

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: July 24, 1992 PLACE: International Ag. Trade Center
TIME: 9:00 a.m. Spokane, Washington

- Contents -

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER 2

II. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3, GUIDELINES FOR LAND
ACQUISITION: TAB #2 3

III. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6, PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM:
TAB #4 4

IV. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #10, REVISIONS TO WWRP
GUIDELINES:
TAB #3 7

V. 1993-1995 IAC BUDGET: TAB #5 8

VI. FUNDING SESSION, WASHINGTON WILDLIFE & RECREATION
PROGRAM, "UNALLOCATED" FUNDS: TAB #7 10

VII. PROJECT CONVERSIONS & COST INCREASES: TAB #6 12

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS: TAB #8 13

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: July 24, 1992 PLACE: International Ag. Trade Center
TIME: 9:00 a.m. Spokane, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eliot Scull	Chair, Wenatchee
James R. Fox	Vice Chair, Friday Harbor
William Fearn	Spokane
Joe C. Jones	Seattle
Donna Mason	Vancouver
Ted Price	Designee for the Honorable Brian Boyle, Commissioner of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources
Jenene Fenton	Designee for Curt Smitch, Director, Dept. of Wildlife
Tom France	Designee for Cleve Pinnix, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Richard Costello	Designee for Robert Turner, Director, Dept. of Fisheries

TAB NUMBERS, WHICH FOLLOW, REFER TO DIVISIONS IN THE MEETING NOTEBOOKS. THE TABS WERE NOT NECESSARILY HEARD BY IAC IN SEQUENCE. A RECORDED TAPE OF THE MEETING'S PROCEEDINGS WILL BE RETAINED BY IAC FOR SIX MONTHS.

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: TAB #1

Eliot Scull, Chair, called the meeting to order July 24, 1992 at 9:00 a.m. It was determined there was a quorum present.

Attendees were welcomed and advised that the meeting was being tape recorded. IAC members, as well as staff and audience participants, introduced themselves.

It was **moved** by James Fox, that the minutes of the IAC's March 19-20, 1992 meeting be approved. **Motion carried.**

On the occasion of the recent retirement of William A. Bush, State Parks and Recreation Commission, James Fox read a motion acknowledging long and dedicated service to IAC.

It was moved by Jenene Fenton that the motion be approved. **Motion carried.**

Rearrangement in the order of agenda items was discussed and agreed upon. Note was also made regarding a new position for the Director's report near the agenda's end.

II. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3, GUIDELINES FOR LAND ACQUISITION: TAB #2

Eric Johnson summarized proposed changes to IAC's land acquisition guidelines in three parts. The first part concerned changes recommended by IAC's Assistant Attorney General regarding "Uniform Acquisition Procedures." Based on this advice, staff proposed that, in the future, sponsors only be informed of their need to determine the applicability of these requirements to their agency. Various "pros" and "cons" and specific language changes were discussed.

Bill Fearn asked if this proposal would affect a sponsor desiring to use a land donation to match IAC funds. Eric Johnson said it would not. Ted Price indicated his endorsement of staff's recommendation; it will save the state millions of dollars.

The second part concerned "opinion of value." IAC currently allows sponsors to use this procedure to establish the value of a piece of property during the application process. Although it is becoming obsolete, staff recommended that it continue to be accepted and that an alternate procedure, an "estimate of value," be instituted.

Jim Fox suggested that the word "as" be deleted from the proposed language at the top of page 4 in the kits:

"C. Estimate of Value - ~~As~~ done by an agency staff member"

Tom France noted that "opinions of value" were done by trained people; "estimates of value" require little training or qualification. He was uncomfortable with this new method and indicated that a high property estimate by an untrained appraiser could result in a project losing funding. Eric Johnson agreed, but added that:

- "Estimates of value" are simpler,
- Sponsors are made aware that a full appraisal is required if funding is approved,
- The Dept. of Transportation (DOT) uses "estimates of value",
- Such "estimates" require no added IAC staff work, and
- The work of certificated appraisers frequently varies widely and is not necessarily an improvement over this proposed alternate method.

The third part concerned "appraisal reviews." IAC members were advised that DOT has assembled a list of approved fee review appraisers to be used by state and local agencies acquiring real property. This list was proposed for official use by IAC as an option available to local and state agencies that must perform appraisal reviews.

Jenene Fenton asked if those on IAC's current list were also on DOT's list. Eric Johnson replied that most were and that an effort has been made to contact those not on DOT's list.

The fourth part concerned "combination projects." Historically, IAC has accepted combination projects that are comprised of both site acquisition and facility development. The unwritten rule directs project sponsors to secure the property within one month of the time IAC approves funding. It was proposed that this rule be formalized.

Bill Fearn voiced his agreement with these recommendations, indicating that paperwork would be reduced.

It was **moved** by Jenene Fenton that the staff proposal to change participation manual #3, "Guidelines for Land Acquisition," as specified in the July 24, 1992 kit, with the exception of the word "as," on page 4, which is to be deleted, be approved. **Motion carried.**

III. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6, PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM: TAB #4

Larry Fairleigh summarized proposed additions/changes to IAC's project evaluation guidelines in four parts. The first part concerned development of a system that compares and ranks WWRP "unallocated" category projects by agreed upon criteria. The system will ensure that proposals which most successfully meet the criteria, regardless of account (for example, HCA's natural area, critical habitat, urban wildlife habitat) will be ranked above those which don't meet the criteria.

The "z score" and "merged list" methods were reviewed. It was noted that the "z score" method would be preferred whenever sufficient project "samples" were available for evaluation. When this isn't the case, the "merged list" method would be used.

Jenene Fenton and Jim Fox observed that this proposal, while imperfect, is the best we have at the moment. IAC will need to keep its attention on the "big picture" and remember that these methods only represent tools used to help find those projects which most merit funding. Jim Fox further indicated that State Parks could, if it wanted, manipulate this system to its advantage. Tom France said this wouldn't happen because of the difficulty in predicting appropriation cut-offs.

Ted Price asked why, of the two methods, staff prefers "z score?" Larry Fairleigh replied that one main reason is that, while the "merged list" method may be easier to understand, it requires that a single evaluation team individually rank all projects. This is impractical when hundreds of projects must be evaluated over many days. The time commitment would be oppressive to most team members. "Z score" distributes this load over several teams, requiring a reduction in time commitment for many members. A second reason is that "z score," statistically, is somewhat more advanced.

The second part concerned the need to develop a "state parks" category evaluation instrument and revise the "local parks" category instrument. The proposed "state parks" instrument in the kits was agreed to by State Parks staff. The "local agency" instrument was widely distributed for comments; while comments were received, none were negative.

The third part concerned a need to adjust the number of WWRP evaluators to increase the statistical validity of the team scores. It was recommended that all teams be composed of 10 members (4-IAC member agency, 4-local agency representatives, 2-citizens-at-large).

The fourth part concerned adjustments in sponsor voting rules. The first adjustment is that project sponsors sitting on the evaluation team may not vote on their agency's project. It was recommended that this rule be deleted since it unnecessarily reduces the total number of scores to be tabulated, thereby directly impacting statistical validity. It was pointed out that a separate rule already addresses potential voting bias (i.e., high and low scores are discarded). The second adjustment would be a new rule stating that "The presenter of the project shall not be the same as the evaluator."

Jim Fox said that this recommendation may cause problems, since some evaluators may wish to decline voting on certain projects for ethical, personal, legal, or other reasons. Jenene Fenton indicated that if this were the case, that individual should decline to serve on the team when first invited.

Ted Price disagreed with the requirement that agencies represented on the evaluation team have separate presenters and evaluators. This would be an added hardship for agencies with limited staff. Additionally, in such cases, the evaluator is normally the most knowledgeable and qualified to present the agency's project. Laura Eckert added that

IAC staff may be able to assist in such presentations by handling the slide projector and/or presenting project details.

Tom France spoke in favor of the staff recommendation. Arden Olson (DNR) spoke against the recommendation. DNR has already spent 240 staff days preparing applications for the IAC biennial budget request. In tough budget times staff allocation considerations are important. Rich Costello and Jenene agreed with this. Ted Price expressed appreciation regarding Laura Eckert's offer of flexibility and possible staff support. With this, he felt that staff's recommendation could work.

In a fifth recommended change, Greg Lovelady referenced page two, the "plan consistency" criteria, of the "state parks" category evaluation instrument (5/22/92 draft). (It was noted that this criteria is virtually identical on all instruments.) Here, it was indicated that three typographical errors needed to be corrected. Two of these errors are present in all evaluation instruments and should be corrected as follows:

"b. One or more of the above plans cite a general need (among the ~~bottom~~ top 40-60 percent..."

"c. One or more of the above plans cites a moderate need (among the top 20-40 ~~60-80~~ percent...."

The third error is only present in the "state parks" category instrument and should be corrected as follows:

"d. One or more of the above plans cites a high priority need (among the top 20 percent of this category's projects) for this project by site type or specific location.....(3-4 points).

Joe Jones **moved** adoption of:

- The "z score" method as presented in the kits (the "merged list" method will be used when insufficient project samples have been submitted, after adoption of alternate evaluation instruments),
- The "state parks" and "local parks" category evaluation instruments as presented in the kits,
- Changes to the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) evaluation team (all teams to include four IAC member-agency representatives, four local agency representatives, and two "expert" citizens-at-large),

- Voting rule changes (team members to vote on their agency's projects and presenters and evaluators to be separate persons), and
- Using IAC WWRP evaluation instruments as the primary "tools," but not the only tools, upon which funding recommendations may be made.

Jim Fox asked if any proposed changes to the "plan consistency" criteria would effect the requirement that local agencies submit comprehensive plans to IAC in support of sponsored projects. Eric Johnson said they would not.

Jenene Fenton **moved** that page two, items 1. b. and c. of the WWRP evaluation criteria ("plan consistency") be changed to read "top 40-60 percent" and "top 20-40 percent" rather than "bottom 60 percent" and "top 60 percent"; and that these changes be made in all WWRP evaluation instruments; and that item 1. d. be changed to read "4 points" rather than "3-4 points." **The motion was carried.**

IV. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #10, REVISIONS TO WWRP GUIDELINES: TAB #3

Larry Fairleigh said that this discussion would cover five issues designed to provide staff with policy direction prior to the September 24-25, 1992 meeting.

The first issue involved adoption into Manual #10 of specific language addressing implementation of the "z score" method. It was proposed that current manual language [section 10.11(A)(2)] be replaced by text suggested in the kit.

The second issue concerned replacement of manual language regarding the "state parks" category. To qualify for "state parks" category funding, projects need only be evaluated and ranked by the Parks Commission, not IAC. For unfunded projects in this category to qualify for "unallocated" funds, however, an IAC sanctioned evaluation is required. Previous manual language did not provide for this evaluation.

The third part concerned new language (tabled from the March, 1992 IAC meeting) regarding project agreements (individual projects, omnibus contracts, etc.) developed to ensure preservation of category statutory minimums while reducing paperwork.

Jenene Fenton inquired into the instance of two state agency projects, one which exceeds contracted cost, and the other which comes in below contracted costs. What flexibility would the agency have in moving funds from the "below" project to the "exceeds" project? Larry Fairleigh replied that savings from a "below" project must go to the next ranked in-category project (if funds are needed to maintain the statutory minimum). Otherwise, the savings would be moved into the "unallocated" category for either HCA or ORA, as appropriate.

It was acknowledged that this may present serious problems for projects with underestimated costs. For this reason, in the future, IAC may wish to consider a special "cost increase" fund pool set-aside. The difficulty is that no mechanism or source for this pool now exists. Another fund pool set-aside may consider second year funding. (See page 15, "cost increase.")

The fourth part concerned a recommendation on the length of lists of projects submitted for consideration by the Governor and legislature. In the last budget cycle, IAC used a "doubled list" process. That is, a list of proposals twice as long as that for which estimated funds were available was sent to the Governor. While this process met the Office of Financial Management's needs and provided for withdrawn projects, it also may have raised unreasonably high budget expectations among those not familiar with the process.

The fifth part concerned manual language to be used by IAC for reserving funds for the required distribution in the second year of the biennium. Under this process, IAC would adopt a proposed distribution for both first and second years. A final decision would be made after final legislative appropriation.

4. Tom France moved adoption of the language recommended in the July 27, 1992 kit memorandum, "Revisions to WWRP Guidelines" - Manual #10, with the proviso that the text on page two of the memorandum be amended to include the following in the second full paragraph of underlined text:

"...To make this comparison, IAC staff will use a statistical method known as a "z score," that allows the conversion of different data sets (project lists) to a common denominator that can be made into a single ranked list for each respective account (Habitat Conservation and Outdoor Recreation)."

Motion was carried.

V. 1993-1995 IAC BUDGET: TAB #5

Keith Loughheed distributed and summarized the document "1991-93 Budget Status Report (43% of Biennium Complete)," indicating that staff felt this new format would be an improvement over those used previously. (Addendum A.) He encouraged comments from others regarding areas where this format could be further improved.

It was indicated that revenue allocation slightly exceeds appropriation estimates in Initiative 215 and NOVA. Larry Fairleigh explained that Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) allocation is lagging due to a transfer process currently underway. This process is designed to transfer LWCFunds from approved projects that, by their nature,

take a long time to implement. Funds will be transferred into other approved projects which are more quickly implemented.

Page two of the document, Keith Lougheed explained, is designed to depict actual "checks written, money out the door" (and not "contracted" dollars as previously shown, which frequently change). Jenene Fenton, Rich Costello, and Ted Price said they like the new format.

Tom France suggested that a column be added to the format which depicts how much money has been committed to date, so this could be compared to that which has been mailed out. Keith Lougheed said that this could easily be added in a new column titled "contracts." He added that additional work was underway to determine, by fund source (I-215, NOVA, etc.), precisely what balances are available.

Next, Laura Eckert presented information on the 1993-95 biennium operating and capital budgets. Additional staff work remains in these areas. Regarding the operating budget, however, no substantial changes from the current biennium are seen. A full staff report should be ready in about two weeks.

By IAC consensus, it was agreed that these matters would be further discussed in a telephone conference call to be arranged in the next 2-3 weeks. Provisions will be made for members of the media and public who wish to participate in this call. (See page 15, "conference call.")

In the capital area, a decision should be made regarding the amount IAC will recommend to the Governor. A letter from Bill Chapman, President of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, was referenced. This letter expresses the Coalition's view regarding the need to support the "Capital Forum's" position. This translates into a need for \$111 million WWRP dollars for the 1993-95 biennium.

Also referenced was a memo from Kay Baxstrom, Office of Financial Management, expressing that department's view that \$50 million would be an appropriate amount.

Tom France said that the State Parks Commission considered this issue and recommends that IAC support \$111 million. IAC must be an advocate for habitat and parks. Jim Fox supported this position and added that IAC may wish to seek a larger amount, since \$111 is widely acknowledged to be inadequate. Donna Mason asked what the \$111 was based on. Tom France replied that it originated with the Capital Forum agreement.

Regarding the 1993-95 Capital Budget request, Laura Eckert said that an unsuccessful effort was made to meet with OFM officials regarding this issue.

Ted Price said that this issue poses a dilemma for his department because state funds are so limited; would it be possible to find some middle ground? Jenene Fenton agreed

with these concerns. Larry Fairleigh pointed out that IAC now has requests for \$185 million in 1993 WWRP funds. Bill Fearn said IAC should ask for the amount it needs, just as other agencies will. Joe Jones agreed with this statement. Tom France suggested that IAC request the \$111 million, but send in a list of projects which is more representative of the need, and a number which exceeds this amount to account for project "attrition."

Eliot Scull said IAC should be an advocacy body. It should request the amount it needs. Jim Fox said the \$111 million is reasonable because it originated with a well thought out IAC-commissioned study.

Jim Fox **moved** that IAC's budget request include a recommendation for \$111 million in WWRP funds. **The motion was carried.**

Eliot Scull suggested that the group recess for lunch at this time, to be followed by project funding consideration at 1:00 p.m.

VI. FUNDING SESSION, WASHINGTON WILDLIFE & RECREATION PROGRAM, "UNALLOCATED" FUNDS: TAB #7

Larry Fairleigh summarized the presentation. He distributed a revised list of projects which had been evaluated for funding consideration. (Addendum B.) He thanked evaluation and technical advisory committee members and pointed out that each of the projects to be reviewed had previously been recommended for funding by IAC, but due to lack of funds had to re-enter the process. It was noted that the "merged list" method of calculating scores had been used due to the small number of projects considered.

At this point, Eric Johnson and Greg Lovelady presented slides and an oral description of each project under consideration.

Eliot Scull then invited members of the audience to add their oral comments to the written record of letters (previously supplied to IAC) regarding these projects. The following individuals presented remarks (following each name is the individual's position regarding the project):

Double Bluff Beach-

Larry Kwarsick, Dir. Island Co. Plan. & Community Dev. - Supports

Green River Trail-

Linda Dougherty, Assoc. Mgr., King Co. Parks - Supports

Mercer Slough, Moon/Ross Property-

Michael Shiosaki, Proj. Mgr., Bellevue Parks Dept - Supports

Frenchmans Bar-

Del Schleichert, Mgr., Clark Co. Parks & Recreation - Supports

Spokane River Centennial Trail-

Robbi Castleberry, Chair, Friends of Centennial Trail - Supports

Lynwood Interurban Trail-

Bill Evans, Director, Lynwood Parks & Recreation - Supports

After receiving audience comments, Larry Fairleigh provided copies of staff recommendations to all present. (Addendum C.)

Bill Fearn **moved** adoption of staff recommendations. **The motion was carried.** (Addendum C).

Larry Fairleigh asked if IAC wished to consider extending its recommendations regarding this list of projects for future fund distributions. Very probably, additional funds will become available (through the unplanned closures and withdrawals inherent in project implementation); the question was, should these dollars be rolled forward to the next biennium and await a future project evaluation, or be applied to the next highest ranked project on the current list?

Jenene Fenton said that the issue of cost increases still existed. (See page 8.) Jim Fox said that it would be appropriate to consider cost increases.

Jenene Fenton **moved** that:

- The list presented by staff be adopted, and
- If additional funds become available, during the fiscal year period, that these funds be applied to the next project on the list (no projects may be added), so long as that project can be successfully completed with those funds;
- If not, the funds will continue to be moved down the list and similarly applied to the next project regardless of sponsor; in addition,
- IAC will, in the future, discuss a method to address cost increases.

Follow-up discussion related that implicit in the motion is that IAC would individually and directly vote on funding for any projects from this list for which funds become available. It would not be an automatic staff decision. The point of the motion is to save further processing and evaluation of project proposals.

Jim Fox **moved** that the motion be amended to include the words "allocation of additional funds to unfunded projects will be subject to IAC approval." **The amendment to the motion was carried.**

The original motion was carried.

The original motion was carried.

Looking to the future, Larry Fairleigh then indicated a concern regarding the time required to present projects during the September funding meeting. With over 300 projects, the photographic slide presentation alone could last 10 hours if current procedures are continued. Laura Eckert added that alternate forms of presentation are under review. Eliot Scull said that IAC owes its sponsors a careful review of all proposals. Laura Eckert said that staff would attempt to have further recommendations on this matter ready for the telephone conference call, in 2-3 weeks.

VII. PROJECT CONVERSIONS & COST INCREASES: TAB #6

Eric Johnson summarized the first of several proposed project changes, the Spokane County, Airway Heights ORV Park Conversion (ORV-85-039A, ORV-86-037D). Previous IAC grants have provided funding for both the acquisition and development of an access road to Spokane County's Airway Heights ORV Sport Park. Recent construction of a prison by the State Department of Corrections has led to (1) the obliteration of the IAC funded access road to the ORV park and (2) building (at Dept. of Corrections expense) two new roads that will provide safer and better access to the park.

It was noted that staff feels that the two new roads represent a net gain in value to the ORV park project, and recommended that this conversion be approved. Tom France asked if approval meant that a road access would be surrendered. Eric Johnson replied "yes," but two maintained city access routes would be gained.

Bill Fearn moved that the conversion motion in the kit be approved. **The motion was carried.**

Eric Johnson summarized the second proposed change concerning the City of Port Townsend's City Dock cost increase (91-164D). Following completion of design, engineering, and project bidding, the City found that the cost of the proposed City Dock replacement project was greater than anticipated in its IAC grant submittal. Approval for an increase of \$69,900, 18 percent above the original November 1990 Initiative 215 project's cost, was requested.

It was noted that staff recommends approval of this proposal based on several factors: high need, no change in scope, revised cost based on actual bid, etc. Eliot Scull asked if the magnitude of this increase didn't seem a little high. Eric Johnson and Tom France replied that it was not; estimating costs for this type of facility are very difficult.

Tom France moved that the cost increase motion in the kit be approved. **The motion was carried.**

Eric Johnson also summarized the third proposed change, King County's Lisabuela acquisition cost increase (87-080A). Based on a court award from a condemnation case involving acquisition of the property, \$257,500 (a 102 percent increase over the original November 1986 amount) is needed to complete this contract. Initiative 215 was the original source of project funding; it would also be the source of this cost increase.

It was noted that staff recommends approval of this proposal based on several factors: high need, no change in scope, the original appraisal only represented an estimate of value, etc. Jenene Fenton expressed dissatisfaction with this proposal. Is it not IAC's goal to keep these funds "moving?" It has been years and still this project is not underway. Tom France asked how this project ranked back when originally funded. Eric Johnson wasn't sure, but though it ranked near the bottom of those funded.

Larry Fairleigh said that this type of project always causes concern: "how much is it really worth?" A point to keep in mind is that we are short of Puget Sound boating access sites. Tom France said that he would have to vote for this proposal, in part, because it lies along a State Parks proposed kayak route. Additionally, King County will have substantial fees to pay even if IAC doesn't support it. (Eric Johnson noted that IAC, by policy, does not pay court costs; this type of contested condemnation is rare.)

Tom France **moved** that the motion in the kit be approved. **The motion was carried (Jenene Fenton abstained from the vote).**

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS: TAB #8

The Director's report was presented by Laura Eckert. The following items were highlighted:

- About 50 percent of time to date spent on constituent relations
- IAC's office facility will need to be replaced in the not-too-distant future
- Staff is somewhat overworked with project loads three-to-four times that considered normal; this will have to change
- We are faced with the loss of a key staff member (Larry Fairleigh) which will impact IAC; recruitment of a successor is continuing
- Planning staff has begun work with the State Wildlife and Recreation Lands Management Task Force

- A meeting may be convened among IAC and Dept. of Transportation staff to discuss the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
- Senator Gorton is working to increase the level of LWCFunds from \$25 million (House level) to \$60 million; a letter may be sent to our delegation indicating IAC support of increasing the amount the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to the states.

The Management Services report was presented by Keith Lougheed who indicated that most of his division's time over the next few weeks would be dedicated to budget research, preparation, and presentation.

The Planning Services report was presented by Greg Lovelady. The following points were highlighted:

- 108 agencies have met planning requirements and are currently eligible to participate in IAC grant programs
- The 1993 NOVA plan continues in production; interviews will soon be underway
- The Growth Management Act will continue to impact state agencies, who were encouraged to become familiar with the siting of "essential public facilities" provisions of this law.

The Project Services report was presented by Larry Fairleigh. The following points were highlighted:

- The division is currently managing 496 active projects
- 311 applications have been received (all programs) and are now being processed (221 are WWRP projects, with an IAC share of about \$185 million)
- Work on the Initiative 215 study is nearly complete and advance word is that Licensing will not change the amount of tax attributable to recreational boaters

Larry then recalled his first IAC meeting in March 1978, the days when project managers would make all project presentations (TAC, evaluation, etc.), and the outstanding quality and thoughtfulness of today's IAC membership. He then thanked all for enhancing his IAC experience and said he was looking forward to new responsibilities with the State Parks and Recreation Commission.

Eliot Scull, on behalf of IAC, thanked Larry, especially for his work as interim director.

IAC member reports discussion was opened by Eliot Scull, who expressed the need to follow-up the previous day's planning session with specific actions. More cohesive strategic planning will be of utmost importance. Ted Price and Joe Jones agreed and suggested that another session be convened. It was decided that staff would pursue organization of a half-to-full day facilitated planning session related to the November 1992 IAC meeting.

Jenene Fenton then expressed the need for IAC to set aside time to consider the WWRP cost increase issue; this should be done prior to June 1993. (See page 8, "cost increase.") Laura Eckert said that staff could definitely have a solution outlined by the September 1992 meeting.

Laura Eckert suggested that IAC schedule the special meeting (telephone conference call for consideration of budget and Initiative 215 issues). IAC concurred and the meeting was scheduled for Monday, August 10, 1992, at 5:00 p.m.

Bill Fearn requested that future meeting summaries reflect the position of those who speak on behalf of project proposals.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

IAC APPROVAL CERTIFIED BY:

Eliot W. Scull, M.D., Chair

Date

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

1991-93 Budget Status Report
(46% of Biennium Complete)

	Appropriation	Expenditures thru 5/31/92	% of Allot.
Capital Budget	\$101,927,000	\$ 31,655,716	(31%)
Operating Budget	2,387,000	842,927	(35%)
Governor's Emergency Fund	<u>200,000</u>	<u>200,000</u>	(100%)
Total	\$104,514,000	\$ 32,698,643	(31%)

Revenues by Source of Funds

	Biennium Estimate	Actual thru 5/31/92	% of Allot.
Initiative 215:	\$ 8,727,000	\$ 4,304,400	(49%)
NOVA:	\$ 4,897,000	\$ 2,408,230	(49%)
Firearm Range Account:	\$ 222,000	\$ 181,824	(81%)
LWCF:	\$ 2,032,000	\$ 312,659	(15%)

By Source of Funds:

	Appropriation	Expenditures thru 5/31/92	% of Allot.
Initiative 215:			
Operations	\$ 2,017,000	\$ 746,410	(37%)
Grants to Locals	<u>3,355,000</u>	<u>540,072</u>	(16%)
Total	\$ 5,372,000	\$ 1,286,482	(24%)
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program:			
Habitat Conservation Acct.	\$ 43,055,000	\$ 20,818,096	(48%)
Outdoor Recreation Acct.	<u>38,618,000</u>	<u>6,972,121</u>	(18%)
Total	\$ 81,673,000	\$ 27,790,217	(34%)
NOVA Program:			
Operations	\$ 293,000	\$ 69,277	(24%)
Grants to Locals	<u>4,604,000</u>	<u>1,849,858</u>	(40%)
Total	\$ 4,897,000	\$ 1,919,135	(39%)
Firearm Range Account:			
Operations	\$ 44,000	\$ 11,540	(26%)
Grants to Locals	<u>627,000</u>	<u>41,172</u>	(7%)
Total	\$ 671,000	\$ 52,712	(8%)
Federal LWCF:			
Operations	\$ 32,000	\$ 21,200	(66%)
Grants to Locals	<u>2,590,000</u>	<u>291,459</u>	(11%)
Total	\$ 2,622,000	\$ 312,659	(12%)
State Building Construction Account (SBCA):			
Grants to Locals	\$ 12,849,873	\$ 1,142,938	(9%)

TABLE 2
Results of July 7, 1992 Project Evaluation
for Currently Available Unallocated Funds

1990 Appropriation - HCA No projects submitted

1990 Appropriation - ORA

			IAC Amt	Sponsor	Total
69.01	92-817A	Fisheries	334,561	865,439	1,200,000
67.00	91-508A	State Parks	-0-	-0-	-0-
		Total:	<u>334,561</u>	<u>865,439</u>	<u>1,200,000</u>

1991-93 Appropriation - ORA

			IAC Amt	Sponsor	Total
68.85	92-092A	Clark County	243,906	243,906	487,812
63.01	92-161D	Lynnwood	483,185	483,185	966,370
61.34	92-706A	DNR	200,000	-0-	200,000
61.34	92-803D	Fisheries	650,000	285,550	935,550
60.18	92-505A	State Parks	160,000	-0-	160,000
60.13	92-083D	King County	317,391	2,355,609	2,673,000
59.49	91-508A	State Parks	-0-	-0-	-0-
58.20	92-144A/D	La Center	-0-	-0-	-0-
58.00	92-116A	Snohomish County	-0-	-0-	-0-
55.67	92-073D	Ilwaco	-0-	-0-	-0-
		Total:	<u>2,054,482</u>	<u>3,368,250</u>	<u>5,422,732</u>

1991-93 Appropriation - HCA

			IAC Amt	Sponsor	Total
85.47	92-704A	DNR	500,000	-0-	500,000
78.14	92-704A	DNR	-0-	-0-	-0-
64.55	92-136A	Bellevue	-0-	-0-	-0-
61.27	92-602A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
59.52	92-601A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
57.33	92-602A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
53.43	92-601A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
51.77	92-105A	Bellingham	-0-	-0-	-0-
48.60	92-602A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
42.88	92-601A	Wildlife	-0-	-0-	-0-
		Total:	<u>500,000</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>500,000</u>

TABLE 1
Results of July 7, 1992 Project Evaluation
for Currently Available Unallocated Funds

1990 Appropriation - HCA		No projects submitted		IAC Amt	Sponsor	Total
1990 Appropriation - ORA						
69.01	92-817A	Fisheries		350,000	850,000	1,200,000
67.00	91-508A	State Parks		340,000	-0-	340,000
				<u>690,000</u>	<u>850,000</u>	<u>1,540,000</u>
1991-93 Appropriation - ORA						
68.85	92-092A	Clark County		243,906	243,906	487,812
63.01	92-161D	Lynnwood		483,185	483,185	966,370
61.34	92-706A	DNR		200,000	-0-	200,000
61.34	92-803D	Fisheries		650,000	285,550	935,550
60.18	92-505A	State Parks		160,000	-0-	160,000
60.13	92-083D	King County		1,000,000	1,673,000	2,673,000
59.49	91-508A	State Parks		500,000	-0-	500,000
58.20	92-144A/D	La Center		55,000	55,000	110,000
58.00	92-116A	Snohomish County		460,400	460,400	920,800
55.67	92-073D	Ilwaco		36,576	36,576	73,152
				<u>3,789,067</u>	<u>3,237,617</u>	<u>7,026,684</u>
1991-93 Appropriation - HCA						
85.47	92-704A	DNR		500,000	-0-	500,000
78.14	92-704A	DNR		300,000	-0-	300,000
64.55	92-136A	Bellevue		475,000	475,000	950,000
61.27	92-602A	Wildlife		229,000	-0-	229,000
59.52	92-601A	Wildlife		34,000	-0-	34,000
57.33	92-602A	Wildlife		456,000	-0-	456,000
53.43	92-601A	Wildlife		48,800	-0-	48,800
51.77	92-105A	Bellingham		218,492	218,493	436,985
48.60	92-602A	Wildlife		134,260	-0-	134,260
42.88	92-601A	Wildlife		88,688	-0-	88,688
				<u>2,484,240</u>	<u>693,493</u>	<u>3,177,733</u>