

- I. Opening of meeting, Determination of Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes of August 28-29, 1972, Additions to the Agenda
- II. CREST Presentation Resolution
COLUMBIA RIVER CONSERVATION LEAGUE Presentation Resolution
- III. A. Fiscal Status Reports
 Fund Summary - July 31, 1972
 Distribution Control Sheet - Init. 215
- ATV Funding - formula
LWCF Status Resolution re lapsed monies
- B. Planning
 SCORP
- C. Special Studies
 Skagit River Study
 Boating Survey
 Rivers' Study Committee
 Trail Planning
- D. Project Status Report
- Administrative Cost Increases
1. City of Spokane, Rochester Heights Park - \$3,000 increase approved
 2. City of Kelso, Tam-O-Shanter Park - \$7,000 increase approved
 3. City of Pullman, Military Hill - \$ 39,965 increase approved
 4. Town of Bridgeport, Waterfront Park - \$5,400 increase approved
- Tam-O-Shanter discussion
- Projects report - current and completed
 Highline #6 discussed
- IV A. Referendum 28
- B. ROR Nationwide Plan
- C. Snake River - Tri-State Demonstration Project
- D. Mapping
- E. Marine Gasoline Tax
- F. (1) Technical Advisory Committee
 (3) Swimming Pool Guidelines discussed
 (2) Community/School - Acq./Dev. Guidelines discussed
- G. Cattle Point, DNR - lease approved
- V A. Confirmation - IAC Assistant Administrator Approved
 Resolution re E. V. Putnam's services to IAC
- B. Cost-of-Living increase - 3% Approved

- C. Reed Island - State Parks and Recreation Commission \$102,000 increase approved
- E. City of Spokane - Havermale Island - Land Exchange: AGO opinion to be obtained
Approved subject to formal finding of value by MAI
- D. IAC Operating Budget 1973-75 - approved \$ 824,355
Local Agency Capital Budget approved \$ 8,632,000
REallocation funds approved 10,226,738
- F. New Project Considerations
1. Bellevue - Mercer Slough approved 5,652,490

Parks	\$ 706,561.25
Bellevue	706,561.25
LWCF	1,413,122.50
 2. City of Spokane, Central City Riverfront Pk. approved \$ 3,838,910

Spokane	\$ 959,727.50
Ref. 18	959,727.50
HUD	1,919,455.00
 3. City of Seattle, Freeway Park approved \$1,375,059.88

Ref. 18	343,764.97
Local	343,764.97
HUD	687,529.94

Discussed:

Eld Inlet, Thurston Co.
King County, South Area Park
North Aberdeen Playfield
Marymoor Park
Morse-Merryman Park, Olympia
Pioneer Park, Aberdeen
City of Yakima, Lions Swim Pool
Bonney Lake, Victor Falls
City of Ephrata, Oasis Municipal Park

V F 2 (a) State Parks and Recreation Commission

1. Horsehead Spit	Approved	\$22,500	
2. Grayland Beach - Acq.	Approved	5,500	Total: \$528,375
3. Green R. Gorge - Acq.	Approved	500,375	

V F 2 (b) Department of Game

1. Key Ecological Acq.	Approved	11,000	Total: 33,700
2. Water Access- Skykomish Boat "		16,800	
3. Crab Creek, WRA	Approved	5,900	

V F 2 (c) Natural Resources Dept.

1. Acquire 5 Recreational sites 1971-73	\$ 62,500		Total: 202,088
2. Development of 4 Rec. sites 1971-73	133,334		
3. Big Greider Lake Acq./Develop	6,254		

November 1972 Meeting - Richland

MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

9:00 a.m., Monday, August 28, 1972
9:00 a.m., Tues., August 29, 1972

Sun Mountain Lodge
Winthrop, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Omar Lofgren, Mr. Jack Rottler, Mr. Warren A. Bishop, Mrs. Frederick Lemere, Mr. George H. Andrews, Director, Department of Highways; Mr. Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Mr. John Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Honorable Bert Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, Dept. Natural Resources; Mr. Carl N. Crouse, Director, Department of Game; Mr. Daniel B. Ward, Director, Department of Commerce & Economic Development.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Lewis A. Bell; Mr. Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Department of Highways

Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer

Department of Fisheries

Don Erickson, Contract Officer

Department of Game

Jack Wayland, Rec. Resource Specialist

State Parks and Recreation Commission

Paul Bourgault

Jay Young

Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management

Dan Keller, Fiscal Analyst

Carl Wieland

Department of Natural Resources

Al O'Donnell, Technical Assistant

Department of Commerce and Economic Development

None

Assistant Attorney General

None

Department of Ecology

Beecher Snipes, Supervisor, Planning and Development

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

Stanley E. Francis, Administrator

Milton H. Martin, Assistant Administrator (apptd. 8-28-72)

Glenn Moore, Rec. Resource Specialist

Richard Costello, Rec. Res. Specialist

AUGUST 28, 1972 PAGES 1-16
AUGUST 29, 1972 PAGES 16-31
APPENDIX A - Revenues Projection

Marjorie M. Frazier, Admin. Secretary
Kathy Scott, Rec. Res. Specialist
Ken Sisson, Rec. Res. Specialist
Roger Syverson, Rec. Res. Specialist
Robert S. Lemcke, Program Coordinator
Kenn Cole, Fiscal Accounts Officer
Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning & Coordination
Don Peterson, Planner
Jeanette Collins, Summer Intern (Monday)
Steve Carley, Summer Intern
Steve Price, Summer Intern (Monday)
Fred Wagner, Summer Intern

LOCAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane
James Webster, King County Parks Department, Seattle
David Towne, Asst. to Supt., Parks and Rec. Dept., City of Seattle
Kenneth Hertz, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Bellingham
Art McCartan, Whitman County, Pullman, Washington
William Hutsinpillar, Parks and Recreation Supt., City of Yakima

OTHER AGENCIES - TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Maurice Lundy, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Seattle
James Tracy, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle (alternate for Jerald Hansen)
Douglas Bohn, Housing and Urban Development Department, Seattle

May 22-23 amended

I. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes of ~~August 28-29~~, 1972, Additions to the Agenda: The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Ten members of the Committee being present, a quorum was declared. Mr. Lofgren introduced:

Mr. Milton Martin, newly appointed Assistant Administrator of the IAC;
Mrs. Joan VanDivort, Vice-President of CREST (Columbia River Environmental Study Team);
Mrs. Walter Horan, Chairman, Washington State Parks Foundation and also a CREST member;
Mr. Kirby Billingsley of CREST;
Mrs. Ruth Allan, Secretary of CREST;
Mr. Lowell Johnson, CRCL (Columbia River Conservation League);
Mr. Robert Smith, Chief of State programs Division, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation;
Mr. Maurice Lundy, Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Approval of Minutes, May 22-23, 1972: Corrections or additions to the minutes were called for by the Chairman. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 22-23, 1972 MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. CREST Presentation: The Chairman referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Columbia River Environmental Study Team - CREST" and called upon Mrs. VanDivort for a presentation of the Study Team's proposed plan for a portion of the Columbia River. Mrs. VanDivort introduced Mr. Robert Rowe, Architect; Mr. James Blackburn, member of the design team of CREST, and Mr. Dave Harris, Wenatchee architect. Slides with audio were shown of the area CREST is interested in preserving for public use. It is envisioned to set aside major portions of the riverfront of the Columbia River in and around the City of Wenatchee as a large public park and natural area. Following the presentation, Mr. Biggs stressed the significance of the proposal, stating he had met with CREST and felt the project had the potential of being one of the most outstanding projects coming before the IAC for assistance. HE MOVED THAT THE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MAKE DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE SPONSORS OF THE CREST PROJECT TO ACTUALLY, PHYSICALLY AND PRACTICALLY DEVELOP A PLAN, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH WOULD BE A REALISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL AND THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED; THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR BE INSTRUCTED TO ACTIVELY MEET WITH THE SPONSORS OF CREST AND BRING TO IT THE ASSISTANCE OF THE IAC THROUGH AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECT AND ITS POSSIBLE SPONSORS---CHELAN PUD, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, ETC.

Mr. Odegaard stated staff would be doing the local work should Mr. Biggs' motion be passed. He recommended the Interagency Committee express interest and support but at this point in time staff should primarily devote its efforts to Referendum 28 through November. MR. BISHOP THEN AMENDED THE MOTION TO STATE THAT THE EFFORTS OF CREST BE TO ENCOURAGE THE LOCAL ENTITIES TO UNDERTAKE THE MAJOR AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

Mr. Biggs restated his motion by adding THAT AS A PRIORITY ITEM AND AS OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED ITSELF THE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BEGIN AN EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT AND ASSIST CREST.

The following Resolution was then adopted by the Committee:

WHEREAS, THE COLUMBIA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY TEAM (CREST), WENATCHEE, WASHINGTON, HAS BEEN CONDUCTING A COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS SHORELANDS BETWEEN ROCKY REACH AND ROCK ISLAND DAMS TO RESULT IN SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPTIMUM USE OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA; AND

WHEREAS, CREST HAS VIGOROUSLY ENDEAVORED TO BUILD PUBLIC INTEREST IN AND APPRECIATION FOR THE GREAT COLUMBIA RIVER THROUGH ITS PRESENTATIONS OF HISTORICAL INFORMATION AND GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT LONG THE SHORELANDS OF THE RIVER;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HEREBY HIGHLY COMMENDS CREST FOR ITS ENDEAVORS IN PREPARING A PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT ALONG THE COLUMBIA RIVER FROM ROCKY REACH DAM TO ROCK ISLAND DAM BY SETTING ASIDE MAJOR PORTIONS OF RIVERFRONT FOR LARGE PUBLIC PARKS AND AREAS OF HISTORIC AND NATURAL SIGNIFICANCE;

AND, FURTHER, BY THIS RESOLUTION ENDORSES THIS CONCEPT AS BEING IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, THUS ENCOURAGING CREST TO

CONTINUE ITS EFFORTS TO BRING THIS PROJECT TO REALITY THROUGH PUBLIC SUPPORT AND BY ENCOURAGING LOCAL ENTITIES TO UNDERTAKE MAJOR AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT;

AND, FURTHER, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY PROCLAIMS THIS STUDY TO BE A PRIORITY ITEM IN THE INTERESTS OF PROVIDING FUTURE OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, AND ASSERTS THAT AS OPPORTUNITY PRESENTS ITSELF IN KEEPING WITH THE WORKLOAD AND DEMAND UPON STAFF TIME, INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE STAFF IS TO BEGIN AN EVALUATION OF THIS PROJECT, TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE FEASIBILITY OF THE PROJECT, ITS OBJECTIVES, ECONOMIC VALUES, RECREATIONAL POTENTIAL, AND LOCAL OFFICIAL SOURCES OF SPONSORSHIP AND FUNDING.

Mr. Crouse asked CREST also to recognize the wildlife resources in the area and plan for them in their overall planning effort. Mr. Andrews suggested the group work through the Department of Highways on the proposed highway in the area. Mr. Bert Cole then stated he would like to become a member of CREST and suggested the IAC begin to assist in initiating projects on a local level in this area.

Columbia River Conservation League: The Chairman then referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Columbia River Conservation League", and called upon Mr. Lowell Johnson, Columbia River Conservation League spokesman, for his presentation. Slides were shown of the League's proposal to designate that segment of the Columbia River between Richland, Washington and Priest Rapids Dam as a National Recreation Area or a National Scenic or Recreation River.

Mr. Biggs noted the project did not involve any considerable land acquisition, but mostly the identification and designation of the area as a protected area to retain the natural environment for the public. In response to questions of Mr. Ward, Mr. Johnson explained there would be no effect on Hanford's developments #1 and #2.

Mr. Francis then read the motion as presented in the memorandum of staff recommendation. MR. ANDREWS AMENDED THE MOTION AS PRESENTED TO DELETE THE WORDING "AND LEGISLATION TOWARDS" IN THE FINAL PARAGRAPH SINCE HE FELT HE AND OTHERS ON THE COMMITTEE HAD NOT HAD A CHANCE TO WEIGH BOTH SIDES OF THE PROBLEM. (THE PARAGRAPH HAD READ AS FOLLOWS: "NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION SUPPORTS AND ENDORSES THE NEED FOR STUDIES AND LEGISLATION TOWARDS OF THE CONCEPT OF A NATIONAL DESIGNATION OF THAT SEGMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON AND PRIEST RAPIDS DAM WHICH WOULD PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE RIVER IN A NATURAL FREE-FLOWING CONDITION.")

THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD. QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. FIVE MEMBERS VOTED FOR THE AMENDMENT; THREE MEMBERS OPPOSED. THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

The Committee by its motion then adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS, THE FIFTY-SEVEN MILE SEGMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON AND PRIEST RAPIDS DAM IS THE ONLY REMNANT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER IN ITS FREE-FLOWING STATE FROM BONNEVILLE DAM TO THE

CANADIAN BORDER, AND

WHEREAS, THIS SEGMENT OF RIVER HAS SCENIC, ECOLOGICAL, FISHERY, ARCHEOLOGICAL, AND RECREATIONAL VALUES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE, AND

WHEREAS, VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS THE COLUMBIA RIVER CONSERVATION LEAGUE HAVE RECOGNIZED THE NEED FOR PRESERVING AND PROTECTING SUCH A RESOURCE IN THE INTEREST OF PUBLIC AND SOCIAL WELFARE, AND

WHEREAS, THE COLUMBIA RIVER CONSERVATION LEAGUE IS PROPOSING THAT THIS SEGMENT OF RIVER BE CONSIDERED FOR DESIGNATION AS A NATIONAL RECREATION AREA OR A NATIONAL SCENIC OR RECREATIONAL RIVER, AND

WHEREAS, SEVERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ARE TO CONSERVE AREAS OF UNIQUE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION VALUES AND TO PROVIDE COMPLETE AND CONVENIENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE TO PARTICIPATE IN A VARIETY OF RECREATION ACTIVITIES AND EXPERIENCES,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION SUPPORTS AND ENDORSES THE NEED FOR STUDIES OF THE CONCEPT OF A NATIONAL DESIGNATION OF THAT SEGMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON AND PRIEST RAPIDS DAM WHICH WOULD PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE RIVER IN A NATURAL FREE-FLOWING CONDITION.

III A. Fiscal Status Reports: Mr. Kenn Cole referred to the Fiscal Report "Fund Summary - July 31, 1972," and gave a brief run-down on expenditures and balances of local and state agencies, followed by explanation of the "Distribution Control Sheet for Initiative 215, Unclaimed Refundable Marine Fuel Tax" tabulation. Questions were asked by the Committee. Mr. Bishop asked rationale for the amount received from the Department of Motor Vehicles. Kenn Cole explained that although there are more boaters every year the number of such boaters claiming the refunds is increasing at a greater rate so that the net amount available is reduced. The study made to distribute funds establishes what percentage of the fuel is sold to boaters, but it does not attempt to determine how much of that money the boaters will reclaim. Bert Cole asked whether boaters would support legislation to eliminate the refund. Mr. Rottler stated he did not feel boaters would support this type of legislation. He pointed out that though studies of Motor Vehicles determine the amount of fuel used by boaters, the determination made perhaps is too low. It was his belief the consumption of fuel is also increasing and the rebates as well, but the studies do not indicate this fact. He mentioned the State of Nevada had concluded in a recent study that the average consumption of fuel per boat was 220.84 gallons annually, whereas the average per boat in Washington based on the Department of Motor Vehicles' statistics is only a fraction thereof (50 gallons). The Chairman asked that further discussion on the subject be held until the agenda item concerning marine gas tax (IV E) was reached.

ATV Funding: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "ATV Funding", setting forth the present status of discussions in preparing guidelines for distribution of ATV funds (registration and fuel tax) collected under the provisions of the ATV bill. Representatives of DNR, Game, IAC, OPPFM, Attorney General's Office, and user groups had met and determined the following:

1. It was commonly agreed that an acreage conversion fraction of .6 mile per acre for areas on the East side and .3 mile per acre for areas on the West side was reasonable due to type and characteristics of terrain.

2. At the time of the June meeting, the best estimate of total funds available was \$127,809. Recently this figure had been ascertained to be \$134,996.51. Predicated on the latter amount, and the inventories submitted, the following distribution was made:

DNR: Miles of ATV trails		1,776 miles
169,480 acres	@ .3 mile/acre	50,844 miles
3,100 acres	@ .6 mile/acre	1,860 miles
		<u>54,480 total miles</u>
GAME: 2,420 acres	@ .6 mile/acre	1,452 miles
PARKS: 400 acres	@ .6 mile/acre	<u>240 miles</u>
		56,172 miles

3. DNR - 97.0%	X	\$ 134,996.51	\$ 130,946.62
GAME - 2.5%	X	134,996.51	3,374.91
PARKS .5%	X	134,996.51	<u>674.98</u>
			\$ 134,996.51

Mr. Francis stated monies are presently available to the state agencies for ATV efforts during the summer of 1972. Funding procedures as passed by the 1972 Legislature by an amendment to the original ATV Act will necessitate changes and adoption of these procedures under the Administrative Procedures Act. The staff of IAC will have funding procedures ready for adoption by the IAC at its November meeting.

Discussion followed. Mr. Andrews mentioned that at a recent meeting (August 18, 1972) of the Legislative Budget Committee, there had been criticism of the funding method and percentages being used. Mr. Francis had met with staff of the Legislative Budget Committee and that agency had appeared satisfied. He said he would have IAC staff send further information on the procedure to the Legislative Budget Committee as well as the Legislative Council.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY BERT COLE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADOPT AND APPROVE THE PROPOSALS AS MADE IN THE REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR ON "ATV FUNDING" DATED AUGUST 28, 1972, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT SUCH FUNDING PROCEDURES WOULD BE READY FOR PUBLIC CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT ITS NOVEMBER 1972 MEETING. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

LWCF Status: Memorandum of staff entitled "LWCF Status", dated August 28, 1972, was reviewed by Mr. Francis. The following information was given:

1. State of Washington unobligated balance March 1, 1972, as reported by BOR, Washington, D.C. \$ 2.9 million
2. IAC unallocated LWCF balance as of May, 1972 \$ 580,471.00

3. Composition of the \$ 2.9 million as researched by the IAC:

Local agencies	\$	218,796
Department of Game		228,000
Department of Natural Resources		133,675
Parks and Recreation Commission		2.4 million

Mr. Francis explained that the State Parks projects had been approved through the IAC but had not cleared BOR for various reasons. Many of the major lag problems had been clarified since the May meeting. As a result, LWCF, BOR, Washington, D.C. report now indicates \$1,142,326 as unobligated as of July 1, 1972. Basically, he stated, these monies are tied up in projects funded by the IAC with LWCF which have developed problems requiring resolution before being submitted to the BOR. The State of Washington has allocated all of the FY 72 LWCF allotment. Congress passed a continuing resolution to allow states to use a proportionate share of the FY 72 allotment, credited against the FY 73 allotment - with the Washington share being \$423,367.

Mr. Francis noted the State of Washington is maximizing its LWCF allotments and the balance indicated by Washington, D.C., was due primarily to administrative delays and time lags. Other states, however, are not maximizing their BOR monies and as a result there will be a sizeable amount reverting to the Secretary of Interior's Contingency Fund within the next two or three years. Chairman Lofgren called for discussion on this topic. Following questions and answers, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND MONIES, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, NOT UTILIZED BY THE VARIOUS STATES AND TERRITORIES WITHIN TWO FISCAL YEARS OF THE FISCAL YEAR IN WHICH SUCH LWCF APPORTIONMENT IS MADE LAPSE, AND

WHEREAS, SUCH LAPSED LWCF MONIES ARE PLACED IN THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S CONTINGENCY FUND TO BE DISBURSED AT HIS DISCRETION TO THE VARIOUS STATES FOR PROJECTS OF UNIQUE AND OUTSTANDING VALUE, AND

WHEREAS, THERE ARE SEVERAL STATES AND TERRITORIES MAXIMIZING THE USE OF THEIR LWCF APPROPRIATIONS AND ARE IN A POSITION TO UTILIZE ADDITIONAL LWCF MONIES IF SUCH WERE AVAILABLE, AND

WHEREAS, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IS ONE SUCH STATE WHICH COULD UTILIZE ADDITIONAL LWCF MONIES FOR SIGNIFICANT STATE, LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROJECTS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE WASHINGTON STATE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION BELIEVES THAT THE DISBURSEMENT OF LAPSED LWCF MONIES SHOULD CONSTITUTE AN INCENTIVE FOR THE STATES WHICH MAXIMIZE THEIR REGULAR LWCF APPORTIONMENTS, AND HEREBY ENDORSES THE CONCEPT THAT SUCH FUNDS SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO THOSE STATES WHICH MAXIMIZE THEIR REGULAR APPORTIONMENT, AND, FURTHER DIRECTS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR TO BRING THIS CONCERN TO THE ATTENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE OUTDOOR RECREATION LIAISON OFFICERS AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN BOOTHBAY, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 10-13, 1972, AND TO OFFER THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION:

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT NASORLO EXPRESSES A CONCERN THAT THE LWCF MONIES RETURNED TO THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S CONTINGENCY FUND BE CONSIDERED AS AN INCENTIVE TO STIMULATE STATES TO MAXIMIZE THEIR REGULAR LWCF APPORTIONMENT, AND TO THAT END SUCH FUNDS BE ALLOCATED ONLY TO THOSE STATES THAT DO MAXIMIZE THEIR LWCF APPORTIONMENT, EXCEPT FOR DEMONSTRATION TYPE PROJECTS."

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III B. Planning: Mr. Pelton explained the two charts dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Planning Status"; one indicating planning and studies status by percent accomplished, and the other indicating whether completion dates were on schedule or behind schedule. He introduced Miss Jeanette Collins, a journalism graduate from the University of Washington, presently a Student Intern with the IAC working on planning and coordination matters. He also stated Mr. Steve Price, Student Intern, was assisting with the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Study.

SCORP: Mr. Pelton further reported that Chapter I of the Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan text had been completed for review of the IAC Technical Advisory and Plan Review committees. A general "timetable" for completion of the update of the plan as noted in memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "SCORP Extension" was explained by Mr. Pelton. Compilation and preparation of all data for the Plan will be available by September and drafting of the plan will be completed by December. Coordination and review of the completed text will be accomplished during January and early February of 1973. The Plan will be presented to the Committee for adoption at the February 1973 meeting.

III C. Special Studies:

Skagit River Study: Mr. Pelton called upon Mr. Herbert Barth, United States Forest Service, for a slide presentation by the Forest Service on the Skagit River Study which is nearing completion. Public hearings are now in process. Questions asked by the Committee were answered by Mr. Barth.

Boating Survey: Mr. Robert Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Boating Survey", and informed the Committee of the IAC's involvement with the Legislative Budget Committee in this study which had been directed by the 1971 Legislature in its Resolution No. 71-75 adopted May 10, 1971. The study deals with the extent to which members of the boating public are contributing and/or should contribute to the funding of watercraft recreation, land acquisition and development. This study therefore relates to the provisions in Initiative 215 which provide for the refund of the Marine Fuel Tax. The questionnaire calls for data as to (1) which boaters are claiming the fuel refund and (2) which boaters are, in fact, using the boating facilities financed with state aid. Questionnaire surveys will be made on four days -- one in July, two in August and one in September. Mr. Lemcke stated the Legislative Budget Committee will also plan to collect information from other states and analyze the effort of individual counties within Washington regarding boat registrations and fees and charges.

Mr. Crouse suggested this type of survey be taken other times of the years besides July-August-September, citing the heavy use of fishing areas in the fall and winter months. Mr. Rottler read paragraph four of the House Resolution:

HR 71-75, paragraph 4: "Whereas, all members of the boating public should make some contribution to funding of the acquisition of lands and development of facilities for use by all...."

He stated the boating public had contributed and was contributing to this program constantly and, in fact, the operating funds of the IAC were a contribution from boater sources. Further, boaters contribute through the monies authorized by Referendum 11 and Referendum 18 through sales tax as do any other citizens of the state.

Mr. Lemcke stated the survey questionnaire will also attempt to determine the use of boating facilities by non-boaters.

Rivers' Study Committee Report: Mr. Lemcke orally reported on the status of the Rivers' Study report (no memorandum was in the August meeting kit). The final report will be presented to the Committee in November.

Trail Planning: Mr. Richard Costello was called upon for a report on Trails Planning. He referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, and noted that all incorporated cities, counties and state and federal agencies concerned had been requested to supply inventory information regarding existing and potential trails. To date most agencies had complied with IAC request. The inventory therefore is nearly ready for final compilation. Results are being assembled; following assembly, both trail users and agency representatives will be given an opportunity to examine the results of the inventory and to comment on it. Following this, staff will prepare:

1. A statement of prioritized statewide trail needs;
2. Guidelines for trail development;
3. A listing of proposed trails and corridors reflective of these needs to establish a framework for a State Recreation Trail System.

Preliminary draft of the Trails Plan will be presented at the November meeting. Mr. Lofgren commented on staff time involved in this inventory and related reports and asked if the IAC had a means of reimbursement for the time spent on the program. Mr. Pelton explained funds were available within the LWCF Planning Grant and that the Department of Ecology also provides some of the planning funds. Mr. Francis stated the Ecology funds were directed toward the Southwest Washington River Basin Study and there were actually no separate funds as such for the trails inventory and study other than sources coming from Initiative 215. No funds were included within either the Trails Act or the ATV Act for planning and coordination efforts.

The Committee's attention was directed to memorandum of staff dated August 10, 1972, entitled "ATV Funds". Funds collected through February 27, 1972 for distribution under the 1971 ATV Act amounted to \$134,996.51. Revenue collected after February 27, 1972, will be distributed under the 1972 ATV Act following completion of the trails inventory.

III D. Project Status Report: Prior to report on projects, Mr. Francis reported to the Committee on the Administrative Cost Increases as follows:

Administrative Cost Increases:

1. City of Spokane, Rochester Heights Park - \$3,000 increase (4.15%) approved

to increase total project cost to \$75,000.

2. City of Kelso, Tam-0-Shanter Park - \$7,000 increase to total project cost of \$57,000.
3. City of Pullman, Military Hill Development - \$39,965 increase (15%) making total project cost \$308,465.
4. Town of Bridgeport, Waterfront Park Development - \$5,400 increase (15%) -- total IAC portion project cost now being \$34,050.

There followed discussion on changes in scope of projects. Mr. Ward reminded staff that significant cutbacks or increases in scope of a project must be called to the Committee's attention for review and approval prior to the change in scope being allowed. Staff agreed and stated any major or substantial changes in scope would, under the Administrator's current authority, require Committee approval. Mr. Odegaard stated he would hope the Committee would not restrict the staff any more than necessary in the approval of increases or cutbacks, that there would be an increasing number of cutbacks coming in because of the present economy -- bidding costs going higher, etc. Therefore, he felt staff should be allowed to make decisions in these matters. It was the consensus of the Committee that staff continue its present policy in regard to changes in scope: (a) minor changes falling within percentage increase authority of the Administrator need not be brought back to the Committee for review and approval; (b) major changes in scope would require Committee attention.

Tam-0-Shanter: In response to Mr. Odegaard's inquiries concerning Tam-0-Shanter Park and a portion of the land-use nearby for a commercial facility, Mr. Francis explained the legality of the City of Kelso's sale some time ago of the land on which this facility reposes. The placement of asphalt surfacing on a road in the adjacent Tam-0-Shanter Park does not involve the commercial building in any way as the road is located in the park and loops through the picnic area. However, since there were questions involved in the project, Mr. Lofgren asked Mr. Francis to investigate the matter and advise him about it.

Project Status Report: Mr. Glenn Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, and noted the following:

Current local agency projects:	140
Last quarter projects closed:	11 local projects 1 Game Dept. project
To date:	144 local agency projects completed 42 state agency projects completed

Mr. Bert Cole inquired concerning the shoreline permit for the Seahurst Project IAC #71-044D. There followed considerable discussion on the need for shoreline permits where applicable. The Administrator was asked to have a policy statement on shoreline permits for the Procedural Guidelines to review at the November meeting. Mr. Biggs felt a shoreline permit ought to be obtained and in the records prior to issuance of any monies from the IAC. Mr. Francis replied the IAC required only a formal piece of correspondence advising that such a permit had been obtained. The document itself (or a copy thereof) is not necessary for IAC records.

Mr. Ward then asked for specific information on the Port of Brownsville project and

the Administrator was asked to advise him later as to its status.

In discussion of the Highline #6 project, Mr. James Webster, King County Department of Parks, explained to the Committee the three parcels of land involved within the project and the reasons for delays. He noted that Parcel #1's option would be processed within ten days and it was felt Parcel #3's ownership problems would be resolved within a week since negotiations were taking place.

IV A. Referendum 28: Mr. Martin referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Referendum 28", and reported the following:

1. Langdon Simons of Hydrodrive, Seattle, appointed as Co-Chairman
William F. "Willi" Unsoeld, Olympia, appointed as Chairman
2. 11 of the 12 Local Committee chairmen appointed. Three major objectives are: Communication; Identification of resources to assist in campaign; and publicity and news media relationship.
3. Organizational meeting had been held.
4. Budget established of \$10,000. (Materials, supplies, brochures, etc.)
5. Speakers' Bureau to be established - back-up from Parks, Game, DNR, and other state agencies concerned. IAC to coordinate.
6. Workshops to be held with local people on the Referendum 28 committees.

Mrs. Lemere asked that those on the Referendum 28 Committee recognize there are six other bond measures under the Washington Futures Program and these are all tied together. She urged that the Referendum 28 chairmen be so advised. It will be necessary, for instance, to obtain a 60% favorable vote in King County alone. Mr. Lofgren in addressing the audience suggested local agencies and communities study the bond issue program thoroughly, contact their regional chairmen and work with them in the promotion of Referendum 28 for recreational facilities.

IV B. BOR Nationwide Plan: Mr. Francis briefly explained the nationwide effort on the part of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to instigate a Nationwide Recreation Plan. Discussions had been held in Portland June 27-28 with representatives of various federal, state and local entities. Similar meetings had been held in other areas of the nation. Suggestions put forth included: opening of more federal lands and longer leases to attract private capital for recreational facilities; need for covered facilities; need for maintenance and operational monies; need for urban parks; wilderness and other recreation area concepts, etc.

IV C. Snake River - Tri-State Demonstration Project: A brief report was then given by Mr. Francis on status of the Tri-State Demonstration Project concerning the Snake River. The \$4 million for the U. S. Forest Service to purchase in-holdings within the Wallowa-Whitman and Nez Perce Forests passed the Congress recently. Representatives of the three states (Washington, Oregon, Idaho) have met and will be meeting in the future on the proposed project. Oregon and Idaho are gathering similar information on ownerships, general acquisition costs, etc., as already obtained by Washington.

IV D. Mapping: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, which noted present status of the mapping program. Symbols, agencies and criteria to be mapped have been suggested but not finalized. Mr. Crouse requested item (5) in the memorandum on page (1) include "boat launching sites" as well as area offices, etc. The item would then read: "Department of Game - Area offices, game farms, hatcheries, boat launching sites, and recreation areas and facilities." The proposed 13 symbols were also discussed. The general approach being used by the Recreation Map Committee was acceptable to the Committee.

IV E. Marine Gasoline Tax: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Marine Gasoline Tax", stating this was a report the chairman had directed staff to prepare for the meeting: (1) To investigate status and situation regarding the Marine Fuel Tax and (2) to investigate feasibility of approaching boating public regarding the possibility of eliminating the tax refund thereby increasing Initiative 215 Revenues to the Outdoor Recreation Account. Mr. Francis explained that the percentage of refunds is presently growing whereas Initiative 215 revenues are decreasing.

1971-72 Biennium	\$ 1,816,715
1973-75 Biennium	1,494,020 contemplated

Further, House Resolution 71-75 directing the study of boating use and marine fuel taxes is being carried out as explained by Mr. Lemcke earlier in the meeting. Mr. Francis stated his contact with the Legislative Budget Committee and previous legislation sponsors indicated the desirability of re-introduction of legislation to eliminate the refund, but not until after the study is completed and the LBC has made its report. Therefore, he suggested this type of legislation be sponsored by the Legislative Budget Committee and/or individual legislators rather than the IAC. Mr. Andrews asked about the questionnaire on ATV fuel recently sent out by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Mr. Francis explained a sampling is also being taken by DMV at the pump as well as the random mail sampling. The results, he said would indicate how much off-road use there is at the present time by ATV's. Mr. Andrews pointed out the original questionnaire did not indicate highway use of gasoline as well as non-highway use; there was no place to indicate if the user was using the gasoline on a highway (the last 10 gallons). Mr. Francis replied that the form had been corrected prior to its use.

At this point, Mr. Rottler explained the position of boaters concerning the use of 215 funds and the possibility of elimination of the refund. He felt boaters would not support this goal because use of the 215 funds is not specifically detailed. Nearly 40% of the 215 funds are presently being used to administer the IAC, therefore he felt public reaction would be negative unless the IAC could offset this procedure and substantiate projects funded with 215 monies specifically for boaters. It was his feeling the method of determining the amount of 215 monies for the Outdoor Recreation Account was vague and the formula given did not indicate a true picture. He then quoted from a report on the situation in the State of Nevada as given in the "Monday Morning Report" of MAREX, Chicago, Illinois:

"NEVADA: The findings of the University of Nevada study of fuel consumption by Nevada boaters which resulted in a legislative increase in gasoline taxes allocated for boating facilities and safety enforcement -- from \$100,000 in 1969 to \$244,545 in 1972 -- have been published. The study is titled, "The Development and Application of Methodology to Determine Marine Fuel Taxes Paid

"by Boaters in Nevada." Assuming 220.84 gallons of marine fuel per boater are purchased in Nevada, on the basis of a simple average for all boats, the study projects that by 1975 boaters will pay \$312,139 in marine fuel taxes."

Mr. Rottler stated the State of Washington study indicates 50 gallons of marine fuel per boater and he felt this was in error. The State of Washington, having considerable ocean area, lakes, rivers and streams, would far exceed Nevada in boater use.

Mr. Francis reminded the Committee it had gone on record as a matter of policy decision to utilize Referendum 18 and Referendum 11 monies equal to 215 monies in boating projects so that the boaters would obtain the full use of their monies. Fiscal reports submitted by staff from time to time have substantiated this policy, and Mr. Francis felt that this premise could be well explained to the boating public. There followed discussion on how the information should be sent out to the boaters. Mr. Francis stated he would work with Mr. Rottler and Mr. Frank Deuster (Northwest Marine Industries) as to methodology. The Chairman then asked the Administrator to have summarization of use of 215 funds (an evaluative report) for all future IAC meetings.

IV F (1) Technical Advisory Committee: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Technical Advisory Committee Reorganization", giving the following information:

Members of Technical Advisory Committee 19
Chairman Willa Mylroie (Highways)
Secretary Robert S. Lemcke (IAC)
Terms for members are as noted in May, 1972 IAC minutes, page (9)
Sub-committees:
a. Swimming Pool Cost Guidelines Bill Hutsinpillar, Chrmn.
b. Community-School Acq/Dev Guidelines Bill Fearn, Chairman
Sub-committees of the TAC appointments:
a. ATV Fuel Survey Committee Art McCartan; Dick Mullins
b. ATV Funding Guidelines Committee Jerry Hansen, Dave Towne

Willa Mylroie referred to memorandum dated August 28, 1972, from the Technical Committee to the IAC, entitled "Progress Report on Current Studies". She outlined the purpose of the Technical Committee Studies as set forth by that committee:

- (1) To provide a multi-interest definition of outdoor recreation program problems posed by the IAC staff, Technical Committee members or the Interagency Committee members.
- (2) To consider alternative solutions to the problems.
- (3) To consider implications of the alternatives.
- (4) To recommend a solution to the staff.

IV F (3) Swimming Pool Cost Guidelines: Mrs. Mylroie posed questions which had been discussed by the sub-committee on Swimming Pool Cost Guidelines and asked Mr. Hutsinpillar for his report. Mr. Hutsinpillar pointed out there were State Health standards to be met in construction of swimming pools as well as National Swimming Pool Institute regulations. The Guidelines of the National Swimming Pool Institute are very concise and it was felt these should be utilized along with the State Health Standards in arriving at any IAC Guidelines. Cost factors were also discussed.

IV F 2. Community/School - Acquisition/Development Guidelines: Bill Fearn stated his committee had met to consider the questions as posed by the IAC administrator to review the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's letter which gave interpretation of eligible recreation facilities on school grounds. The committee stressed cooperation between the two entities could result in providing recreational facilities for communities and schools through joint acquisition of acreage and use of each other's facilities, through written agreements for such joint usage and administration of the public use of the combine facilities by the community recreation director. Pro rata division of eligible costs on the basis of hours of use or seasons of use by the two agencies was also proposed. Mr. Bishop concurred with the conclusions reached by the sub-committee and urged guidelines be written to insure that the public would have full use of the recreational facilities which would be jointly provided. Mr. Douglas Bohn, speaking for the Housing and Urban Department, stated the maximizing of these types of facilities would be in keeping with the HUD guidelines. In the joint agreement the use of the recreational facilities for the general public at all times is emphasized. When school is in session, however, the recreation facilities are for the use of the school. Following discussion Mrs. Mylroie advised the recommendations of the sub-committee to the staff of IAC would be available at the November IAC meeting. She then announced the appointment of Dave Towne as chairman of the sub-committee for Revision of the IAC Procedural Guidelines.

IV G Cattle Point - Dept. of Natural Resources: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Cattle Point - Department of Natural Resources". The Administrator had investigated the possibility of purchasing the site versus a lease. As a result, it was determined the Board of Natural Resources was not in favor of a fee title sale and the Department of Natural Resources would not approve fee title sale of the property. OPPFM raised certain questions concerning the cost/benefit of the acquisition and this subject was being reviewed and discussed by both agencies; therefore, Mr. Francis reported the project remained in status quo pending resolution of the questions. Mr. Al O'Donnell advised that the Department of Natural Resources had satisfactorily answered the questions posed in the project to OPPFM in a letter dated August 18, 1972. Mr. Francis stated he had not yet seen a copy of this letter. MR. BISHOP MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

THE DNR RECREATION SITE, KNOWN AS CATTLE POINT, AND APPROVED AT THE MAY IAC MEETING SHALL BE LEASED RATHER THAN PURCHASED AS A RESULT OF THE BOARD OF NATURAL RESOURCES' POSITION REGARDING SUCH SALES; AND

FURTHER, SUCH AGREEMENTS AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO INITIATE AND CONSUMMATE THE LEASE WILL NOT BE EXECUTED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THOSE QUESTIONS POSED BY THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT ARE RESOLVED AND INDICATION OF SATISFACTORY RESOLUTION RECEIVED FROM THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V. NEW BUSINESS A. Confirmation - IAC Assistant Administrator appointment: The Chairman referred to memorandum dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Appointment of Assistant Administrator". IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS THAT MR. MILTON H. MARTIN BE APPOINTED AS THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 28, 1972 AT A SALARY OF \$1,465 PER MONTH. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IT WAS THEN MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, AND SECONDED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FORMALLY AND WITH SINCERITY COMMEND MR. EDWARD PUTNAM FOR HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COMMITTEE DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS.

The following resolution was then adopted by the Committee:

WHEREAS, EDWARD V. PUTNAM HAS FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS BEEN ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AS ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR AND IN THE CAPACITY AS ACTING ADMINISTRATOR IN 1969, AND

WHEREAS, THE SAID INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THAT TIME,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS OUTSTANDING ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO EDWARD V. PUTNAM FOR HIS SERVICE IN THE FIELD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION WHILE SERVING ON THE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

AND RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. EVANS, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO EDWARD V. PUTNAM.

V B. 3% Cost-of-Living Increase - Exempt positions: The Chairman referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Cost-of-Living Increase". IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE GRANT A 3% COST-OF-LIVING SALARY INCREASE, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1972, TO THE ADMINISTRATOR AND THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR THEREBY ESTABLISHING THE ADMINISTRATOR'S SALARY AT \$1,562 PER MONTH AND THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR'S SALARY AT \$1,509 PER MONTH. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V D. Reed Island - State Parks and Recreation Commission: The Chairman announced that Item C of the agenda (IAC Operating Budget 1973-75) would be held over until Tuesday morning as the first item for discussion. Mr. Francis referred to memorandum from staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Reed Island Acquisition - Park and Recreation Commission, IAC #69-567A" which proposed an increase of \$102,000 for the project to compensate for increased land value as judged by a court award. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. CROUSE THAT:

WHEREAS, EMINENT DOMAIN WAS REQUIRED TO ACQUIRE THE REED ISLAND SITE, AND THE COURT AWARD IS AT A COST HIGHER THAN THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED COST, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED A COST INCREASE OF \$102,000 bringing the total approved project cost to \$220,000. APPROVED FUNDING IS AS FOLLOWS:

REF. 11 \$36,000 REF. 18 \$77,000 INIT 215 \$107,000 TOTAL: \$ 220,000

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENT WITH STATE PARKS AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED ON THE FOREGOING PAGE FOR THE REED ISLAND PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE NECESSARY FORMS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREON.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V E. City of Spokane - Havermale Island - Land Exchange: Mr. Glenn Moore called upon Bill Fearn, Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane, for an explanation of the memorandum dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Spokane Havermale Island - Land Exchange". Mr. Fearn, using map of the project, indicated the acquisition of 3.46 acres of land on Havermale Island which had cost \$473,900, of which the IAC share had been \$118,475. Total cost of the project was increased to \$737,000 at the May 24, 1971 IAC meeting, increasing the IAC share to \$184,250. The project was completed on July 20, 1972 when the full IAC share was reimbursed.

As a result of Expo 74, and many months of study by design consultants, it was determined that the federal pavilion (which will be residual after Expo) should be located on the land acquired with Federal and State funds. The City concurred with the recommendation and requested approval for the exchange of 2.3 acres of the Havermale Island Acquisition for land immediately adjacent thereto and at least equal size and value. The exchanged land was acquired by the City through a donation agreement from the Burlington Northern Railroad. Mr. Odegaard and other committee members questioned the staff with respect to the appraisal, finding of value, HUD involvement, etc., concerning the exchange of land. Mr. Bishop suggested the Administrator be authorized to work out the necessary details as noted in the proposed motion in the memorandum with the understanding that a legal opinion from the Assistant Attorney General of the IAC would be obtained prior to any exchange of land.

MR. BISHOP MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BE AUTHORIZED TO WORK OUT NECESSARY DETAILS TO ACCOMPLISH THE PROPOSED LAND EXCHANGE CONCERNING HAVERMALE ISLAND AS OUTLINED IN THE MEMORANDUM OF STAFF DATED AUGUST 28, 1972, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT A FORMAL FINDING OF VALUE DONE BY AN MAI QUALIFIED APPRAISER SUBSTANTIATING THE PROPERTY TO BE EXCHANGED IS EQUAL TO OR MORE VALUABLE THAN THE LAND INITIALLY ACQUIRED WITH OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT ASSISTANCE; AND

FURTHER, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT AN ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION AUTHORIZING THE EXCHANGE OF LAND BE OBTAINED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXCHANGE, SAID OPINION TO CERTIFY THAT THE LAND EXCHANGE IS IN KEEPING WITH THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The meeting recessed at 3:30 p.m. to reconvene the following day, Tuesday, August 29.

----- TUESDAY AUGUST 29, 1972 -----

V C. IAC Operating Budget 1973-75: Chairman Lofgren called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Mr. Francis interpreted the IAC Operating Budget program for 1973-75 as outlined in memorandum dated August 28, 1972. B-7 forms summarizing staff operating

budget recommendations were reviewed, as well as a table indicating the Revenues Projection for 73-75 and Local Action Program for that biennium. Funding indicated:

	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total IAC Operating Budget	\$ 409,989	\$ 414,457	\$ 824,355
Est. Revenues			<u>131,850</u>
Net Operating 215			\$ 692,505

Mr. Rottler asked that the Administrator include in the budget purchase of sound equipment (portable microphone) for IAC meetings. Mr. Andrews suggested this could be rented and Mr. Bert Cole suggested other state agencies could loan equipment to the IAC. The Chairman then asked the Administrator to investigate procuring a microphone system on a loan basis for the next meeting.

Mr. Rottler suggested the Assistant Attorney General of the IAC be requested to be present at each meeting of the Committee to answer any legal matters which may arise. The absence of Mr. Mort Tyler, the Assistant Attorney General, was clarified by Mr. Francis, and assurance was given that there would be legal assistance at future meetings.

Other questions were asked of staff concerning the education and training program for employees which could be enhanced and the possibility of moving part of the IAC staff into the quarters used by the Arts Commission when that agency vacates their building. This would increase rental costs in the budget. Mr. Odegaard asked about the increased cost of travel for the planning and project staff. Additional staff was also discussed, the administrative intern program explained and other questions from the Committee were answered by Mr. Francis.

Mr. Andrews felt the Administrator having charge of the agency would realize amounts necessary to cover the various programs of the IAC and he, therefore, should be supported in his proposed budgetary program insofar as is possible. However, Mr. Andrews noted the budget program indicated almost a 50% increase from previous biennium figures of 1969-71 and about a 30% from 1971-73. He felt he could not support this large an increase, that all state agencies should be wary of increasing their budgetary programs for this next biennium. He then asked if the budget as presented to staff reflected the anticipation of passage of Referendum 28. Mr. Francis stated it did. Mr. Andrews then asked if there would be a Supplemental Budget in the event Referendum 28 did not pass. Mr. Francis replied he did not feel that the 1973-75 biennium workload would be severely altered regardless of the outcome of Referendum 28. The IAC had already expended some \$50 million in projects during the current biennium; further, there would be a continuing planning program and a tremendous amount of work in the Project Section created by the projects which had been approved by the Committee.

Mr. Biggs asked if the Administrator had any estimate of percentage increase which would be attributable in his mind to pressures of Referendum 28 or lack of them -- any added work? Mr. Francis replied he did not anticipate there would be any additional work because in essence the staff would be handling less money and less projects per se in the administration of the grant-in-aid program. Mr. Biggs pointed out that the Administrator had referred to additional pressures in regard

to Referendum 28 in the budget presentation. Referendum 28 will mean \$10 million for 73-75, \$5 million for state and \$5 for local. This, coupled with the \$6 million anticipated from BOR would give the IAC \$8 million for state agencies and \$8 million for locals with revenues from Initiative 215 adding 50/50 to those areas. Therefore, he said, the Committee is talking about a total program of approximately \$16 to \$18 million as against \$50 million in the present biennium. The impact in that analyzation would be on the Project Section, not on other sections. He noted there was approximately a 32 or 33 percent increase in the budget and from his analyzation of it, he did not consider it to be an austerity budget.

Mr. Biggs supported Mr. Andrews' concern that State Government should carefully review any increase in budgetary programs because of the economy of the state. The budget presented by the Administrator he felt added sophistication to the organization rather than adding to the capability for the agency to do the work involved. He also felt 10% should be in the budget to provide for salary increases. Mr. Francis replied normal salary increases were in the budget, whereas unanticipated salary increases were not. Mr. Biggs felt each state department should have at least a 10% increase built into the proposed budgets. He asked for figures which would show a comparison between bienniums - present and future. Mr. Francis then referred to the "Revenues Projection" table in the memorandum (Appendix A of these minutes). Following discussion, the Committee members asked the Administrator to prepare a one sheet table indicating the current level of funding of the IAC, what will be needed in addition thereto and a comparison tabulation between bienniums.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AUTHORIZE THE ADMINISTRATOR TO SUBMIT TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT A 1973-75 BIENNIUM AGENCY GROSS OPERATING BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$824,355; AND, FURTHER, SUBMIT A REVENUE PROJECTION OF \$131,850 FOR THE 1973-75 BIENNIUM; WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE OPERATING BUDGET WOULD BE REVIEWED BY THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT AS A FORMALITY OF THAT AGENCY'S RESPONSIBILITY;

FURTHER, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO SUBMIT TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT THE LOCAL AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,632,000 COMPRISED OF THE FOLLOWING FUND SOURCES:

INITIATIVE 215	\$	500,000
REFERENDUM 28		5,000,000
LWCF		3,132,000

AND, FURTHER, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THE FOLLOWING AMOUNTS FOR REALLOCATION FROM THE CURRENT BIENNIUM FUNDS APPROPRIATED AS GRANTS TO LOCAL AGENCIES:

REFERENDUM 11	\$	1,491,318
REFERENDUM 18		7,793,874
INITIATIVE 215		941,546
LWCF		1,907,487
	\$	<u>10,226,738</u>

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. ANDREWS AND MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE; MR. ODEGAARD REQUESTED HE BE RECORDED AS "ABSTAINING". MR. LOFGREN, AS CHAIRMAN, VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, THUS THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Biggs requested his negative vote be recorded to indicate he felt the budget as presented indicated too great an increase and that he would be derelict as a member of the Committee if he did not express his feeling by a "no" vote. He stated this was not a criticism of the budget as such but an expression he sincerely felt -- the time was not right for increase in state budgets.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the budget presentation was inadequate because it did not indicate comparison figures between bienniums, nor reasons for increases. Mr. Lofgren agreed and stated the budget document should be in the hands of the Committee early enough for discussion and questioning. At this point, Mr. Odegaard gave his reasons for abstaining. He felt (1) he did not have sufficient time to review the budget prior to voting, (2) the IAC's principle function was to fund projects, and therefore, the emphasis on administration and planning needed clarification; and (3) Referendum 28 appeared to be the basis for the budget, and he felt the Administrator should not budget on the basis of a referendum passing.

Prior to Local Project discussion, Mr. Francis informed the Committee that due to other pressing matters, time did not permit preparation of the kind of spreadsheet on the budget he would have liked to have had for the meeting. However, this type of comparison tabulation will be prepared and mailed to the Committee members prior to November's IAC meeting.

V F. New Project Considerations. 1. Local Projects: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Local Project Considerations" and corrected the figures: A total of 19 projects instead of 20 were presented for Committee consideration; Seven, rather than six, applications which had been received were either found to be technically incomplete or had been withdrawn by their sponsors. \$3,597,474 Referendum 18 and LWCF monies were available for allocation by the Committee; Staff recommended approval of 11 projects totaling \$2,940,567 of IAC funds. Three projects deemed special projects because of their unique characteristics were presented to the Committee:

1. Bellevue - Mercer Slough Acquisition (LWCF Contingency Project): Memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled "Mercer Slough - City of Bellevue" was referred to by Mr. Francis. A joint application for the acquisition of land in the Mercer Slough area of South Bellevue had been received from the City of Bellevue and the State Parks and Recreation Commission. The project totaled \$5,652,490 (\$149,500 of this being relocation assistance). Funding would be on a 50/50 basis. Further, Mr. Francis noted that the BOR/LWCF portion would be submitted for funding to the extent of \$1,413,122.50 from the Secretary of the Interior's Contingency Fund; and \$706,561.25 would be provided by the local agency's LWCF for the FY 1973, with \$706,561.25 being provided from the FY 1973 LWCF for the State Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Syverson gave a slide presentation of the project. In response to questions, Mrs. Blaisdell, City of Bellevue, explained the relocation aspects of the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROTTLE THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE MERCER SLOUGH PROJECT TO BE WORTHY OF STATE, LOCAL, AND FEDERAL PARTICIPATION; AND

RECOGNIZING THE URGENCY TO PRESERVE THIS OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA(S) DOES

HEREBY APPROVE THE TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$5,652,490 OF WHICH \$5,502,990 IS FOR LAND ACQUISITION AND \$149,500 IS FOR RELOCATION ASSISTANCE, WITH THE FUNDING TO BE AS FOLLOWS:

50% CITY OF BELLEVUE	\$ 2,826,245
50% BOR/LWCF	2,826,245

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE BOR/LWCF PORTION BE SUBMITTED FOR FUNDING TO THE EXTENT OF \$1,413,122.50 FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S CONTINGENCY FUND; THAT \$706,561.25 BE APPROVED FROM THE LOCAL PROJECT LWCF FOR FY 1973; AND THAT \$706,561.25 BE APPROVED AS COMING FROM THE FY 1973 LWCF FOR THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. City of Spokane, Central City Riverfront Park: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff concerning the Central City Riverfront Park project (August 28, 1972) and outlined the extensive project which is located in the downtown business area adjacent to the Spokane River. Mr. Ken Sisson showed slides of the project. Havermale and Cannon Islands and a substantial portion of the North and South riverbanks are included in the project. Approximately 25 acres will be reclaimed through development of an urban park for the central city area. Total cost, \$3,838,910, would include 50% funding by HUD (\$1,919,455).

Mr. Odegaard asked for a map demonstration of the property which had been approved August 28 by the Committee for land exchange. Mr. Sisson indicated the Havermale Island exchange areas discussed the previous day and those involving the Central City Riverfront Park proposal. Mr. Odegaard stated the site preparation did not include complete explanation of costs of utilities which would serve the area to be developed by the IAC and other areas not under the Outdoor Recreation Account. Mr. Tom Atkison, of Atkison Architects, explained that the power lines into the park would be completely separate from the lines used for Expo purposes; however, sewer and water lines would be more difficult to distinguish and therefore allocation of funds as in the cost estimates on the resume' sheet did reflect the park needs as well as the federal site. Mr. Odegaard then asked staff for assurance that the ultimate figures to be cited for utilities would accurately reflect a proper distribution of the base utility cost between the areas funded from the Outdoor Recreation Account and the other areas not so funded. He also asked if the City would be able to develop the park, putting in all of the utilities, and bear the complete cost themselves if the project were not approved by the IAC. Mr. Fearn replied there was no way a park could be placed in that area without Expo. Mr. Lofgren then stated two separate costs were being discussed: one a park development cost and the other Expo. Mr. Francis then stated (1) if there were no Expo, the costs would still be the same to develop the Central City Waterfront Park; and (2) the costs shown for development are the pro-rata costs and are attributable to the park facilities involving IAC funds.

In further questioning, it was brought out by Mr. Fearn that HUD had approved a grant for the remaining acquisition, but there was also an additional

\$2 million in HUD funds being ^{Requested} reserved for development. ~~Therefore, as seen as the IAC grants a new allocation, the City of Spokane will then obtain HUD monies. Approval of the Central City Riverfront project by the IAC will provide a better basis for the HUD funds Application.~~

*amended
11/27/72
approved*

Mrs. Lemere asked whether ^{Help The entrance fee charged} parking would be free to the public in the parking lots being provided within the project. Mr. Fearn replied that during the time of Expo parking would not be free to the public. Mrs. Lemere then stated the IAC was being placed in a position of funding a park where fees would be charged to the general public. She stated the IAC had never been in this type of position before and she questioned its good judgment. Mr. Odegaard then asked Mr. Fearn about the open space land aspect of the Havermale Island exchange previously discussed. He felt the IAC would be merely trading open space land for land which is already open space land. He acknowledged that an attorney general's opinion would be obtained as requested in the motion of the Committee concerning the Havermale Island exchange in yesterday's meeting (August 28). However, it was his feeling the IAC had approved purchase of the property being exchanged stating at that time it was desirable open space land; now the IAC was being asked to state the land was no longer needed for open space but was required for a federal building. The IAC does not usually trade land, he said, and it was difficult for him to understand how land once considered valuable by the IAC when it was obtained could now be considered as no longer needed for open space. He questioned whether the land had ever been needed before.

*amended
11/27/72
approved*

Mr. Fearn and Mr. Atkison explained (1) the Railroad deed would stipulate the land given in exchange was now open space land -- that it becomes open space land after it is acquired, and (2) the U. S. Government has committed itself to leaving 2/3 of these acres in open space and the City of Spokane is not trading open space for closed space but is obligated to give a piece of ground to the Federal Government, part of which will also be open space. The Chairman asked Mr. Sisson to re-read the motion proposed by staff for approval of the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MR. ANDREWS THAT

THE CITY OF SPOKANE, CENTRAL CITY RIVERFRONT PARK PROJECT, BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR FUNDING AT A TOTAL COST OF \$ 3,838,910:

25% REFERENDUM 18	\$ 959,727.50
25% LOCAL	959,727.50

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE CITY OF SPOKANE SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOR 50% FUNDING: \$ 1,919,455.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Since Mr. Bert Cole would not be present for the afternoon session of the meeting, he asked for a status report concerning the CITY OF POULSBO'S PARK PROJECT. Mr. Biggs and Mr. Francis explained both had discussed the project with representatives of Poulsbo and there would be significant changes made. The City of Poulsbo had therefore

withdrawn its project and would be meeting with IAC staff for a thorough review of all aspects enabling Poulsbo's park proposal to be presented to the Committee at the November meeting.

3. City of Seattle, Freeway Park: Memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, entitled, "City of Seattle - Central Freeway Park", was called to the attention of the Committee. Mr. Francis explained the development of the 3.3 acre Freeway Park which would be located adjacent to and on top of a concrete deck which was scheduled for construction by the Washington Department of Highways above I-5 between Seneca and University Streets. Staff did not recommend funding because the project would not be under construction until 1974 and it was thought that more critical development and acquisition projects should be given priority consideration for Outdoor Recreation Account monies. Slides of the project were shown by Kathy Scott. Mr. Rottler asked the reason for delay in construction of the park. Mrs. Scott replied the parking garage would not be completed until 1974 and the deck could not be constructed until then. Dave Towne then gave a complete explanation of Phases I, II and III in the construction:

Phase I - construction of the parking garage. To be funded from a \$3 million revenue bond issue of the City of Seattle. Bids are contemplated this Fall.

Phase II - Construction of the concrete lid between Hedreen property and the parking garage by the Dept. of Highways

Phase III - Development of the Freeway Park itself -- to be bid in late 1973 or early 1974.

Mr. Towne stated the City of Seattle in order to proceed on the project needed to finalize its financial picture for the park, therefore state assurance of the 25% funding was being requested. The Department of Highways construction schedule was outlined by Mr. Andrews, corroborating that park development would be slated for 1974.

In response to a question from Mr. Bishop, Mr. Francis replied staff of the IAC were convinced the project was unique and would be an outstanding one, however there was concern in tying up the monies for a two to four year period when those funds could be used elsewhere for local projects. The Committee in approving this project would be committing itself to a project for future funding.

Mr. Bishop felt since this was a project involving three entities with the City of Seattle providing more funds than the IAC, it was in a special category and should receive careful consideration for IAC funding. In response to Mr. Lofgren's inquiry, Mr. Francis stated there remained \$625,000 in Referendum 18 funds in the Outdoor Recreation Account at the present time. The City of Seattle was requesting \$343,765 which would leave a balance of approximately \$282,000.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT BECAUSE OF THE COMPLEXITIES IN THE SEATTLE FREEWAY PARK PROJECT WITH INVOLVEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS, CITY OF SEATTLE AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THAT THE PROJECT BE APPROVED FOR THE FOLLOWING FUNDING:

REFERENDUM 18	\$	343,764.97)	
LOCAL		343,764.97)	\$1,375,059.88 TOTAL COST
HUD		687,529.94)	

Mr. Francis pointed out that the balance of Referendum 18 funds was being held in reserve for funding acquisition and development projects for the November meeting. Discussion followed. It was the consensus that the IAC was committed to allocating funds for initial construction of this project and therefore whether or not it would deplete Referendum 18 funds, it should be approved for 25% IAC funding.

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

Slides were then shown of the other 16 projects being recommended by staff for funding. Discussion concerning the projects followed.

Eld Inlet, Thurston County: Mrs. Lemere asked if the site would not be eligible for Init. 215 funds. Mr. Francis replied it was not anticipated that this would be a boater-oriented facility due to low tide situations.

King County South Area Park: Mrs. Scott noted this project was not being recommended for acquisition funding because the future development costs would be high and it would be difficult to bring utilities on the site. In response to Mr. Odegaard's questions, Mr. Moore stated the project did not rank high enough within the overall state priorities to receive funding. The high development costs caused the project to rank lower than others being considered by staff. Mr. Odegaard in his questioning of Mr. Moore and Mr. Webster pointed out that Forward Thrust could assist in development costs and it was difficult for him to understand why the project had been turned down when there were development funds other than IAC's available for it.

North Aberdeen Playfield: Mr. Fred Wagner was introduced to the Committee by Mr. Francis prior to presentation of this project. (University of Pennsylvania student completing his practicum through the Interagency Committee experience.)

Marymoor Park: Mr. Webster, City of Seattle, explained to the Committee this would be Phase II development of the Park with bicycle track and trails tied into the planned county system of urban trails which will follow the Sammamish River.

Morse-Merryman, Olympia: This project was not recommended by staff. Following presentation of the project by Mrs. Scott, Don Clark, Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, City of Olympia, informed the Committee of his concern regarding the present policy of the IAC in not recommending this project. Mr. Lofgren noted there had been an Attorney General's verbal opinion obtained in regard to the reversionary clause in the deed and it was necessary to abide by that opinion. The reversionary clause called for return of the park to a private association rather than reverting to continued outdoor recreation use for the general public. Mr. Lofgren urged Mr. Clark to meet with the staff of the IAC to resolve the matter so that the project could be returned to the Committee for review in November.

Pioneer Park, Aberdeen: Because of a problem concerning 40 year easement, Mr. Wagner reported this project was not recommended by staff. Further, it did not rank high enough within the five projects of similar category being reviewed by staff. Following discussion, staff was advised to work with the City of Aberdeen to resolve the problems involved in the project with the understanding that it be brought back to the Committee in November for consideration along with other projects received for possible funding at that session.

City of Yakima, Lions Swimming Pool: Staff did not recommend this project. Although staff agreed that the proposed pool is quite unique in design and would provide an excellent indoor-outdoor pool, the City of Yakima already had three other pools within the city. Therefore, the project did not rank high enough in its category for funding.

Mr. Hutsinpillar was asked for his opinions and stated through the city did have three other pools, because of increased population pressures it was necessary to replace the outmoded existing outdoor pool which had been constructed in 1933. There would be a removable roof covering and a movable bulkhead to increase use period of the pool to year-around.

Bonney Lake, Victor Falls: Mr. Syverson reported this project had been withdrawn by the City of Bonney Lake due to lease problems involving oil and gas rights.

City of Ephrata, Oasis Municipal Park: Mr. Sisson in his presentation noted there would be a 9 hole pitch and putt golf course included within the project. Mr. Odegaard inquired as to the number of other golf courses in the area. The Technical Committee had not taken this into consideration at its review meeting and staff also had not considered this aspect of the situation. Mr. Odegaard and Mr. O'Donnell felt a survey should be made as to golf courses in the area presently serving the public.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. WARD THAT THE LOCAL PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF AND LISTED ON PAGE 25 OF THESE MINUTES BE APPROVED FOR FUNDING;

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE LOCAL PROJECTS LISTED ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT AGREEMENTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

MR. ODEGAARD AMENDED THE MOTION REQUESTING THAT THE CITY OF EPHRATA'S OASIS MUNICIPAL PARK PROJECT BE TABLED BY THE COMMITTEE UNTIL THE NOVEMBER 1972 TAC MEETING TO ALLOW TIME FOR A SURVEY OF GOLF COURSE AREAS IN THE EPHRATA VICINITY WHICH WOULD CLARIFY WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A NEED FOR THE GOLF COURSE AS PROPOSED IN THE PROJECT.

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

MR. ROTTLER MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE TRAIL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR THE CITY OF LONGVIEW BE SEPARATED FROM THE PROJECT LISTING FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

LOCAL PROJECTS APPROVED AT AUGUST 28-29, 1972 MEETING

PRIORITY	REGION	SPONSOR	PROJECT	TOTAL	REF. 18	INIT 215	LWCF CONTING.	HUD	LOCAL	STATE PARKS LWCF ALLOCATION
I	VI	Clark Co.	Vancouver Lake	\$ 65,000	\$ 48,750				\$ 16,250	
I	V	Thurston Co.	Eld Inlet	327,800	81,950		\$163,900		81,950	
II	IV	Seattle	Freeway Park	1,375,059.88	343,764.97			687,529.94	343,764.97	
II	II	Aberdeen	N. Aberdeen	18,375	9,281.25			4,500	4,593.75	
II	IX	Quincy	Quincy East	110,500	27,625		55,250		27,625	
II	XII	Spokane	Central Riverfront	3,838,910	959,727.50			1,919,455	959,727.50	
IIA	VI	Cathlamet	Cathlamet Pool	180,035	45,008.75	NON	90,017.50		45,008.75	
IIA	VII	Douglas Co.	Eastmont Pool	249,500	62,375		124,750		62,375	
III	IV	Kitsap Co.	Buck Lake	126,984	95,238				31,746	
IV	IV	Bellevue	Mercer Slough	5,652,490			1,413,122.50	706,561.25	2,826,245	706,561.25
VI	VI	Longview	Trail Dev.	324,893	81,223.25		162,446.50		81,223.25	
Totals				12,269,546.88	1,754,943.72		1,413,122.50	2,611,484.94	4,480,509.22	706,561.25
VII	IX	Ephrata	Oasis Reg. Dev.	301,950	226,462.50				75,487.50	

The Ephrata Oasis Reg. Dev. Project was TABLED by the Committee until further information is gathered. This project will be reconsidered at the November meeting in light of the additional information requested by the Committee.

Ref. 18	\$ 226,462.50
BOR)	1,302,925.25
)	706,561.25
	\$ 2,235,949.00

BOR Contingency \$ 1,413,122.50 (Mercer Slough)

Mr. Francis, in response to an inquiry from Mr. Lofgren, reported the following remaining Outdoor Recreation Account balances as a result of the Freeway Park funding: \$ 311,521 Ref. 18; \$ 56,571 LWCF: Total \$368,092.

Mr. Barlam, City of Longview, asked what objections Mr. Rottler had to the City's project. Mr. Rottler stated it sounded like a very good project but he felt it would be better to evaluate it separately from the entire recommended listing.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. MR. ROTTLER VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THE AMENDMENT WAS DENIED.

THE CHAIRMAN THEN CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED BY MR. ODEGAARD IN REGARD TO THE EPHRATA OASIS MUNICIPAL PARK PROJECT. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard then asked for a complete financial status report, including LWCF, Ref. 18 and Init. 215. After funding the Seattle Freeway Park, Mr. Francis stated there were the following balances:

REFERENDUM 18	\$ 311,521
INITIATIVE 215	28,557
LWCF	<u>56,571</u>
TOTAL	\$ 396,649

Of this, \$368,092 is other than Initiative 215 monies.

MR. WARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THERE BE NO FURTHER LOCAL PROJECTS CONSIDERED AT THE AUGUST 1972 MEETING. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Andrews informed the Chairman it was necessary for him to leave the meeting because of a prior commitment. He asked that his vote on the state agency projects be recorded by proxy.

V F 2 (a) State Parks and Recreation Commission: Mr. Paul Bourgault presented the proposed projects for the Parks and Recreation Commission. Memorandum dated August 28, 1972, and resumes for each project were referred to by Mr. Bourgault in his overall presentation:

- (1) Horsehead Bay Spit - Acquisition: Acquisition of 1.5 land spit, approximately 720 feet long, located in Pierce County at the intersection of Carr Inlet and Horsehead Bay. Site will provide for protected anchorage and water-related activities. \$22,500 Initiative 215 funds.
- (2) Grayland Beach - Acquisition: Acquisition of a 0.4 acre addition to Grayland Beach State Park; includes frontage on Long Lake. \$5,500 Ref. 18 funds.
- (3) Green River Gorge - Acquisition: Acquisition of 187 acres including over 8,000 front feet along Green River, lying across river from the existing Flaming Geyser State Park. \$500,375, Ref. 18 funds.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT,

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT AGREEMENTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

HORSEHEAD SPIT	INITIATIVE 215	\$ 22,500
GRAYLAND BEACH	REFERENDUM 18	5,500
GREEN RIVER GORGE	REFERENDUM 18	500,375
	TOTAL.....	\$ 528,375

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V F 2 (b) Department of Game: Mr. Jack Wayland gave the presentation on the Department of Game's three project proposals. Memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972 and resumes for each project were referred to by Mr. Wayland in his presentation.

- (1) Key Ecological Acquisition sites: Acquisition of 119 acres as an addition to the 10,410 acre Desert Wildlife Recreation Area located 11 miles southwest of Moses Lake, Grant County. \$5,500 Ref. 18 funds; \$5,500 BOR funds.
- (2) Water Access Program 1971-73 - Skykomish Boat Ramp, Snohomish County: Acquisition of 4.19 acres on the Skykomish River for a boat launch site, to be located one mile west of Monroe on eastern bank of the river. \$ 16,800 Initiative 215 funds.
- (3) Crab Creek, Wildlife Recreation Area: Acquisition of 160 acres as an addition to the 21,000 acre Crab Creek Wildlife Recreation Area, located 17 miles southeast of Vantage, Grant County. \$2,950 Ref. 18; \$ 2,950 BOR funds.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROTTLER THAT,

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT AGREEMENTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

DESERT WILDLIFE AREA	REF. 18	\$ 5,500)	\$ 11,000
	BOR	5,500)	
SKYKOMISH BOAT LAUNCH	INIT. 215			16,800
CRAB CREEK WILDLIFE AREA	REF. 18	2,950)	5,900
	BOR	2,950)	
TOTAL.....				\$ 33,700

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V F 2 (c) Department of Natural Resources: Mr. Charles Butler of the Department of Natural Resources presented the several projects proposed for funding. Memorandum of staff dated August 28, 1972, was referred to by Mr. Butler as well as resumes for each of the projects discussed.

- (1) 1971-73 Recreation Sites - Acquisition: The acquisition of five sites (50-year leases) as follows:

Elwell Creek	(Snohomish County)	24 acres	School Grant Land	\$14,500
Indian Caves	(Skamania County)	22.9 acres	Forest Bd. Grant Land	11,450
Flodelle Creek	(Stevens County)	54.2 acres	Normal School " "	10,800
Island River	(Skagit County)	17 acres	School Grant Land	16,150
Coxit Creek	(Okanogan County)	80 acres	School & Ind. Grant Land	9,600

- (2) 1971-73 Recreation Sites - Development - 4 sites:

(a) Robbins Lake - Development of a boat launch, parking and picnic area - Robbins Lake located in Tahuya Multiple-Use Area.	\$ 11,216
(b) Elwell Creek - Development of primitive camp and picnic area in Marckworth Multiple Use Area	40,250
(c) Island River: Development of primitive camp and picnic area along south bank of Cascade River, Skagit County (Resume' contained incorrect total cost of \$4,600 - was corrected.)	46,000
(d) Cold Springs: Development of primitive camp and picnic area in northern portion of Loomis-Loup Loup Multiple Use area, Okanogan County	35,868

- (3) Big Grieder Lake - Acquisition and Development:

(4) (a) Acquisition of 50-year lease for 4.27 acres on Big Grieder Lake; located on Sultan-Pilchuck multiple use area within Greider Lakes trail system.	1,700
(b) Development of 4.27 acre site following acquisition to provide in-hike primitive camping and picnic facilities	4,554

Following the presentation, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT,

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT AGREEMENTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

1971-73 RECREATION SITES - ACQUISITION - 5

ELWELL CREEK	REF. 18	\$ 7,250	BOR	\$ 7,250	\$ 14,500
INDIAN CAVES	" "	5,725	"	5,725	11,450
FLODELLE CREEK	" "	5,400	"	5,400	10,800
ISLAND RIVER	" "	8,075	"	8,075	16,150
COXIT CREEK	" "	4,800	"	4,800	9,600

1971-73 RECREATION SITES - DEVELOPMENT - 4

ROBBINS LAKE	INIT. 215	5,608	"	5,608	11,216
ELWELL CREEK	REF. 18	20,125	"	20,125	40,250
ISLAND RIVER	" "	23,000	"	23,000	46,000
COLD SPRINGS	" "	17,934	"	17,934	35,868

BIG GREIDER LAKE - ACQUISITION & DEVELOPMENT

ACQUIRE	REF. 18	1,700			1,700
DEVELOP	REF. 18	4,554			<u>4,554</u>

TOTAL \$ 202,088

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

NOVEMBER 1972 Meeting: Mr. Lofgren asked for suggestions where to meet in November. Seattle or Richland area had been suggested, with a trip on the Columbia River to precede the Richland meeting on Sunday, November 26 if held there. This would give the Committee members and staff an opportunity to view some of the river which had been under discussion during the formal presentations by CREST and CRCL on Monday, August 28th, to the Committee.

MRS. LEMERE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ROTTLER, TO HOLD THE NOVEMBER 1972 IAC MEETING IN SEATTLE.

Mr. Crouse urged consideration be given to the opportunity for the Committee to view the last free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River by holding the meeting in Richland. MR. BIGGS MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO STATE THAT THE IAC NOVEMBER 1972 MEETING BE HELD IN RICHLAND AND THAT THE COMMITTEE MEET IN SEATTLE AT SOME FUTURE

Minutes - Pg.30 - August 28, 1972

TIME. MR CROUSE SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AS AMENDED AND IT WAS CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

as amended



OMAR LOFGREN, CHAIRMAN
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR
RECREATION

APPENDIX "A" - Revenues Projection