

I. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes of

IIA Fiscal Status Reports

- (1) Disbursement Record - Local Agency Proj. 2-1-73 thru 4-30-73
- (2) Disbursement Record - Summary 2-1-72 to 4-30-73
- (3) Initiative 215 Control Sheet
- (4) Fund Summary - April 30, 1973

DNR Report - Mr. Lloyd Bell - report on LWCF obligated monies of DNR

- (5) LWCF Fund Status

IIB Project Status Reports

Administrative Cost Increase reported - Port of Columbia, Turner Bay 70-064D
\$525.00

IIC Planning and Special Studies

- (1) Status BOR Nationwide Plan
- (2) SCORP - Progress Report
- (3) Land and Water Conservation Fund - Continuing Eligibility Option
MOTION TO APPROVE BY THE COMMITTEE
- (4) Skagit River Study
- (5) Socio-Economic Study John F. Boyd Associates
- (6) Southwest Washington Study
- (7) Local Comprehensive Plans and C.I.P.'s
- (8) Inventory of Accretion Beaches - Wolf Bauer contract
MOTION TO APPROVE CONTRACT BY THE COMMITTEE

III OLD BUSINESS

A. IAC Capital Budget 1973-75 - Ref. 28, Washington Futures Program

(Explanation of Legislative funding - page 9
Parks and Rec. additional money; DNR switching; and Game approval)
Administrator to contact Legislative committees re IAC funding, etc.

B. Trails

MOTION ADOPTING PROGRAM AS INTERIM CORRIDORS - FINAL ADOPTION TO BE 1973 FALL MTG.

C. Project Change Requests

1. Parks and Rec. Comm. - Saddlebag Island - WITHDRAWAL APPROVED
2. City of Seattle, Magnolia Tidelands 66-024A PROJECT TERMINATION APPROVED
3. DNR - Smith Island - MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATOR TO SIGN MEMO OF AGREEMENT
WITH DNR - report asked of administrator on this project for next meeting.
4. Dept. of Game, Land Exchange - Washougal River 69-610A APPROVED
5. Port of Brownsville, Brownsville Boat Harbor, 72-002D. APPROVED to return
\$126,903.16 funds to Ref. 18 and allot \$126,903.16 from Init. 215 instead.

IV NEW BUSINESS

A. State Agency Project Presentations

1. Dept. of Game
 - a. Key Ecological Acq. - five sites) APPROVED with PROVISIO that projects
 - b. Acquisition - seven sites) be reviewed re re-development or maint.
 - c. Development - 12 sites) and report to IAC at next meeting

2. Department of Natural Resources
a. Reassignment of cost over-runs - APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE
b. Projects

(1) Chehalis Valley Vista	Acq.	\$ 914.00
(2) Mystic Falls	Acq.	22,842.00
(3) Point Lawrence	Acq.	53,491.00
(4) Cattle Point (Stage I)	Dev.	50,868.00

MOTION TO APPROVE THESE SEPARATELY FAILED

APPROVAL OF ALL PROJECTS. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(See listing on page 20-21)

(Chairman deviated from the agenda.)

VIII. IAC Meetings

- A. Local and Date of July meeting APPROVED (LATER CHANGED ON LAST PAGE OF THESE MINUTES)
B. Local and date of October, 1973 meeting APPROVED

VI. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- (a) Tri-State Demonstration Project
(b) Mercer Slough - City of Bellevue/State Parks
(c) Bureau of Outdoor Rec. Liaison meetings
(d) Administrative action with IAC
(1) Man-years
(2) Move into Arts Comm. old quarters
(3) Reorganization of staff - Rec. Spec./Clerk-Typists, etc.
(4) IAC billings program
(5) Assignment of project officers to sections of state
(6) Reclassification of Rec. Res. Spec. positions
(7) Report on State Financing of Water Related Facilities (LBC report)

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

None

WEDNESDAY MAY 30, 1973

IV. Local Project Presentations

Recommended funding memo and explanation - Tables I and Tables II

Comments on specific projects:

Kitsap Co., Salisbury Park
Ilwaco, Waterfront Park
City of Brier, Brier Park Dev.
King County, Marymoor Park Phase III
City of Auburn, Brannan Park I
City of Okanogan, Okanogan Swimming Pool
City of Olympia, Morse-Merryman Park
City of Pullman, - Mayor asked questions re funding
City of Olympia, Woodruff Park
Clark County, Cascade Park Dev.
Port Angeles, Westend Park Phase II
City of Yakima, Lion's Swimming Pool
Clark County, Vancouver Lake
King County, Luther Burbank School
(next sheet - continued)

City of Lacey, Lacey Community Park
Lewis County, Mayfield Lake Park, Phase II
Cowlitz County, Harry Gardner Park
Snohomish Co., No. County Saltwater Park

MOTION OF BELL TO FUND AT LESSER LEVEL. DEFEATED.

DISCUSSION RE FUNDING AT LESSER LEVEL.

MOTION TO DELETE THE CONTINGENCY FUNDS WITHIN PROJECTS. DEFEATED

MOTION TO APPROVE ALL EXCEPT COWLITZ COUNTY - MR. BISHOP FAILED

MOTION OF ODEGAARD TO REWORK FUNDING FORMULA AND PROJECTS BEING RECOMMENDED. FAILED

MOTION BY BIGGS TO HAVE MEETING 30-45 DAYS TO CONSIDER LOCAL PROJECTS - THEN REVIEW PRIORITY, ETC. MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF MAJORITY

MOTION BY BELL TO ADD TO LISTING PROJECTS REJECTED; COMMITTEE BE ALLOWED TO ADD THEM, ETC. -- MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY

MOTION BY CROUSE TO RECONSIDER BISHOP'S MOTION TO APPROVE ALL PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH EXCEPTION OF HARRY GARDNER, COWLITZ COUNTY. THIS MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MOTION TO HAVE 30-45 DAY SESSION ON PROJECT FUNDING AND RECONSIDER THE 11 PROJECTS REJECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MOTION TO APPROVE COWLITZ PROJECT - BY ODEGAARD. FAILED

Presentatbn of Carty's project - Cowlitz.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROJECT OF COWLITZ COUNTY - WAS THEN APPROVED
CARRIED

MOTION OF ODEGAARD TO ADD WESTEND PARK, PORT ANGELES, \$60,531 - APPROVED

MOTION TO APPROVE ALL THE PROJECTS WAS CARRIED. SEE PAGE 33, 1973 of MINUTES

ODEGAARD MOTION TO GIVE RETROACTIVITY TO LOCAL PROJECTS AT SPECIAL MEETING WITHDRAWN

MOTION TO CONTINUE OPEN HEARING - ATV and Procedural Guidelines to June 22, 1973 meeting CARRIED.

JULY meeting reconsidered - back to July 23-24, as originally scheduled

Adjourned 4:30 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

9:00 a.m. May 29-30, 1973
Tuesday-Wednesday

Junior Ballroom, Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Lewis A. Bell, Mr. Bert Cole, Director, Department of Natural Resources; Mr. Carl N. Crouse, Director, Department of Game; Mrs. Frederick Lemere, Mr. Omar Lofgren, Chairman; Mr. John Biggs, Director, Department of Ecology; Mr. Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Mr. Warren A. Bishop; Mr. Robert Anderson, Acting Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. George Andrews, Director, Department of Highways; Mr. Jack Rottler; Mr. Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries.

STAFF OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE & MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General
Marianne Holifield

Commerce and Economic Development
Merlin Smith

Ecology, Department of
Beecher, Snipes, Supervisor, Planning and Development

Fisheries, Department of
Don Erickson

Game, Department of
James Brigham - Dan Barnett

Highways, Department of
Willa Mylroie, Research and Special Assignments Engineer

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Kenn Cole, Fiscal Accounts Officer
Richard Costello, Rec. Res. Specialist
Stanley E. Francis, Administrator
Marjorie M. Frazier, Administrative Secretary
Robert S. Lemcke, Coordinator
Glenn Moore, Rec. Res. Specialist
Milton H. Martin, Assistant Administrator
Gerald Pelton, Chief, Plan. and Coordination
Bruce Thompson, Planner
Katherine Scott, Rec. Res. Specialist
Roger Syverson, Rec. Res. Specialist
Fred Wagner, Rec. Res. Specialist

Natural Resources, Department of
Al O'Donnell, Technical Assistant
Lloyd Bell

Parks and Recreation Commission
Paul Bourgault

MAY 29, 1973 PAGES 1-23
MAY 30, 1973 PAGES 23-35

MEETING CONTINUED JUNE 22, 1973
SEE MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 1973

Program Planning and Fiscal Management
No representation

LOCAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane
William Hutsinpillar, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Yakima
Richard Mullins, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Port Angeles
David Towne, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Seattle
James Webster, King County Parks Department, Seattle

OTHER AGENCIES - TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

None

-
1. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes of ^{February 26, 1973} ~~May 29-30, 1973 (Continued June 22, 1973)~~, Additions to the Agenda: Chairman Lofgren called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Seven members of the Committee were present and a quorum was declared.

Chairman Lofgren introduced the following persons:

Mr. Robert Anderson, Acting Director, Commerce and Economic Development Department
Mr. Bruce Thompson, Planner II, staff of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, replacing Mr. Don Peterson.

The members were advised of the appointment of Mr. David Towne as Superintendent of the Parks and Recreation Department, City of Seattle. Also, Marianne Holifield's resignation as Assistant Attorney General, effective June 30, 1973, was announced. Chairman Lofgren thanked Mrs. Holifield on behalf of the Committee for her services during her tenure with the Interagency Committee. It was noted that Mr. Biggs, Mr. Cole and Mr. Crouse would be attending the meeting later following other commitments.

A Public Hearing at 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 30, for discussion and adoption under the Administrative Procedures Act of Rules concerning the organization and operations of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, eligibility of public agencies for state outdoor recreation financial assistance, application procedure, and requirements for projects that are accepted for assistance, including projects for All-Terrain Vehicle recreational areas and trails, was also announced by the Chairman.

Approval of Minutes, February 26, 1973: In response to a call from the Chairman for corrections or deletions to the minutes of February 26, 1973, Mr. Al O'Donnell, on behalf of Mr. Bert Cole, Director, Department of Natural Resources, offered the following:

Page 16, February 26, 1973 IAC minutes, last paragraph:
Second sentence, strike the words "A private car traveling on a private road (roads other than county, city or state)" and substitute the phrase "A conventional two-wheel drive passenger automobile traveling on a non-highway road, as defined in the ATV Act,"....

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 1973, IAC MEETING BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

II A. Fiscal Status Report: The following fiscal status reports were reviewed by Mr. Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer:

- (1) Disbursement Record, Local Agency Projects - Feb. 1, 1973 thru April 30, 1973
- (2) Disbursement Record Summary 2-1-72 to 4-30-73
- (3) Initiative 215, Unclaimed Refundable Marine Fuel Tax, Distribution Control Sheet
- (4) Fund Summary - April 30, 1973

(1) Disbursement Record: Mr. Cole noted that since 1965 through April 30, 1973, 305 Local Agency Projects had been approved; of these 165 have been closed, with 140 in current status.

(2) Disbursement Record Summary: Sixty-eight (68) vouchers were processed during the last quarter, and 13 projects were closed.

(3) Initiative 215 Control Sheet: \$252,000 was transferred in the last quarter from the Motor Vehicle funds to the Outdoor Recreation Account under the Initiative 215 grant-in-aid program. Net available to the state and local agencies was \$193,000.

(4) Fund Summary, April 30, 1973: Mr. Cole pointed out there would be a new column in the next Fund Summary report which will account for the Referendum 28 funds - \$5,000,000 for local agencies and \$5,000,000 for state agencies. Balances for the state and local agencies of Referendum 11, LWCF, 18 and 215 funds were commented upon. Adjustment reflecting action taken by the Committee at the February 26, 1973 meeting with regard to Mercer Slough was mentioned by Mr. Cole. The transfer involved \$243,203 from Parks to the Local Agency (Bellevue) with Contingency Fund share of the project not being included on the summary until Federal agreement has been executed to allocate and obligate those funds.

Following Mr. Cole's report on the Fund Summary, Chairman Lofgren recognized Mr. Lloyd Bell, Technical Assistant to Mr. Bert Cole, Department of Natural Resources, for comments concerning the Land and Water Conservation Fund balances within DNR. Mr. Bell noted that \$1,568,043.40 in total available funds had not been obligated by DNR; however, there would be one-half million in additional LWCF obligation brought before the Committee at the present meeting. Mr. Bell in explanation of the remaining \$1,000,000 unobligated noted the following:

(1) Of the \$1,000,000 eight percent (8%) (approximately \$75,000) will be in savings -- projects have been completed or acquisitions made at lesser amount than allocated.

(2) 15% results from withdrawal of certain projects - or postponement.

(3) 2% is involved in Right-of-way Reserve Account, to allow flexibility in obtaining rights-of-way for roads, and used for purposes of negotiations.

(4) 27% in unobligated funds has resulted from problem projects which will require more time and planning. The Natural Preserves Act may be involved in some of these projects.

(5) 14% involves projects currently held up with controversial Shoreline Management Act hearings.

(6) 12% are concerned with tideland acquisition program; purchases for acquisition of public access to the tidelands are on negotiated basis rather than condemnation, and this is taking considerable time.

(7) 21% of projects are simply behind schedule and DNR is making every effort to clear these from the books.

Mr. Lloyd Bell advised the Committee that Mr. Bert Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, had asked him to give the foregoing report since there had been concern on the part of the Committee at the February 26, 1973 meeting concerning unobligated funds for state agencies.

(5) Land and Water Conservation Fund Status: Mr. Kenn Cole explained the Land and Water Conservation Fund status report. The IAC has obligated approximately \$300,000 since the February 26, 1973 meeting and about \$673,000 in BOR funding was proposed at this current meeting, which will obligate \$1,126,000 on IAC records. (SEE APPENDIX "A" TO THESE MINUTES - LWCF STATUS REPORT.)

Mr. Cole pointed out that the local agency proposals as presented by IAC staff in the May kit would use \$288,000 out of the available \$293,000; DNR had approximately \$122,000 BOR funded projects for approval at the current meeting; Game, \$263,000 plus. Thus, provided all projects are approved as presented by IAC staff, the balance in BOR funds specifically unobligated by the State would be \$454,000.

Mrs. Lemere inquired whether the balance of BOR funds would then revert back into the 1974 available IAC funding program. Mr. Kenn Cole assured her this was the case, that the State of Washington projected BOR funding for 1974 was \$850,000, making a total of \$1,305,000 available from BOR in 1974. In response to further inquiry, Mr. Martin stated it was anticipated the BOR would restore funds in 1975 which the State of Washington did not receive in 1974. OPPFM (Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management) and the IAC have already coordinated in setting aside funds from the Fiscal Year 1974 to assure matching ability in 1975 for the State of Washington. Mr. Lofgren stated this situation had been discussed with Mr. James Watt, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Washington, D.C. The problem of unused LWCF monies had been reviewed by BOR, and a request of the states to reallocate unused BOR monies to those states having viable projects to make use of these funds had been discussed.

Mr. Lofgren stated the BOR had also been contacted regarding the reallocation of monies not used by other states to those states who were in a position to use them. These funds at present revert to the Secretary's Contingency Fund for allocation to unique state projects which qualify and are therefore eligible for use of the Contingency Fund. The BOR had not approved reissuance of these monies to those states presently maximizing their use of BOR funds. Mr. Bishop felt it was incumbent upon the State of Washington to locate outstanding projects which would qualify for Contingency Funding and make use of these monies. Mr. Martin replied that the pattern in the past year had been for the IAC to begin to research projects, working with local agencies, and attempt to initiate these types of projects through the IAC for ultimate funding through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's Contingency Fund.

IIB. Project Status Reports: Mr. Roger Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, entitled "Project Status Reports", and noted there were 139 current local agency projects, 119 current state agency projects, and that during the last quarter, 12 local projects and 7 state agency projects had been closed. To date, 165 local agency projects and 40 state agency projects have been completed. Mrs. Lemere asked whether any kind of survey of the average time it has taken to complete a project had ever been made. Mr. Syverson replied in the negative. Discussion followed concerning billing procedure of the agency.

Administrative Cost Increase - Port of Columbia - Turner Bay Marina #70-064D:

The administrative cost increase granted to the Port of Columbia on the Turner Bay Marina Project (IAC #70-064D) was explained by Mr. Syverson. The project received a grant of \$525.00 to cover cost over-runs incurred by the Port due to increased labor and materials costs and the original cost estimates being too conservative. The funding of the project was therefore changed as follows:

<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>REF. 18</u>	<u>INITIATIVE 215</u>	<u>LOCAL AGENCY</u>
\$ 155,480	\$ 54,628.00	\$ 61,982.00	\$ 38,879.00

II C. Planning and Special Studies: Mr. Gerald Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, entitled "Planning Status". He explained that the graph on planning action differed from previous format, and provided a more precise status of planning reports and studies.

1. Status BOR Nationwide Plan: Memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, entitled "Nationwide Plan Review", was reviewed by Mr. Pelton. IAC staff reviewed the document (300 pages, 17 chapters), and has indicated in a letter to Mr. Watt, Director of the BOR, its concern that Chapter II on "Summary of Findings and Recommendations" was not included for review. This is considered the most critical chapter in the report. Staff felt there should be information within the Plan for federal action, establishment of policy and funding commitments.

2. SCORP - Progress Report: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, entitled "SCORP Document", and circulated two copies of the Printer's blue line drafts of Volume I, SCORP (Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan) to the Committee members for their review. The following information was given to the Committee in Mr. Pelton's report:

a. 2,000 copies of Volume I and 500 copies of Volume II will be printed for general distribution.

b. Volume I - pages 97 through 120 (the acquisition and development tables for local, state and federal agencies) have been summarized and the district tables deleted in the printed version. Since these tables will change yearly, it was not felt they were necessary in a general distribution version of the Plan.

c. 30 photographs have been added to the document.

d. Volume II will not receive as widespread distribution as Volume I -- it is more technical and is intended primarily for staff level use.

3. Land and Water Conservation Fund - Continuing Eligibility Option: Reference was made to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, entitled "Land and Water Conservation Fund Eligibility". The two BOR planning options for eligibility to receive Land and Water Conservation Funds were explained by Mr. Pelton. Option I continues the previous form of eligibility whereby a state must submit the SCORP as the basis for a specified period of eligibility; whereas Option II (recently adopted by BOR) allows a state to be granted continuing eligibility based on approval of an acceptable plan, an on-going planning program, and an approved implementation process for approved actions. Mr. Pelton briefly outlined the six basic criteria upon which the adequacy of a state's continuing planning program would be judged: Staff; planning program; budget; coordination; participation in planning; and accomplishments. Mr. Pelton noted that the Administrator had advised Interagency Committee members by memorandum of April 24th that Option II would be more advantageous to the State of Washington:

- a. It would provide opportunity to maintain an on-going level of workload.
- b. Update of SCORP will be possible without increase in man-years.
- c. It will be possible to have greater "in-house" capability, and possibly reduce the need for Personal Service Contracts.
- d. Greater flexibility can be had in both type and scope of implementation of SCORP.
- e. A five-year period of eligibility will be possible before a major update and printing is necessary, thus saving funds of the IAC.

Mr. Pelton then announced that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation had informed Governor Evans on April 27, 1973, of its acceptance of the Washington Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan under Option II, thus establishing the SCORP on a continuing basis.

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

WHEREAS, A REVISED EDITION OF THE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN (SCORP) OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON HAS BEEN PREPARED AND ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS AUTHORITY UNDER RCW 43.99.122, AND

WHEREAS, SAID PLAN HAS BEEN FORWARDED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF RETAINING ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDING ASSISTANCE, AND

WHEREAS, UNDER RECENTLY ADOPTED AMENDMENTS TO PART 630 OF THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION MANUAL, TWO ELIGIBILITY OPTIONS HAVE BEEN OFFERED TO STATES,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY CONCUR WITH CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY AS GRANTED TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ASSISTANCE BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION ON APRIL 27, 1973.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. Skagit River Study: Mr. Robert Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Skagit River Study", calling attention to the flow chart attached to the memorandum which had been provided by the U. S. Forest Service. Public hearing schedule has been changed from August to December 1973. The IAC is presently reviewing the preliminary field draft report concurrently with the Forest Service Regional Office. The Study is scheduled for completion in February 1974.

5. Socio-Economic Study: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Socio-Economic Study", and stated the title of the study itself was a misnomer, that the study would be more of a demographic study of which socio-economic factors will be an element. A contract has been signed with John F. Boyd and Associates who will work closely with Planning and Coordination staff to (1) define the demographic factors relating to outdoor recreation planning and project evaluation; (2) develop procedures for incorporating the demographic indicators into on-going agency programs and process, and (3) design a system which makes available to the IAC, on a current and on-going basis, the defined demographic information. The contract will be completed

during this biennium with final report due at the July 1973 meeting.

6. Southwest Washington Study: Memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Southwest Washington Study", was referred to by Mr. Pelton. Revisions have been made to the Southwest Washington Study Work Plan to reflect mutually identifiable changes in needs and emphasis. A completed report in draft form will be submitted to the Study Coordinator by June 1, 1973, which will complete IAC commitments to the Department of Ecology relative to this study. Mr. Pelton noted that all policies and priorities contained in the report will be directly from or based upon those included in SCORP as adopted by the Committee in February, 1973. Mr. Odegaard inquired whether staff would be involved in other special studies or reports which would require additional funds or man-years to accomplish. Mr. Martin replied any additional studies or workload requested of the IAC would naturally require outside assistance either in the form of funds or man-years; however, he indicated there are sufficient funds budgeted to carry out the main objectives of the IAC -- funding of grant-in-aid projects and planning. Mr. Odegaard suggested there be an unwritten understanding between the Committee and the IAC staff that should there be any proposed commitments on behalf of the IAC staff for involvement in special studies, that the Committee be assured there will be funds and man-years available in which to accomplish these added responsibilities.

Chairman Lofgren asked the IAC staff to brief the Committee on additional studies prior to accepting any special tasks to insure that each member of the Committee would be able to review any proposed responsibilities of staff very carefully. Mr. Pelton informed the Committee that the Southwest Washington Study funds had been provided to the IAC through the Department of Ecology.

7. Local Comprehensive Plans and C.I.P.'s: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Local Comprehensive Plans and C.I.P.'s". The review program of the Planning and Coordination Section on local comprehensive plans and capital improvement programs had indicated (1) fifty of the 108 plans on file with the IAC were adopted prior to 1966; (2) many plans did not address the six required elements of the Guidelines (findings and recommendations, description of planning area, goals and objectives, demand and need, inventory, and an Action Program); (3) few plans have been updated (or supplemented) since their submission (over half of them were submitted in 1965 or 1966.) Consequently, Planning will be working with agencies to encourage them to keep CIP's current and to bring all comprehensive plans on file up to date.

8. Inventory of Accretion Beaches: Mr. Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Inventory of Accretion Beaches". Approximately 300 copies of the Interagency Committee's Report on Wild, Scenic and Recreation Rivers have been distributed to agencies and individuals concerned with state scenic and recreational rivers system. Mr. Lemcke explained that as an extension of this, an inventory of accretion beaches (saltwater shorelands in Puget Sound, Hood Canal, San Juan Islands, and Straits of Juan de Fuca) needs to be accomplished. The IAC had therefore executed a contract with Mr. Wolf Bauer on a program to establish a procedure whereby Class I accretion beaches (points, hooks, spits, tombolos, barrier beaches) may be identified and inventoried. The study will help tie together the river systems program with marine shorelands, towards consideration of both as one integral resource.

Mrs. Lemere asked if this study would be in addition to the inventory of beaches which is a part of the requirement under the Shorelines Management Act for each county. Mr. Lemcke and Mr. Lewis Bell explained a county's requirement is to indicate the existing land use within that county and not necessarily what the land could be used for, i.e., recreation, development, etc. The Bauer contract will deal with the physical features

of the area, concentrating on those with highest potential for recreation use.

Mr. Odegaard stated that counties are by law required to secure this type of information to meet the criteria of the Shorelines Management Act. He questioned whether funds from the IAC should be used in this type of accreted beaches study, and if there was an actual need for the inventory to be made. Mr. Lemcke replied the study would give the IAC valuable information on beach areas which is presently not available from any existing sources. Mr. Bauer's proposal is to inventory beach areas in relation to the land's life cycle, its present existence and its future maintenance. Many beaches are eroding because of improper actions being taken in regard to their use. The results of the inventory will enable the IAC to take a position of leadership and assist local agencies in identifying their critical resource areas.

Mr. Odegaard pointed out IAC is not knowledgeable or familiar with previous studies made through this same type of inventory. King County was cited by Mrs. Lemere as having recently completed its own study. Mr. Odegaard therefore felt it should not be IAC's responsibility to advise an agency of land areas which should be acquired and those which should not. Priorities as established by the IAC should be adhered to and critical resource areas are within those priorities, but it should be the prerogative of local agencies to determine their needs, and to identify their critical resources.

Mr. Pelton confirmed that the highest priority is identification of critical resource areas, and explained the Bauer system will provide a method of determining these areas. Mr. Crouse agreed with Mr. Pelton, stating counties would not be able to tie together a system which would prove workable for the state and thus a coordinating agency would be able to compile invaluable information for the counties through the Bauer inventory.

Mr. Martin indicated the proposed study had been discussed in-house with knowledgeable people in state government and it had been IAC staff decision to approach Mr. Bauer for a contract to do the work.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BELL, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE IAC CONTRACT WITH MR. WOLF BAUER FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A PROCEDURE WHEREBY CLASS I ACCRETION BEACHES MAY BE IDENTIFIED AND INVENTORIED BE APPROVED.

At this point Mr. Odegaard asked whether the IAC had checked with other agencies which might have already undertaken this type of study, specifically the Department of Ecology. Mr. Pelton replied Ecology staff had been included in the meetings with Mr. Bauer and were aware of and approved the intent of the proposed study.

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

Chairman Lofgren introduced Mr. John Ballwig, Park and Recreation Director, City of Pullman, and Mr. Jeff Domaskin, member of the Washington State Park and Recreation Committee.

III. OLD BUSINESS.

A. IAC Capital Budget 1973-75 - Referendum 28, Washington Futures program: Chairman Lofgren called upon Mr. Francis, Administrator, for the report on the IAC Capital Budget 1973-75 and Referendum program as noted in memorandum from staff dated May 14, 1973. The following are highlights of Mr. Francis' report:

1. The 1973 Legislature passed the total 1973-75 IAC Operating Budget at the requested amount of \$26,943,676.
2. Of this, \$657,993 is for use as Operating Expenses of the Interagency Committee.
3. New monies -- all sources -- amount to \$ 11,907,450
Reappropriation - all sources -- amount to 14,378,233
4. OPPFM has advised IAC that State funds anticipated for Federal fund matching will be held back (impounded) in the amount applicable to the decrease in anticipated Federal Funds.
5. State Agency 1973-75 Capital Budgets - Outdoor Recreation Account - were affected as follows by action of the State Legislature:

(a) \$10,000,000 - Referendum 28 approved for transfer from State and Local Improvement Fund, \$11,403,340 appropriated.

(b) Parks and Recreation Commission:

- (1) Governor's Budget \$4,050,000 for State Parks was cut \$400,000, with cut coming from Boating Destination Program.
- (2) Senate restored \$ 50,000 - develop Rockport State Park
- (3) Senate diverted \$100,000 - General Administration Dept. for development of Capitol Lake, Olympia
- (4) House restored \$ 150,000 - Ike Kinswa State Park development
- (5) House line-itemmed Nalley Property acquisition - \$1,700,000

Therefore, State Parks' budget as finally passed is \$1,500,000 over that approved by the IAC and as set forth in the Governor's Budget.

(6) To accommodate the Nalley acquisition, State Parks must affect a complete realignment of its Capital Budget through the IAC. Two courses of future action were noted: (A) Adjust State Parks' Budget for the ensuing two biennia; or (B) adjust all state agency budgets to absorb the loss, with resultant proportionate loss to DNR and Game departments during next two biennia.

(c) Department of Natural Resources:

- (1) Governor's Budget request of \$1,131,520 was cut by \$215,550 by the Senate.
- (2) Senate switched \$20,000 General Fund item for fire control camp sites to the Outdoor Recreation Account.
- (3) DNR will need to realign its Capital Budget to accommodate decrease through the IAC.

(d) Department of Game:

- (1) \$3,450,480 was approved as submitted.

(e) Dept. of General Administration:

- (1) \$100,000 for development of Capitol Lake, Olympia.
- (2) This Department will need to qualify under guidelines for grant-in-aid program of the IAC.

Mr. Odegaard commented as follows:

(1) He clarified the \$100,000 appropriated for the Capitol Lake, Olympia, project. The Legislature did not divert funds from State Parks; it appropriated these funds directly to the Department of General Administration.

(2) The \$400,000 cut was made from the State Parks' boating program; State Parks staff attempted to have this item placed back within its budget. In essence the Legislature did return \$200,000 of the cut by appropriation of monies for Rockport (\$ 50,000) and Ike Kinswa (\$ 150,000).

(3) The Legislature did not delete any projects from those requested by State Parks, but added the Nalley property acquisition at \$1,700,000.

Mr. Odegaard stated State Parks ^{based on Mr. Francis' analysis,} did not want to be in the position of having another agency's funds, and suggested ^{amended} that the IAC approach the Legislature in September to obtain supplemental funding to take care of the present budgetary situation based upon the recreational needs of the state.

In response to a question from Mr. Bishop, Mr. Odegaard stated State Parks had replied to a request of the Legislature for available acquisition sites and had supplied the information, with the Nalley property acquisition being one of several submitted for legislative consideration. It was his understanding at the time of submission of the listing that in no way were any of the projects to be in lieu of any other projects.

Mr. Bishop stated that might well be true, but if the Legislature makes any changes, it either has to fund recommended projects or replace them with others -- one of those two actions has to occur. Mr. Bishop stated it was the responsibility of the IAC staff to indicate to the Legislature through the proper procedures any changes in funding structure between state agencies. He felt the legislative committees (Ways and Means) should be advised of this procedure; that they might not be aware of it.

At this point, Mr. Lloyd Bell, DNR, asked that the record indicate DNR's recommendation that the State Parks and Recreation Commission's budget should be reduced in approved IAC projects by \$1.5 million over the next two years. Mr. Odegaard agreed with the ^{amended} concept that no one state agency should be given monies ^{already appropriated to other agencies} over the other state agencies. He reiterated ^{based on Mr. Francis' analysis,} the need to approach the Legislature in September to ask for authorization for additional funds to even the budget picture. ~~No agency should suffer because of the action of the Legislature in not approving enough monies.~~ (out)

Mr. Bishop stressed the need for immediate meetings with the Ways and Means committees of both Legislative Houses to discuss the State Agency Capital Budgets, rather than waiting until September. He also asked that the Committee be briefed on the results of these meetings at the July IAC meeting. Mr. Francis was advised by Chairman Lofgren to set up meetings with the legislative committees mentioned to inform them of the present status of State Agency Capital Budgets and offer a possible solution to the present problem. Meetings with the staff of each state agency concerned was then discussed and it was the consensus that the preliminary meetings with the state agencies would be arranged by the administrator of the IAC. Mr. Odegaard asked if state agencies

could be represented at the meetings with the legislative committees. Mr. Lofgren assured him this would be possible.

IIIB. Trails: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Washington State Recreation Trails Program", and noted that the document name had been changed from "trails plan" to "trails program" to denote that it will provide a procedure for the establishment of a state trails system rather than a plan.

The Trails document was explained by Mr. Richard Costello, Rec. Res. Specialist with the Planning and Coordination Section of the IAC. Various agencies have reviewed the document and have had input to insure close liaison with all interested groups (Forest Service, National Park Service, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Housing and Urban Development Agency; State Attorney General, state agencies concerned, and all thirty-nine counties, five municipal parks and recreation agencies; plus twenty user organizations (hikers, bicyclists, horsemen, 4-wheel drive clubs, canoeists, and motorcyclists).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BELL, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP THAT:

WHEREAS, A STATE TRAILS PLAN HAS BEEN PREPARED BY THIS COMMITTEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS AUTHORITY UNDER RCW 67.32 AND

WHEREAS, REVIEW DRAFTS OF THIS DOCUMENT HAVE BEEN WIDELY CIRCULATED AND FAVORABLY COMMENTED UPON, AND CHANGES MADE RESULTING FROM THOSE COMMENTS, AND

WHEREAS, THIS STATE TRAILS DOCUMENT IS RECOGNIZED AS THE BASIS FOR A CONTINUING PROGRAM OF ACTION WHEREBY POLICIES MAY BE ADOPTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN WHICH WILL ALLOW THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF A RECOGNIZED SYSTEM OF TRAILS WITHIN THIS STATE, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, (1) THAT THE STATE TRAILS PLAN AS REQUIRED BY RCW 67.32 WILL HEREINAFTER BE CALLED THE WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PROGRAM, AND (2) THAT THIS PROGRAM DOCUMENT IS HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE STATE TRAILS SYSTEM PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, (1) THAT THE STATE TRAILS CORRIDORS AS DEPICTED IN FIGURES 2, 3, AND 4 OF THE ADOPTED PROGRAM DOCUMENT BE CONSIDERED AS "INTERIM" CORRIDORS ONLY UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE STATE TRAILS COMMITTEE CAN BE ACTIVATED AND CAN REVIEW ALL PROPOSED CORRIDORS AS WELL AS CONSIDER OTHER ROUTES FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION, AND (2) THAT PROPOSED "INITIAL" TRAILS CORRIDORS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE FOR ADOPTION AT THE FALL MEETING, 1973. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III C. Project Change Requests - Committee Action:

1. Parks and Recreation Commission - Saddlebag Island - Withdrawal: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Saddlebag Island, IAC #71-502A, Request for Withdrawal", and explained the circumstances prompting State Parks' request. Problems with negotiating the acquisition at the appraised price caused the State Parks and Recreation Commission to formally delete the Saddlebag Island project from its priority acquisition schedule on March 19, 1973. \$125,000 of Initiative 215 funds formally in this project are to be reallocated to the Puget Sound Boating Program of the State Parks agency.

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

THE IAC APPROVE THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S REQUEST TO WITHDRAW THE

SADDLEBAG ISLAND ACQUISITION PROJECT (IAC #71-502A) AND THAT \$125,000 OF INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS BE REALLOCATED TO THE PUGET SOUND BOATING PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO SUBSEQUENT APPROVAL BY THE IAC OF ANY PROPOSED USE OF THESE FUNDS BY STATE PARKS AND THAT STATE PARKS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY THE PROJECT FOR WHICH THESE FUNDS ARE TO BE USED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. City of Seattle, Magnolia Tidelands #2, Termination IAC #66-024A: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "City of Seattle, Magnolia Tidelands #2 - Request for Project Adjustment and Final Reimbursement". The adjustment requested by the City represented a substantial reduction in scope from the original request of \$125,000, approved by the IAC in November, 1966. The City acquired 39 parcels which included approximately 65% of the original proposed acquisition area and controls approximately 90% of the land area within the total project area. The City feels the project as now acquired will insure control of the waterfront strip, to preserve it for public open space and recreational uses. This ownership comprises the larger parcels of land in the original acquisition proposal which would have lent themselves to private economic development. The City indicates it cannot acquire the remaining parcels of land without initiating condemnation proceedings and asked the Committee to consider the project completed and authorize final reimbursement.

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

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF SEATTLE HAS SUBMITTED A REQUEST FOR A PROJECT ADJUSTMENT AND FINAL REIMBURSEMENT ON THE MAGNOLIA TIDELANDS ACQUISITION #2 PROJECT, AND

WHEREAS, THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE PROJECT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE CITY'S REQUEST FOR PROJECT ADJUSTMENT AND TERMINATION BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION,

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REIMBURSE THE CITY OF SEATTLE FOR ELIGIBLE ACQUISITION COSTS TO THE EXTENT CONSISTENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S CONCURRENCE TOTALS RECEIVED APRIL 16, 1973.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. DNR - Smith Island: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated May 7, 1973, entitled "Dept. of Natural Resources - Smith Island Recreational Site Replacement". DNR requested substitution of land and replacement of facilities on the property acquired in 1967 through Outdoor Recreation Account funds to property immediately north of the existing site. The Snohomish River channel and silting basin are in need of immediate maintenance dredging and it is proposed to use Smith Island, including a portion of the present recreation site, for spoils storage. The site was originally partially acquired with Land and Water Conservation Fund monies and must be replaced on an in-kind basis with equal or greater value and public usefulness to meet the federal requirements for conversion to non-recreational use. IAC and DNR will execute a Memorandum of Agreement (as attached to the May 7, 1973 memorandum to the Interagency Committee from Mr. Francis, Administrator) to accomplish substitution of the land with BOR approval to meet federal requirements. Following Mr. Francis' presentation, Mr. Lewis Bell abstained from voting on the proposal due to a possible conflict of interest.

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

THE IAC RECOGNIZES THE NEED TO PERFORM MAINTENANCE DREDGING OF THE SNOHOMISH RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL AND SILTING BASIN AND

FURTHER, RECOGNIZING THE NEED FOR AN ADEQUATE SPOILS STORAGE AREA, DOES HEREBY AGREE TO THE CONVERSION TO NON-RECREATION USES OF THE DNR SMITH ISLAND SITE IN RETURN FOR A REPLACEMENT SITE, AND HAVING FOUND THE REPLACEMENT SITE TO BE OF EQUAL OR GREATER VALUE AND USEFULNESS FOR PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION, DOES HEREBY APPROVE SUCH EXCHANGE SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS PUT FORTH IN THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT - SMITH ISLAND - BETWEEN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION", DATED MAY 29, 1973, AND

DOES HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO SIGN SUCH MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT IN THE NAME OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION.

Discussion followed. Mr. Odegaard inquired whether this proposal would lead to the use of Smith Island by a commercial agency. Mr. Francis replied he was not aware of any future uses after the spoils period, but the proposal would free the site for any other future uses. Mr. Odegaard stated it would not be a good move on the part of the IAC to free the land for possible later highly-commercialized development and he asked assurance such would not be the case.

At this point, Mr. Lloyd Bell and Mr. Al O'Donnell clarified the DNR lease arrangements. Prior to the issuance of the lease with the IAC there had been an agreement with the State Department of Highways to use a portion of the site as a temporary storage area for fill materials for use in freeway construction. There was at that time no income to DNR derived from this temporary storage. The State Highways Department was then asked to leave the site in good condition so that it could be used as a park area for additional boat launching. This benefited the recreational use of Smith Island rather than detracted, but it did not serve DNR as a source of income.

Mr. O'Donnell felt the same safeguards would apply under the DNR lease program and commercial ventures would not be a serious item to consider following the Port of Everett use of the site. Mr. Francis offered to follow up on the lease arrangements with DNR, ascertain the deposit of the spoils and their disposal during the period of the lease, and inform the Committee. The Chairman so directed.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

4. Department of Game - Land Exchange - Washougal River: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, (Department of Game - Statewide Water Access 69-71, IAC #69-610A, Land Exchange Request). An exchange of land was explained concerning project agreement 69-610A wherein 0.12 acres of land acquired under that agreement would be exchanged for approximately 0.08 acres of land to provide an additional 20 feet of right-of-way for public access to a public fishing area. A finding of value prepared by the Department of Game determined the property values were equal. The additional right-of-way to be received will more than compensate for the difference in value (\$300.00) by providing a hazard free access to the public fishing area.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE 0.12 ACRES ACQUIRED UNDER PROJECT AGREEMENT 69-610A FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.08 ACRES OWNED BY MR. RAY H. FORD TO PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL 20 FEET OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR PUBLIC ACCESS TO A PUBLIC FISHING AREA, AND

WHEREAS, A FINDING OF VALUE PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME DETERMINES THE PROPERTY VALUES TO BE EQUAL;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HEREBY APPROVES THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THIS MATTER. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5. Port of Brownsville - Brownsville Boat Harbor: Memorandum dated May 20, 1973, "Request for Change in Funding - Port of Brownsville, Brownsville Boat Harbor, IAC #72-002D", was reviewed by Mr. Francis. The proposal involved placing of \$126,903.16 of Initiative 215 funds within the project development to achieve a greater maximization of all available funds. Referendum 18 funds in like amount will be returned to the Outdoor Recreation Account.

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

WHEREAS, INASMUCH AS CONSTRUCTION WORK HAS NOT BEGUN ON THE BROWNSVILLE BOAT HARBOR PROJECT, PORT OF BROWNSVILLE, AND INASMUCH AS THERE IS NOW AVAILABLE DEVELOPMENT FUNDING FROM INITIATIVE 215, \$126,903.16 OF REFERENDUM 18 FUNDS WHICH WERE COMMITTED TO THIS PROJECT AT THE NOVEMBER, 1971 MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, ARE HEREBY RETURNED TO THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT, AND INITIATIVE 215 MONIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$126,903.16 ARE HEREBY COMMITTED TO THE BROWNSVILLE BOAT HARBOR PROJECT, IAC #72-002D.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. State Agency Project Presentations.

1. State Department of Game:
 - a. Key Ecological Acquisition - five sites
 - b. 71-73 Statewide Water Access Acquisition - seven sites
 - c. 71-73 Statewide Water Access Development - 12 sites

Mr. Glenn Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Department of Game Projects", noting there were 12 acquisition projects and 12 development. Slides were shown. Mr. Lofgren asked staff to determine how far the Bogachiel River development site was from the Bogachiel State Park in response to inquiry of Mr. Odegaard. Mr. Francis in turn asked the Department of Game to determine the location of the site and report back to the Committee later in the day.

Mr. Odegaard and Mrs. Lemere inquired why there was need for two sites on Wildcat Lake. Mr. Moore pointed out this was a 109 acre lake and that the area provided by the county does not include a boat launch ramp and is strictly a swimming area.

Mr. Odegaard questioned items in the Department of Game resumes indicating "reconstruction of existing ramp", "resurfacing of existing road", etc. -- whether these were eligible to receive Outdoor Recreation Funds, and if so, would it be possible for other departments to place within their projects major maintenance or reconstruction of worn-out items and use Outdoor Recreation Account funds. Mr. Francis replied that when the Governor's Jobs Now program became effective and the acceleration program of the \$15 million of Referendum 18 took place, improvement and development of park and recreation facilities was a factor in the program. However, the reconstruction of facilities -- or improvement of same -- must add to the recreational opportunity for the citizenry and not be a major maintenance item. Mr. Odegaard maintained items in the Department of Game projects were not adding to recreational opportunity and were, in fact, reconstruction of existing boat ramp and redevelopment of parking areas. The Chairman asked the Administrator to make note of the problem discussed and be prepared to discuss it further with the Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME PROJECTS NOTED ON PAGE 16 OF THESE MINUTES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, 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 THE PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Lewis Bell asked whether staff had considered if these items could have been taken care of through normal maintenance of the sites. Discussions held with the Department of Game to clarify these items was then explained by Mr. Syverson. At this point, Mr. Crouse agreed that Outdoor Recreation Account monies should not be used for maintenance of projects and suggested that the Department of Game staff review these specific projects to determine if items in question could be considered part of development rather than maintenance.

Mr. Francis noted certain local projects had been approved recently calling for re-development of parks or upgrading of existing facilities to provide additional recreational opportunity (City of Seattle, Atlantic Park and City of Colfax, Schmuck Park). Mr. Odegaard suggested the projects be deferred until the Department of Game had had a chance to re-review them. Mr. Lofgren then asked if the Department of Game would be willing to withdraw any of the projects; Mr. Crouse replied he would rather see them approved and more careful screening take place on all future Game Department projects. The Administrator suggested the approval of the projects be conditioned upon further review regarding resolution of the maintenance versus new construction problem.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, TO AMEND THE MOTION STATED BY MR. ODEGAARD, APPROVING THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME PROJECTS AS NOTED ON PAGE 16 OF THESE MINUTES WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME WILL FURTHER REVIEW THESE PROJECTS TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE OF MAINTENANCE ITEMS VERSUS NEW CONSTRUCTION ITEMS AS INCLUDED IN SPECIFIC PROJECTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME PROJECTS APPROVED MAY 29-30, 1973

Acq. or Dev.	Project	Ref. 18	LWCF	Init. 215	Total
Acq.	Skagit WRA	\$ 42,500	\$ 42,500	\$	\$ 85,000
Acq.	Skagit River	-	1,600	1,600	3,200
Acq.	Bass Lake	-	-	500	500
Acq.	Scatter Creek WRA	26,000	26,000	-	52,000
Acq.	Toutle River	1,320	-	-	1,320
Acq.	Toutle River	12,100	12,100	-	24,200
Acq.	Wenatchee River	250	-	-	250
Acq.	Wenatchee River	250	-	-	250
Acq.	Entiat River	500	-	-	500
Acq.	Desert WRA	2,800	2,800	-	5,600
Acq.	Gloyd WRA	18,700	18,700	-	37,400
Acq.	Gloyd WRA	16,500	16,500	-	33,000
	(Sub total)	\$120,920	\$120,200	\$ 2,100	\$243,220
Dev.	Hoh River	17,394	17,394	-	34,788
Dev.	Big Quilcene River	4,347	4,347	-	8,694
Dev.	Bogachiel River	15,984	15,984	-	31,968
Dev.	Chehalis River	11,532	11,532	-	23,064
Dev.	Nooksack River	6,740	6,740	-	13,480
Dev.	Skagit River	13,710	13,710	-	27,420
Dev.	Skagit River	12,911	12,911	-	25,822
Dev.	Wildcat Lake	6,974	6,974	-	13,948
Dev.	Lake Stevens	-	9,497	9,497	18,994
Dev.	Skykomish River	20,877	20,877	-	41,754
Dev.	Skokomish River	5,020	5,020	-	10,040
Dev.	Black Lake	18,228	18,228	-	36,456
	(Sub total)	\$133,717	\$143,214	\$ 9,497	\$286,428
	Grand total (12 Acq. 12 Dev.)	\$254,637	\$263,414	\$ 11,597	\$529,648

TOTAL APPROVED: \$ 529,648

2. Department of Natural Resources: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, "Department of Natural Resources - 71-73 Capital Budget". DNR had requested by letter April 25, 1973, approval to reassign \$60,355 of the \$225,000 Referendum 18 funds originally budgeted for the Sultan Basin Road Project (which was withdrawn by IAC approval on February 26, 1973) to meet cost over-runs on six development projects within the Sultan-Pilchuck Multiple-Use Areas, as noted in the memorandum and included in the motion below.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS REQUESTED APPROVAL TO REASSIGN \$60,355 REFERENDUM 18 FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE SULTAN BASIN ROAD PROJECT TO MEET COST OVER-RUNS ON SIX DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE SULTAN BASIN MULTIPLE-USE AREA, AND

WHEREAS, THE REASSIGNING OF THESE FUNDS IS IN KEEPING WITH THE INTEREST OF THE 1971-73 CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AS ADOPTED BY THE IAC,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE REQUEST TO REASSIGN \$60,355 REFERENDUM 18 FUNDS TO MEET COST OVER-RUNS FOR SIX DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE SULTAN-PILCHUCK MULTIPLE-USE AREA IS HEREBY APPROVED.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

	<u>Amount</u> <u>Budgeted</u>	<u>Current</u> <u>Estimate</u>	<u>Overrun</u>
Upper Ashland Lake Dev.	\$ 15,740	\$ 25,240	\$ 9,500
Lower Ashland Lake Dev.	8,946	18,008	9,062
Beaver Plant Lake Dev.	8,089	17,089	9,000
Cutthroat Lake Dev.	27,600	34,522	6,922
Reflection Ponds Dev.	18,500	41,817	23,317
Greider Lake Dev.	10,000	12,554	2,554
	<u>\$ 88,875</u>	<u>\$149,230</u>	<u>\$ 60,355</u>

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Lloyd Bell, speaking in behalf of Director Bert Cole, Department of Natural Resources, stated that the Pilchuck area is the center of continued land use complex having to do with watershed multiple-use principles of DNR. In answer to the question of Mr. Lewis Bell having to do with DNR's intention of use on the Upper Basin site, Mr. Lloyd Bell stated DNR is willing to modify its outdoor recreation area plans in the Sultan Basin based upon the result of a meeting held with the Department of Social and Health Services, the City of Everett, and Snohomish County officials. Emanating from this meeting will be a statement from DNR stating after this funding session, DNR will ask for no more facilities placed in the Basin if the City of Everett comes forward with a firm plan, including the funding, to place its secondary filtration plant in operation by 1980. DNR believes that this negotiation will be favorably received and it has notification from the Department of Social and Health Services that that Department is working with the City of Everett to move toward a 1980 date for a functioning filtration plant.

Looking at the projects individually, Mr. Lloyd Bell stated they would now suit the

new plan outlined and DNR would not be placing any camping on the Upper Basin site until about 1980 or, earlier if the filtration plant is in place, subject to the City of Everett's concurrence and cooperation in building the required filtration plant.

amended of staff
(1) Chehalis Valley Vista: Slides were shown of each project. Mr. Odegaard remarked on the comments on the resume re Chehalis Valley Vista, which indicated that the property is located in the center of a recent clear-cut area, detracting from its native beauty. Mr. Syverson replied that the site has since been reseeded and replanted some years ago, and the Department of Natural Resources has given assurance that some of the new planting will be trimmed and cut back to make the vista useable to the public, but that no major clear-cutting will be done in the area. Mr. Odegaard felt the site if not attractive should perhaps not be considered for funding at this time. Mr. Lloyd Bell then explained the clear-cutting policies of the Department of Natural Resources, and stated the site would be an educational one in that the public could view a multiple-use area and learn the various steps entailed in clear-cutting and regeneration of the forests.

The fifty year lease basis in these projects, as well as other DNR projects, was then raised by Mr. Odegaard, and the fact that it was not his understanding at any time that DNR would clearcut the timber on land purchased by Outdoor Recreation Account funds.

(2) Bald Mt. Vista: A similar discussion was held regarding the Bald Mt. Vista area. Mr. Odegaard felt the lease of the land still gives the Department of Natural Resources the right to clear-cut and remove timber, and DNR also retains the mineral rights. Mr. Lewis Bell agreed with Mr. Odegaard, whereupon Mr. Al O'Donnell of DNR, pointed out that the primary use of the area will be maintained for public recreation and every other type of management of the land must be consistent and complimentary to that purpose. It was his feeling adequate precautions are within the lease agreement itself to maintain the land for recreational purposes, and that the lease agreement has been used for several years on Outdoor Recreation Account projects.

Mr. Odegaard then inquired whether DNR received permission from the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation prior to clear-cutting land purchased with Outdoor Recreation Account funds. Mr. Francis replied he was not familiar with this aspect of the lease and that he would need to meet with DNR and review the various clauses within the lease agreements. However, he felt there were adequate precautions within the lease up to the present time and there had been no difficulties in the past in regard to the terms therein.

(3) Point Lawrence: Management of the site was questioned by Mr. Odegaard. The site is in the San Juans area and as such will present a maintenance problem which he felt DNR might not be able to provide in a primitive camping situation. Mr. Lloyd Bell briefly outlined the DNR tidelands access program, and noted that projects presently being viewed by the Committee had all been previously approved within the overall DNR Capital Budget program for primitive camping sites at total cost of \$450,000. Sites have now been located and DNR will be presenting these to the Committee for final review prior to expenditure of the funds. Mr. Syverson answered Mr. Odegaard's question and stated the IAC staff had not taken into consideration the aspect of which state agency could best carry out the project.

(4) Upper Ashland Lake: Mr. Bell asked if it were possible for DNR to log the

timber on the Upper Ashland Lake site without violating the lease agreement. Mr. Francis and Mr. Lloyd Bell replied it was, but that it was highly improbable because the land would be under recreation use, and the agreement states the land will be managed in this manner for a period of fifty years. Mr. Lew Bell's questions will also be researched at the time the Administrator discusses the lease agreements to insure a clause protecting the IAC for the lifetime of the lease from removal of timber and other matters. *amended*

(5) Cattle Point: *from DNR* Mr. Odegaard questioned having pull-through camp loops in a primitive camping site. He stated some years ago the Cattle Point site had been on a lease arrangement *San Juan County for a county park* through State Parks to DNR, which had subsequently been cancelled in order that the San Juan County could have the park. However, they were unable to pay the lease and DNR has now decided to develop the site. Mr. Odegaard felt (1) the County could apply for the Outdoor Recreation funds rather than the Department of Natural Resources, (2) a wider strip for access to the tidelands would be necessary than that planned, and (3) because of the pull-through camp loops, the site might not be classified as primitive.

Mr. Francis was not able to respond to the situation regarding the relationship of the County, DNR and the State Parks Department regarding leasing of the land and development of it since this point had not been brought out at the time of the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Francis felt a camping site having no electricity, sewer disposal or water supply would be classified as a primitive camping site; however, there is no definition of "primitive camping site" as such included in the DNR enabling legislation, SCOPR or the Procedural Guidelines.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Odegaard why he had some reluctance in DNR's being involved in a primitive camping program, noting that as long as the IAC protects the management of these types of areas in the best manner for the use of recreationists overnight, it is the obligation of the IAC to so provide them. Mr. Odegaard stated there was a need for more background information on this particular site and the primitive camping program of DNR. Whereupon Mr. Bishop stated it is the responsibility of the IAC to insure primitive camping areas are available for the public's use. Mr. Lewis Bell pointed out it is the purpose of the IAC to make additional facilities available for the public's use, but the taking of trees from the recreational areas was of concern to him. The fact that DNR is proposing in its lease agreement the same authority on these projects as it has had on projects which have come before the Committee before, was brought out by Mr. Francis. There has been no change in the leases and DNR has not mismanaged any land it has obtained through the Outdoor Recreation Account up to this time. The Chairman requested Mr. Francis to follow up on the review of the DNR leases, and report back to the Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE PROJECTS LISTED ON PAGE 20 OF THESE MINUTES 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 FEBRUARY 26, 1973, 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.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Crouse suggested if a major change had been made in the method of reviewing and selecting DNR projects, then the matter should be carefully reviewed. However, he did not feel this was the case, and that DNR had followed the usual procedure in bringing its projects before the Interagency Committee for consideration and approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO DELETE THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' APPROVED PROJECTS OF THIS FUNDING SESSION:

CHEHALIS VALLEY VISTA	ACQUISITION	\$ 914.00
MYSTIC FALLS	ACQUISITION	22,842.00
POINT LAWRENCE	ACQUISITION	53,491.00
CATTLE POINT (STAGE 1)	DEVELOPMENT	50,868.00

AND THAT THESE FOUR PROJECTS BE CONSIDERED SEPARATELY BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.

THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION TO APPROVE ALL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' PROJECTS. MR. ODEGAARD VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE ~~REITERATING HIS DISAPPROVAL OF THE FOUR SITES: CHEHALIS VALLEY VISTA; MYSTIC FALLS; POINT LAWRENCE; AND CATTLE POINT (STAGE 1), AND HIS DESIRE TO HAVE THEM REVIEWED SEPARATELY BY THE COMMITTEE.~~

amended
reiterating his desire to have

THE MOTION FOR APPROVAL WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECTS
APPROVED MAY 29-30, 1973

Acquisition or Development	Project	Ref. 18	Init. 215	LWCF	Total
Acq.	Upper Basin	\$ 5,710	-	-	\$ 5,710
Acq.	Chehalis Valley Vista	457	-	\$ 457	914
Acq.	Bald Point Vista	3,807	-	3,807	7,614
Acq.	Mystic Falls	11,421	-	11,421	22,842
Acq.	Point Lawrence	26,745.50	-	26,745.50	53,491
Acq.	Center Island	-	\$ 29,000	29,000	58,000
Dev.	Upper Ashland Lake	25,240	-	-	25,240
Dev.	Lower Ashland Lake	18,008	-	-	18,008
Dev.	Beaver Plant Lake	17,089	-	-	17,089
Dev.	Cutthroat Lake	34,522	-	-	34,522

(CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

Dev.	Reflection Ponds	41,817	-	-	41,817
Dev.	Howell Lake	10,546	-	10,546	21,092
Dev.	Cattle Point (Stage 1)	25,434	-	25,434	50,868
Dev.	R. F. Kennedy Dock	14,360	←	14,360	28,720
Dev.	Cedar Creek Road	69,000	-	-	69,000
Dev.	Sherman Valley Road	<u>60,950</u>	-	-	<u>60,950</u>
TOTALS		\$350,746.50	\$43,360	\$121,770.50	\$515,877

TOTAL APPROVED: \$ 515,877

The Chairman then deviated from the agenda and called for agenda items VIII, VI, and VII.

VIII. IAC Meetings:

A. Local and Date of July, 1973 meeting: Mr. Martin reported on the proposed change in date of the July 1973 meeting as indicated in memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973. Due to conflict in meeting dates of other organizations and agencies, the July date originally scheduled July 23-24 was proposed to be changed to July 30-31, 1973, in the same location - Bellingham.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MR. BELL, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEET IN BELLINGHAM ON JULY 30-31, 1973. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

B. Change in date of October, 1973 meeting: Mr. Martin referred to memorandum of staff dated May 29, 1973, concerning change in date of the October, 1973 meeting. Again, due to conflict with another organization's annual meeting date, the October 23-24, 1973 meeting was proposed for scheduling to October 29-30, 1973, in Spokane.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEET IN SPOKANE ON OCTOBER 29-30, 1973. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

VI. Administrator's Report: Mr. Francis reported on the following highlights of the IAC administration and coordination over the past few months.

(a) Tri-State Demonstration Project: \$4 million has been provided through Congress to purchase certain in-holdings in the Wallowa-Whitman - Nez Perce National Forests. Lands are now in United States Forest Service possession with negotiations presently being carried on with the Department of Justice and the land-owners in order that a final price may be set.

(b) Mercer Slough - City of Bellevue/State Parks: Documentation is being readied for submission of the Mercer Slough application to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. A change in the BOR procedure regarding Contingency Projects was briefly discussed by Mr. Francis. These types of projects are now held and reviewed on a

quarterly basis at a meeting of the Regional Director after being sent to Washington, D.C. It will therefore now take one year to fifteen months before notification is received back to a state whether BOR is interested in promoting the contingency project.

(c) Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Liaison meetings: Liaison officers of Idaho, Oregon and Washington now contact one another through bi-weekly conference call system with Maurice Lundy, Regional Director of BOR, Seattle, which provides all with the opportunity to present any problems, questions, or discuss topics currently under review in the outdoor recreation field. Informal meeting was held recently in the State of Washington with James Watt, Director, BOR, Washington, D.C., and liaison officers with Mr. Lundy in attendance. Contingency monies were discussed at that time also. Use of Land and Water Conservation Funds for indoor facilities has been a subject. Possibility of amendments to the Land and Water Conservation fund law calling for a split of "up to 50%" were called to the attention of the Committee. Mr. Odegaard and Mr. Crouse felt the law should not be changed, but should remain at the same 50% level - state and local.

(d) Administrative action within IAC:

- (1) IAC man-year maximum is 18; 17 presently on board; one man-year short;
- (2) Planning and Coordination Section has moved into the vacated offices of the Arts Commission within the present IAC building complex.
- (3) Reorganization of staff within the agency has provided two clerk-typists immediately under direction and supervision of the Projects Section; one clerk-typist directly under supervision of the Planning and Coordination Section. This has enabled more direct communication with staff and has been found to be more expeditious in handling the workload of the respective divisions.
- (4) IAC billings: Responsibility for clearance of billings has been placed within the Project Section, enabling Accounting and Projects to expedite payment of billings.
- (5) Project Officers have been assigned to various sections of the state working on a district basis to give continuity to project administration.
- (6) Reclassification of positions: Administrator is presently negotiating with the Department of Personnel to upgrade Recreation Resource Specialists series to provide a Recreation Resource Specialist IV position, and to set up an entry position of Recreation Resource Specialist I.
- (7) Report - State Financing for Water Related Facilities - This report was mailed out by the Administrator to all Interagency Committee members. Mr. Don Peterson, Legislative Budget Committee, and his staff collaborated on the report. IAC had input and assisted in computation tables. The report contains a comprehensive review of the sources and amounts of public funds which have been invested over the last decade in the state program for acquisition and development of pleasure boating facilities. Based upon this report, the Legislative Budget Committee is recommending enactment of legislation which would eliminate refunds of marine fuel taxes in this state and make these monies available for acquisition and development of needed pleasure boating facilities (House Bill 87).

Following Mr. Francis' report, Mr. Crouse inquired about the BOR Nationwide Plan, stating it was his opinion the plan should not be too definitive, to allow leeway in which the state agencies would be able to operate. Mr. Francis replied this was the intent, however, the "missing" chapter on "Summary of Findings and Recommendations" was important and a draft has now been received which is currently under study by the IAC. This chapter, however, is in very broad terms and will not handicap the IAC in working within the recommendations of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. Lofgren inquired how the reclassification of the Recreation Resource Specialist positions would be handled. Mr. Francis stated the positions are already in the IAC budget and presently there are two Recreation Resource Specialist II's unfilled; one of these positions will be reclassified to a Rec. Res. Specialist IV and the other will drop to a Rec. Res. Specialist I, for the entry position.

In response to questions from Mr. Odegaard and Mr. Lofgren, Mr. Francis stated the Planning and Coordination Section would have a change in thrust in that personnel would be assisting local agencies with updating of their Comprehensive Plans in addition to responsibilities entailed on SCORP, Rivers Study and the Trails Program. No other special studies are contemplated by the IAC other than the socio-economic study and the Wolf Bauer accretion beaches study. Funds for these are available and activities of staff will not deter the other on-going work of the IAC (grant-in-aid projects, planning, etc.). The IAC will continue to need full staffing in order to handle adequately the time involved in the proper administration of projects. The backlog of projects (mostly development) is being taken care of and staff is now able to devote more time to project administration and completion of many actions necessary to close out projects and finalize billings.

Chairman Lofgren introduced Honorable Pat Patterson, Representative, Washington State Legislature.

VII. Committee Member Reports: There being no Committee member reports, the Chairman recessed the May meeting until 9:00 a.m., May 30, 1973, Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY MAY 30, 1973

Chairman Lofgren called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and called upon Roger Syverson for Local Project presentations.

IV. Local Project Presentations: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 20, 1973, "Local Project Considerations", noting that 45 local agency projects had been processed by the staff during the past quarter with 21 project applications having been held over from the November, 1972 IAC meeting. Six of these applications were withdrawn; ten were found to be technically incomplete and were returned to the local sponsors for submittal at a later date.

Twenty-nine (29) projects were technically complete and 17 of these recommended by staff committing IAC dollars in the amount of \$2,281,000. If approved, staff recommended the following funding:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>CURRENT BALANCE</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REMAINING BALANCE</u>
Initiative 215	\$ 95,152.00	\$ - 0 -	\$ 95,152.00
Ref. 11/18	242,722.01	242,722.01	- 0 -
LWCF	293,618.35	287,921.00	5,697.35
Ref. 28	<u>1,932,625.00</u>	<u>1,750,356.99</u>	<u>182,268.01</u>
Totals	\$ 2,564,117.36	\$ 2,281,000.00	\$ 283,117.36

Priority classification of the 29 projects was explained by Mr. Syverson as noted

In Table I of the memorandum. Table II indicated the 17 projects recommended for approval by staff. Mr. Syverson also briefly commented upon the Action Conformance Report, Local Agencies, 1971-73 Biennium, which indicated in all 13 regions of the state \$15,204,691 for Development (76%) and \$4,841,195 for Acquisition (24%).

Slides were shown of the local projects and explanations given by Project staff. Specific comments on some of the projects were as follows:

Kitsap County, Salisbury Park: Mr. Odegaard questioned whether project staff in approving an acquisition project is cognizant of the future development plans of the site. Mr. Syverson replied staff does require that the agency advise the IAC of the intended use of the site. Schematic plans may accompany applications or are reviewed at a meeting with IAC staff.

Ilwaco, Waterfront Park: Mr. Odegaard inquired concerning the difference in cost for site preparation on the City of Raymond, Raymond City Playfield, site (\$34,124) and the Ilwaco, Waterfront Park site (\$750.00). Fred Wagner, Project Officer, replied the City of Ilwaco will be doing much of the site preparation work and will therefore be able to keep within the \$750.00 cost. Mr. Lewis Bell asked if the IAC staff used a standard figure for the cost of tennis courts. Roger Syverson stated this cost varies in relation to the type of court being developed, i.e., cement, asphalt, etc. Also, whether or not there is lighting for the court creates a difference in cost.

City of Brier, Brier Park Development: In answer to questions from Mr. Odegaard, Kathy Scott stated this project would require \$7,100 in landscaping costs to make it a viable project since present forestation on the site is in poor condition.

King County, Marymoor Park Phase III: Difference in costs for the ball fields in this project were questioned by Mr. Lofgren. Mr. Moore stated the county must provide drainage in a certain area of the project and surface the land with about two feet of top soil to provide a top grade baseball field. The other fields receive different type of activity and do not require as much money to develop as the baseball field.

City of Auburn, Brannan Park I: Mr. Lewis Bell questioned the need for ball fields in addition to that provided by the School. Mr. Syverson stated the tennis courts and ball fields are all open to the public and there is very little duplication of school facilities. The school itself has only a softball field.

City of Okanogan, Okanogan Swimming Pool: There was discussion concerning the need for a swimming pool in the Okanogan area, and the Administrator pointed out this swimming pool when completed would be the only pool available to the public. The previous pool had been rendered unsafe by a recent flood.

City of Olympia, Morse-Merryman Park: Mr. Bishop inquired whether the value of the land was reflected in the local share of 25%, and was informed there was approximately \$8,000 from the City of Olympia added to the local share to make up the 25%, the rest being donation. A private association is donating \$44,500 in land value and \$20,000 in cash to this project. In response to Mrs. Lemere's question, the Committee was informed the Assistant Attorney General had rendered an opinion in regard to the donation of the land and legality of IAC involvement in the project.

Following presentation of City of Bellevue's Hillaire Neighborhood Park, Honorable James Dunn, Mayor of the City of Pullman, asked for an explanation of the Committee's

procedure in evaluating and processing local applications to place them in a recommended or not recommended category. Mr. Lofgren outlined the various categories in which the projects were placed and staff analysis procedure in reviewing the projects for the Committee prior to presentation.

City of Olympia, Woodruff Park: Mr. Odegaard raised the question on the development of this park and others which might fall in the same category. Some redevelopment is noted in this particular project -- and there are four tennis courts within the project which would be redeveloped. The costs of these tennis courts differed from that shown in other local projects. Mr. Odegaard suggested that some cities (local governments) might be constructing tennis courts at a lower cost, but in the long run these courts might not last as long and require extensive maintenance work later. It was his contention and concern that local governments consider maintenance of tennis courts and other such facilities as well as the cost involved in construction of them. It might be well to have a better facility placed within the project the first time around.

Clark County - Cascade Park Development: Staff reported this project was not recommended. Mr. Odegaard then questioned whether IAC staff favors those projects having donation of land within them so that such opportunity will not be lost for use of that land as a park and recreation area. Mr. Syverson pointed out that each project is evaluated within its priority category and there are other factors besides donation taken into account. All projects must vie with others within the priority given to them, and this project ranked lowest within that priority. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Odegaard, Mr. Douglas Bridges, Park and Recreation Director, Clark County, stated the land would still be available for development as a park at a later date; that there was no time limit on the donation; and the park would be developed later by Clark County in some way.

Port Angeles, Westend Park Phase II: Mr. Fred Wagner reported on this project, stating it was not being recommended by staff at this time. Mr. Lofgren recognized Mr. Richard Mullins, Park and Recreation Director, City of Port Angeles, who distributed a statement to the Interagency Committee outlining the need for the park and the history of the acquisition of the land since 1944. Total value of the acquisition thus far is \$193,099 -- all without the use of Outdoor Recreation Funds. In February 1972 \$129,937.50 in development funds were approved by the IAC for Phase I. Since that time the City was not able to award the bid within the funds allowed. Consequently, modification, redesign and a Phase II application resulted from conferences with IAC staff. Mr. Mullins urged the Committee's review of Phase II application for the Westend Park to meet the needs of the Port Angeles area.

Mr. Bert Cole asked why IAC staff did not recommend the project. Mr. Syverson stated the first phase funded a year ago was to be a complete viable unit. IAC staff at that time understood that the only reason the total site had not been included was that all land was not available for purchase by the City. The second phase was then brought to the IAC staff and it was discerned that the Phase II project was really not a viable unit. Also there were items in the Phase II project which were in the Phase I. Therefore, IAC staff required more information regarding the changes in the second phase before any recommendation could be made to the Committee. Also, Mr. Syverson stated, the Phase II project ranked lower in the evaluation criteria system, with other projects in the same category.

Mr. Mullins explained the position of Port Angeles and noted the number of hours spent in conferring with IAC staff in order to make Westend Park a viable project so

that the project would stand on its own merits. Alternates necessary were decided upon and discussed with IAC staff. Mr. Francis stated the bids for the Phase I project had been higher than the contingency allowed within the project, therefore Port Angeles had come back to the IAC with a different project entirely. Mr. Bert Cole inquired whether staff felt the project now is being proposed for more funding than should be allocated to the Port Angeles region. Mr. Francis replied this was not the problem, that there were sufficient monies programmed into Region I to cover the project. The IAC staff was concerned with a situation where a portion of a Phase I project which had been approved was now coming in under a Phase II proposal; whereas, it had been anticipated that the Phase II project would involve a minor amount of funds to cover such items as tennis courts, parking, etc. Elements within the Phase II project are actually those which should have been taken care of under Phase I, as approved previously by the IAC.

Mr. Bert Cole at this point remarked that the Port Angeles recreation agency is just beginning to indicate to the public in that area its concern for recreational sites and it has now become a community which would be supportive of the IAC program. He felt probably because of lack of experience the Port Angeles project coordinators perhaps had not make sufficient plans. He hoped there might be consideration given by the Committee members to the project as presented by the City of Port Angeles. He felt if funds were available, the project should be recommended by the Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE WESTEND PROJECT OF CITY OF PORT ANGELES BE APPROVED FOR FUNDING BY THE IAC.

The Chairman then asked that the motion be held in abeyance until completion of project presentations by IAC staff. Mr. Bert Cole acknowledged and concurred in the Chairman's suggestions. MOTION WAS HELD IN ABEYANCE.

Mr. Francis then pointed out that Mr. Dick Mullins of Port Angeles is a full-time park and recreation director and a professional; that the Westend Park project did have professional assistance in the drawing of park plans; and that the architects also were professionals but had apparently misjudged the costs on the Port Angeles project.

City of Yakima, Lion's Swimming Pool: Mrs. Lemere asked that the resume for the City of Yakima Lion's Swimming Pool be corrected to indicate the project had come before the Committee before. In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. William Hutsinpillar stated there was a definite need for the facility even though there were five other pools in other locations in Yakima accessible to the public. Mr. Francis felt the need in the City of Yakima for swimming pools was not as great as that of other communities requesting swimming pools for their localities, i.e., Okanogan, Cathlamet. Mr. Biggs then pointed out population of a given area and the needs of the people for recreational facilities in that area should also be taken into consideration. Mr. Syverson stated the projects not recommended by staff at this funding session were not necessarily projects of no value or merit. Due to limited funding available from the IAC, the dollar amount for projects became a factor staff took into consideration in its evaluation criteria of the 29 eligible projects. Mr. Biggs asked that the Yakima Swimming Pool project be set aside for individual discussion following review of the local projects. The Chairman so ordered.

Clark County, Vancouver Lake: In response to Mr. Biggs' inquiry, Mrs. Kathy Scott stated that the Port of Vancouver has been advised of the project plans in that area and has agreed with the proposal of Clark County regarding the donation and use of the 112 acres in this particular project.

King County, Luther Burbank Park II: Mrs. Lemere inquired whether it would be possible to use Initiative 215 funds in this project and was informed the project was strictly for day-use only. The project was not recommended by staff, and Mr. Biggs expressed his concern about recreational sites of this type and the great need to continue development through the IAC funding program so that the facility would be complete and useful to the people. He stated the value of the facility was great and its potential should not be lost without IAC staff knowing what its future interest would be in the project. Mr. Francis explained there were five projects in category of Priority III in which Luther Burbank Park Phase II was considered. Due to limited funding ability, staff was unable to include it in the recommendations and approved two out of the five projects for referral to the Committee -- projects which were considered of greater need in their respective areas at this time. He noted that local agencies may return to the IAC with projects for consideration. Staff was aware of the full potential of the site and the entire development scheme, but each phase, Mr. Francis emphasized, must stand on its own.

Mr. Lewis Bell agreed with Mr. Biggs and proposed funding at a lesser percentage for local projects if such would assist in funding more projects -- 75% is IAC funding at this time, with local supplying 25%. Perhaps it would be better to have IAC participate at 50%, allowing funds to be given to more of the local projects. Mr. Lofgren stated the basic policy now of the IAC was to fund 75% on local projects. Mr. Bell replied rules and guidelines should be amended where applicable in order to assist some of the valuable projects shown at this meeting which had not been recommended by staff. Mr. Odegaard offered the assistance of State Parks' Outdoor Recreation Account funds in the Luther Burbank Project, stating he and his staff would be pleased to meet with King County to discuss placing Initiative 215 funds in the project. Mr. Francis was asked by the Chairman to coordinate a joint State Parks-King County project for the Luther Burbank site if such were feasible.

City of Lacey, Lacey Community Park: In response to inquiries of Mr. Bell and Mr. Biggs, Mr. Syverson stated the Procedural Guidelines provide policies and procedures concerning donations of land constituting a share of the local participation. Mr. Francis briefly explained this portion of the guidelines and Mr. Biggs asked that donation procedures be thoroughly spelled out in the 1973 Procedural Guidelines.

Cowlitz County, Harry Gardner Park: Following explanation of the project by Mrs. Scott, Bert Cole noted that the project is in a flood control zone and it might be possible the county could participate in obtaining federal or state flood control funds to assist the project. Mr. Lewis Bell agreed, stating 85% of the cost of the project might possibly be assisted through use of the flood control funds. Mr. Biggs pointed out there was an application pending on this site for a sewage disposal system, and he suggested the project be set aside for separate review; the Chairman so ordered.

Lewis County, Mayfield Lake Park, Phase II: In response to Mr. Bert Cole's question, Fred Wagner stated that the City of Tacoma has not yet met its responsibilities for recreational development on Mayfield Lake. The project was not recommended by staff.

Snohomish County, North County Saltwater Park: Staff reported this project was not being recommended and that the County should consider using its revenue bonds on this particular site. The project has been divided into three separate types of development. The entire site was evaluated in Category 7 as a regional facility because of its size. Mr. Bell inquired if the golf course was actually needed in

that area. Mr. Syverson replied it would serve a good purpose and is needed, but staff felt it was a little premature to build the golf course at this time. However, if the golf course were put in, it would generate enough money to pay off revenue bonds. Mr. Bell then suggested this project be considered separately and the chairman so ordered.

Recess was declared at 12:10. Upon reconvening at 1:30 p.m, Chairman Lofgren declared an Open Hearing under the Administrative Procedures Act which would follow the continuation of presentation of local projects.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LEWIS BELL THAT FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING ONLY, THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE DEVIATE FROM ITS GUIDELINES AND CONSIDER FUNDING LOCAL PROJECTS AT A 50% LEVEL RATHER THAN 75%; AND THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES BE ENCOURAGED TO USE THEIR REVENUE SHARING FUNDS OR OTHER FUNDS AT THEIR DISPOSAL TO AUGMENT THAT BALANCE WHICH THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WOULD HAVE FUNDED TODAY.

In support of his motion, he called attention of the Committee to the fact that each and all of the local agency applicants now have federal funds by way of revenue sharing which they did not have before and which in some respects is in lieu of federal matching funding (such as HUD). He felt that \$700,000 would be available to match with other projects not recommended at this meeting by passage of his motion.

MR. BIGGS THEN SECONDED THE MOTION following Mr. Bell's motion.

Mrs. Lemere inquired what would happen to local agencies who had built their applications upon the fact of 75% funding. Discussion followed.

Mr. Francis stated 75% funding had been the policy for local agencies and that staff was not prepared to speak for any applicant agency, either those recommended or those not recommended, to meet the additional 25% which would be required under Mr. Bell's motion. He stressed there might be some very serious problems created with local agency applications in meeting this loss of percentage due to prior local agency budget commitments.

Mr. Biggs stated even though he had seconded the motion he, too, could see some similar basic problems and questions evolving from this change in funding. He had serious questions as to what this would do to the continuity of the IAC Funding. If this would change IAC Funding policy permanently, further deliberations on the part of the IAC members would be needed to resolve the problem. He felt Mr. Bell's motion was logical and appropriate, but further clarification of what this would do to the current policy was needed.

Mr. Bishop stated if this were to become a basic policy, it should be considered as a direction to the staff for projects coming to the IAC at a later time, but not at this meeting. Most of the local agencies have their funding programs all set up, the IAC staff has arranged the priorities and the funding for consideration of the Committee, and therefore Mr. Bishop did not feel IAC should adopt a policy on those projects currently before the Committee. He asked that staff be directed to make a study on this type of "new policy" and come up with recommendations to the IAC at a special meeting. It could then be decided whether such a change in procedure would be in the best interests of local agencies and the IAC.

At this point Mr. Odegaard asked from Mr. Kenn Cole the funding figures for local

agencies in 1973-74. Both Mr. Francis and Mr. Kenn Cole replied. Mr. Cole stressed that the IAC would be restricted from using BOR money which hasn't yet been made available to the IAC in Fiscal 1974. Mr. Odegaard then suggested that IAC fund with the BOR funds in mind which are on tap and those which will be on tap in the future. Mr. Francis replied it was not possible to fund against BOR monies because it is unknown how much in BOR funds will be allocated to the State of Washington. Congress may restore monies to the states in 1975 under the apportionment formula, but advance funding against BOR is not advisable.

Mr. Crouse pointed out that 70% of the IAC funds for local agencies will be committed at this meeting, leaving only 30% for the rest of FY 1974. Mr. Biggs, Mr. Bell and Mr. Odegaard, then queried Mr. Kenn Cole concerning the fiscal 74 funds. Mr. Kenn Cole explained to the Committee that \$11 million in the funding includes All-Terrain Vehicle Funds; \$2,281,000 plus about \$1 million is the first year money from the Outdoor Recreation Account excluding the All-Terrain Vehicle funds.

Mrs. Blaisdell was then recognized by the Chairman and stated that local agencies have already allocated their revenue sharing monies in their budgets, and know where these funds will be spent within the local agency. She felt if local agencies were asked now to reconsider their funding in their applications and find monies to compensate for that which IAC would not fund, it would be most difficult.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. BELL VOTED "YES". THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A MAJORITY VOTE.

Stating the local agencies' message should not be ignored, Mr. Biggs asked that the local projects be reconsidered at a special meeting and that staff re-review them prior to that meeting. Mr. Francis felt this would place an undue hardship on the locals who had appeared at this meeting and who had submitted viable projects for consideration of the Committee. He felt this might create more problems than it would solve. He felt Mr. Bell's concern was adequately taken care of in the new Procedural Guidelines to be adopted by the Committee wherein it is stated that the IAC "may fund up to 75%" for local agencies, thus taking into consideration lesser funding in some instances for local agencies.

Mr. Biggs asked the Chairman what would happen if the IAC postponed decisions on all of the local projects presented for 30 to 45 days, and have staff come back with new recommendations for each project allocating within a 50% to 75% level. Mr. Francis stated the staff would have to work up a set of reasonable criteria to ascertain the financial capability on each local agency and to re-review the priorities.

Lewis Bell commented on the contingency fund figures within each project, and MOVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DELETE THE CONTINGENCY FUNDS INDICATED WITHIN EACH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND LEAVE IT UP TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE IAC AS TO WHETHER OR NOT A PROJECT WOULD BE ENTITLED TO HAVE MORE FUNDS; CHECKING THE ABILITY TO PAY FOR THE PROJECT OF EACH COMMUNITY; AND LOOKING OVER THE SITUATION OF EACH SPONSORING AGENCY'S FISCAL CAPABILITY THOROUGHLY.

MR. BIGGS SECONDED THE MOTION. Mr. Odegaard spoke against this motion, pointing out the construction costs involved in each project fluctuate with the financial climate and that it is necessary to have a contingency fund within each project to cover charges over and above those proposed at the time the project was funded through the IAC.

THE CHAIRMAN CALLED FOR A VOTE ON THE MOTION. MR. BELL AND MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THE MOTION FAILED TO CARRY DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY.

Mr. Odegaard then asked to have those projects not recommended considered first by the Committee and then consider those which had been recommended by staff. Mr. Bishop seriously objected to this kind of an approach, and MOVED TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROJECTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ONE PROJECT: COWLITZ COUNTY, HARRY GARDNER PARK. MRS. LEMERE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Discussion followed. Mr. Biggs stated he did not care for this type of an approach. Mr. Crouse felt the Committee had a commitment with the local agencies to discuss the projects submitted for Committee review. Mr. Biggs then stated if Mr. Bishop's motion prevailed, each project would receive the 75% funding and valuable projects not recommended to the Committee would be lost.

Chairman Lofgren recognized Mr. Ken Keeler of Poulsbo who asked if the motion passed would this not make superfluous any comments or remarks from groups or cities present at the meeting desiring to speak in behalf of their projects? Mr. Lofgren stated this was a correct assumption. However, local agencies having projects not recommended would be able to return in October for funding consideration. Mr. Bert Cole stated the monies on tap at that time would not be sufficient to fund these projects and also consider new projects at the same time.

Mr. Robert Anderson, Commerce and Economic Development Acting Director, stated he would rather see another meeting to review the projects.

QUESTIONS WAS CALLED FOR ON MR. BISHOP'S MOTION. BELL AND MRS. LEMERE VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THE MOTION FAILED TO CARRY DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY.

MR. ODEGAARD THEN MOVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONSIDER EACH OF THE LOCAL PROJECTS WHICH STAFF HAS NOT RECOMMENDED AND THOSE WHICH THE COMMITTEE APPROVES OVER THE RECOMMENDED REJECTION BY STAFF, BUT GIVEN THE MARK OF BEING WORKED INTO THE FUNDING FORMULA FOR 73-74; AND, FURTHER, AFTER THAT HAS BEEN DONE, THAT THE STAFF TAKE THE TOTAL APPROVED PROJECTS AND RETURN TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITH SUGGESTED PRIORITY OF THOSE PROJECTS WHICH CAN BE FUNDED IN 73-74.

Mr. Bell stated he had some projects which staff approved which he would have objection to, and he also had others which staff had rejected which he would like to have added for approval. He therefore felt the Committee ought to be allowed to remove those not desired and add those which were desired.

THERE WAS NO SECOND TO MR. ODEGAARD'S MOTION. THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

At this point, Mr. Biggs stated that he felt the staff had graded the applications on the basis of a climate they were not aware of at the time and a climate of which the Committee was not aware. This "financial climate" had now been brought before the Committee through discussion of the local agency projects, and therefore any recommended project at this point is not a fair effort because the limitations (financial resources) had not been taken into consideration. He felt it would be unfair to those agencies having projects not recommended to take action on them today because it would give them no chance at all in the foreseeable period of time for their projects to be started.

MR. BIGGS THEREFORE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ANDERSON, THAT THE CHAIRMAN RECONVENE A MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITHIN A PERIOD OF 30-45 DAYS AT THE DECISION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND THE ADMINISTRATOR AT A PLACE THEY DECIDE; AND

FURTHER, THAT THE LOCAL PROJECTS BEFORE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TODAY BE HELD IN ABEYANCE PRIOR TO THAT TIME WITHOUT ANY PREJUDICE; AND

FURTHER, THAT THE STAFF REVIEW AND RECOMMEND THE TOTAL LIST OF PROJECTS (THOSE RECOMMENDED AND THOSE NOT RECOMMENDED) AND RECOMMEND PRIORITIES TO THEM BASED UPON A FORMULA OF 50% TO 75%; WITH THE PROVISIO THAT PROJECT STAFF COMMUNICATE WITH THE APPLICANTS ON THE FINANCIAL SITUATIONS.

Mr. Odegaard noted that some of the local projects might go past the statutory time limit for permits and other legal matters which must be taken care of by local agencies. Also he felt there might be higher construction costs as a result of a 30-45 day delay, and some projects might lose acquisition of the site due to options which must be picked up soon. He felt it would be simpler to take the local projects, review them, determine what kinds of problems exist, and fund them if at all possible. He asked that the twelve projects on which there were differences of opinion be taken one at a time for discusson.

Mr. Biggs, however, felt his motion was a better alternative than acting almost arbitrarily on these projects.

Mrs. Lemere stated she was against Mr. Biggs' motion because the local agencies had brought their projects to the IAC in good faith, having met all of the rules and regulations for applying for grant-in-aid funds, and it was necessary now for the Interagency Committee to take action upon them. She said it would not be the first time in IAC history it had not been able to fund all of the projects before it because of lack of funds.

The secretary was then asked to re-read Mr. Biggs' motion. She was instructed to add "INCLUDED THEREIN WAS THE FACT THAT STAFF SHOULD COMMUNICATE WITH THE APPLICANTS TO FIND OUT WHAT THEIR SITUATION IS WITHIN THEIR FINANCIAL CLIMATE."

VOTE WAS THEN TAKEN ON THE MOTION. MR. BELL, MR. CROUSE, MR. BIGGS AND MR. ANDERSON VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE; MRS. LEMERE, MR. ODEGAARD, MR. LOFGREN, MR. COLE AND MR. BISHOP, VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY.

MR. BELL THEN MOVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADD TO THE PROJECTS ANY REJECTED PROJECTS THAT THE COMMITTEE WISHED TO HAVE ON THE APPROVED LIST, AND THEN THE COMMITTEE PROCEED TO DELETE FROM THE LIST OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS ANY PROJECTS WHICH THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FELT SHOULD BE DELETED AND HAVING ARRIVED AT AN AMENDED LIST OF PROJECTS, THE COMMITTEE VOTE THEREON.

MR. ODEGAARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Francis then re-explained the funding situation of the IAC: \$2,281,000 being recommended for expenditure at this meeting with approximately the following available in 1974:

\$	283,117.36	remaining balances
	310,000.00	Init. 215
	431,250.00	LWCF funding FY 1974
\$	<u>1,024,367.36</u>	Subsequent funding in 1974.

Mr. Bishop stated he did not feel the Committee should "sit in judgment" on the staff's recommendation, and he felt the Committee did not have enough information on the projects to proceed in the manner proposed by Mr. Bell, and he would therefore oppose the motion.

In speaking for the motion, Mr. Odegaard stated that (1) the Committee has no more knowledge about each project recommended than non-recommended and therefore could ask any questions equally; (2) if the Committee follows staff recommendation each time, it merely "rubber-stamps" the funding of local agency projects; and (3) over six to eight years, the IAC has deleted certain projects and inserted others which in the Committee's judgment were more worthy of funding; therefore he did not feel the motion of Mr. Bell was out of line.

The Chairman requested the motion be re-read by the secretary. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. ODEGAARD AND MR. BELL VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY.

Mr. Crouse stated there were many good projects he would like to see funded by the Committee, and asked to propose two motions.

MR. CROUSE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MR. BISHOP'S MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LOCAL PROJECTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF HARRY GARDNER PARK, COWLITZ COUNTY.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE, *and was based on Kenn Cole's statement that IAC would have over \$1,000,000 in funding.*

MR. CROUSE THEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE CHAIRMAN CALL A MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITHIN 30-45 DAYS FOR CONSIDERATION OF GUIDELINES FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF THE REMAINING MONEY IN 1974 AND AT THAT TIME THE COMMITTEE WILL ATTEMPT TO GIVE THE NECESSARY DIRECTION TO STAFF IN ORDER THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MAY FUND AT THE OCTOBER MEETING THE REMAINING AVAILABLE MONEY; AND FURTHER, THAT THE PROJECTS TURNED DOWN TODAY BY STAFF OR BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE TO BE HELD WITHIN 30-45 DAYS. *amended*

Mr. Crouse further explained that the projects turned down by the Committee today would be considered at the special session of the Committee including the ones recommended by staff at the present session. At this meeting Mr. Crouse explained, the Committee would be establishing guidelines for future local projects and percent of funding. Mr. Francis pointed out that if the Committee used additional IAC funds at the special session there would be no need to fund in October because there would be no monies left with which to fund. Mr. Crouse replied that in 30-45 days, the Committee should have an idea of how much money it would have, including possibly the federal funds. At that time he felt staff could recommend amounts and the Committee could adopt in any amount they would recommend.

Mr. Biggs then stated that the first motion passed had already funded the local projects (with the exception of Cowlitz County's Harry Gardner Park), and the Committee may have deprived some local agencies with very good projects of an opportunity to be heard by the Committee. He therefore felt the rules of the Committee had already been changed, though not officially.

In response to Mr. Lewis Bell's question on funding, Mr. Kenn Cole again gave the figures remaining for expenditure by the IAC.

Mr. Kenn Cole indicated there was some \$60,000 additional available for projects. The Chairman then recognized Mr. Martin Carty Cowlitz County, who stated his project was critically needed in this area and requested the Committee's further consideration.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. BIGGS AND MR. ANDERSON VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED THAT THE COWLITZ PROJECT (HARRY GARDNER PARK) BE APPROVED. THE MOTION DIED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.

Mr. Martin Carty of Cowlitz County was again recognized by the Chairman. Mr. Carty reported on the campers and trailers using the area and pointed out the great need for the development of day-use and overnight facilities in north Central Cowlitz County. The site is heavily used by fishermen and hunters as well as the general recreationist. Mr. Carty also reviewed permits obtained for this project.

Following Mr. Carty's presentation, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE COWLITZ COUNTY, HARRY GARDNER PARK, BE RECONSIDERED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR FUNDING AND APPROVED WITHIN THE LOCAL PROJECTS PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Biggs' motion and his opinions expressed regarding the Harry Gardner Park. He felt questions on the project concerning shoreline management permits, fisheries hydraulics permit and the flood control zone had been adequately answered. Mr. Bert Cole reiterated there should be funds within the flood control program to assist this project and he therefore would be opposed to its funding.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. BERT COLE AND MR. LEWIS BELL VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Odegaard then stated that since \$60,000 was available within the IAC funds as reported by Mr. Kenn Cole, that this money could be used for another project. HE THEREFORE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE PORT ANGELES, WESTEND PARK PROJECT TOTALING \$80,708 with \$60,531 FROM REFERENDUM 28 FUNDS, BE APPROVED FOR FUNDING.

Mr. Bishop inquired why this project should have preference over others which had been rejected. Mr. Odegaard explained it was a phase I and II project and it had merit with a higher priority than the other projects shown to the Committee. Since there were funds available in the amount of \$60,000 with which to fund this project, he felt it should receive funding. Mr. Dick Mullins, Park and Recreation Director, spoke in behalf of the project. Mrs. Blaisdell questioned funding this project over others of like need and asked where it ranked in the criteria of projects reviewed by staff. Mr. Fred Wagner reported the project was 14th out of 15 projects in its category.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MRS. LEMERE, MR. BISHOP AND MR. CROUSE OPPOSED FUNDING THE PROJECT. MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

BY ITS ACTION, THE COMMITTEE FOUND THE LOCAL PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 33 OF THESE MINUTES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AND AUTHORIZED THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT AGREEMENT INSTRUMENT WITH THE

Minutes
May 29-30 (June 22)
1973

REGION	SPONSOR	PROJECT	TOTAL COST	REF. 18	REF. 28	LWCF	HUD	LOCAL
XII	Spokane County	Little Spokane River	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 67,500.00	\$	\$	\$	\$ 22,500.00
IV	Kitsap County	Salisbury Point	152,000.00	114,000.00				38,000.00
			Priority I					
II	Raymond	City Playfield	137,775.00	61,222.01	42,109.24			34,443.75
II	Ilwaco	Waterfront Park	40,000.00		30,000.00			10,000.00
II	Airway Heights	Sunset Park II	60,000.00		15,000.00	30,000.00		15,000.00
IV	Brier	Brier Park I	66,990.00		50,242.50			16,747.50
IV	King County	Marymoor IIB	326,818.33		245,113.75			81,704.58
IV	Auburn	Brannan Park I	344,527.00		258,395.25			86,131.75
XI	Okanogan	Swimming Pool	267,635.00		66,908.75	133,817.50		66,908.75
V	Olympia	Morse Merryman	286,880.00		215,160.00			71,720.00
I	Pt. Angeles	Westend Park	80,708.00		60,531.00			20,177.00
			Priority III					
IV	Kitsap County	Wildcat Lake	137,211.00		102,908.25			34,302.75
VI	Clark County	Vancouver Lake I	590,292.00		442,719.00			147,573.00
			Priority V					
IV	Seattle	Brighton Park	385,794.00		96,448.50		192,897.	96,448.50
IV	Port Orchard	Tremont Park	11,500.00		8,625.00			2,875.00
XIII	Pullman	Palouse River	82,900.00		62,175.00			20,725.00
V	Lacey	Community Park II	70,000.00		52,500.00			17,500.00
			Priority VII					
VI	Cowlitz County	Harry Gardner Dev.	248,207.00		62,051.75	124,103.50		62,051.75
TOTALS			\$3,379,237.33	\$242,722.01	\$1,810,887.99	\$287,921	\$192,897.00	\$844,809.33

10 PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR INIT. 215 FUNDS

Total From Outdoor Recreation Account: \$ 2,341,531.00
 17.1% Acquisition: \$ 401,248.50
 82.9% Development: \$1,940,282.50

LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS 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.

Mr. Clyde Caldart of Poulsbo asked to have the motions concerning local projects clarified. Mr. Lofgren explained that the listing of projects as recommended by staff had been approved by the Committee with the addition of the Port Angeles Westend Park; that a meeting would be called within 30-45 days to review those projects which had not been recommended for evaluation of the Committee as to future funding; AND THAT APPLICANTS WILL RECEIVE AMPLE NOTIFICATION OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE IAC so that they may be represented. This will be a continuation of the May 1973 meeting of the IAC.

Mr. Biggs felt applicants having projects not recommended need to know the new guidelines concerning funding up to 75%. Mr. Francis repeated that these would be in the 1973 Procedural Guidelines which state funding may be "up to 75% with local agencies contributing at least 25%." Mr. Crouse and Mr. Biggs were assured their concerns in this regard would be taken care of and funding capabilities of the communities would be examined as well as other matters which they had brought up for discussion and consideration of the Committee.

Mrs. Blaisdell asked if it would be possible for local agencies to obtain waivers of retroactivity on development projects not recommended at the meeting. Mr. Francis replied such could be granted but there would be no guarantee that the local project would be funded by the IAC and therefore the local agency would be proceeding at its own risk.

MR. ODEGAARD THEN MOVED THAT LOCAL PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED AT THE SPECIAL MEETING BE GIVEN WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY.

Mrs. Lemere felt this was not necessary because this ruling was already in the Procedural Guidelines. Mr. Francis stated normally this is done by letter from the applicant. Mr. Kenn Cole pointed out the IAC could not fund any project having a state waiver against the BOR money. BOR will not grant waivers until they have the project application and information in their office and the project has been approved by the Committee.

Following this discussion, MR. ODEGAARD WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

The local agencies were asked by Mr. Lofgren to pick up their Project Agreements following the meeting. There were signed by the Administrator enabling local agencies to commence work on their projects immediately.

Mr. Lofgren reviewed the motions of the Committee once again for the benefit of the audience.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. BELL, TO CONTINUE THE HEARING ON THE TWO ELEMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT (PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AND ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE GUIDELINES) UNTIL JUNE 21ST; THAT SAID HEARING BE HELD IN OLYMPIA ON THAT DATE TO GIVE THE 20-DAY PERIOD NECESSARY FOR NOTIFICATION OF THE PUBLIC WHICH IS REQUIRED; AND THAT AT THAT MEETING THE COMMITTEE CONSIDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT ELEMENTS AND GUIDELINES NECESSARY FOR IMPLEMENTATION;

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE COMMITTEE UNDERTAKE TO REVIEW THE ELEVEN PROJECTS WHICH DID

NOT ACHIEVE RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE TODAY, AS WELL AS GUIDELINES ON FUNDING OF LOCAL PROJECTS AS STATED IN A PREVIOUS MOTION.

Mrs. Blaisdell informed the Committee of the convention of the Association of Washington Cities in Spokane, June 19-22, 1973.

MR. BISHOP THEREFORE CHANGED HIS MOTION TO READ "JUNE 22ND IN OLYMPIA", BEGINNING AT 9:00 A.M. WITH OPENING HEARING ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT REGARDING PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AND ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE JULY MEETING DUE TO A CONFLICT IN OTHER MEETING DATES. SECONDED BY MR. BERT COLE. MRS. LEMERE VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

MR. BELL MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE MEET ON JULY 23-24 AS ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED, AT A SITE PICKED BY THE STAFF. MR. ODEGAARD SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

THE MEETING RECESSED AT 4:30 P.M., MAY 30, 1973, TO RECONVENE AT 9:00 A.M., JUNE 22, IN OLYMPIA.

SEE MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 1973 - CONTINUED MAY MEETING, 1973.

RATIFIED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON

~~7/23/73~~
as corrected & amended

OMAR LOFGREN, CHAIRMAN