr. Fairleigh assured him it would, that the term meant large sized buildings, expensive to build -- those types of buildings which usually are funded through the 057 State Building Construction Fund. Interpretive signing and displays are eligible.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, TO APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP) INTERIM GUIDELINES, WITH THE PROVISO THAT ITEM 2. "STATUTORY MINIMUMS FOR ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS REQUIRED BY 43.98A BY CATEGORY WILL BE MAINTAINED ON A BINENNIAL BASIS" BE DELETED.

Mr. Tveten asked if there were any projects on the new state and local listings which had been on the listing in 1990, but which could not be funded because there was not enough money in that funding session. Mr. Fairleigh replied some state agencies' projects have been carried forward, and several local agencies' projects will be coming back to the Committee in September. Mr. Tveten then stated that those projects on the listing this biennium, if they cannot be reached, would automatically go into the next funding session. Mr. Fairleigh explained that there already is a second listing and some projects that fell below the funding line came in again, or they may appear in the next biennium. Mr. Wilder stated local government funding is on an annual basis and if a project does not make it through the first time, they can come back.

Mr. Tveten pointed out that a project is submitted, reviewed, receives public input, the public has said they would support it..then it drops off the listing because there is not enough money. Even if it is considered a second time, it may not be approved for funding. He asked if the IAC had a problem with this. Mr. Fairleigh acknowledged the problem, but said that the state agencies would have many more projects left on the table than the locals.

In response to Mr. Wert's questions, Mr. Fairleigh briefly outlined the steps taken for a local agency to submit a project for the local agencies' listing. He noted the caps set by staff in order to fund as many projects as possible and explained how these were set up following the percentages allowed by law. Mr. Wert felt the staff was taking away the \$1 million projects by its capping recommendations. Some are even excluded completely. He wanted the Committee to know that there is not enough evidence, in his opinion, to say there is a need to limit the funds at this level at this time.

Mr. Wilder stated the staff and Committee have been attempting by capping projects to be of service statewide and not just to the larger projects. In reply to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Fairleigh said phased projects would not receive any extra points.

Mr. Jones referred back to the page (3) Ineligible projects, and suggested there be an asterisk placed before the "interpretive

centers" clarifying the fact that kiosks and interpretive shelters are eligible.

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

IV. NEW BUSINESS - G. INITIATIVE 215: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, "Local Government Initiative 215 Program", dated March 21, 1991. In order to be responsive to the increased cost of providing boating opportunities for the public, staff recommended a change in the maximum IAC per project share for local government Initiative 215 projects: Acquisition, Maximum \$500,000 per project; Development, Maximum \$300,000 per project.

Mr. Tveten questioned why this action was not being made a part of the IAC Local Agencies' Participation Manuals as guidelines. Mr. Fairleigh replied caps for this program have never been in the guidelines to allow flexibility on the part of staff and the Committee. Mr. Tveten and Mr. Fox felt the guidelines should contain this information for locals.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FOX, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT A CHANGE IN THE MAXIMUM IAC PER PROJECT SHARE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE 215 PROGRAM PROJECTS BE APPROVED:

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| ACQUISITION | MAXIMUM PER PROJECT IAC SHARE | \$ 500,000 |
| DEVELOPMENT | MAXIMUM PER PROJECT IAC SHARE | 300,000 |

WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THESE CHANGES WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PARTICIPATION MANUALS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - H. WASHINGTON TRAILS PLAN: Memorandum of staff dated March 21, 1991, "State Trails Plan", was referred to by Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services. He mentioned that the plan had lacked one map which had been completed and was ready to be adopted. This map depicted selected trail corridors of statewide significance. The State Trails Advisory Committee had reviewed the map which is based on existing trail plans or proposals. Mr. Jim Eychaner, Recreation Resource Planner, was called upon to review the map for the Committee.

Mr. Eychaner displayed the map noting that it indicated corridors needed for future trail development. The corridors were from city, county, state, and other agency/organization plans and proposals. Major trails were indicated and it was difficult to indicate the smaller ones. All have had public review process.

There followed discussion on some of the trails which would affect highways (bicycle trails). Assurance was given that these had been reviewed by the entities affected, and the Transportation Department was aware of the proposed trails. Mr. Tveten asked how many trails to trails projects had been completed. Mr. Eychaner said he did not yet

have that information available, but is working on it. In reply to questions, he said that the Pacific NW Trail was not shown in the trail system because of opposition to it. Mr. Fox asked how Washington state compared to other states in furnishing trails for the citizens. Mr. Eychaner said the state was in "healthy condition" and had many trails. But, because of season of use/type of use/etc., the user groups feel there are not enough.

Loren McGovern, NOVA Committee Member, reported that the Forest Service Trails have gone down in the last thirty years. Less than one-third are now in use compared to that time. The State of Oregon has sold its public land that belonged to the state to private people and now they are in a bind to locate places for public trails. Washington State has held on to its lands, and this is a plus.

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

WHEREAS, ON NOVEMBER 9, 1990, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ADOPTED ALL BUT ONE ELEMENT OF THE WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN IN COMPLIANCE WITH RCW 67.32.050, AND

WHEREAS, THE FINAL ELEMENT, A MAP DEPICTING CORRIDORS OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE NEEDED FOR FUTURE TRAIL DEVELOPMENT, HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN COOPERATION WITH APPROPRIATE CITIZENS, AGENCIES, AND THE STATE TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STAC),

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ADOPTS ATTACHMENT I, A MAP DEPICTING CORRIDORS OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE, AS THE FINAL ELEMENT OF THE 1990 WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN AND AUTHORIZES ITS SUBMITTAL TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE FOR APPROVAL,

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THIS ADOPTION IS SUBJECT TO FURTHER PLAN APPROVAL BY THE GOVERNOR AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. LEGISLATION 1991 - 1. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT: Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum dated March 21, 1991, "1991 Legislation - Status", reporting as follows:

1. Noted the cut-off dates remaining - April 5, April 19, and April 28 when Regular Session will end.
2. Noted the Tracking Report attached to the memorandum -- List of those bills in which IAC had an interest.
3. HB 1427 - Authorizing \$95 million from the WWRP contingent upon passage of HB 1034, which increases the debt limit from 7% to 8%.
4. HB 1330 - 1991-93 Operating Budget bill prepared by the Governor.
5. SHB 1916 - State Lands Stewardship Act (reported later by Greg Lovelady).

6. To date, over 944 measures have been introduced in the Senate; and 1,180 in the House: 2,224.

2. Operation and Maintenance Legislation: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 21, 1991, "Operation and Maintenance Legislation". Mr. Lovelady gave the background concerning the Operation and Maintenance legislation as proposed by the IAC, now Substitute House Bill #1916.

1. IAC Special Report #90-8, "Operation and Maintenance Needs of State-Owned Habitat, Natural Areas, Parks, and Other Recreation Sites" was delivered to the Legislature on December 15, 1990.
2. Assessment results were given to the House Natural Resources and Parks Committee on January 22, 1991.
3. At request of the Governor's Office, the IAC developed agency request legislation - State Lands Stewardship Act (House Bill 1916, introduced February 14, 1991). This bill would establish a stewardship account for wildlife habitat, natural areas, parks, and other recreation sites managed by IAC member agencies. It would fund operation and maintenance shortfalls and help support responsible stewardship of newly acquired lands.
4. Supported operation and maintenance includes:

Basic responsibilities associated with holding and protecting property, such as assessment, in-lieu property taxes, fire protection, and noxious weed control; Structure, infrastructure, and other improved resource responsibilities associated with the built or manipulated environment; and human use management responsibilities associated with visitor services and protection.
5. Earmarked revenue would come from:

Increase in state real estate excise tax 0.05 percent on the amount of sale in excess of \$50,000;
Increase in annual excise tax on motor homes, travel trailers and campers 0.5 percent.
6. Public hearing was held March 1 - House Natural Resources and Parks Committee The bill passed out of committee with a 6 to 4 vote on March 4.
7. March 7 another hearing was held before the House Revenue Committee. The bill passed out of this committee with an amendment dropping the recreational equipment tax which had been in the bill.
8. The bill is now in House Rules Committee.

Mr. Lovelady reported staff would continue to monitor the bill. This type of legislation may take several years to pass.

JULY 2⁵-26, 1991 IAC MEETING: Mr. Wilder suggested the July meeting be held in the southwestern part of the state -- City of Vancouver. A tour could be arranged for the first day to include

Columbia River sites. The regular meeting will take place beginning at 9:00 a.m., on Friday, July 26th. Dr. Scull stated he would not be able to attend the July meeting and appointed Jim Fox as Acting Chairman.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

James R Fox
CHAIR, IAC
July 26, 1991
DATE