

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: February 8 & 9, 2007

*PLACE: Natural Resources Building,
Room 172, Olympia, Washington*

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER.....3

CONSENT CALENDAR.....3

MANAGEMENT STATUS REPORTS.....4

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES.....4

WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP) - Farmland
Preservation Category6

IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER #05-05 – Cultural Resources and
IAC Projects7

WWRP- URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT CATEGORY8

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) – Category Changes
for 2006 grants.....10

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) Education and
Enforcement Category – Revising Project Caps and Evaluation Questions12

FIREARMS AND ARCHERY RANGE RECREATION (FARR) PROGRAM –
Revising Caps and Match Levels12

CONVERSION POLICIES – Proposed Changes13

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS14

CONVERSION POLICIES – Proposed Changes15

LEVEL OF SERVICE PROJECT – Workshop.....15

STRATEGIC PLAN.....17

STRATEGIC PLAN – Discuss Possible 2007-09 Updates18

EXECUTIVE SESSION19

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) – Category Changes
for 2006 grants – CONTINUED.....19

**INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

Day 1

DATE: February 8, 2007

TIME: 10:30 a.m.

PLACE: Natural Resources Building

Room 172, Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Chapman	Mercer Island, Acting Chair
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Steven Drew	Olympia
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Rex Derr	Director, State Parks
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Acting Chair Bill Chapman called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

Chair Chapman welcomed everyone and asked committee members to introduce themselves.

Upon reviewing the agenda, Director Laura Johnson noted that two agenda items may need to be moved, as Jim Fox who is scheduled to present these items has a legislative hearing that he will need to attend.

Acting Chair Chapman noted that Val Ogden's husband has recently gotten out of the hospital and she will not be able to attend the meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Approval of IAC Minutes- September 21 & 22, 2006, October 27, 2006, and November 16, 2006
- b. Time Extensions
- c. Cost Increase - #05-1064 City of Langley Boat Ramp
- d. Service Recognition – Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR) and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)

Resolution # 2007-01

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2007-01. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2007-01 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

MANAGEMENT STATUS REPORTS

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2 for details.)

- Minutes will now be sent out to Board members ahead of time for review and comment to ensure minutes are approved in the most efficient manner.
- Introduced new Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) Deputy Director, Rachael Langen.
- Legislative session is going strong.
- IAC name change bill is successfully going through the legislative process.
- Director Johnson noted that she just returned from the LWCF meeting. She will be working on some process information for the LWCF to use in the future.
- Noted upcoming grants application workshops. Staff is preparing for the May application deadline, with workshops in March.
- IAC is on target with budget items. Staff should know the next biennial budget by the end of April.

Director Johnson highlighted the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) list document (previously called the "Blue Book") and thanked Susan Zemek for the good work on this booklet. Soon Susan will also be providing the Board with updated program sheets.

Bill Chapman noted that Sally Jewel, local business person and advocate, was on a plane to attend a meeting at the White House to discuss LWCF activities yesterday.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

- A. Current Session activities
- B. Reports to 2007 Legislature – Status Update
 - a) Trails Database Cost Estimate
 - b) Youth Athletic Funds Matching Funds Project
 - c) Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Noise Study
 - d) "Level of Service" Study

Jim Fox provided an update on current legislative activities.

- Both the Senate and House legislative committees have heard the IAC name change bill. Both are now on the way to the Rules committees.
- Typically staff tracks about 70 bills per session. Last year was a record low with only 50 bills tracked, but this year 50 bills were being tracked after two and a half weeks.
- HB1651 is boating legislation, concerning excise tax.
- ORV Noise issues generated two pieces of legislation, HB1434 and SB5544.
- There is a lands acquisition bill based on the Public Lands inventory, SB5236.
- Bill to move the Governors Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) to the IAC with \$500,000 in the Governor's budget for this.
- One bill is missing from the memo. SB1545 prohibits wetland mitigation banks on agricultural lands.

- All IAC citizen members are up for Senate confirmation. None have been scheduled yet.
- Most programs funds come through the capital budget. Most have dedicated fund sources. Some of the Non-highway and Off-road Vehicle Activity (NOVA) funds are tagged to be shifted to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to meet a budget request they submitted.

Board Discussion:

Karen Daubert asked about the boating bill and if it was related to the presentation given to the IAC in September.

Jim reported that yes, the boating bill was related to the presentation given to the IAC.

Steven Drew asked about the shift of funds from the NOVA account. He asked if that shift could reverse any decisions that the Board made this year.

Jim reported that Mark Jarasitis did a careful review of NOVA funds and found that the shift was uncommitted funds, but that the \$900,000 amount being discussed was at an upper limit the IAC could feel comfortable with.

Steven then asked how the budget shift would be pulled. How would staff decide what category these funds will come from?

Jim noted that one approach would be to take the funds out before the money was divided between the categories, or to adjust after the division and take the amount out proportionately.

Bill Chapman asked about the state and local parks funding paragraph in the memo.

Jim reported that it is rare that these bills go anywhere, but it is good to see the interest in parks.

Rex Derr agreed that it is good to see the interest in parks. The Governor's budget was a good budget proposed for state parks.

Mark Quinn was confused about the boating program bill and how it would work.

Jim Fox agreed that the boating bill was confusing, but his understanding was that a small portion would go to State Parks and the rest of the amount would be divided between State Parks and the IAC. The IAC would decide how much would go to State Parks and how much would be retained in the IAC for a boating program. He does not believe it will be at the proposed \$35 million level if it is passed. Staff has not taken a stand on this legislation and it is not in the Governor's budget.

Reports to 2007 Legislature – Status Update

Jim Fox provided updates on the various reports the IAC was tasked to complete for this Legislative Session.

Public Testimony:

Ed Bushnell, from Lynnwood Washington and vice-president for the American Motorcycle Association provided an update on how he developed the legislation for HB1448. He was glad to see how the IAC gathered the information for the ORV study. He personally didn't like the makeup of the committee, but he applauds the IAC for getting the information from all the user groups. He knows there is a problem with ORV noise, but would like to mention that on January 29 Straddleline had a noise training event at the ORV park. He appreciates that the IAC helped to get the Straddleline ORV Park open again and reported that the park is doing good things.

Jeff Parsons asked what the staff's role would be regarding Mr. Bushnell's concern with the legislation.

Jim reported that the report makes recommendations for IAC to look at. At a future meeting we can look at the recommendations in the report to see what changes we could make in the grant programs. Before that occurs stakeholders will certainly be contact for input.

WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP) - Farmland Preservation Category

Jim Fox provided the Board with an update on the Farmland Preservation category and changes proposed for this category. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

If the Board decides to hold a second year funding round, it would need to make a decision at the June meeting to be able to present in September. Staff is working on a model conservation easement, since the current easement documents don't fit with the farmland program. There are a number of issues that staff will need the Board's guidance on at the June meeting. In the meantime, staff will get stakeholder comments.

Board Discussion:

Mark Quinn suggested that staff contact Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) about their farmland conservation program.

Jeff Parsons suggested contacting other non-governmental agencies as well.

Jim Fox noted that staff agrees that contacting other organizations is the next step.

Bill Chapman discussed his concerns and preferences for this program.

Steven Drew believes wind turbines are very important for agriculture and would like to see more done with wind turbines than the footprint of buildings.

Mark Quinn noted that the WDFW has found that one size does not fit all. The Board would need to be very clear on the priorities they want before making them in perpetuity.

IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER #05-05 – Cultural Resources and IAC Projects

Leslie Ryan-Connelly and Myra Barker presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 and presentation for details.)

Leslie stated that the purpose of the Executive Order 05-05 is to protect and preserve those cultural resources that may be found on any state funded project. The order is very similar to the National Preservation Act.

Cultural resources are defined as archeological and historic sites, artifacts and traditional areas, or items of religious, ceremonial and social uses to affected tribes. The order states that all Governor appointed state agencies must conduct a cultural resource review. For IAC this will include most of the grant programs and projects.

Staff has requested Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation concurrence on projects that may be exempted from EO 05-05 review. Staff is working on a programmatic agreement that will formalize which projects may be exempted. IAC is coordinating with other state agencies to ensure they are not duplicating their efforts.

Myra noted that the projects that aren't exempted will likely experience a cost increase in order to conduct surveys. Some sponsors might have to change their project scope, or the completion date of their project. In addition, staff cannot release funds until we know that projects are in compliance.

Board Discussion:

Rex Derr noted that State Parks has been basically following this Executive Order for the past 20 years. They have an archeologist on staff and review whenever they break ground. They are still surprised at times about the amount of time and cost this causes, but they believe it is a good thing to do. IAC needs to develop some form of monitoring of both the time and costs of this Executive Order. This will assist IAC in setting expectations for time extensions.

Karen Daubert agreed with Rex's comments. She asked how long it takes for the review. She would like as much done in advance to avoid project delays.

Myra noted that the first 99 projects went fairly quickly, but she doesn't know how long it will take to review the remaining two.

Leslie reported that these two projects still need tribal review.

The Board expressed interest in having staff track the time and money spent on projects as a result of this order.

Steven Drew would like to have an initial review of habitat projects, up front, to identify projects of concern before funding the projects. As the Board rates projects for acquisition there needs to be a low level of assessment.

Mark noted that the WDFW does a pretty thorough review of their projects ahead of time, but are still finding they need a lot more time and money for review.

Bill Chapman shared his concern with slowing down an acquisition since they are usually very time sensitive. The analysis or survey should be one after the land is acquired.

WWRP- URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT CATEGORY

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented an update to this category on funding within the WWRP program. (See notebook item #6 and presentation for details.)

Leslie provided policy alternatives with pros and cons for each:

- 1a – dedicate a portion of funds to local projects and a portion of funds to state agency projects
- 1b – dedicate a portion of funds to projects within specific distance from an urban center
- 2 - provide more weight to the urban-specific evaluation criteria
- 3 – modify the evaluation team to include more people with local agency perspectives

Staff is asking the Board to provide direction on a preferred alternative, which will then be taken out for public comment. The subcommittee will meet via conference call soon to review and discuss this topic. A final discussion is needed at the Board meeting in November.

Board Discussion:

Karen Daubert noted that alternative #3 was not one that the subcommittee discussed, but she likes it. She is concerned with dedicating portions to different groups as it would be very difficult to come up with the right percentage.

Steven Drew believes 1a and 2 would both do the same thing, but the options do provide different approaches. Alternative 2 calls for a change in criteria that may have long range repercussions that aren't clear at this point.

Craig Partridge believes that unintentional consequences could be an issue. He also agrees with Karen that adding local agency members to the evaluation team would be beneficial.

Bill Chapman hopes to increase points for education. One way to avoid unintentional consequences would be to look at past lists, and apply to see what the new criteria to test the impact.

Mark Quinn asked what the goal of this revision is. Is it to get more projects in the urban area or higher quality projects?

Karen noted that her goal is to increase the awards to local agencies without causing harm to the quality of projects because varying the criteria could impact the goal.

Jeff Parsons agreed with Bill Chapman about having points for education. Urban wildlife is both biological and social and people need to appreciate the wildlife in their own communities. He is concerned about being arbitrary in deciding a percentage.

Steven Drew would like to expand or tighten the definition of recreation education. Education is a good way to build partnerships but if done across the board it may pull the focus off the intended purpose of this program. He is in favor of a division with more education in the urban areas.

Craig noted that it is important to have an educational element. He is concerned with the word recreation. This is the conservation account, not the recreation account. The Board shouldn't over-encourage public use since this is about habitat for wildlife. He would like to add the "appropriate style of recreational public use".

Jeff agreed with Craig and suggested only giving points for compatible types of wildlife recreation.

Bill Chapman asked about trying an option where a percentage would go to the state or local projects. He also suggested staying at 90 percent to give flexibility on the remaining 10 percent.

Steven is concerned with two different rating systems, including one for local and another for rural. He would rather have two separate category lists.

Bill summarized the Board's discussion. Members appeared to agree on option 3 and clearly do not like option 1b.

Jeff responded that there is a way to include 1b under alternative 2, by making it a weighting amount. He prefers options 2 and 3.

After further discussion, the Board decided to eliminate 1b as an option.

Craig believes the public comment period is key to this process and that there is no reason to have a Board decision today. In that context he suggests 1a, 2 and 3 going to the public for comments. He believes the chances for unintended consequences are the least for 1a.

Mark noted that if the goal is to get money to local agencies then 1a is the way to do it. If the goal is to increase the quality of projects in urban areas, then redefine the criteria.

Jeff stated that there may be two different types of projects that we want to protect and he doesn't know if the legislation anticipates this issue.

Karen noted that the public use criteria could be doubled to reach the total of 10 points possible. Rather than decreasing points on the other criterion, she suggested adding to the total number of points. Use this as an experiment and take this back to the subcommittee. Population distance from an urban area can be doubled to 10. The potential for special needs populations should also be increased to five points and should have the educational component included in the definition.

Rex noted that if the Board wants to help local governments it needs to steer away from thinking that urban centers are more important. He does not like option 1b. As long as a criterion includes things that are of concern, such as urban growth, then he thinks option 2 is good. Option 3 does not excite him, although it might help. He's not sure he likes 1a either since he would rather focus on social and biological issues.

Director Johnson noted that this was the policy discussion staff was hoping the Board would have. Staff will go back and evaluate what impact the criteria would have had on past processes. She also reiterated that public comment will be very helpful.

Public Testimony:

Bill Blair, Seattle Parks and Recreation Department, agrees with Mr. Parsons on the importance of these issues. He likes alternative 1a as Seattle has not applied for funds in this category for several years due to the limited chance they had in getting a grant. He would like to see the scoring increased for the population section, as it is currently only weighted at 5 points in the evaluation process. If the criterion doesn't change then Seattle programs will continue to not apply.

Director Johnson introduced Brit Kramer, Executive Director for the Washington Recreation and Parks Association (WRPA), who was in the audience. Brit noted that the WRPA plans to attend a lot more of IAC's meetings and to be more engaged in the future.

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) – Category Changes for 2006 grants

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 and presentation for details.)

Greg reviewed the proposal for Board discussion and decision at this meeting.

Reviewed projects suggested for moving to NHR funding:

#06-1960 – Harts Pass Trailhead Parking

#06-1854 – Pasayten Campsite and Trail Restoration

#06-1609 – Iron Goat – Horseshoe Trail Planning

Public Testimony:

Ruth Ittner, volunteer coordinator for Iron Goat Trail, originally applied for Non-Highway Roads (NHR) project and then staff moved it to the Non-Motorized category. She provided an overview of the project.

Resolution # 2007-02

Rex Derr **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2007-02. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2007-02 **APPROVED** by Board as presented. Steven Drew voted nay.

The Chair asked Steven why he voted nay.

Steven Drew disagrees with moving projects into different categories. He would like to have a policy vote on how to handle the NOVA money that is still on the table. Since there is money still unspent the Board needs to decide if that money is going to be shifted to another category, earmarked in this category or will it go back into the pot during next years funding cycle to be divided up based on criteria.

Bill Chapman is in support of the staff working with clients to decide the best category for a specific project.

Steven noted the Board voted on the other categories at the last meeting, yet on this category, which the Board voted to shift projects to in order to use all of the excess money, still has unspent funds. He believes the Board should actively choose an option for this money.

Director Johnson proposed having staff comes back at the June meeting with a packet showing the relevant NOVA policies.

Karen noted in the staff memo there seems to be a recommendation for keeping the money in the category it is in.

Bill asked Steven if he had a motion.

Steven did not have a motion but would take a straw poll.

Bill Chapman will be voting against it and would encourage Steven to continue to work with staff to pull the policy information together on this topic.

Jeff's NOVA program's proposal was for a straw poll which is non-binding. Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to identify the unallocated portion as a problem, and requested staff to bring back alternatives and consequences at the June meeting, and to form a Board subcommittee to work with staff. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Steven asked if this subcommittee would be looking at concerns identified at the last meeting as well as today's meeting.

Jeff stated that the NOVA program and identified problems associated with the unallocated money are the issues he is suggesting looking into.

Bill asked Director Johnson if the suggestions made by the Board would be achievable by staff.

Director Johnson is concerned with the deadline of the June meeting. She wants to make sure that there would be time for user group input.

The Board decided to table the decision until the second day of the meeting (page 19).

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) Education and Enforcement Category – Revising Project Caps and Evaluation Questions

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #8 and presentation for details.)

Greg reviewed the current policy and changes that are being prepared.

Board Discussion:

Steven Drew asked about the larger projects noted in the memo.

Greg explained that one county always submits a project for a large amount since a couple of different groups team up to submit this project. He provided the background and reasoning behind the comments and staff recommendations on the memo.

Craig asked about a couple of comments concerning non-governmental projects. He is a little concerned as it may negatively affect his agency law enforcement efforts under this program.

Resolution # 2007-03

Mark Quinn **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2007-03. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2007-03 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

FIREARMS AND ARCHERY RANGE RECREATION (FARR) PROGRAM – Revising Caps and Match Levels

Marguerite Austin presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 for details.)

This year there is about \$600,000 available for this grant program, more than in the past. For this grant round only staff is asking for the approval of providing larger grants and for the review of this program before any future grant rounds. Historically there has been a \$50,000 cap but there have been requests for a larger cap. With the matching requirements it has worked quite well, but recently there have been larger facilities that

have needed to submit multiple grants to get the projects completed. A larger cap would help these groups to complete larger projects. Staff is requesting a \$100,000 cap. The reason there was a larger amount of funds this year is because so many clubs are being impacted by urban growth or change of location in clubs, so projects have not been completed and funds have been returned. Staff is also concerned with Executive Order 05-05 and the need for more review of these projects. The advisory committee may have a different recommendation once they have an opportunity to discuss this issue.

Resolution # 2007-04

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2007-04. Mark Quinn **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2007-04 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

CONVERSION POLICIES – Proposed Changes

Jim Eychaner presented this item. (See notebook item #10 for details.)

Jim provided the Board with an overview of the three steps in the grant process.

1. Pre-application – up front work
2. Post funding – active grant
3. On-the-ground post completion, where compliance fits in

There is ever increasing pressure on more lands. Local leaders look at the land already publicly owned as attractive sites for schools, fire stations, and public works areas.

Jim reviewed the current policy and changes the proposed.

Board Discussion:

Mark Quinn expressed concern about the vagueness of proposed policy 2b (policy on habitat). WDFW finds it more and more difficult to complete acquisitions. Overall WDFW has very few projects that are "out-of-compliance" and with other priorities for the agency, getting those few projects back into compliance is a low priority. This policy proposal could put them in a high-risk standing that could prevent them from getting future funds. An element change is a new concept which includes small issues that need to happen to get the project back into compliance, such as signage.

Jim discussed the differences in compliance changes and elemental changes and how this might help agencies reach compliance easier. There is also a recommendation that the Director review and approve elemental changes, which is another way to reach compliance in the most effective way possible. This proposal also has an appeal process.

Director Johnson reported that the Board is going to see more of these conversion issues in the future.

Jim indicated that a possible next step is to revise manual seven as approved by the Board. Staff will probably request a delay in decision making on the section regarding high risk projects. He believes final recommendations for this partner issue will take a long time, up to a year.

Marguerite Austin noted that as long as applicants make staff aware of their circumstances staff can help review and guide them through the process.

Mark stated that he would like to see the revised policy in the new format before making a decision about it. He wants plenty of time to review it because 95 percent of WDFW conversion issues are very minor.

Marguerite reviewed the general concepts on how this process will work. She noted that the discussion with WDFW staff has revealed that a step-by-step process needs to be laid out to make this process easier to understand and follow. The final proposed document will have the step-by-step process and checklist.

Mark is concerned with having to go through many steps to reach a conclusion for an "easy" conversion.

Marguerite agreed to have staff review this proposal to adjust the process to streamline where possible because she understands his concern.

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS

Mark Quinn, WDFW, reported on a historic level land exchange between his agency and DNR that will fix some of the checker-boarding. They are getting ready to discuss changes and this will really make a difference in the landscape of eastern Washington. This is a major issue and will be the biggest acquisition in agency history. This should happen by late summer.

Craig agreed that this is a great outcome and very historic. It is a very interesting discussion in the Legislature and there are still a lot of questions to answer.

Director Johnson reviewed the issues for the Executive Session including Portage Island.

Recess for the evening at 4:45 p.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Day 2

DATE: February 9, 2007
TIME: 8:30 a.m.

PLACE: Natural Resources Building
Room 172, Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Chapman	Mercer Island, Acting Chair
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Steven Drew	Olympia
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Larry Fairleigh	Designee, State Parks and Recreation

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

Meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m. by Acting-Chair Bill Chapman.

CONVERSION POLICIES – Proposed Changes

Public Testimony:

Pete Mayer, City of Mercer Island and Mercer Island Parks and Recreation Department, provided his comments on the compliance issue and conversion policy discussion. He appreciates the Board's interest in this topic and their careful attention to detail.

Bill Chapman discussed the need to have historic documentation on how and why decisions are made for future boards and the public.

LEVEL OF SERVICE PROJECT – Workshop

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #11 for details.)

Jim reminded that the study was commissioned by the 2006 Legislature to create a formula to measure for level of service in outdoor recreation sites. As far as Jim knows this is the first such study of its kind and is a very unique project.

Jim then introduced Chuck Everett and Sarah Daniels from the consultant group EDAW. They provided an overview of their process and how they came up with the different methodologies tested. They reviewed the different methods and provided the Board with an opportunity to select their preferred methodology.

Four original options included:

- 1) Population Ratio
- 2) Service area
- 3) Community Driven
- 4) Demand Based

From the four methods, three hybrid options were developed:

- 1) Population ratio/Service area
- 2) Community Driven/Demand based
- 3) Preferred service area

The Board concluded that no matter which option is chosen some kind of community involvement is needed. There was quite a bit of support for the demand based method. There were varying degrees of support for the hybrids, but the Board kept coming back to the demand based method.

Jim noted that staff was asked to consider health in these methodologies. The consultants took all of the comments, feedback, and made a recommendation in the form of a report for the Legislature, which is supposed to be delivered today.

The conclusion was:

- 1) There is no one solution that works for all communities
- 2) Each community needs to be given options
- 3) The solution needs to be measurable
- 4) There needs to be alignment with the Priorities of Government process.

Staff handed out the study overview report to the Board members.

Chuck reviewed the document and explained how groups would use this information in outdoor recreation planning.

Board Discussion:

Steven Drew asked about not including schools.

Jim Eychaner reported that for this exercise schools were not included in the study, but communities would not be limited if they want to include schools in their assessment.

Karen Daubert thinks this is excellent and looks forward to a point in time when this will be useful statewide. Seattle has been using the service area methodology but found that there is a topography issues such as a freeway going through the area.

Sarah reported that in the study they did not use barriers to travel in the service area.

Bill asked Jim to provide a quick overview of the background on this project. Members specifically indicated concern that the report has the IAC Board listed on the report and

the recommendations in the report have not been approved by the Board. Members agreed that the cover letter accompanying the report to the Legislature would clarify that the report is not the product of the IAC Board and the Board did not adopt or endorse the recommendations.

Jim responded that this was on a very fast track and that there was not time to include the Board in the process. A fast timeline was a concern for all three reports that were requested through the last legislative session. As a result, staff is submitting these reports to the Legislature as consultant reports assisted by the IAC staff and not as a recommendations by the Board.

Craig commented that the report displays excellent outreach with lots of input from the public.

Bill does not want to undercut the work done by staff, but also doesn't want it to look like the report was approved by the Board either. He's not sure what he has in front of him and is a little disappointed in the menu style of the report.

Larry Fairleigh noted that the report shows good work done in a short timeframe. It costs a lot to develop these recreational activities and he's hoping this can be pulled into the future trends issue. He would like to see it go to both a statewide and regional level.

Karen Daubert is concerned with the A standard because the 100 percent requirement seems too stringent.

Jeff Parsons is not upset with what has been done, but is concerned with the portrayal of what it is considered accurate. He hopes to have an opportunity to work with the Legislature to refine this.

Steven likes the tool and constraints. With Board and legislative session support he is supportive of further refining this tool.

Public Testimony:

Pete Mayer, city of Mercer Island and WRPA, complimented staff on their work in the report and for allowing so much public input. The challenge is on who this work represents. It is hard to determine the definition of what you decide is a community park, neighborhood park, city park, etc. He appreciates the report's comments on barriers. He is intrigued in what the future might bring.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Review of Staff 2007 Work Plan and Related Board Agenda Topics Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #12a for details.)

Director Johnson provided an overview of the 2007 agenda items, which include a blend of both policy and grant making opportunities for the Board. There will be opportunity for

a similar schedule for 2008 with the additional grant program funding. She highlighted the good work staff has done.

Jeff Parsons asked about Board member input on the agenda. He would like a policy discussion on projects that have been funded in the past but have fallen off the list. How do we get them back on track?

Director Johnson reported that this topic is an issue that Chair Ogden is interested in. We may want to have a phone meeting or some other process to get agenda items on the schedule for Board members.

Steven Drew would also like to have input on agenda items including the topic that Jeff mentioned. He would like a discussion on what to do with projects that linger. How long should they linger? Timing for this discussion is critical but he realizes it will not fit in today's meeting. He is looking to staff to find a time to get this on a future agenda.

Director Johnson noted that Steven was discussing reallocations, where Jeff was discussing why a project that was ranked high the first time is not as highly ranked in the next round or rounds.

STRATEGIC PLAN – Discuss Possible 2007-09 Updates

Susan Zemek presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #12b for details.)

Susan noted that it is time to revisit the strategic plan. She asked each of the Board members to provide their top two priorities for the next five to six years.

Initial brainstorming:

- Karen agrees with a longer timeline, but believes six years may be too long
- Did not see Level of Service (LOS) in the plan but believes it should be added in the next version.
- Activity number one is the most important.
- Projects that drop off the list need to be added.
- Reappropriation should also be added.
- Activity number seven is important but due to staff schedules, she wonders if 2009 is too soon.
- Larry Fairleigh likes number two and number seven, including specialized conversion issues that State Parks is working on now.
- Director Johnson noted that conversion/compliance issues are on the list for the staff and Board to work on.
- Mark Quinn mentioned the land acquisition legislation, SB5236.
- Mark would like to see the same type of process that was shown with recreation LOS for acquisition and boating needs.
- Policies, procedures and processes to access grant funds are increasingly difficult for staff participation in the process.
- WWRP is the most important and critical, but very time consuming.

- Jeff Parsons would like to see how to manage the flow of money.
- Jeff would also like to include the ability to accurately portray to the Legislature and the general public on how to meet the needs of the state.
- For activities 9, 10, and 11 they did a big check presentation that was very well received.
- The WWRC has been more visible in the last year than the IAC, so they may want to raise the profile issue in the public eye.

Jeff emphasized the need to create realistic expectations. Part of this includes perception but the other problem is trying to get the word to people to apply and distinguish reallocation amounts. He believes this is an overriding issue for what the Board does.

Susan noted that most items were deleted since the task was completed. The only new addition was for the follow up to the lands study. She noted that staff will bring the changes back to a future meeting.

Karen would like to have the changes sent out early in order to provide comments so that the final version can be adopted at the June Meeting.

Bill also thinks that a four year plan may fit better than a six year plan.

Jeff Parsons would like the LOS to have more on health issues and an assessment section upfront. He would also like to include how to address the needs for those who aren't self-starters and how to get kids involved in recreational activities early on.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Director Johnson reviewed the executive session process. At today's meeting, the executive session concerns possible litigation.

The regular meeting recessed into executive session at approximately 10:30 a.m.

Assistant Attorney General, Susan Thomsen, presented this agenda item to the board.

The regular meeting reconvened at approximately 11:30 a.m. the acting chair reported that the board discussed the possible litigation but that no action was taken during the executive session.

NONHIGHWAY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT (NOVA) – Category Changes for 2006 grants – CONTINUED

Steven Drew returned to the discussion on NOVA that had been tabled on February 8 (page 12) with a three part motion.

1. Move to create an IAC Board subcommittee to review carryover and unspent NOVA fund policies and procedures and to bring back recommendations for the June meeting.
2. Instruct staff to let 2007 NOVA applicants know that unspent funds are under review.
3. Authorize staff and the subcommittee to also study general NOVA funds and permit fund policies.

Jeff Parsons **SECONDED** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Steven reported that the reason for three steps is to not hinder the May application deadline and some of this is an accounting issue.

Jim Fox provided a diagram of the process and then explained the diagram. He believes Steve's motion is pretty clear on what is needed by the subcommittee, what information would be taken to the evaluation committee, and what recommendations to bring to the Board in June.

Steven did not have this diagram in mind. He was thinking that the subcommittee would bring issues to the Board before talking to user groups for their input. The reason would be to make sure the Board is okay with the recommendations before sending them out to the user groups.

Jim will leave it up to the Board to make the decision but would suggest the recommendations go to the legislatively mandated NOVA advisory subcommittee before taking it to the general public.

Karen asked how controversial this will be.

Jim reported that this will be very controversial and the room will be packed when this issue is discussed.

Larry Farleigh asked if this would need a change in statute.

Jim Fox said there is some debate on this issue.

Karen believes this does not compare to the Urban Wildlife Habitat (UWH) issue, which the whole Board agreed was a problem. She is not sure there is the same Board agreement on the issue and is wary to open this up after just going through a long process with the user groups and public.

Bill noted that he will be voting against this motion. He is in agreement with Karen and Jim regarding the concern about opening this up again so soon. He is not as concerned with the issue as Steven is. Finally, he would like to set up a process for getting items on the agenda.

Jeff Parsons is concerned since the Board just got new information about the approximately \$900,000 funds raided by the Legislature. He doesn't want to set the Board up to have the Office of Financial Management (OFM) or the Legislature look at grant funds as solutions to other problems not related to the IAC. For that reason he believes this may constitute the need to revisit this issue.

Larry asked if there had already been a "raid."

Director Johnson noted that yes, it has been proposed in prior biennia that funds be moved to DNR for projects.

Larry noted that if this is a problem then it needs to be solved right now, since there are many other issues such as the Lummi issue which need immediate attention.

Steven noted that if the \$900,000 occurs then they need to adjust the next fund cycle. He explained how the funds would need to be changed in the next cycle to counterbalance the \$900,000 diversion.

Director Johnson reviewed the process and shared her concerns. She is not sure a process can be completed in a short time frame, but staff could bring briefing items to the Board at the June meeting.

Steven believes the subcommittee would bring this issue back with a recommendation for next steps at the June meeting.

Jim Fox has never in his time with the IAC seen funds being removed from projects that have been approved. In the last session some unobligated funds were moved to State Parks and DNR. Trail users are aware of this diversion of funds and they are concerned. He has heard from groups before that would rather see the whole program go away before letting another penny go to the "other guys".

Larry asked what the grant round timing concern would be and would like to hear more from staff before getting more deeply imbedded into this issue.

Marguerite noted that in March staff will conduct workshops for 2007 applicants. At that same time staff could make any needed announcements. Typically there are not a lot of funds left over as staff is able to move applications around in September to better fit for funding in November. The NOVA user group would be very concerned with any changes to this program.

Steven agreed with almost everything Marguerite stated, but noted that there were funds which were unspent in prior years. This is an accounting method that needs to be reviewed and revised.

The question was called.

Steven Drew, Jeff Parsons and Mark Quinn voted in support of the motion. Bill Chapman, Larry Farleigh and Karen Daubert voted against the motion. Motion failed due to lack of a majority.

Larry asked to have staff bring back briefing issues at the June meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:47p.m.

IAC Approval

Val Ogden
Val Ogden, Chair

6/7/07
Date

Next meeting: June 7 & 8, 2007, CenterPlace, Spokane Valley, WA

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

360/902-3000
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: info@iac.wa.gov



Salmon Recovery Funding Board

360/902-2636
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: salmon@iac.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

RESOLUTION #2007-01
February 2007 Consent Agenda

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following February 2007, Consent Agenda items are approved:

- a) Approval of IAC Minutes – September 21 & 22, 2006, October 27, 2006, and November 16, 2006
- b) Time Extensions,
- c) Project Changes
 - #05-1064D – City of Langley, Boat Ramp Improvement – Cost Increase Request
- d) Service Recognition – LWCF and FARR

Moved by: Karen Daubert

Seconded by: Jeff Parsons

Adopted / Defeated / Deferred (underline result)

Date: February 8, 2007

Attachment A

Time Extension Requests for Board Approval

Consent Calendar - Resolution #2007- 01

PROJECT #	SPONSOR NAME	PROJECT NAME	GRANT PROGRAM	DATE BOARD FUNDED	EXTENSION REQUESTED	CIRCUMSTANCE OR REASONS FOR DELAY
01-1160D	Kitsap County	Veterans Memorial Park	LWCF	1/30/2002	12/31/2007	Kitsap County is ready to begin construction of Veterans Park in Port Orchard. This project involves renovating two softball fields with irrigation and an accessible pathway from the existing parking lot and restroom. Construction has been delayed due to compliance with the Historic Preservation Act. The County is ready to start construction as soon as the consultation process is complete. The time extension request fits within the contract period in the federal agreement with the National Park Service for this project.
02-1362D	Lind Gun Club	Lind Gun Club Improvement	FARR	12/05/2002	10/31/2007	The Lind Gun Club has almost finished the upgrades to their trap field and gun club facility. The project was stalled due to asphalt work that was needed for the parking and walkways. Adams County was going to be doing a nearby road project and agreed to do the asphalt work for the gun club while the roadwork was being done. Unfortunately, the road project did not extend to the Club facility so the Gun Club has to complete this project on its own. The Club is requesting a board extension to allow them time to finish this last crucial scope element. (2 nd Request)
01-1026D	City of Seattle	Magnuson Boat Ramp Renovation	BFP-Local	11/15/2001	12/31/2007	The City of Seattle is requesting a one-year time extension for the Magnuson Boat Ramp Renovation project. The project was originally delayed due to a lengthy permitting process, and mitigation requirements that were not originally anticipated. In November 2004 the Army Corps of Engineers issued their permit for the in-water work, and at the time of the last IAC approved time extension (July 2005), Seattle expected the design to be completed in 2005 with construction during the 2006 work window. Unfortunately, the design work is not complete. The engineers continue to work at finalizing the design of the new ramps and floats and expect to finish by January 31, 2007. The City hopes to bid the project and construct during the 2007 July – October work window. (2 nd Request)

02-1053D	City of Seattle	Mt Baker Rowing and Sailing Center	LWCF	9/19/2002	6/30/2007	<p>The City of Seattle is requesting a time extension for the Mt. Baker Rowing and Sailing Center project. The project is behind schedule due to several factors that have had compounding consequences. To summarize, they include: design, contractor experience, volunteer and main contractor delays, and most recently weather. Work that has been completed to date includes grading and site preparation for the building expansions; footings and concrete stem walls; and work on the elevator pit, and column supports. Framing alteration to the existing structures is underway.</p>
01-1054D	Snohomish County Parks and Recreation	Snohomish River Estuary Water Trail Trailheads	NRTP	9/27/2001	12/31/2007	<p>Snohomish County Parks and Recreation received grant funding to create two trailheads for the Snohomish River Estuary Water Trail with one trailhead located at South Ebey Island and the other at Spencer Island. Due to permit requirements the construction phase of this project has been delayed. Permit applications have been submitted and the County is waiting for final approval of the permits that are currently under review. Snohomish County expects to complete the project by October 31, 2007, as the latest permit will only allow piles to be driven between August 15 and October 30.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2nd Request)</p>
01-1143	Snohomish County Parks Department	Lake Stevens Community Ball Fields	LWCF	7/18/2001	12/31/2007	<p>Snohomish County is requesting an extension due to two problems encountered during the construction phase of this project. The first was a required realignment of an existing park road. The park entrance and county road realignment could only be accomplished with the purchase of adjacent property. Negotiations with the private landowner went on for two-and-a-half-years resulting in an unsuccessful acquisition. The entrance to the park was then redesigned and engineered to be located south of the original location and again private land was needed to implement the change. The negotiations took a year-and-a-half but finally resulted in a successful purchase.</p> <p>The second problem relates to satisfying requirements for setbacks from sensitive and natural areas (wetlands). The final determination is that the project site is located far enough away that it will not impact the wetlands so the County can proceed with construction.</p>

RESOLUTION #2007-02

**NOVA Program Funding
Project Category Changes From Nonmotorized to Nonhighway Road**

WHEREAS, in the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program, at the November 2006 Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) Board meeting, it was found that the Nonhighway Road Category, after funding all projects, would have a remaining balance of \$179,659; and

WHEREAS, at the same meeting it was found that in the Nonmotorized Category, using all available funds, there would be an unfunded project balance of \$739,782 leaving 11 unfunded trail and trail related projects; and

WHEREAS, to reduce the amount of funds carried over to the next grants cycle while assisting the maximum number of eligible projects possible, staff was asked to assess remaining ("alternate") 2006 NOVA Nonmotorized Category projects for possible re-categorization into the Nonhighway Road Category; and

WHEREAS, in this assessment it was found that three Nonmotorized Category projects would qualify for consideration in the Nonhighway Road Category; and

WHEREAS, the assessment also found that in each case, the applicant supports the category change and the elements to be transferred represent viable, stand-alone projects;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC approves the projects listed in Table 1 for transfer to the Nonhighway Road Category and funding with 2006 NOVA funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC's Director is authorized to execute the necessary project agreements to facilitate prompt project implementation.

Resolution moved by: Rex Derr

Resolution seconded by: Jeff Parsons

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: February 8, 2007

Table 1. Category Change Funding Recommendations

Project	Nonmotorized: amount of original submittal	Nonhighway Road: amount of elements eligible for transfer
<p>USFS OKNF Methow RD, Harts Pass Trailhead Parking, IAC #06-1960N: The project site is used for eligible Nonhighway Road activities. This is a planning project that would result in completion of the design for a new parking area and expansion of a trailhead. There would be no modification to the scope or grant request.</p>	<p>\$53,553 (IAC) \$ <u>None</u> (Sponsor) \$53,553 (Total)</p>	<p>\$53,553 (IAC) \$ <u>None</u> (Sponsor) \$53,553 (Total)</p>
<p>USFS OKNF Methow RD, Pasayten Campsite & Trail Restoration, IAC #06-1854M: The original project scope includes trail and campsite maintenance activities. Maintenance activities for campsites are eligible in the Nonhighway Road Category, while trail maintenance activities are funded through the Nonmotorized Category. The project scope would be slightly modified to include only costs associated with maintaining campsites via rehabilitation, revegetation, and closure in sensitive areas in the Spanish Camp, Rimmel Lake and Corral Lake Areas. The grant request would be reduced by \$19,478, match revised to \$20,874, and total project cost revised to \$33,452.</p>	<p>\$44,976 (IAC) \$<u>34,848</u> (Sponsor) \$79,824 (Total)</p>	<p>\$25,498 (IAC) \$<u>20,874</u> (Sponsor) \$46,372 (Total)</p>
<p>USFS MBNF Skykomish RD, Iron Goat-Horseshoe Trail Planning, IAC #06-1609N: The original project scope includes planning for 1.5 miles of trail from the Martin Creek trailhead to the historic Horseshoe Tunnel then on to connect with the Kelley Creek trail. However, the last mile includes elements which are ineligible in the NHR category. This revised request would provide funding solely for the nonhighway road section of the trail which is the first half mile.</p>	<p>\$21,750 (IAC) \$<u>36,000</u> (Sponsor) \$57,750 (Total)</p>	<p>\$21,750 (IAC) \$ <u>0</u> (Sponsor) \$21,750 (Total)</p>

RESOLUTION #2007-03

NOVA E&E Policies: Project Caps and Evaluation Questions

WHEREAS, the funding cap policy in the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation's (IAC) Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program, Education and Enforcement (E&E) Category is generally considered to be complex and supportive of disproportionately large grant requests; and

WHEREAS, a new cap policy, based on limiting the total amount that may be granted to each project, has been developed which resolves the above issues; and

WHEREAS, many agree that an individual E&E project cap of \$200,000 will work best; and

WHEREAS, the E&E Category's "matching funds" evaluation question has not kept pace with the increasing amount of value provided by applicants and thus has been of little use in recent years in helping to rank projects; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation points for this question have been redrafted in a way that would re-establish the question's usefulness by increasing the amount of match needed to receive evaluation points; and

WHEREAS, the E&E Category is in need of a new evaluation question, similar to those that now exist in most other IAC grant programs, that will encourage the reduction of government costs; and

WHEREAS, such a question has been prepared,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC does hereby replace its current NOVA Program E&E caps policy, which is based on Full-Time Equivalent employees and maximum capital expenditures, with a new \$200,000 maximum grant award per individual project policy; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC hereby adopts the revised E&E category "Matching Shares" evaluation shown in Attachment 1; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC hereby adopts the new E&E category "Non-Government Contributions" evaluation question shown in Attachment 2; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC's Director is authorized to implement each of these policies in time for the 2007 grants cycle.

Resolution moved by: Mark Quinn

Resolution seconded by: Karen Daubert

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: February 8, 2007

SCORED BY IAC STAFF

7) **Matching Shares. What percentage of the total project cost is the applicant contributing?**

NOVA Plan Policies A-1, B-4.

IAC staff scores this question based on information provided in the application. Only elements considered reimbursable are eligible for use as an applicant's match. (Manual #13, page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**) No additional information is required.

- a.0 to 10 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
.....(0 points)
- b. 10.01 to 20 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
..... (1 point)
- c. 20.01 to 30 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
.....(2 points)
- d. 30.01 to 40 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
.....(3 points)
- e. 40.01 to 50 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
.....(4 points)
- f.Over 50 percent of the project's value will be contributed.
.....(5 points)

IAC project staff will award from 0 to 5 points; the multiplier is one.

Last revised 2/8/2007.

TEAM SCORED

- 6) **Non-Government Contributions.** Does this project *reduce government costs* through documented donations (labor, equipment, materials), signed cooperative agreements, or signed memoranda of understanding (including no cost leases, interagency agreements, donations, or similar cost saving arrangements)?

Because contributions sometimes “disappear” after project evaluation, it is very important that applicants provide to IAC staff for the project file such documentation as *signed* agreements or memoranda of understanding. The following considerations are provided to help applicants and evaluators understand some of the elements that help a project score well.

- ▶ The significance of the non-governmental contribution for this project
- ▶ The longevity of the commitment for this project.

- a. *No or weak evidence* of non-government contributions provided for the current grant request..... (0 points)
- b. *Little – modest evidence* of non-government contributions provided (1-2 points)
- c. *Signed documentation* of significant non-government contributions provided to IAC staff(3-4 points)
- d. *Signed documentation* of exceptionally high non-government contributions provided to IAC staff..... (5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points; the multiplier is one.

Revised 2/8/2007

RESOLUTION #2007-04

Firearms And Archery Range Recreation Program

Revise the Cap on Grant Request for Fiscal Year 2008

WHEREAS, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) has authority to establish maximum grant limits for the Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR) Program, and

WHEREAS, the current limit is set at \$50,000 per project application, and

WHEREAS, an estimated \$600,000 will be available for grants during this grant cycle, which is considerably higher than a typical grants cycle, and

WHEREAS, it is important to distribute these funds to eligible projects in a timely fashion,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC does hereby modify its current FARR caps policy and increases the maximum grant amount to \$100,000 for the 2007 grants cycle, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director is authorized to modify the appropriate policy manual and application materials to reflect this interim change.

Resolution moved by: Karen Daubert

Resolution seconded by: Mark Quinn

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: February 8, 2007