

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: September 24-25, 1992 PLACE: Holiday Inn, Rooms A & B
TIME: 9:00 a.m. Renton, Washington

- Contents -

I.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #1: MEETING CALLED TO ORDER	1
II.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #2: MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS	2
III.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #4: WWRP COST INCREASE PROCESS	3
IV.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #5: RETREAT FOLLOW-UP	3
V.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #3: WWRP PROCESS REVIEW	3
VI.	BLUE NOTEBOOK, TABS #1, #2, #3: WWRP CRITICAL HABITAT, NATURAL AREA, AND URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT PROJECTS	3
VII.	BLUE NOTEBOOK, TAB #5: WATERCRAFT RECREATION PROGRAM, INITIATIVE 215	7
VIII.	WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #6: STATE PARKS, WWRP OMNIBUS #92-503A, CRYSTAL FALLS STATE PARK REQUEST	8
IX.	GREEN NOTEBOOK, TABS #1, #2, #3, #4: WWRP STATE PARKS, LOCAL PARKS, TRAILS, AND WATER ACCESS PROJECTS	8
X.	COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS	12

- List of Tables -

Table 1.	Staff Recommendations Summary, WWRP - Habitat Conservation Account	13
Table 2a.	Critical Habitat Category Projects - Approved Recommendations . . .	14
Table 2b.	Natural Area Category Projects - Approved Recommendations . . .	15
Table 2c.	Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Projects - Approved Recommendations	16
Table 3.	State Agency Initiative 215 Projects - Approved Recommendations	17
Table 4.	Staff Recommendations Summary, WWRP - Outdoor Recreation Account	18
Table 5a.	State Parks Category Projects - Approved Recommendations . . .	19
Table 5b.	Local Parks Category Projects - Approved Recommendations . . .	20
Table 5c.	Trails Category Projects - Approved Recommendations	21
Table 5d.	Water Access Category Projects - Approved Recommendations . . .	22

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: September 24-25, 1992
TIME: 8:30 a.m.

PLACE: Holiday Inn, Rooms A & B
Renton, 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
Cleve Pinnix	Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Richard Costello	Designee for Robert Turner, Director, Dept. of Fisheries

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE THREE NOTEBOOK KITS PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING. NOTEBOOK NAMES AND TAB NUMBERS FOLLOW. THE TABS WERE NOT NECESSARILY HEARD BY IAC IN SEQUENCE. (A RECORDED TAPE OF THE MEETING'S PROCEEDINGS IS RETAINED BY IAC).

I. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #1: MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Eliot Scull, Chair, called the meeting to order September 24-25, 1992 at 8:30 a.m. A quorum was determined to be present.

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

It was moved by Joe Jones that the summary of IAC's July 24, 1992 meeting be approved. **Motion was carried.**

It was moved by Jenene Fenton that the summary of IAC's August 10, 1992 telephone conference call meeting be approved. **Motion was carried.**

On the occasion of the departure of IAC's past executive director, a special commemorative plaque was presented to Dr. Robert L. Wilder for exemplary service to the people of Washington State. Chair Eliot Scull made the presentation.

Also, later in the meeting, on the occasion of the parting of past IAC Projects Division Chief, Eliot Scull acknowledged the achievements of Larry Fairleigh. An engraved plaque was presented.

II. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #2: MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

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

- Much of staff's time since the last meeting was spent in preparing kit materials for the present meeting; many thanks to all those who assisted
- IAC's budget was also been presented to OFM; there may be a report by the November 1992 meeting regarding its disposition
- Ron Taylor has been retained to assist in conducting project compliance inspections
- Eric Johnson was recently promoted to the position of IAC assistant Chief, Project Services Division
- Recruitment of a successor to Larry Fairleigh, past Projects Division Chief is continuing; approximately 150 applications were received
- The Dept. of Licensing has concluded its review of marine fuel usage and announced that there will be no change in rates
- The State Lands Wildlife & Recreation Management Task Force continues to meet with the assistance of IAC staff
- IAC's November meeting agenda includes project funding presentations and several policy issues (trails, WWRP, etc.).

The Management Services report was presented by Keith Lougheed who noted that revenues continue to exceed budgeted amounts in several categories.

The Project Services report was presented by Eric Johnson. The following points were highlighted:

- Approximately 15 watercraft recreation projects will be presented for funding consideration at the November meeting; another 45 projects will be presented in the nonhighway and off-road vehicle activities program; the third Fire Arms Range Account grants cycle will soon begin with grants workshops in October
- Staff has nearly completed the transfer of federal LWCFunds from slow performing state agency projects to better performing local agency projects, as directed by IAC; this action's goal is to improve the state's poor rate of obligation/expenditure
- An evaluation of the WWRP funding process has begun; any person with comments is invited to contact staff.

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

- As assisted by Planning Division Staff, the Wildlife and Recreation Lands Management Task Force continues to progress toward completion of its mandate to address state agency maintenance and operation costs
- 108 agencies have met planning requirements and are currently eligible to participate in IAC grant programs
- The 1993 NOVA plan continues in production; interested parties were encouraged to contact staff regarding workshops which will begin in October

III. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #4: WWRP COST INCREASE PROCESS

Eric Johnson indicated that further work on developing a cost increase process has been delayed; it is expected that a proposal will be ready for presentation at the November meeting.

IV. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #5: RETREAT FOLLOW-UP

Laura Eckert noted that the full IAC met last July to consider agency strategic planning issues. This resulted in draft agency Vision and Mission statements. These statements will now be presented to IAC advisory committees and other interested parties for comment. These individuals will also be requested to provide information on agency strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats. This will be followed by separate staff and full IAC retreat sessions.

It was the consensus of the Committee that IAC's follow-up retreat would be conducted on the morning of November 19, 1992, immediately prior to the business meeting.

V. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #3: WWRP PROCESS REVIEW

Eric Johnson discussed the process which led to the present funding meeting. It was indicated that basically three program participation manuals govern operations: WWRP (#10), Applications (#5), and Evaluations (#6). Applications for this cycle were first accepted on May 1, followed by technical reviews and evaluations.

The purpose of the September 24-25 meeting is to establish recommended projects and amounts for WWRP statutory, unallocated, and alternate categories for submission to the governor.

VI. BLUE NOTEBOOK, TABS #1, #2, #3: WWRP CRITICAL HABITAT, NATURAL AREA, AND URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT PROJECTS

Greg Lovelady opened the presentation by noting that all projects had been evaluated in accordance with IAC and legislated procedures. That is, agreed upon evaluation instruments, teams, and accepted procedures were used.

At this point, Dennis Burns and Greg Lovelady presented slides and an oral description of each Habitat Conservation Account project under consideration. Following this, staff recommendations were presented. Based on a 1993-95 appropriation of \$111 million, as approved by IAC at its July meeting, half, or \$55.5 million, would be allocated for Habitat Conservation Account purposes. Implicit in this recommendation are two assumptions:

- Allocation of 100 percent of critical habitat and natural area monies during the first year of the biennium
- Allocation of 75 percent of urban wildlife habitat and "unallocated" category monies during the first year of the biennium (25 percent held for the biennium's second year).

Advantages of this "front-end" allocation plan were noted: approved acquisition projects are allowed to proceed as quickly as possible (before land prices further escalate) and sponsors are allowed maximum time to implement projects. A disadvantage is that sponsors, anticipating an opportunity to improve a project's standing through an improved second evaluation presentation, will find second-year projects competing for fewer dollars.

In each Habitat Conservation category, statutory (Chapter 43.98A) funds were applied to project lists as required (35 percent in critical habitat, 20 percent in natural areas, and 15 percent in urban wildlife). Following this, the combined projects "unallocated z score" list (30 percent of the total, 75 percent first year) was used to establish the next best proposals *regardless of category*. After this, to account for project attrition, "plus-half alternate" proposals were marked. Table 1 contains detailed information regarding how this was implemented.

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):

- NA-7 Rattlesnake Ridge
Cynthia Sullivan, King County Council, Mountains-To-Sound Greenway - Supports
- NA-7 Rattlesnake Ridge
Jim Ellis, Chair, Mountains-To-Sound Greenway - Supports
- UW-9 Moon/Ross Property
Lee Springgate, Dir. Bellevue Park & Recreation Dept. - Supports
- UW-10 Heron Cove and CH-18 Point Roberts
Dr. Patricia Beckmann, Kitsap County, Miller Bay Citizens
Action Group - Supports
- UW-4 Kiwanis Ravine
Robert Kildall, Friends of Discovery Park - Supports
- UW-5 East Duwamish and UW-3 West Duwamish Greenbelt and UW-4 Kiwanis Ravine
Bill Blair, Manager, Seattle Open Space Program - Supports
- CH-19 Fortson Ponds and CH-25 Hazel Ponds and CH-24 Hood Canal Coho
Steven Jenks, Dept. of Fisheries - Supports
- UW-4 Kiwanis Ravine
Nancy Kroening, Friends of the Great Blue Herons of Kiwanis Ravine - Supports
- UW-14 Fuchs Foundation Property
Nancy White, Director Community Outreach, Clover Park
Technical College -Supports
- UW-1 Chuckanut Mountain Park
Roger DeSpain, Director, Whatcom County Park and Recreation Dept. - Supports

At this point, Chair Eliot Scull opened Committee discussion on project recommendations. Ted Price inquired regarding the significance of an IAC recommended project ranking if the assumptions implicit in the recommendation changed. For example, at a later date, may IAC reconsider funding order if less than the suggested \$111 million are appropriated? Director Eckert said, in such a case, the law is silent whether IAC is bound to a project list adopted at the present meeting. Additional complications could arise if the governor and/or legislature delete projects from IAC's list.

Perhaps this is an appropriate question for legal counsel: what discretion does IAC have to re-order projects if the legislative process makes less money available than anticipated? Clearly it would be inadvisable to initiate sweeping changes.

Jenene Fenton said that she wasn't aware that the potential existed to re-arrange project priorities should a funding level different from that proposed by IAC be appropriated. Laura Eckert said that the legislative process could, as it has in the past, rearrange funding "packages" which would leave IAC little alternative but to reorder rankings.

Cleve Pinnix said that it was his understanding that when IAC forwards the WWRP project list to the governor that it constitutes the most projects that can be considered. From that point the list may only diminish until IAC's next funding cycle. Another issue concerns the importance of the priority rankings. Does the statute require priorities? Greg Lovelady read RCW 43.98A.070, which states, in part, that "...the committee shall recommend to the governor a prioritized list of all... projects."

Eric Johnson further indicated that OFM has specifically asked to see which projects are recommended for statutory, unallocated, and alternate funding. Laura Eckert said that this is consistent with the view that this prioritized list could be changed after initial submission by IAC. She added that, at this time, it is difficult to see any merit changing priorities. A possible further complication is that omnibus project contracts will be written, within which an agency's projects will be prioritized.

Jenene Fenton, Bill Fearn, Cleve Pinnix, Jim Fox and Eliot Scull expressed their view that, once adopted at the present meeting, IAC should not reconsider priorities. Cleve Pinnix further noted that, within the bounds of reason, the list sent to the governor should be composed of all projects that might be funded. Keep in mind that attrition will allow a certain number of "below the line" projects to be funded.

Ted Price said that two earlier speakers had requested that the Rattlesnake Ridge project (NA-7) be moved up on the list; there should be some IAC discussion regarding movement on the evaluation team lists. Jim Fox said he was interested in the educational/interpretive aspects of the Heron Cove (UW-10) and Fuchs Foundation (UW-14) projects. Does IAC's evaluation criteria consider these factors? Greg Lovelady pointed out that criteria #10 ("educational and scientific value of the site") and #13 ("interpretive measures") address these values.

Jim Fox also noted that many of the critical habitat projects supported heron rookeries, but none of the higher ranked projects supported food for the herons. Does the ranking criteria evaluate over-all ecological integration?

Greg Lovelady noted that, while open to some interpretation on the part of evaluators, it does.

Rich Costello said "threatened, endangered, and sensitive" (T&E) criterion basically addressed "fur and feather" oriented projects, and not "fin fish" projects. Jenene Fenton noted that the American Fisheries Society just issued its report on anadromous fish (salmon, cutthroat, steelhead) on the Pacific Coast. In Washington 94 stocks have been identified as of "concern." The Wildlife Dept. has not submitted any "fish oriented" projects. However, it does manage fisheries over which it is concerned. The brown trout is an example.

Ted Price noted that there is a very high cost project (Wildlife's \$10 million Mule Deer, CH-5) ranked relatively high on the list. This single proposal could eliminate several lower ranked projects. Jenene Fenton noted that this, and other, Department projects have already been significantly cut back so that whatever funding becomes available can reach further down on the list. The mule deer project is a 10 year program valued at \$45 million. It has been divided into phases, the third of which is presently under consideration.

Joe Jones asked for clarification regarding multipliers for T&E criteria versus "public use" criteria. Greg Lovelady said that the T&E criteria has a higher multiplier.

Jim Fox asked for further discussion as to why fish oriented projects seemed to score so low. He, Bill Fearn, and Donna Mason found this of some concern. Eric Johnson replied that the key reason was the high multiplier for the T&E criterion, in which Fisheries' Department projects all scored zero. The average project score in that category, however, was 9.11, putting the Department at a serious disadvantage.

Considerable discussion followed regarding the overall significance of the evaluation criteria, development of the Z-score "unallocated" projects list, benefit-cost considerations, and shifting specific projects on the evaluation team list. It was noted that during the second year, all unfunded projects on the list sent to the governor would be re-evaluated.

Jenene Fenton moved adoption of the resolution in the kit, with the exception that Habitat Conservation Account Projects be recommended through Z-score project #53, Teal Slough, adjusting critical habitat, natural area, and urban wildlife for any subsequent addition of "alternate" category project. The motion was seconded.

Bill Fearn noted that this motion will not provide funding for Fisheries' projects. Jenene Fenton noted that it does maintain these projects on the list, providing an opportunity for possible funding through second year re-evaluation.

Cleve Pinnix asked if there would be support for establishing a funding cap, given that the Mule Deer project would cost \$10 million; is the last dollar for that project as important as the first dollar? Jenene Fenton "yes." The Mule Deer project has already been severely cut back.

It was noted that, under the \$111 million scenario, approximately \$6.5 million would be available in second year HCA set-aside funds.

Based on public testimony, available matching funds, and the statewide significance of the Sound-To-Mountains effort, Ted Price moved to amend the motion, by changing the Rattlesnake Ridge project (NA-7, DNR) to be number one among natural area projects. After some discussion, this first amendment to the motion was carried.

Jim Fox moved that the Fortson Ponds project (CH-19, Fisheries) be moved to the number one position among critical habitat projects. In favor of the motion, he noted that in this case the scoring system had failed to recognize the importance of this project (while not officially rated T&E, there is concern regarding the future of fisheries stock) and that in relation to other projects, Fortson does not represent much money. After some discussion, this second amendment to the motion was carried (three voted no).

As amended, the original motion was carried.

VII. BLUE NOTEBOOK, TAB #5: WATERCRAFT RECREATION PROGRAM, INITIATIVE 215

Greg Lovelady said that 35 watercraft recreation (I-215) projects had been evaluated and that approximately \$6.269 million would be available for distribution in this program next biennium. At this point, slides and an oral description of each project were presented. Following this, staff recommendations were distributed.

It was noted that while these primarily development-oriented projects were more predictable than land acquisitions in terms of implementation, that the permitting process can complicate and delay matters. For this reason, a list of "alternate" projects is proposed in the event there are withdrawals or cost savings that free-up funds for the next best project. No re-evaluation would occur during the second year of the biennium for unfunded proposals.

Rich Costello inquired as to the point in the process at which it would be determined that an alternate project might join those which have been funded. Laura Eckert replied that it might be practical to establish a cut-off date. Also, the alternates list has an added advantage in that it supplies an approved method of adding funded projects in the event that more I-215 funds become available.

It was noted that I-215 funds would be made available to agencies via IAC contracts, not line-items in individual agency's budgets.

At this point Eliot Scull invited members of the audience to add their comments to the record regarding these projects. The following individuals presented remarks (following each name is the individual's position regarding the project):

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 215-10 Seattle Waterfront, Phase 1 Development, DNR
Tom Dyer, Director, Wooden Yacht Racing Association | - Supports |
| 215-30 Mukilteo, State Parks
Paul Schaefer, Assistant Planner, City of Mukilteo | - Support |

It was moved by Donna Mason that the kit resolution adopting the list as presented be adopted. Ensuing discussion concerned statewide geographic distribution of I-215 projects. Laura Eckert clarified that the present

projects represented only state agency proposals; in November, a different list composed of local agency I-215 projects would be considered. **Motion carried.** Table 3 lists each project, in rank order, as adopted by IAC as its official funding recommendation to the governor.

VIII. WHITE NOTEBOOK, TAB #6: STATE PARKS, WWRP OMNIBUS #92-503A, CRYSTAL FALLS STATE PARK REQUEST TO PAY 10 PERCENT ABOVE ESTIMATED FAIR MARKET VALUE

Don Clark explained that, by IAC policy, sponsor agencies are authorized to pay for approved acquisitions up to the amount of the appraisal. The agency may pay up to 10 percent more than this only with the approval of IAC's director. Beyond this, the project must be reconsidered by the full Committee. This latter situation now confronts the Crystal Falls State Park project, #92-503A. (The increase can be covered by the amount of the original grant).

The appraised value of the property (approx. 4.25 acres between Colville and Ione, on SR 20) is \$16,500; the owner insists on \$22,000, 33 percent over the appraisal. Both State Parks and IAC staffs recommend this request be approved on the basis of its importance to the state park ("it's at the front door") and the relatively small total dollar amount involved. Jenene Fenton noted that there are real concerns among some Eastern Washington residents that the state is out-competing local citizens when it pays estimated fair market value; these concerns become much more serious when the state pays above fair market.

It was moved by Bill Fearn that the kit resolution approving this cost increase be approved. **Motion approved.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. until the following morning at 8:25 a.m.

IX. GREEN NOTEBOOK, TABS #1, #2, #3, #4: WWRP STATE PARKS, LOCAL PARKS, TRAILS, AND WATER ACCESS PROJECTS

Eric Johnson opened the presentation by observing that IAC would be considering Outdoor Recreation Account projects. At this point, Don Clark, Marguerite Austin, Scott Chapman and Eric Johnson presented slides and an oral description of each project. Following this, staff recommendations were presented. A summary of these recommendations is contained in Table 4.

Eric Johnson indicated that the general format and assumptions underlying these recommendations were the same as those presented earlier in the Habitat Conservation Account. In the recommendations, it was noted that:

- All "state parks" category funds are allocated during the biennium's first year,
- "Local parks" category projects are divided equally among the two fiscal years,
- "Trails, water access, and unallocated" category funds are allocated 75 percent in the biennium's first year and 25 percent in the second.

IAC was reminded that Chapter 43.98A RCW guarantees the State Parks and Recreation Commission \$13.875 million under an \$111 million appropriation; within this amount, IAC policy is to allow State Parks to "protect" any project on the list. At this point the meeting was adjourned until 1:30 p.m. for lunch.

Upon reconvening, members of the audience were invited 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):

WA-16, LP-28 South Lake Union/Kurtzer and Rainier Playfield Improvements
Charles NG, Parks Grants & Contracts Coordinator - Supports

LP-33 County Park Expansion, San Juan County
Jeanne Salbreiter, Superintendent, San Juan County Park Board - Supports

LP-25 Park at the Lakes
Rebecca Morrell, Administrative Assistant, City of West Richland - Supports

LP-14 Connell Park
Dave Cooper, Police Chief, Connell (as read by Eliot Scull) - Supports

WA-3 Guillemont Cove
Phil Best, Kitsap Land Trust, Open Space Council, etc. - Supports

WA-3 Guillemont Cove
Dotty Spathe, Kitsap County Open Space Preservation Program - Supports

WA-6, LP-6,7 Washougal River Greenway, Biddlewood Acq. and Ellsworth Acq.
Doug Hagedorn, Landscape Architect, Clark County - Supports

WA-18 Sunnyside Beach
Mary Dodsworth, Town of Steilacoom - Supports

LP-4, WA-9, WA-14 NE Tacoma Acq., NW Point Dev., and Dickman Mill
Lori Flemm, Planning & Development Manager, Metro Park Dist., Tacoma- Supports

LP-16 Northern State Recreation Area
Jon Aarstad, Director, Skagit County Parks, Recreation and Fair Dept- Supports

At this point Cleve Pinnix requested that IAC consider going into executive session due to litigation concerns and needed discussion regarding certain water access (site acquisition) projects. Director Eckert stated her legal understanding was that this should be no problem as long as no decisions were made in the session and only the announced subject was covered. From approximately 2:00-2:40 p.m. IAC adjourned into executive session.

On returning, the audience was thanked for its indulgence. Cleve Pinnix said that the session was prompted by a recognition that there may be two water access projects linked to federal-state litigation and treaty Indian tribes.

It was important that IAC understand how this issue could impact site funding decisions.

Ted Price noted that several projects seemed to center on the San Juan Islands area; does the evaluation criteria measure proximity to other sites? Don Clark explained that two criteria address this issue. In the local parks category for example, sponsors must identify existing facilities within the proposal's service area. Another evaluation criterion concerns how well the proposal meets an identified need, that is, will it alleviate the deficiency for which it is designed.

Jenene Fenton expressed concern regarding how the "state parks" category is addressed. While it is important that the Parks Commission have the prerogative of establishing priorities under statutory funding amounts, an anomaly occurs when z-score "unallocated" funds are latter applied. State Parks and IAC independently rank "state parks" category projects. In 1992, the resultant lists found a few projects which had been highly ranked in State Parks' process, instead near the bottom in IAC's (read "z-score") process. Note that Parks' ranking is first developed, followed by IAC's z-score listing.

At this point, at least two alternative ways of funding are possible. In the first, as presented in staff's recommendations: (a) Parks' reserved and other "statutory minimum" projects are marked on the z-score list for recommendation to the governor for funding; (b) beginning at the top of the z-score list which combines *all ORA categories*, remaining project amounts are summed; (c) when the maximum ORA "unallocated" amount is reached (25% = \$10,555,225) a line is drawn. Projects above the line, regardless of category, are recommended for funding.

A second alternative offered by Jenene Fenton is: (a) Parks' reserved and other "statutory minimum" projects are marked on the z-score list for recommendation to the governor for funding; (b) retaining these project amounts and beginning at the top of the z-score list, all amounts are summed; (c) when the maximum ORA "unallocated" amount is reached (24% = \$10,555,225) a line is drawn; (d) from the top of the list to the line, the sum of all "parks" category projects accumulated; (e) omitting each "statutory minimum" (Parks' reserved) project on the z-score listing, this accumulated sum is used to determine, in ranked order, which remaining "parks" category projects will be recommended to the governor.

The principal difference in the latter alternative is that the dollar amount of Parks' projects in the z-score list is first summed. This sum is then made available to Parks as the limit which may be applied to its highest priority projects. This eliminates any accidental disproportionate allocation of "unallocated" category dollars to that agency. Jim Fox indicated his agreement with this proposal.

Jim Fox moved adoption of the resolution in the kit ("Recommendations, Outdoor Recreation Account, September 25, 1992). Donna Mason indicated that, due to a potential conflict of interest, there was one project on which she must

abstain from voting; if the projects are considered as a "block," due to z-score interconnections, she would abstain from voting on the entire block.

Jenene Fenton moved that the motion be amended by basing ORA "parks" category fund distribution on the following process.

1. Have Parks designate funding for projects of its choice up to the statutory "parks" category minimum (\$13,875,000 - these are "protected");
2. Apply first year "unallocated" funds ($\$55,500,000 \times 25\% \times 75\% = \$10,406,250$; was changed to $\$10,555,225$ to accommodate a borderline project) to remaining unfunded z-score list projects and determine the dollar amount of "parks" category projects involved;
3. Apply this dollar amount ($\$1,178,000$) in rank order to unprotected projects on the "parks" category list.

It was noted that this method is process driven and works regardless of the final appropriation. Additionally, it was clarified that all numbers would require checks for errors prior to submission to OFM; since the motion is based on process, any corrections should be made by staff. ED NOTE: NO CORRECTIONS WERE NEEDED

From staff's recommendation, this proposal reduces the "parks" category allocation from $\$4,300,000$ to $\$1,178,000$ in "unallocated" category funds. In turn, this adds sufficient monies to the "trails" category to fund through the Silver Creek Trail (TR-11, plus $\$2,662,368$ in "unallocated" funds). This establishes a new "trails" category "unallocated" amount of $\$4,198,530$. It would also add one more project to the "water access" category (plus $\$84,809$ for South Lake Union/Kurtzer, WA-16) by providing a total of $\$4,803,872$ in "unallocated" funds. The "local parks" category remains unchanged. The amendment to the motion was carried (two against; Donna Mason abstained).

Cleve Pinnix moved that, due to increased threat, SP-28 Mt. Spokane-Ingebretsen be moved up in rank to a position immediately after SP-6. The amendment to the motion was carried.

Cleve Pinnix moved that SP-22 Allen Island, which has just been sold for an amount far in excess of the requested amount ($\$7$ million versus $\$2.5$ million) be removed from the list. The resultant "freed-up" amount should be used to move further down the z-score list. The amendment to the motion was carried.

Cleve Pinnix suggested that after adjournment, SP-26 Gates Farm be checked by staff to ensure that it is not encompassed in the Wildlife Department's China Caves "critical habitat" category project.

The original motion, as amended, was carried, Donna Mason abstaining. Tables 5a-d depict project lists as adopted by IAC as its official funding recommendation to the governor.

X. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Eliot Scull noted the importance of assisting the 1993 Legislature in understanding the importance the project lists adopted at the present meeting. It was observed that it would be especially important for citizen IAC members to participate in this task. Cleve Pinnix suggested that staff should assist in preparing materials and scheduling a presentation during a "legislative week-end." Ted Price noted the importance of a citizen chair assuming a key role in any such presentation. Laura Eckert said that "legislative week-ends" often focus on other matters in election years. She would, however, work on this and report back no later than the November IAC meeting.

She also supported the potential value of an abbreviated version of the kit notebooks used in the present meeting. Eric Johnson said that WRPA's "Legislative Breakfast" usually finds 40-60 legislators in attendance. Perhaps IAC members could also attend. Jenene Fenton noted that work should also be done to notify legislators of any projects IAC has recommended for funding in their districts. Donna Mason indicated that Clark County has had some success with well-produced video tapes; perhaps these could be prepared. Laura Eckert stated that the Wildlife and Recreation Coalition may be able to assist in such an effort. IAC staff must be cautious in this area.

Jenene Fenton expressed interest in discussing public notification of the results of the present meeting. Laura Eckert indicated that she would be working on this; it would be helpful if a press officer from a participating agency could assist. Jenene Fenton said she would speak to the Wildlife Department's information section.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

IAC APPROVAL CERTIFIED BY:

Eliot W. Scull, M.D., Chair

Date

Table 1. Staff Recommendations Summary, WWRP - Habitat Conservation Account

First Year Funding

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
Critical Habitat		
Statutory category amount (35%)	\$19,425,000	\$19,425,000
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	11,487,760	30,912,760
Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and z-score amounts ² for CH, NA, & UWH as applied to CH	16,488,016	47,400,776
Natural Areas		
Statutory category amount (20%)	\$11,100,000	\$11,100,000
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	-0-	11,100,000
Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and z-score amounts ² for CH, NA, & UWH as applied to NA	-0-	11,100,000
Urban Wildlife Habitat		
Statutory category amount (15%)	\$ 8,325,000	\$ 8,325,000
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	999,740	9,324,740
Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and z-score amounts ² for CH, NA, & UWH as applied to UWH	8,270,734	17,595,474

¹ \$55,500,000 x 30% = \$16,650,000 (Where 30% equals the maximum amount which may be categorized as "unallocated" [RCW 43.98A.040].)
 \$16,650,000 x 75% = \$12,487,500 (Where 75% equals the amount dedicated the first year.)

² \$51,337,500 ÷ 2 = \$25,668,750

Table 2a. Critical Habitat Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	40.00	92-810A	Fortson Ponds	Fisheries	310,500	-0-	310,500
* 2	65.32	92-630A	Peregrine Falcon Habitat Phase 2	Wildlife	2,262,500	-0-	2,262,500
* 3	62.51	92-633A	East Slope Inholdings	Wildlife	2,336,100	-0-	2,336,100
* 4	62.36	92-636A	Sharptailed Grouse Phase 2	Wildlife	2,770,000	-0-	2,770,000
* 5	60.57	92-632A	Balch Lake	Wildlife	339,150	-0-	339,150
* 6	59.16	92-638A	Mule Deer Winter Range	Wildlife	10,050,000	-0-	10,050,000
**/ 7	59.09	92-629A	Skagit Delta Wetlands	Wildlife	2,925,500	-0-	2,925,500 ¹
** 8	58.99	92-635A	Shrub Steppe Habitat	Wildlife	5,478,000	-0-	5,478,000
** 9	58.05	92-631A	Willapa Wetlands	Wildlife	2,191,000	-0-	2,191,000
** 10	57.77	92-634A	Blue Mountain Elk Winter Range	Wildlife	2,746,000	-0-	2,746,000
*** 11	55.57	92-652A	Washington Harbor	Wildlife	3,029,000	-0-	3,029,000
*** 12	49.60	92-644A	Tonasket Creek	Wildlife	2,500,000	-0-	2,500,000
*** 13	47.92	92-637A	Hood Canal Estuary	Wildlife	122,000	-0-	122,000
*** 14	46.57	92-645A	Martin/Burke Islands	Wildlife	4,149,500	-0-	4,149,500
*** 15	45.86	92-641A	Upland Wildlife Restoration	Wildlife	2,320,000	-0-	2,320,000
*** 16	45.41	92-639A	East Olympic Elk Winter Range	Wildlife	2,000,000	-0-	2,000,000
*** 17	44.99	92-646A	Grand Coulee Ranches	Wildlife	6,000,000	-0-	6,000,000
*** 18	43.42	92-649A	Cornehl Lake	Wildlife	81,000	-0-	81,000
*** 19	43.21	92-728A	Point Roberts	DNR	800,000	-0-	800,000
*** 20	37.51	92-642A	Omak Wood Products	Wildlife	5,400,000	-0-	5,400,000

* = Statutory, \$19,425,000 ** = Unallocated, \$11,983,750 *** = Alternates, \$26,401,500

¹ *\$1,356,750
 **\$1,568,750

Table 2b. Natural Area Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee For Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	63.58	92-722A	Rattlesnake Ridge	DNR	1,500,000	-0-	1,500,000
* 2	90.80	92-718A	Coastal NAP	DNR	3,000,000	-0-	3,000,000
* 3	84.45	92-724A	Cypress Island	DNR	1,000,000	-0-	1,000,000
* 4	80.67	92-726A	Dallas Mountain	DNR	2,500,000	-0-	2,500,000
* 5	79.71	92-725A	Table Mountain	DNR	2,000,000	-0-	2,000,000
* 6	69.56	92-720A	Pinecroft	DNR	500,000	-0-	500,000
* 7	69.28	92-719A	Larkspur Meadows	DNR	300,000	-0-	300,000
* 8	58.73	92-721A	Mount Si	DNR	250,000	-0-	250,000
*/*** 9	58.71	92-723A	Teal Slough	DNR	1,500,000	-0-	1,500,000 ¹

* = Statutory, \$11,100,000

*** = Alternates, \$1,450,00

¹ *\$ 50,000
***\$1,450,000

Table 2c. Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	80.01	92-339A	Chuckanut Mountain Park	Whatcom County	544,350	544,350	1,108,700
* 2	77.41	92-242A	Juanita Bay Acquisition	Kirkland	510,000	730,000	1,240,000
* 3	76.81	92-292A	West Duwamish Greenbelt	Seattle	1,050,000	1,050,000	2,100,000
* 4	76.41	92-348A	Kiwanis Ravine	Seattle	351,040	351,040	702,080
* 5	76.07	92-293A	East Duwamish Greenbelt	Seattle	706,850	706,850	1,413,700
* 6	75.40	92-729A/D	Woodard Bay NRCA Dev.	-DNR	1,500,000	-0-	1,500,000
* 7	75.17	92-727A	Woodard Bay	-DNR	500,000	-0-	500,000
***/**/ 8	73.73	92-621A	Vancouver Wetlands (Port)	-Wildlife	3,223,000	-0-	3,223,000 ¹
*** 9	71.78	92-136A	Mercer Slough Acquisition	Bellevue	475,000	475,000	950,000
*** 10	70.81	92-371A/D	Heron Cove Acquisition	Kitsap County	414,734	414,735	829,469
*** 11	68.94	92-623A	Yakima River Wetlands	-Wildlife	2,794,500	-0-	2,794,500
*** 12	67.94	92-296A	Black River Riparian Forest	Renton	1,454,000	1,454,000	2,908,000
*** 13	65.48	92-341A	South Vancouver Lake	Vancouver	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
*** 14	63.07	92-369A	Fuchs Foundation Property	-Clover Park Tech.	2,148,000	-0-	2,148,000
*** 15	63.04	92-624A	Fisher Island	-Wildlife	272,000	-0-	272,000
*** 16	61.90	92-622A	Vancouver (Shillapoo) Phase 2	-Wildlife	652,000	-0-	652,000
*** 17	58.86	92-363A	Snohomish River Estuary	Snohomish County	199,500	199,500	399,000
*** 18	58.82	92-304A	Sammamish Cove (Greenwood)	King County	1,006,100	1,006,100	2,012,200
*** 19	58.53	92-302A	Gazzam Lake	Bainbridge Isl. P&R Dist.	2,157,000	2,157,000	4,314,000
*** 20	57.61	92-105A	Connelly Creek Corridor	Bellingham	312,150	312,150	624,300
*** 21	55.74	92-625A	China Caves	-Wildlife	2,789,000	-0-	2,789,000
*** 22	54.71	92-305A	Squak-Tiger Corridor	King County	339,500	339,500	679,000
*** 23	54.36	92-331A	Brush Prairie	Clark County	211,623	211,623	423,246
*** 24	54.03	92-361A	North Creek Park	Snohomish County	383,250	383,250	766,500

* = Statutory, \$6,243,750 ** = Unallocated, \$503,750 *** = Alternates, \$18,749,847

¹ *\$1,081,510 **\$ 503,750 ***\$2,141,490

Table 3. State Agency Initiative 215 Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee For Outdoor Recreation - Watercraft Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$6,269,000 Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	39.01	92-578D	Puget Sound/NW WA, Ph. 1	State Parks	703,500	-0-	703,500
* 2	38.66	92-576D	San Juan Islands, Phase 1	State Parks	593,200	-0-	593,200
* 3	37.48	92-608D	Sprague Lake Access, Phase 2	Wildlife	118,000	55,000	173,000
* 4	34.00	92-820D	Ridgefield Boat Launch	Fisheries	150,000	-0-	150,000
* 5	33.51	92-577D	San Juan Islands, Phase 2	State Parks	1,272,100	-0-	1,272,100
* 6	32.84	92-579D	Puget Sound/NW WA, Ph. 2	State Parks	966,400	-0-	966,400
* 7	32.67	92-716D	Long Lake Phase 3 Development	Natural Resources	223,000	-0-	223,000
* 8	32.66	92-609D	Lower Kalama River Access	Wildlife	126,000	-0-	126,000
* 9	31.83	92-580D	Hood Canal/Olympic Pen., Ph.1	State Parks	773,000	-0-	773,000
* 10	31.68	92-717D	Seattle Waterfront, Ph. 2 Dev.	Natural Resources	900,000	-0-	900,000
* 11	29.67	92-815D	Willow Grove Boat Launch	Fisheries	300,000	455,112	755,112
* 12	29.35	92-610D	Silver Lake Redevelopment	Wildlife	85,000	-0-	85,000
**/* 13	28.99	92-614D	Mineral Lake Access Phase 2	Wildlife	270,000	-0-	270,000
** 13	28.99	92-822D	Pleasant Harbor Boat Launch	Fisheries	750,000	-0-	750,000
** 14	27.68	92-818D	Knappton Boat Launch	Fisheries	300,000	-0-	300,000
** 15	27.49	92-821D	Nahcotta Boat Launch	Fisheries	250,000	-0-	250,000
** 16	26.83	92-582D	Central Basin	State Parks	595,300	-0-	595,300
** 17	26.66	92-819D	LaPush Boat Launch	Fisheries	200,000	-0-	200,000
** 18	26.49	92-823D	Potlatch Boat Launch	Fisheries	200,000	-0-	200,000
** 19	26.34	92-825A/D	Boston Harbor Boat Launch	Fisheries	250,000	-0-	250,000
** 20	26.17	92-615D	Clear Lake	Wildlife	89,000	-0-	89,000
** 21	26.16	92-584D	Columbia/Snake Rivers, Ph 2	State Parks	289,000	-0-	289,000

* \$6,269,000 Projected Available ** = \$3,134,500 Plus Half Sum of Projection \$9,403,500 Cumulative Total

Table 4. Staff Recommendations Summary, WWRP - Outdoor Recreation Account

First Year Funding

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
State Parks		
Statutory category amount (Based on 100% distribution)	\$13,875,000	\$13,875,000
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	4,300,000	18,175,000
Alternates: Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and unallocated amounts ² for SP, LP, TR, WA, and second year set-aside as applied to State Parks	11,149,000	29,324,000
Local Parks		
Statutory category amount (Based on approximately 50% distribution)	\$ 7,058,334	\$ 7,058,334
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	-0-	7,058,334
Alternates: Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and unallocated amounts ² for SP, LP, TR, WA and second year set-aside as applied to Local Parks	8,155,003	15,213,337
Trails		
Statutory category amount (Based on approximately 75% distribution)	\$ 6,243,750	\$ 6,243,750
Plus z-score unallocated (based on 75% ¹)	1,536,162	7,779,912
Alternates: Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and unallocated amounts ² for SP, LP, TR, WA and second year set-aside as applied to Trails	9,894,478	17,674,390
Water Access		
Statutory category amount (Based on approximately 75% distribution)	\$ 4,162,500	\$ 4,162,500
Plus z-score unallocated ¹	4,719,063	8,881,563
Alternates: Plus half the sum of the cumulative statutory and unallocated amounts ² for SP, LP, TR, WA and second year set-aside as applied to Water Access	8,700,864	17,582,427

¹ $\$55,500,000 \times 25\% = \$13,875,000$ (Where 25% equals the maximum amount which may be categorized as "unallocated" [RCW 43.98A.050].)

$\$13,875,000 \times 75\% = \$10,406,250$ (Where 75% equals the amount dedicated the first year; was changed to \$10,555,225 to accommodate a borderline project.)

² $\$55,500,000 \div 2 = \$27,750,000$

Table 5a. State Parks Category P cts - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Request	Match	Total
* 1	74.13	92-536A	Squak Mountain Section 9 Phase 1	1,800,000	0	1,800,000
* 2	71.87	92-541A	Lime Kiln Point Acquisition	1,500,000	0	1,500,000
***/** 3	69.97	92-549A	Squak Mountain Section 9 Phase 2	1,800,000	0	1,800,000**1,384,300 ***415,700
* 4	69.29	92-563D	Squak Mountain Initial Devel.	196,100	0	196,100
* 5	64.65	92-562D	Lime Kiln Point - Initial Dev.	500,000	0	500,000
* 6	64.00	92-538A	Green River Gorge Acq. Ph 5	750,000	0	750,000
* 7	46.55	92-522A	Mount Spokane -Ingebretsen	169,000	0	169,000
* 8	62.58	92-542A	Fisk Property	1,400,000	0	1,400,000
* 9	61.95	92-567D	Belfair	260,000	0	260,000
* 10	61.59	92-564D	Beacon Rock	650,000	446,900	1,096,900
* 11	61.03	92-509D	Steamboat Rock Group Camp	740,400	0	740,400
* 12	60.92	92-544A	Larrabee - Chuckanut	2,000,000	0	2,000,000
*** 13	59.86	92-561A	Green River Gorge Acq. Ph 7	500,000	0	500,000
*** 14	59.07	92-548A	Camano Island	2,000,000	0	2,000,000
*** 15	57.71	92-551A	Green River Gorge Acq. Ph 6	500,000	0	500,000
/ 16	57.51	92-547A	Stuart Island	800,000	0	800,000 *492,900 **306,200
* 17	56.00	92-569D	Fort Columbia	100,000	0	100,000
* 18	55.64	92-572D	Fort Casey	190,000	0	190,000
* 19	55.08	92-543A	Fort Casey Phase 2	500,000	0	500,000
* 20	55.01	92-537A	Nisqually/Mashel Phase 3	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
* 21	52.84	92-568D	Flaming Geyser - Whitney Bridge	866,600	0	866,600
*** 22	52.08	92-552A	Fort Casey Phase 3	780,000	0	780,000
*** 23	50.73	92-550A	Nisqually/Mashel Phase 4	2,080,000	0	2,080,000
*** 24	48.34	92-553A	Moran	1,050,000	0	1,050,000
* 25	47.73	92-546A	Ollalie - Twin Falls	310,000	0	310,000
*** 26	47.50	92-554A	Gates Farm	1,580,000	0	1,580,000
*** 27	46.70	92-558A	Burrows Island Phase 3	500,000	0	500,000
*** 28	46.44	92-571D	Statewide Development - Fuel	140,000	0	140,000
*** 29	45.77	92-560A	Sucia, Finger Islands	1,100,000	0	1,100,000
*** 30	45.64	92-559A	Yakima Greenway Ph 3	310,000	0	310,000
* 31	45.50	92-539A	Ocean Beaches SCA	500,000	0	500,000
*** 32	43.86	92-570D	Hartstene Island	250,000	0	250,000
*** 33	41.89	92-575A	Gulf Road Beach	1,260,000	0	1,260,000
* 34	24.83	92-545A	Osoyoos Lake	140,000	0	140,000

* = Statutory, \$13,875,000 (76.84% Acquisition) ** = Unallocated, \$1,690,500 *** = Alternate, \$12,655,700

Table 5b. Local Parks Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	65.15	92-287D	Campus Drive Park	Federal Way	300,000	3,388,000	3,688,000
* 2	64.83	92-295A/D	Chiawana Park Phase 2	Franklin County	128,000	128,000	256,000
* 3	64.68	92-326D	Maltby Community Park	Monroe Park Dist.	73,073	73,073	146,146
* 4	63.83	92-351A	Northeast Tacoma Acq.	Tacoma MPD	167,486	167,486	334,972
* 5	63.34	92-324A/D	Benton Crawford Park Ph 2	Prosser	69,500	69,500	139,000
* 6	61.15	92-247A	Biddlewood Acq.	Clark County	142,547	142,547	285,094
* 7	61.01	92-330A	Ellsworth Acq.	Clark County	92,262	92,262	184,524
* 8	60.99	92-317D	North SeaTac Park	SeaTac & Seattle Port	300,000	1,416,684	1,716,684
* 9	60.51	92-239A/D	Wick Park	Stanwood	300,000	663,742	963,742
* 10	60.03	92-321A	I-90 South (Robertson)	Bellevue	412,500	412,500	825,000
* 11	59.15	92-334D	Bagley Community Park	Vancouver	300,000	817,910	1,117,910
* 12	58.67	92-288D	Steel Lake Park	Federal Way	300,000	319,414	619,414
* 13	58.66	92-312D	Lake Tapps Park	Pierce County	300,000	553,480	853,480
* 14	58.20	92-335A/D	Connell Park	Connell	74,132	74,132	148,264
* 15	58.14	92-298A	May Creek Trail	Renton	126,600	126,600	253,200
* 16	56.69	92-344A	Northern State Rec. Area	Skagit County	364,585	364,585	729,170
* 17	56.02	92-261D	Sunnyside Beach	Steilacoom	158,857	158,857	317,714
* 18	55.67	92-342A	Sunset Farms Park	Whatcom County	458,800	458,800	917,600
* 19	54.45	92-309A	McElroy Park	Ellensburg	81,964	81,965	163,929
* 20	54.02	92-328A	Wineberg Community Park	Clark County	462,500	462,500	925,000
* 21	53.49	92-279A	Albion Heights Acq.	Spokane	69,000	69,000	138,000
* 22	52.99	92-280D	Cannon Hill Addition	Spokane	185,614	185,614	371,228
* 23	52.16	92-325A	Bender Field	Lynden	266,500	266,500	533,000
* 24	51.49	92-366D	Waterfront Park	Medical Lake	91,989	91,989	183,978
* 25	51.48	92-355A/D	Park at the Lakes	West Richland	300,000	395,909	695,909
* 26	51.32	92-307D	Jenkins Creek Park Phase 2	King County	219,940	219,941	439,881
* 27	50.85	92-364A/D	Athletic Facility	Okanogan	180,737	180,738	361,475
* 28	50.83	92-384D	Rainier Playfield Improvements	Seattle	179,138	179,138	358,276
* 29	50.81	92-282A	North Spokane Sports Complex	Spokane	500,000	525,500	1,025,500
* 30	50.50	92-315A	Howe Farm	Kitsap County	432,750	432,750	865,500
* 31	50.32	92-320D	Valleyford Community Park	Freeman School District #358	19,860	19,860	39,720
*** 32	49.36	92-319A	Tollgate Farm	North Bend	500,000	532,000	1,032,000
*** 33	49.33	92-343D	County Park Expansion	San Juan County	38,337	38,337	76,674
*** 34	49.17	92-308D	Beaver Lake Play Area	King County	300,000	467,805	767,805
*** 35	48.51	92-264A	Thrasher's Corner Park	Bothell	500,000	1,520,000	2,020,000

* = Statutory, \$7,058,334 (56.27% Acquisition)

** = Unallocated, \$-0-

*** = Alternates, \$1,338,337

Table 5c. Trails Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Score	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	72.30	92-318D	Duwamish/Green River Trail	Tukwila	226,161	226,161	452,322
* 2	70.65	92-362D	Centennial Trail	Snohomish County	1,659,725	1,659,725	3,319,450
* 3	70.41	92-356A/D	Whatcom Creek Trail	Bellingham	1,715,450	1,715,450	3,430,900
* 4	68.68	92-297D	Cedar River Trail	Renton	702,249	702,250	1,404,499
* 5	66.40	92-303A	Cedar River Trail	King County	380,821	380,821	761,642
* 6	63.78	92-337D	Foothills - McMillen to Orting	Pierce County	127,506	127,506	255,012
**/* 7	63.65	92-531D	Iron Horse - Cabin Creek/Col R	State Parks	2,968,000	0	2,968,000
** 8	62.53	92-730D	Tiger Mountain Trail/Trailhead	DNR	803,000	0	803,000
** 9	62.43	92-336D	Foothills-Buckley to Lwr Burnett	Pierce County	164,368	164,369	328,737
** 10	62.16	92-530D	Iron Horse-Cedar Falls/Cabin Ck	State Parks	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
** 11	61.81	92-731D	Silver Creek Trail	DNR	695,000	0	695,000
*** 12	61.79	92-518A	Cross State Missing Links	State Parks	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
*** 13	60.67	92-327A/D	Hylebos Creek Trail	Milton	234,550	234,550	469,100
*** 14	59.54	92-535D	Spokane River Centennial Trail	State Parks	750,000	180,000	930,000
*** 15	59.16	92-517A	Stillaguamish Robe Gorge	State Parks	1,500,000	0	1,500,000
*** 16	58.92	92-367D	Centennial Trail Phase 1	Skagit County	155,210	155,210	310,420
*** 17	58.91	92-281D	Centennial Loop Trail	Spokane	300,000	412,800	712,800
*** 18	58.54	92-521A	Iron Horse Trail Connections	State Parks	370,000	0	370,000
*** 19	57.03	92-322D	Enatai to Mercer Slough	Bellevue	215,000	215,000	430,000
*** 20	56.30	92-533D	Mount Spokane Trails Phase 2	State Parks	383,000	0	383,000
*** 21	55.27	92-524D	Wallace Falls Parking/Trail	State Parks	243,100	0	243,100
*** 22	52.53	92-520A	Iron Horse Secord	State Parks	350,000	0	350,000

* = Statutory, \$6,243,750

** = Unallocated, \$4,198,530

*** = Alternate, \$5,500,860

*1,431,838
**1,536,162

Table 5d. Water Access Category Projects - Approved Recommendations

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Distribution Based on \$111 Million Appropriation for 1993-95 Biennium

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Match	Total
* 1	92-805A	Hood Canal Shellfish	Fisheries	1,250,000	3,750,000	5,000,000
* 2	92-370A/D	Double Bluff Beach Access	Island County	300,000	300,000	600,000
* 3	92-316A	Guillemot Cove	Kitsap County	2,007,750	2,007,750	4,015,500
* 4	92-653A	Rocky Ford Creek Ph 4	Wildlife	113,400	0	113,400
** / * 5	92-241A	Edmonds Waterfront	Edmonds	1,108,000	1,108,000	2,216,000
** 6	92-332A	Washougal River Greenway	Clark County	108,349	108,349	216,698
** 7	92-540A	Riverside Phased Acquisition	State Parks	260,000	0	260,000
** 8	92-656A	Washougal River Bank	Wildlife	152,900	0	152,900
** 9	92-352D	Northwest Point Development	Tacoma MPD	366,664	366,665	733,329
** 10	92-306A	Maple Valley Riverside	King County	223,600	223,600	447,200
** 11	92-516D	Skykomish River Access	State Parks	330,000	0	330,000
** 12	92-806A	Cline Spit	Fisheries	1,200,000	0	1,200,000
** 13	92-359A	Deschutes Falls	Thurston County	425,000	425,000	850,000
** 14	92-350A	Dickman Mill	Tacoma MPD	575,500	575,500	1,151,000
** 15	92-116A	Thomas Eddy Park	Snohomish County	460,400	460,400	920,800
** 16	92-385D	South Lake Union/Kurtzer	Seattle	84,809	84,809	169,618
*** 17	92-809D	Fox Island Fishing Pier	Fisheries	888,030	0	888,030
*** 18	92-349A	Chambers Creek	Steilacoom	603,225	603,225	1,206,450
*** 19	92-357A	Little Squalicum Greenway	Bellingham	257,600	257,600	515,200
*** 20	92-534D	Riverside State Park	State Parks	169,000	0	169,000
*** 21	92-512A	Spencer Spit - Maylor	State Parks	650,000	0	650,000
*** 22	92-664D	Plummer Lake Access Area	Wildlife	66,000	0	66,000
*** 23	92-665D	Alice Avenue/Wenatchee River	Wildlife	115,000	0	115,000
*** 24	92-654A	Upper Nisqually River	Wildlife	65,200	0	65,200
*** 25	92-514A	Phased Beach Access	State Parks	260,000	0	260,000
*** 26	92-807A	North Bay Tideland Access	Fisheries	180,000	0	180,000
*** 27	92-510A	Birch Bay Old Marina Site	State Parks	500,000	0	500,000
*** 28	92-511A	Fort Ebey Tidelands	State Parks	60,000	0	60,000
*** 29	92-655A	Little Ash Lake	Wildlife	236,500	0	236,500
*** 30	92-528D	Columbia River Phase 1	State Parks	2,140,000	0	2,140,000
*** 31	92-808A	Bush Point Fishing Access	Fisheries	750,000	0	750,000
*** 32	92-658A	Cowlitz River Blue Creek	Wildlife	288,000	0	288,000
*** 33	92-515D	Ocean Beach Access	State Parks	801,000	0	810,000

* = Statutory, \$4,162,500 (98% Acquisition) ** = Unallocated, \$4,803,872 *** = Alternate, \$8,029,555

*491,350
 **616,650