

I. Opening of the Meeting, Determination of Quorum, etc.

Trophy awarded to William Fearn, Sunday, August 25th fish derby.

Approval of June 27, 1974 Special Meeting Minutes - corrections made and accepted

Additions/Deletions to the Agenda - three.

Added Klickitat, WRA, Dept. of Game
Deleted NR, Cypress laldn
Deleted Game, Methow River

II A. Fiscal Status Reports

1. Disbursement Record - Local Agencies
2. Initiative 215 Cumulative Report
3. Fund Summary - July 31, 1974
4. Land and Water Conservation Fund Report
FY 75 apportionment; LWCF Act Amendments; December 1974 Funding.

II B. Project Status Report

1. Administrative Actions reported:

Coulee City, Community Park Development	Cost increase	\$ 17,482.90	10%
Elma, Elma Rec. Center	" "	2,280.00	7%
Redmond, Grass Lawn Pk.	" "	21,000.00	4%
Lake Sammamish, Parks & Rec.	" "	53,000.00	4%
Lake Wenatchee, Parks and Rec.	" "	50,000.00	11%
Crawford Cave, Parks and Rec.	" "	2,500.00	3%
Tennant Lake, Game Dept.	" "	8,615.00	10%

II C. Planning Status Report

1. Trails

- a. Public Recreation Lands Inventory
- b. Demand Study

II C. 3. Local Action Conformance Report

II C. 4. Accretion Beach Inventory

MOTION APPROVED RE WORKING WITH ECOLOGY ON WOLF BAUER
STUDY TO COMPLETE SAME; OR FIND \$3,000 WITHIN IAC OPERATIONAL BUDGET

III A. Technical Advisory Committee

Reappointed: Richard Mullins - David Towne to TAC (term expire 5-22-77)

MOTION - appreciation to Willa Mylroie - Chairman, TAC - former
New Chairman: Beecher Snipes announced

III B. Capital Budget - IAC 1975-77 Update report

III C. Procedural Guidelines

(see next page)

Procedural Guidelines approved were:

03.07.000	Participant's Matching Share (percentages and priorities)	Revised 8-26-74	percentages
03.08.010	Donations of Goods and Services on Dev. Proj.	Adopted	
04.15.010	Formal Appraisal Requirements	Revised effective 11-15-74	
04.15.020	Abbreviated Appraisal Requirements	Revised 8-26-74	
04.15.030	Easement Appraisal Requirements	Revised 8-26-74	
05.02.010	Eligible Dev. Projects		
	a. Support facilities	Revised 8-26-74	
	b. Interpretive facilities	Adopted 8-26-74	
	c. Renovation/redevelopment	Adopted 8-26-74	
05.05.000	Ineligible Dev. Costs - rec. equipment	Revised 8-26-74	
05.13.000	Underground Utilities	Adopted 8-26-74	
05.14.000	Architectural Barriers Act	Adopted 8-26-74	
08.05.000	Cost Increases - Dev. Projects 10% inc.	Revised 8-26-74	
09 Chapter	Billing Procedures - State Agencies	Revised 8-26-74	
09 Chapter	Billing Procedures - Local Agencies	Revised 8-26-74	
	(certain segments thereof revised)		
	(Cost Categories and Force Account)		
08.13.000	Post Completion Inspection	Adopted 8-26-74	

III D. Project Changes

1. E. J. Miller Park, City of Prosser \$15,862 cost increase APPROVED
2. Highbridge, Spokane, City of \$265,722 BOR figure APPROVED - and difference of \$10,150 not eligible
3. Water Gate Boat Launch, Everett \$200,000 total cost figure APPROVED; reduction in acreage APPROVED
4. Game, Boating Access Dev. 1969-71 \$ 13,872 APPROVED cost increase
5. Game, Boating Access Dev. 1971-73 \$235,507 APPROVED cost increase
6. Game, Lake Stevens Boat Launch \$ 13,006 APPROVED cost increase
7. Game, Klickitat WRA, Exchange of Power Transmission Easements APPROVED

III E. Nalley Property

Report on - updated - meetings with legislative bodies, etc.

III F. Legislation

a. Federal Legislation - S-2233 and HR-2624 - Hells Canyon/Snake River

b. Proposed State Legislation:

- (1) Amendments to Marine Rec. Land Act of 1964
 - (a.) Eliminate optional refund provision.
 - (b.) Study effective year it is done
 - (c.) Eliminate restriction on 215 limiting capital improvement to not more than 50%.
- (2) Wild, Scenic and Rec. Rivers System - similar to HB 582, last Session.
- (3) Broaden Operating Budget Basket of IAC - ATV Funding
- (4) State Outdoor Rec. Bond - consider new one.

MOTION ADMINISTRATOR TO LOOK INTO SITUATION AND REPORT BACK IN DEC.

IV A. SCORP - Local Agency Priorities

Revision MOTION - ADOPTED Deleted "Acquisition of Locally Significant Features" -- maintained six priorities rather than seven.

IV IAC 1975-77 Operating Budget

MOTION to approve \$885,808 FOR 1975-77 IAC OPERATING BUDGET.
APPROVED.

IV B. a. Management Review Sub-Committee

Appointed by Bishop: GEORGE ANDREWS, JOHN LARSEN, LEWIS BELL, MICAELA BROSTROM,
AND WARREN BISHOP

To assist Administrator, and IAC re administrative problems, proposals,
budgets, etc.

IV C. 1. Department of Natural Resources ALL APPROVED

a. Long Lake Indian Paintings, Stevens County	Ref. 18	\$2,141
b. McLane Creek, Capitol Forest	" "	19,510
c. Mima Falls Trailhead, Capitol Forest		2,095
d. Upper Clearwater, Jefferson Co.	" "	8,900
e. Hoh Oxbow, Jefferson Co.	" "	12,135
f. Chehalis Valley Vista, Capitol Forest	" "	10,500

IV C. 2. Dept. of Game ALL APPROVED

a. Tippet Ranch	Ref. 18	\$ 720,000
b. Gloyd Seeps WRA	Ref. 18	164,000
c. Driscoll Island	Ref. 18	127,400
d. Skagit WRA	Ref. 18	102,000
e. Cherry Valley, WRA	Ref. 18	494,500
f. Humptulips R/North Bay, Grays Harbor	Ref. 18	58,500
g. Klickitat WRA	Ref. 18	28,000
h. Desert WRA Fesdesco and G. Stn. Pkg.	Ref. 18	105,500
i. Desert WRA - 645 Drain	Ref. 18	17,000
j. Desert WRA - Frenchman Hills Pkg.	Ref. 18	51,000
k. Moses Lake - Outlet Pkg. Areas	Ref. 18	30,000
l. L. T. Murray, Rosa Creek Rec. Site	Ref. 18	12,000
m. L. T. Murray, Joe Watt Elk Viewing Area	Ref. 18	35,000
n. L. T. Murray, Umptanuma Rec. Site #2	Ref. 18	39,000
o. Skagit WRA, Dike Construc.	Ref. 18	11,000
p. Bogachiel River Rearing Pond Boat Launch	Ref. 18	40,000
q. Bogachiel River Leyendecker Park	Ref. 18	16,000

V. Administrator's Report

1. Available Funds at Dec. 1974 meeting
2. LWCF Funding percentages
3. 1974 - 10th Anniversary of IAC
4. Personnel Changes
5. Mercer Slough report

6. EXPO 74
7. Capitol Lake Project
8. IAC Asst. Atty General - Trails; Aquatic Lands; Timber Leases
9. Cost for copying IAC records
10. Cypress Island and Swallow's Nest
11. Northwest Regional Commission
12. BOR - Federal/State Recreation Commission
13. Marine Oregon Board (Oregon Marine Board!)
14. Washington Aeronautics Commission
15. Local Agency contacts
16. Park Maintenance Award Program
17. NASORLO Convention in Spokane, Sept.
18. Fair Employment Practices Act
19. Fort Worden Conference - IAC-STATE AGENCIES-BOR

VI. Committee Members' reports - Odegaard.

VII. Other Reports
Meeting Dec. 9-10, 1974, Olympia.

Adjourn 11:25 A.M.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

9:00 a.m. August 26, 1974
9:00 a.m. August 27, 1974

Hagewoods Restaurant Conference Facilities
Port Angeles, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Adele Anderson; Mr. George Andrews, Director, Department of Highways (Monday); Lewis A. Bell; John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Ecology; Warren A. Bishop; Honorable Bert Cole, State Land Commissioner; Carl N. Crouse, Director, Department of Game; Madeline Lemere; John S. Larsen, Director, Comm. & Econ. Department; Charles H. Odegard, Director, Parks and Recreation Comm.; Micaela Brostrom; Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries.

IAC MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General
Charles Murphy

Commerce and Economic Development
Gary Vibber
Merlin Smith

Ecology, Department of
Beccher Snipes

Fisheries, Department of
Frank Haw

Game, Department of
Dan Barnett
James Brigham
Stan Scott

Highways, Department of
Willa Mylroie

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Larry Burk, Rec. Res. Spec.
Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer
Marjorie Frazier, Admin. Secretary
Robert S. Lemcke, Coordinator
Glenn Moore, Rec. Res. Spec.
Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning & Coordination
Dave Redekop, Planner
Milt Martin, Assistant Administrator
Roger Syverson, Rec. Res. Spec. (Chief Project Officer)
Stanley E. Francis, Administrator

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1974
PAGES 2- 27

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1974
PAGES 27- 36

Natural Resources, Department of
Al O'Donnell

Park and Recreation Commission
Lynn Martin
Jan Tveten

Program, Planning and Fiscal Management
None

LOCAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane
Ken Hertz, Director, Parks and Recreation, Whatcom County, Bellingham
Art McCartan, Whitman Co. Parks Dept., Whitman County, Pullman
Richard Mullins, Director, Parks and Recreation, Port Angeles
Richard Richmire - alternate for Dave Towne, City of Seattle, Park and Rec. Dept.
James Webster, King Co. Dept. of Parks, King County, Seattle

OTHER AGENCIES - TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Donald J. Ketter - alternate for Maurice Lundy, Reg. Director, Bureau of Outdoor
Recreation, Seattle

I. Opening of Meeting, Determination of a Quorum, Introductions, Additions and
Approval of Minutes of June 27, 1974, Additions to the Agenda: Chairman Warren Bishop
called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m., a quorum being present.

Introductions: The following persons were introduced:

- (1) Honorable Mayor C. V. (Vern) Basom, City of Port Angeles
- (2) Don Ketter, representing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
- (3) Stan Scott, Department of Game
- (4) Gary Vibber, Dept. of Commerce and Economic Development, TAC member
- (5) Beecher Snipes, new Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee, from
Department of Ecology

The Chairman asked Mayor Basom for his comments. The Mayor welcomed the Interagency
Committee to Port Angeles and awarded a trophy to Mr. William Fearn, Park and Recreation
Director, City of Spokane, for the IAC fishing derby held Sunday, August 25th.

Mr. Bishop stated certain agenda items would be held for discussion pending the arrival
of Mr. George Andrews, Director of Highways, who had requested input to specific matters
relating to budget and All-Terrain Vehicles.

Approval of June 27, 1974, Special Meeting Minutes: Mr. Charles Odegaard requested the
following corrections be made to the minutes of June 27, 1974, Special Budget Meeting:

- (1) Page 3 - Item II A 1. Nalley Property - Park and Recreation Commission,
(4) - Add following "The major ownerships and property appraisals
and values were explained", the following sentence:

"Property acquisition included three ownerships - Tribal Trust Land, Rendsland property and the Nalley Estate."

- (2) Page 4, bottom of page, item (2), delete last sentence and add the following:

"Therefore, at present there is no guaranteed public access to that portion of the land known as the Nalley Estate."

- (3) Page 5, Item (6), first line, delete "Nalley Property" and insert "Nalley Estate".

- (4) Page 7, Item II A (6) where mention of Land and Water Funds are made, indicate by parentheses the year:

"LWCF (Fiscal Year 76) \$ 1,500,000"

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. LARSEN, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 27, 1974 MEETING BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Additions/Deletions to the Agenda: Mr. Francis made the following changes to the agenda:

- (1) Add III D. 2. d. Dept. of Game, Klickitat WRA
- (2) Delete IV C. 1. b. Dept. of Natural Resources (b) Cypress Island
- (3) Delete IV C. 2. d. Dept. of Game (d) Methow River

Following discussion, the Committee elected to continue the IAC meeting Tuesday, August 27, as two days had been advertised to the general public for the Open Public Meeting (August 26-27).

II A. Fiscal Status Reports: Mr. Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer, reported on the following Fiscal Status Reports:

(1) Disbursement Record - Local Agencies: During April 1, 1974 thru July 31, 1974, a total of \$1,648,493.66 had been reimbursed to Local Agencies from the Outdoor Recreation Account -- fifty-five vouchers having been processed through the accounting office. Mr. Cole corrected an error on page (5) of the report indicating there were 134 current projects instead of 234. Three hundred and fifty-three (353) have been approved since inception of the IAC program, with 219 closed. Since April 1973 to July 31, 1974, \$8,456,552.49 has been reimbursed from the Outdoor Recreation Account to local agencies.

(2) Initiative 215 Cumulative Report: Mr. Cole pointed out that during the four month period since the last regular meeting of the IAC, \$787,366.28 had been transferred from the Motor Vehicles Department to the IAC for disbursement under Initiative 215. Available for distribution to local and state agencies was \$665,353.58, a total of \$122,012.70 having been used for operating expense of the IAC. Mr. Cole stated the additional \$400,000 accruing over the last sixteen months was attributable to the adjustments made based on the new percentage from the Motor Vehicle Study of the amount of gas tax applying to the boaters ... 1.03% (beginning with July 1, 1973).

(3) Fund Summary - July 31, 1974: In referring to the Fund Summary Report, Mr. Cole indicated (1) it did not reflect the 1975 LWCF apportionment from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as the IAC has not yet received word on the amount to be funded;

(2) Transfer of monies from State Parks to DNR for funding the County Line project was included in the report; and (3) project funding changes before the meeting August 26-27 had not been taken into account within the report.

Mr. Odegaard questioned the sum indicated as a balance in Initiative 215 for State Parks and Recreation Commission (\$117,144.41). He stated his agency had a "zero" balance and this should be indicated in the Fund Summary. Following discussion, Mr. Kenn Cole was asked by the Chairman to check State Parks' funding and mail a corrected Fund Summary (July 31, 1974) report to all Committee members.

(4) Land and Water Conservation Fund Report: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "LWCF Status", highlighting the following:

(a) Washington State is over-committed in LWCF funds at end of FY 74 as a result of \$191,203.75 to the Mercer Slough Project (pending approval by BOR). BOR records indicate a balance of \$154,608.60; but in actuality Washington is over-committed by \$36,595.15.

(b) Washington State was able to secure \$100,000 of Special Contingency Funds for Lake Union Park Project, Seattle.

(c) FY 75 Apportionment: Current information on status of the LWCF Appropriation Act presently before Congress indicated that both House and Senate have passed the bill and it was sent to President Ford for signature. By middle of September or the first of October, IAC will receive information on the apportionment for the State of Washington. Anticipated amount is approximately \$3.1 million for FY-1975 (based on \$180 million for State use).

Mr. Odegaard and several of the Committee members inquired as to the percentage increase or decrease in LWCF amounts to the states over the years. Following discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Francis would obtain historical record on LWCF funding from 1965 to the present and have this available for discussion later on during the meeting. (See page 33 of these minutes - V. 2, and Appendix "A")

(d) LWCF Act Amendments: Several amendments affecting the LWCF Act in Congress were explained by Mr. Francis. Support appears evident to increase the authorization level to \$1 billion and to provide for 25% of a state's apportionment to be used for sheltered facilities. However, it is not expected that these will be passed this year due to overriding effects of inflation, etc. Mr. Crouse asked whether the State of Washington would have sufficient state matching monies should the LWCF funds be increased. Mr. Francis replied there would be enough funds to match an increased level of LWCF monies without going strictly to a 50-50 match.

(e) December, 1974 Funding - LWCF: Mr. Francis explained the restrictive funding for the December, 1974 IAC meeting, the bulk of funds for local agencies use being Federal Land and Water Conservation. Local projects must be totally or partially eligible for funding through BOR with LWCF monies. Based on expected \$3.1 million LWCF apportionment, \$1,550,000 would have been available for local agency funding purposes. However, deductions due to overcommitment and borrowed LWCF monies (\$469,902), leave a balance of \$1,080,908 available for December funding.

II. B. Project Status Report: Memorandum dated August 26, 1974, "Status of Current Projects", was explained by Mr. Roger Syverson, Chief, Projects Administration Section. Eight local and nine state agency projects were closed out in May, 1974

Mr. Syverson corrected the number of approved local projects as indicated in the memorandum from 130 to 134.

Administrative Actions: The following administrative actions were listed for the Committee:

- (1) Town of Coulee City, Community Park Development, IAC 74-010D
10% administrative cost increase of \$17,482.90 approved.
- (2) City of Elma, Elma Rec. Center, IAC 74-001D
7% cost increase approved - \$2,280.
- (3) City of Redmond, Grass Lawn Park, IAC 74-060A
4% administrative cost increase approved - \$21,000.
- (4) State Parks and Rec. Commission, Lake Sammamish Dev., IAC 72-501D
4% administrative cost increase approved - \$53,000.
- (5) State Parks and Recreation Commission, Lake Wenatchee Dev., IAC 72-504D
11% administrative cost increase approved - \$50,000.
- (6) State Parks and Recreation Commission, Crawford Cave, IAC 71-513D
3% administrative cost increase approved - \$2,500.
- (7) Dept. of Game, Tennant Lake, IAC 74-606A
10% cost increase approved - \$8,615

II C. 1. Planning Status Report: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Administration Division, introduced new member of the Division -- Dave Redekop, who replaced Bruce Thompson as Planner on the SCORP program.

II C. 2. Trails Report: Reference was made to memorandum of staff "ATV Funds Distribution and First Meeting of the ATV Sub-Committee of the State Trails Committee", dated August 26, 1974. Mr. Pelton reported distribution of the ATV Funds collected from May 1, 1973 thru December 31, 1973, was nearly complete with twelve of the sixteen counties and the three eligible State Agencies having applied and received their funds. Disbursement of \$848,979.07 is anticipated by August 31, 1974. The first meeting of the ATV Sub-committee was held June 17th, with Chairman Joe Wernex (DNR) presiding. Purpose and function of the Sub-committee was discussed, as well as feasibility and desirability of cross-state ATV trails, statewide representation from ATV users, criteria for determining ATV trails, areas of statewide significance and environmental impact of ATV trails and areas. Corridor identification is underway; ATV user groups have been contacted and asked to identify general areas in their region of the state for ATV use; maps will be compiled and studied by the ATV Sub-committee at its August 28th meeting for assimilation onto a statewide map. By April of 1974 IAC staff expects to present the ATV corridors for adoption by the Interagency Committee.

In referring to the "ATV Fund Distribution Table" included with the memorandum of staff, Mr. Pelton pointed out that Asotin County, ~~Grant~~ ^{FERRY} County and Thurston Counties have, subsequent to tabulation of the table, applied for the funds for which they are eligible; Grant County has not made application. *amended 12-9-74*

In response to question of Mr. Crouse, Mr. Kenn Cole stated \$15,000,000 had been projected for ATV funds during the next biennium. Mr. Francis and Mr. Pelton pointed

out that the basic law states that the results of the study will prevail to determine the amount of money allocated, thus the \$15 million projection. However, the law was amended at the 1974 Special Session to permit one percent (1%) for the remainder of this biennium. In the 1975-77 biennium, it is not possible to project a clear-cut figure and therefore the \$15,000,000 projected amount used in the IAC budget would require reassessment and re-figuring subject to the action of the State Legislature in January 1975. At this point, Mr. Bishop suggested discussion on the ATV funding be held pending the arrival of Mr. George Andrews who had requested that he have input on the matter.

Mr. Pelton noted that a county may retain its funds received under the ATV program and accumulate these within a five-year period, thus Mason County (receiving only \$84.58) could use the funding later for an ATV trail program when sufficient monies had accrued. Also, counties may use the funds for planning, acquisition, development or management of ATV trails.

Mr. Bishop inquired whether there would be further legislation on the ATV law. Mr. Bert Cole replied he did not feel there would be any special effort to modify the legislation until it had been possible to put into practice the principles of the law as presently outlined. Mr. Biggs asked why \$107,548.49 was being given to Whatcom County in relation to smaller amounts for the other counties. Mr. Pelton stated Whatcom County had an excellent, strong trail program; that it had developed an ATV plan and inventory which when applied to the formula used for ATV fund distribution authorized an allocation in the amount shown.

I a. Public Recreation Lands Inventory: Mr. Pelton advised that the cooperative inventory update accomplished by the Soil Conservation Service had been completed for local agencies and that summary tables are being prepared by county. Future inventories will incorporate statistical information in a format other than area types for more universal use of inventory statistics.

I b. Demand Study: A technical advisory committee and a user advisory committee have been established to aid staff in developing the new Demand Study. Initial actions have been taken to determine the type of study to be accomplished and the type of questionnaire to be used; a status report will be made at the December meeting. Mrs. Lemere asked that the questionnaire include a question about the "Pea Patch Programs", and was informed that local recreation programs will be a part of this study.

II C. 3. Local Action Conformance Report: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Local Action Program Conformance Report". Attached to the memorandum were tables and figures indicating the relationship between the estimated and actual funding distribution for local projects by district and by priority. Mr. Pelton referred to Tables I, II, and Figures I and II, giving explanation of each, i.e., Local Action Program Funding by District -- and Local Action Funding by Priority. It was pointed out that the fund distributions as shown in the tables and figures were based on a combination of projected available funds, acquisition and development needs as determined by the SCORP Distribution Model and an analysis of past funding distribution and committee policies. Staff recognized because of changing needs, the types and scope of projects presented to the IAC and other factors beyond staff or committee control, that 100% compliance with projected estimates is neither possible nor feasible. Mr. Pelton pointed out funding alternatives for the December 1974 IAC meeting which would allow greater compliance with the Local Action Program.

Mr. Bert Cole inquired why Priority I - Shoreline Acquisition - had been programmed only \$539,290 and other priorities (II, III, and V) had been programmed considerably more in funds from the Outdoor Recreation Account. He was informed that the lack of projects coming in from local agencies to acquire shorelines accounted for the low figure, plus the high cost of acquiring that type of property. Also, Mr. Pelton advised that some of the districts have a limited amount of shorelines for acquisition and thus seldom come into the program with this type of project. In response to Dr. Anderson's question, Mr. Pelton stated the Action Program is designed to comply with the State Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan (SCORP) and indicates distribution of the monies according to needs within the state for recreational facilities. Also, IAC attempts to assist smaller communities (or districts) where a lack of planning staff exists to develop a local comprehensive plan. These are also part of the Project Evaluation process.

There followed discussion on the inability of smaller eligible local agencies to promote and file with the IAC a Comprehensive plan for their areas thereby enabling them to qualify for presentation of a project to the IAC for funding consideration. Mr. Francis stated the IAC staff was aware of this problem; that some communities are unable to generate local matching monies; and since many smaller counties are unable to plan for a grant-in-aid project, the IAC needs to recognize this kind of consideration in its deliberations in order to meet the needs of the smaller local governmental agencies.

Mr. Odegaard pointed out the effect of cross-state utilization of outdoor recreation facilities -- especially those recreational areas of State Parks, DNR, Game and certain federal agencies (Forest Service, National Park Service, etc.), He stated many communities feel there is a higher use for their local funds in some other area than the IAC grant-in-aid program. Other public recreation areas provided by the federal government, DNR, Game and Parks are adequate for certain regions of the state and meet the recreational needs, thus the nearby counties or cities using these facilities may not require additional park facilities.

Mr. Pelton stated the Planning Division was attempting to make the Committee more aware of the requirements of the Statewide plan, its affinity with the Local Action Program, the recreational need-supply and -demand. Thus, there needs to be this general outline by district and priority indicating what the IAC is attempting to accomplish in acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas throughout the state.

CONCERNING

amended 12-10-74

Mr. Bishop inquired the relationship of the Action Program with the IAC Operating Budget. Mr. Francis briefly outlined the necessity of preparing two Operating Budgets as requested by the Governor and OPPFM -- one on the traditional order and the other a Program Budget System Document which will explain the various tasks of the agency, its responsibilities and performance of those tasks. The grant-in-aid function is but one of the IAC tasks. The distribution of the grant-in-aid monies will be reviewed and discussed by legislative liaison committees and OPPFM in relation to how the IAC is accomplishing its responsibilities and tasks.

Mrs. Lemere asked Mr. Pelton to insure that the Demand Study reflect the changes in recreation patterns which have occurred in the last few years. She also mentioned that BOR funding may possibly include indoor recreation facilities in the future and the survey should reflect this as well. Mr. Pelton assured

her these matters were being taken into consideration.

II C. 4. Accretion Beach Inventory: Mr. Robert Lemcke, Coordinator, Planning Division, referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Accretion Beach Inventory" and commented upon the personal services contract with Mr. Wolf Bauer for inventory of all significant, undeveloped, Class I accretion beaches in Puget Sound, Hood Canal, San Juan Islands and the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Mr. Bauer had located approximately 280 Class I beaches and had obtained photo-documentation and geo-hydraulic information on them. However, transcribing the information to inventory data sheets had not been completed. Since available funds had been expended without the completion of these records, staff recommended that rather than seek additional funds, the information be turned over to the Department of Ecology. That agency has obtained a federal grant to conduct a comprehensive inventory in the same geographical areas in preparation of the Coastal Zone Management Program. Arrangements have been made to make the Bauer inventory material available to the Department of Ecology, and in return, to have the full benefit of their findings when their study is completed.

Mr. Bert Cole asked the length of time necessary for the Department of Ecology to complete its full study which would include the Bauer material. Staff informed him it would probably be approximately one year.

Mr. Beecher Snipes, Department of Ecology, explained the federal grant which had been made available since May 1974 to the Department of Ecology, and stated his agency had no objection to the procedure for incorporation of the Bauer study within the proposed Department of Ecology Study as outlined by Mr. Lemcke. Mr. Odegaard and other Committee members expressed concern that the study should be completed in usable form at as early a date as possible. There followed discussion on the pros and cons of the study (1) being completed by the IAC staff compiling Mr. Bauer's work, or (2) having Mr. Bauer complete the work entirely through a personal service contract arrangement with the IAC, or (3) delivering the material to the Department of Ecology for incorporation in its report, thus completing the study in usable form.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY ADELE ANDERSON, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ACKNOWLEDGE THE TERMINATION OF THE ARRANGEMENTS WHICH THE COMMITTEE HAS HAD WITH MR. WOLF BAUER FOR INVENTORY OF ACCRETION BEACHES; AND

FURTHER, ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY HAS RECEIVED A FEDERAL GRANT WHICH WILL INVOLVE SIMILAR STUDIES TO THE BAUER STUDY AND WHICH WILL RELATE TO THE STUDY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS BEEN CARRYING OUT;

THEREFORE, WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS IMPOSED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT UPON THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY'S STUDY, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WOULD HOPE TO HAVE COOPERATION IN THE COMPLETION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY'S STUDY.

The motion was discussed by several Committee members and staff, consensus being the timeliness of the completion of the study was of prime importance. Mr. Lemcke stated the cost to complete the study would be approximately \$3,000.

In response to Mr. Odegaard's question whether the IAC would have sufficient funds within its 1973-75 budget to cover this expenditure, Mr. Francis stated

it would be possible to locate the \$3,000 if the Committee chose to have the IAC complete the study. Mr. Bishop noted there had been a great deal of concern expressed by the Committee at the time the IAC had entered into the inventory contract with Mr. Bauer, and it had been the consensus then that the study was necessary, valid, and would be useful to the IAC as well as other state and local agencies. It was his feeling the study was an important one and should be completed as quickly as possible. He asked Mr. Snipes if the Department of Ecology would be able to have the required and desired information on the Accretion Beach Inventory in a timely manner. Mr. Snipes stated the type of grant received by the Department of Ecology would extend over the next biennium; that it would be necessary to review the Bauer material to ascertain how it would be of use in the study to be done by the Department of Ecology; and that the Department of Ecology did not wish to duplicate any type of inventory which had been done by another agency and which would be of use within its grant study. Mr. Bert Cole suggested that the staff coordinate with the Department of Ecology and work out the difficulties, reporting the results at the December IAC meeting. At this point, Mr. Biggs asked to have Mr. Odegaard's motion read.

Following reading of the motion, Mr. Biggs felt an alternate motion was in order.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY DR. ANDERSON THAT THE STAFF BE DIRECTED TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY WITH THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT THE PARTIALLY COMPLETED WOLF BAUER ACCRETION BEACH INVENTORY STUDY IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY STUDY AND COMPLIMENTARY TO IT;

AND IF THAT IS AN AFFIRMATIVE FINDING, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE IAC SHALL THEN DETERMINE WHETHER THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY WILL ACHIEVE IN A TIMELY MANNER THE RESULTS FROM THE STUDY THAT THE IAC HAD ORIGINALLY HOPED TO ACHIEVE;

FURTHER, IF AFTER CONSULTING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY THE IAC STAFF DETERMINES THERE IS A NEED FOR THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO COMPLETE THE BAUER ACCRETION BEACH INVENTORY STUDY BECAUSE OF THE TIME ELEMENT, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO LOCATE WITHIN THE IAC OPERATING BUDGET FOR 1973-75 THE \$3,000 REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE BAUER STUDY.

The Chairman asked Mr. Odegaard whether he wished to withdraw his motion and accept a vote of the Committee on the second motion proposed by Mr. Biggs.

MR. ODEGAARD WITHDREW HIS MOTION; DR. ANDERSON WITHDREW HER SECOND TO THE MOTION.

Mr. Tollefson suggested the motion by Mr. Biggs be amended so that the staff could accept funding on a 50-50 basis with the Department of Ecology. The motion was not so amended; however, Mr. Odegaard felt if these details could be worked out, he would have no objection. The Chairman agreed, stating if the Department of Ecology could achieve the results of the study in a timely manner the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation would not need to expend \$3,000.

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

Following a short recess, Mr. Bishop reiterated the thrust of the attitudes of

the members on the Committee regarding the Bauer Study and the Department of Ecology related to TIMELINESS. He urged IAC staff discuss the matter with the Department of Ecology and keep in mind the original objectives of the study -- to obtain the information needed on a timely basis for the Interagency Committee. If that cannot be accomplished by combining efforts with the Department of Ecology, then the IAC staff should take steps to have the information completed through Mr. Bauer and is authorized to locate the funds for payment of the remainder of the study within its Operating Budget for 1973-75.

III A. Technical Advisory Committee: Mr. Francis recommended to the Interagency Committee the reappointment of Richard Mullins (Director, Park and Recreation, Port Angeles) and Mr. David Towne (Superintendent, Park and Recreation, Seattle) to the Interagency Committee's Technical Advisory Committee effective May 22, 1974, terms to expire May 22, 1977. Their reappointments had been recommended through the Washington Association of Cities Council to represent local agencies on the Technical Advisory Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONCURS IN THE REAPPOINTMENT OF RICHARD MULLINS, DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION, CITY OF PORT ANGELES, AND MR. DAVID TOWNE, SUPERINTENDENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, CITY OF SEATTLE, AS REPRESENTATIVES FROM LOCAL AGENCIES TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS (EXPIRING: MAY 22, 1977). MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Milt Martin, Assistant Administrator, referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "IAC-Technical Advisory Committee". He brought out the following points:

- (1) Meeting of IAC-TAC had been held in Olympia July 25-26, 1974 to review Procedural Guidelines revisions; TAC organization-function-and-operating procedures; and to elect new officers for the Fiscal Year 1975.
- (2) Beecher Snipes, Department of Ecology, was elected as Chairman; William Fearn, Parks and Recreation Director, City of Spokane, as Vice-Chairman; Robert S. Lemcke, IAC, to continue as Executive Secretary.

As the former Chairman of the IAC-TAC, Willa Mylroie, Department of Highways, was called upon for comments. She expressed her appreciation in serving as chairman for the past two years, referred to the purpose, role and objectives of the Technical Advisory Committee and its composition of 19 members. Qualifications of TAC members were included in an attachment to the staff memorandum for IAC member review. Mrs. Mylroie pointed out the number of hours of service the TAC Chairman must render to the Technical Advisory Committee as well as the number of hours of service from each member of the TAC.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE RECOGNIZING THE MANY HOURS OF WORK DEMANDED IN THE CAPACITY OF CHAIRMAN OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS APPRECIATION TO WILLA MYLROIE, REPRESENTATIVE ON THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS, FOR HER EFFORTS THE PAST TWO YEARS IN SERVING AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Martin introduced the following members of the Technical Advisory Committee: William Fearn, James Webster, Dick Mullins, Jim Brigham, Al O'Donnell, Lynn Martin, Beecher Snipes, Art McCartan, Frank Haw and Gary Vibber. He expressed appreciation of the IAC staff for the assistance given to it by the TAC members. Mr. Mullins thanked the Interagency Committee members for his reappointment confirmation to the TAC.

III B. Capital Budget - IAC 1975-77: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated August 20, 1974, "1975-77 Capital Budget", and reiterated the amounts allocated to each state agency for the 1975-77 biennium:

State Parks and Recreation Commission	\$ 2,470,000
Department of Game	1,097,500
Department of Fisheries	1,062,689
Department of Natural Resources	719,811
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,350,000

He explained the motion passed by the Committee at the June 27, 1974 meeting which contained the condition that the State agencies share of the FY 77 Land and Water Conservation Fund allocation (an estimated \$1,500,000) be held in the Operating Budget of the IAC as a reserve, to be distributed to the participating State agencies subject to their demonstrated capacity to use the additional funds. The capacity of each State agency to do so will be disclosed on July 31, 1975. (See minutes of June 27, 1974 - page 10.)

Each State agency had submitted a schedule of anticipated actions and accomplishments on its IAC Capital Budget program through June 1975, which will be used as a measure of the degree of conformance by each agency to its own pre-determined schedule as the basis for its recommendation on the additional funding.

Parks, Game, DNR responded; the Department of Fisheries did not since they will not be seeking additional funds for their 1975-77 Capital program. Each state agency stressed that many factors might alter their schedules. IAC staff recognized this and will take these factors into consideration when an analysis of conformance is made next July.

III C. Procedural Guidelines: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff (a) "Procedural Guidelines - 1970 - 15% Contingency Development Projects Policy", relating to 4N(1)a of those guidelines. This guideline directed that all development projects be submitted with a 15% contingency item; that these projects would not be eligible for any cost increases; and should bids exceed the 15% contingency the sponsoring agency could absorb the additional costs or withdraw and re-submit the project on the basis of the higher costs. The guideline also provided certain conditions under which a 15% increase could be administratively approved.

4N(1)a ceased to exist upon publication of the 1973 Procedural Guidelines edition, but remained valid and in effect for projects approved between August 1971 and June 1973. Mr. Francis stated of these a total of 103 projects are still current (56 local and 47 state). He outlined the reasons for requesting this guideline be rescinded and Section 08.05.000 - Cost Increase Development Projects apply to the 103 projects.

IT WAS MOVED BY BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT,

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 4 N(1)_a OF THE 1970 GRANT-IN-AID PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES, AND

WHEREAS, THE PREMISE OF THESE PROVISIONS IS NO LONGER GERMANE IN TODAY'S CONSTRUCTION -- RAPIDLY SPIRALING INFLATIONARY CLIMATE, AND

WHEREAS, THOSE SPONSORING AGENCIES WITH PROJECTS STILL CURRENT AS APPROVED UNDER THIS PROVISION OF THE 1970 GRANT-IN-AID PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES WILL SUFFER UNDUE HARDSHIP WITH POSSIBLE COMPROMISE OR LOSS OF RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IF THESE PROVISIONS REMAIN IN EFFECT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HEREBY RESCIND SECTION 4N(1)_a OF THE 1970 GRANT-IN-AID PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES, AND DOES FURTHER HEREBY WAIVE ITS APPLICATION TO ANY CURRENT PROJECTS SO AFFECTED BY SECTION 4N(1)_a, AND FURTHER THAT ANY SUCH PROJECTS SO AFFECTED SHALL NOW AND HENCEFORTH BE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 08.05.000 OF THE 1973 GRANT-IN-AID PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ORIGINAL TOTAL APPROVED PROJECT COST SHALL BE CONSIDERED THE APPROVED PROJECT COST FOR APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 08.05.000.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(b) Costs attributable to Environmental Legislation: Staff memorandum entitled "Costs attributable to compliance with environmental legislation on IAC-funded development projects", dated August 26, 1974, was discussed by Mr. Lemcke. A review of the subject by the Technical Advisory Committee had been requested by the Interagency Committee at its meeting of December 10, 1973. The TAC members at the meeting of June 17-and-July 25-26, agreed on the points noted below. The IAC staff recommended, therefore, that no action be taken by the Interagency Committee to change the Procedural Guidelines:

- (1) *All technical costs related to and resulting from recent environmental legislation are presently eligible under the existing IAC Procedural Guidelines for State and Local agencies.*
- (2) *Reasonable costs associated with travel and per diem for the securing of necessary environmentally related permits were eligible for reimbursement under existing IAC Procedural Guidelines for State and Local Agencies if properly accounted for and specifically identified.*
- (3) *Administrative costs (and legal costs in instances of litigation) associated with environmental legislation were not presently eligible for IAC reimbursement or funding under the existing State and Local Agency Procedural Guidelines.*

Mr. Syverson explained the research by staff in arriving at the four points:

- (a) Investigated those projects prior to date of the Shoreline Management Act to have a sampling of projects not within the guidelines;
- (b) Reviewed the recent project applications received;

- (c) Discovered that the engineering cost, which is one category related to environmental legislation, has not increased significantly over the last few years (perhaps only 1 1/2 percent to 2 percent.
- (d) Other costs related to environmental costs are eligible for reimbursement under the IAC program but were difficult to pinpoint.

Staff felt there had not been a substantial increase in direct costs due to environmental legislation. The Technical Advisory Committee in reviewing the matter had agreed that construction costs, where there is a delay, do cause an increase in cost of the project; however, they are not easily identifiable costs.

Mr. Odegaard, Mr. Biggs and Mr. Cole felt the response given by staff was valid and honest; however, each felt the question of environmental cost increases had not been clearly interpreted. Mr. Odegaard pointed out that costs for State Park projects over the years has increased a great deal in meeting environmental considerations due to recent legislation; however, he agreed it was worthwhile and vital to the environmental program of the state. Mr. Biggs noted there had been no reference in staff response to those costs attributable to shoreline management appeal cases, hearing board matters, etc. The question asked of staff, he said, was "are the environmental concerns increasing the costs of projects". He felt they were and that staff had not taken the needed approach. However, he agreed the legislation for protection of the environment was excellent and should not in any way be challenged.

At this point, Mr. Odegaard suggested Mr. Jan Tveten present two park projects (Tolmie State Park and Stewart Island) which had typical problems associated with environmental costs. Mr. Tveten spoke of the problem in obtaining permits and authority for the Tolmie State Park project and the delays encountered in working through various agencies (Coast Guard, Highways, Transportation Dept. in Washington, D.C., etc.); and the permit problem involved in the Stewart Island project.

Dr. Anderson questioned whether it would be appropriate for part of the costs to be borne by the Environmental Protection Agency or its equivalent in the state. Mr. Ken Hertz, Director, Parks and Recreation, Whatcom County, was asked to comment for the local agencies. He stated from the standpoint of environmental costs, there is no question that these are very extensive -- relocation enters into the costs. Local agencies can indicate these have increased significantly; however, in studying the proposed guideline, the local agencies determined it would be difficult to pinpoint the indirect costs. Local agency representatives on the Technical Advisory Committee felt all those eligible for grant-in-aid funding from the IAC were faced with the same problem. They felt, however, that direct costs are adequately covered by the IAC existing Local Agency Guidelines.

In response to Dr. Anderson's question, Mr. Biggs stated the monies being discussed were all public monies, regardless of which department or agency had control of them, and he did not feel other state agencies and governmental entities would be amendable to having the Department of Ecology allocate funds to do environmental computations. He felt the cost of travel, personal services

involved in environmental aspects of projects, etc., should be a part of the project's environmental costs, and agencies should work these into their overall requests for reimbursement to the IAC.

Mr. Tveten briefly outlined the problems relating to Leadbetter Park -- and indicated a three to four percent additional cost for environmental studies, permits, etc.; funds which he felt could have been better diverted to the construction of the project.

Discussion ended at this point, the consensus of the Committee being that environmental costs were necessary, valid, and must be in accordance with the laws as passed; that local and state agencies will need to incorporate these costs within their overall project costs in keeping with the IAC Procedural Guidelines.

(c) IAC Procedural Guidelines Revisions: Mr. Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "IAC Procedural Guidelines" - proposed revisions, and noted there were thirteen changes before the Committee for consideration. Mr. Bishop recommended taking each item separately with questions from the Committee members acceptable.

1. FORMAL APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS, SECTION 04.15.010 - REPLACEMENT: The text of the guideline was reviewed and reason for the requirements given by Mr. Lemcke. Mr. Crouse felt the guideline as presented was too restrictive and might tie-down the agencies to an unnecessary degree. He specifically referenced the first sentence ..."The text of the appraisal report shall be divided into four parts as outlined below:". He felt staff should keep in mind there are many pieces of property where all of the suggested material could not be obtained; perhaps the format would differ and an agency would not be able to apply the guidelines to certain properties. Mr. Francis agreed every piece of property is different but stated the proposal would bring the IAC into conformance with Federal government standards. Certain variations could be accommodated from time to time in different situations. He suggested staff note the comment of Mr. Crouse and make exceptions where necessary.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSEN, SECONDED BY MR. BELL, THAT THE LANGUAGE OF THE PROPOSED PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE, SECTION 04.15.010, "FORMAL APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS", BEGINNING WITH THE FIRST LINE OF ITALICS, BE CHANGED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL WORDING, PRIOR TO THE FIRST SENTENCE:

"THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES WILL BE USED WHERE THEY ARE REASONABLE AND APPLICABLE."

Mr. Crouse had no objection to the motion and felt it would adequately cover his concerns. At this point, Mr. Biggs expressed his desire to insure that the guidelines of the agency not be as precise as that proposed for 04.15.010 "Formal Appraisal Requirements". He recommended there be flexibility within this type of guideline. Mr. Francis explained the workload of the IAC is such that diversity of forms, papers, applications, etc., coming in for grant-in-aid projects would limit its effectiveness in reviewing these for the required information under the guidelines -- and it was therefore necessary to formalize to some extent the types of forms and material the IAC could effectively and efficiently use within its operational procedures for projects.

Mr. Bishop observed that the Technical Advisory Committee had reviewed the proposed revisions with State agency representatives as well as the local representatives, and the Committee was being asked to confirm their findings in order to have uniformity in the manner in which the IAC would be doing business with state and local agencies. Mr. Biggs stated he would like to see IAC staff authorized by the Committee to establish such forms, requirements, etc., that become necessary without coming to the IAC meetings for review and approval of revisions and changes to the Guidelines. He felt the guidelines were operating procedures of the agency itself and the Committee should approve them in that sense.

The motion was read by the secretary. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

Dr. Anderson asked if it would be possible to move to adopt all of the guidelines being presented without a review of each one. It was the consensus of the Committee that each should be reviewed separately.

Mr. Lemcke proceeded with explanations for the following Guidelines:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 2. | ABBREVIATED APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS-TITLE TERM & POLICY | 04.15.020(8) | |
| 3. | EASEMENT APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS - TITLE TERM & POLICY | 04.15.030(5)D | |
| 4. | ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - SUPPORT FACILITIES | 05.02.010(11) | |
| 5. | ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - REDEVELOPMENT | 05.02.010(13) | |
| 6. | ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - INTERPRETIVE CENTERS | 05.02.010(12) | |
| 7. | INELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT COSTS - RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT | 05.05.000(20) | |
| 8. | UNDERGROUND UTILITIES | 05.13.000 | |
| 9. | ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT | 05.14.000 | |
| 10. | POST-COMPLETION INSPECTION | 08.13.000 | |
| 11. | BILLING PROCEDURES - STATE AGENCIES - ENTIRE CHAPTER | CHAPTER 09 - ENTIRE | |
| 12. | BILLING PROCEDURES - LOCAL AGENCIES - COST CATEGORIES | CHAPTER 09 - PART | |
| 13. | { BILLING PROCEDURES - LOCAL AGENCIES - FORCE ACCOUNT | CHAPTER 09 - PART | |
| | { BILLING PROCEDURES - LOCAL AGENCIES - HISTORICAL DATA | CHAPTER 09 - PART | |

Comments on certain guidelines were as follows:

9. ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT: Both Mr. Bell and Mr. Odegaard suggested corrections in this guideline. Item (5) was changed to read:

"Toilet facilities and drinking fountains at heights to accommodate occupants of wheelchairs."

Mr. Odegaard asked if adequate facilities for the handicapped are already included in the project being redeveloped or are within the service area of a specific project, would it then be necessary to construct additional facilities for the handicapped within the project? Mr. Francis replied in the negative stating that the IAC staff would review the guideline and amend it for this purpose; however, it should be understood that if the park facility will increase numbers of persons using it, then additional facilities for the handicapped might be necessary. It would be up to IAC staff to review projects to insure meeting this guideline.

(The Guideline was changed to indicate the following:

(see next page)

"If adequate facilities for the handicapped are already provided in the project area, it will not be necessary to construct additional facilities for the handicapped within the project. IAC staff will determine the need for facilities for the handicapped upon conferring with project sponsors.")

11. 12. 13. BILLING PROCEDURES - STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES: In reviewing the Billing Procedures Revisions - Chapter 9, Mr. Bert Cole noted 09.05.000 Project Completion required a change to insure that participant "*shall be*" notified of inspections and encouraged to accompany the Administrator or staff, rather than "*may be*".

Dr. Anderson asked recourse of the IAC if upon inspection a project did not meet requirements or had been changed to include other than outdoor recreation aspects within it. Mr. Francis stated the IAC has the right to sue, request reimbursement of funds, etc.

10. POST-COMPLETION INSPECTION - SECTION 08.13.000: Mr. Odegaard questioned items A through G (points to be taken into consideration in inspecting projects) and asked if these had been taken from the BOR Manual. Mr. Syverson replied in the affirmative, however there had been some slight changes made to make them applicable to IAC development projects. Tri-ennial inspection was discussed, and Mr. Larsen felt the IAC should attempt to retain flexibility in this respect.

11. BILLING PROCEDURES - STATE AGENCIES: (CHAPTER 09) -- Mr. Lemcke noted the three basic changes which had been made to Chapter 09 guidelines for State Agencies (also to be applicable to the Local Agency guidelines):

- (1) *Cost Categories on Page (12) changed to be consistent with federal guidelines;*
- (2) *Force Account, page (14) - 3 (b) Equipment Rates - changed to comply with the BOR Manual;*
- (3) *Historical data:*

"If the historical data upon which the rate is determined does not include a depreciation factor, a factor not exceeding 6 2/3% per annum of the acquisition cost may be used in lieu of historical factor."

8. UNDERGROUND UTILITIES: Mr. Odegaard returned to the guideline relating to Underground Utilities. He questioned the sentence "the participant will be expected to take all reasonable steps to bury, screen, or relocate existing overhead lines at development or acquisition projects, -- etc." He stated many instances where it would not be possible to follow this guideline to the letter. Further, in the second paragraph, he asked that "shall not" be deleted from the first sentence...."Mass recreation use areas (swimming, picnicking, crowded spectator seating, etc.) shall not be located under electric wires on fund-assisted areas or facilities." He gave two examples of parks where it would not be possible to follow this guideline and stated the departments of Game, and DNR, would also have similar problems. He suggested staff relate this guideline to specific projects, and where applicable and possible, and feasible, initiate this type of requirement.

Mr. Webster suggested that "or" be changed to "of" in the first sentence quoted

by Mr. Odegaard (..development of acquisition projects".) No action was taken by the Committee in regard to this suggestion.

Mr. Francis recognized the problems involved in the guideline insofar as Parks, DNR and Game were concerned; however, he stated it was also necessary to meet BOR regulations, and asked Don Ketter, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, to respond. Mr. Ketter stated the BOR would reserve the right to be flexible in this matter; would look at potential safety hazards; if it can be proved the facility is not a mass recreation area (i.e., swimming pool, picnicking area, etc.) and not hazardous to leave the utility lines, the BOR would reserve the right to make an amendment to its own policy and possibly permit the lines to remain.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSEN THAT THE THIRTEEN PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AS PROPOSED IN MEMORANDUM OF STAFF DATED AUGUST 26, 1974, BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITH THE AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED BY THE COMMITTEE BEING MADE THERETO; AND THAT THE GUIDELINE CONCERNING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES (SECTION 05.13.000) BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS: (Amendments - underlined)

"05.13.000 UNDERGROUND UTILITIES:

"Overhead utility lines constitute a major detraction from the natural quality of many outdoor recreation areas. The participant will be expected to take all reasonable steps to (1) bury, screen, or relocate existing overhead lines at development of acquisition projects, and (2) to put all new electric wires under 25KV and telephone wires underground. (The existence of all overhead lines must be documented in the project application and the participant must indicate what measures are required to mitigate such environmental intrusions; if the participant feels that the overhead lines should not be removed, rerouted, or buried, the reasoning must be indicated.)

"As a general policy, mass recreation use areas (swimming, picnicking, crowded spectator seating, etc) should not be located under electric wires on fund-assisted areas or facilities. Installation of electric wires over any area which has received fund assistance without the prior consent of the Administrator may constitute conversion to other than outdoor recreation use.

MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE, STATING HIS VOTE WAS (1) PREDICATED UPON HIS BELIEF THAT MANY OF THE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES BEING PRESENTED REPRESENTED ITEMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGMENT AND WOULD INEVITABLY BECOME ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES; AND (2) HE DID NOT FEEL QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON A GUIDELINE WHICH HE FELT REQUIRED A COMPLETE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING ELECTRIC WIRING HAZARDS INVOLVED IN PARK AND RECREATION AREAS. HE ALSO NOTED THE GUIDELINES WERE IN HIS VIEW TOO PRECISE AND WOULD BECOME MEANINGLESS AND INEFFECTIVE IF FLEXIBILITY WAS NOT MAINTAINED IN SOME MANNER.

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

Mr. Bishop clarified the attitude of the Committee concerning revisions to the Procedural Guidelines and stated in the future when the IAC staff through review by the Technical Advisory Committee approves modifications or changes

as necessary within the Procedural Guidelines, (1) if these do not affect policy actions of the Interagency Committee and would be considered strictly administrative "housekeeping", then these guidelines could be approved within the TAC and staff of the IAC for distribution as revisions and changes. (2) However, those guidelines involving policy decisions and considered to be of more import and impact to the Interagency Committee, should be brought to the Committee at its regular meeting for review and adoption.

Dr. Anderson asked that copies of the revisions or changes to the guidelines be sent to the Interagency Committee members by mail in advance of the official publication of them. Should a Committee member have input at that time, IAC staff could be so advised. Staff was instructed by the Chairman to abide by the foregoing instructions.

(d) DONATIONS OF GOODS AND SERVICES ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS 03.08.000: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "IAC Procedural Guidelines - Donations of Goods and Services on Development Projects." This guideline expands Section 03.08.000 to include the donation of goods and services as the participant's (or part of the participant's) matching share, in addition to the presently eligible donation of real property.

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

WHEREAS, THE CHANGE AND ADDITION TO THE LOCAL AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES RE-VISING SECTION 03.08.010 "DONATIONS OF GOODS AND SERVICES ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS", WAS REVIEWED AND CONCURRED IN BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND DULY RECOMMENDED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY ADOPTS REVISED SECTION 03.08.010 OF THE LOCAL AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES, TO BECOME EFFECTIVE AUGUST 26, 1974.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Upon reconvening from lunch, Mr. Bishop re-emphasized the need for the Administrator, Assistant Administrator, and staff of the IAC to carefully review proposed changes to the Procedural Guidelines and insure those being approved administratively do not in any way conflict with the policy matters as identified by the Interagency Committee over the years it has been in existence. Staff should release to the IAC members any changes made to the Guidelines so they will be aware of those changes, the purposes for them, etc.

III D. Project Changes: Project Changes requests occurring over the past few months were brought to the Committee's attention for consideration. Roger Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974 concerning the City of Prosser's E. J. Miller Park.

(a) City of Prosser, E. J. Miller Park, IAC 74-048D: Mr. Syverson explained the cost increase recommended by staff for the City of Prosser, E. J. Miller Park, -- an additional \$15,862 was requested to complete the project due to increased costs in construction and labor.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. LARSEN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF PROSSER HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF

\$15,862 FOR THE E. J. MILLER PARK (IAC 74-048D), AND

WHEREAS, THE REQUESTED INCREASE REFLECTS INFLATIONARY CONSTRUCTION COSTS FAR BEYOND THOSE FIGURED INTO THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATE, AND

WHEREAS, THE SCOPE OF THE CONTRACT WILL NOT BE CHANGED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE REQUESTED COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$15,862 IS APPROVED AND THE NEW TOTAL COST FIGURE FOR THE PROJECT IS DETERMINED TO BE \$114,482 AND THE 75% IAC SHARE IS ESTABLISHED AT \$85,861.50.

Mr. Odegaard questioned the 8% per month cost increase reflected in staff's memorandum. Mr. Francis replied the initial figuring had been done in January or February of 1974 and there had been some errors, thus the percentage appeared high.

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

(b) City of Spokane, Highbridge Park, IAC 69-105A: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff, dated August 26, 1974, and reported on the approval of negotiated values of properties within the project which had exceeded appraised value. BOR approval of the project change had been obtained up to \$265,722, leaving \$10,150 of the negotiated purchase price (\$275,872) as a cost increase on the project. Since most of the negotiated values exceeded the 10% limit authorized to be granted by the Administrator, the matter was brought to the attention of the Committee for review and approval.

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

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF SPOKANE HAS REQUESTED THE APPROVAL OF NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION COSTS ON 16 PARCELS OF THE HIGHBRIDGE PARK PROJECT AT ABOVE APPRAISAL VALUE AND HAS SUPPLIED INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF THIS REQUEST FOR NEGOTIATED PURCHASE PRICES TOTALING \$275,872, AND

WHEREAS, THIS INFORMATION AND REQUEST HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION IN DETAIL ON A PARCEL BY PARCEL BASIS, AND

WHEREAS, THE BOR HAS DETERMINED THAT ADEQUATE JUSTIFICATION HAS BEEN SUPPLIED TO INCREASE THE FEDERAL SHARE TO 50% OF \$265,722, AND

WHEREAS, THIS PROJECT IS FUNDED ON A 50% FEDERAL, 50% LOCAL BASIS WITH NO STATE REFERENDA OR INITIATIVE FUNDS INVOLVED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE FUND SUPPORT FIGURE OF \$265,722 AS DETERMINED BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION IS APPROVED AS THE ACCEPTED TOTAL COST FIGURE FOR THE SUBJECT PARCELS AND FURTHER THAT THE DIFFERENCE OF \$10,150 BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION PRICES AND THE BOR ACCEPTANCE FIGURE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED ELIGIBLE FOR FURTHER FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(c) Port of Everett, Water Gate Boat Launch, IAC 72-068A: Mr. Lewis Bell, Attorney for the Port of Everett, excused himself from consideration of the

confirmation of stipulated settlement and request to decrease the project acreage concerning the Port of Everett's Water Gate Boat Launch project. He was not present during the proceedings concerning this project.

Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Port of Everett, Water Gate Boat Launch, 72-068A," and advised that the acquisition of the project was not based on a court condemnation award but rather on a stipulated settlement. Further, the Port will only purchase 22.27 acres of the original 33 acres funded for acquisition in May of 1972 for \$200,000. This represented a reduction of 10.73 acres. The Port also secured a non-exclusive right-of-way easement (1.3 acres) for roadway and utilities purposes. Following consultation with the Port, staff recommended the purchase of only the 22.27 acres for \$200,000 and the securing of the 1.3 acres of easement.

Questions were asked by Committee members as to the scope of the project originally, its present scope, and elements contained within it (i.e., boat launching ramps, parking to accommodate cars, roadway access, etc.) During the discussion, it was pointed out it would be necessary to fill in part of the water area to build additional parking space. Mr. Biggs stated the net result would be to decrease the total area by nearly ten acres, most of these being uplands. Mr. Syverson agreed there would be about 1 and one-half acres of uplands left, whereas in the original project there had been four acres. There followed considerable discussion on the exact size of the project when completed. Mr. Odegaard expressed his concern that thirty to thirty-five percent of the original area will not be in the project should the Committee approve staff's recommended motion. He asked for justification on those lands being deleted by staff, and asked to see a map of the project. Mr. Syverson indicated on the project map the scope of the original project and staff's recommended changes within that scope. Following his explanation and discussion on appraisal figures and further questions being answered for Mr. Odegaard, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, SECONDED BY MR. CROUSE THAT

WHEREAS, THE IAC STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT THE MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION MADE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT THE MAY, 1974, MEETING CONCERNING A RECOMMENDED COST INCREASE FOR THE PORT OF EVERETT SPONSORED WATER GATE BOAT LAUNCH PROJECT (IAC 72-068A) DID NOT ACCURATELY AND COMPLETELY DESCRIBE THE CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVED, AND

WHEREAS IT HAS NOW BEEN CLARIFIED THAT THE COST INCREASE REQUEST OF \$48,000 WAS BASED ON A STIPULATED SETTLEMENT RATHER THAN BEING BASED ON A COURT AWARD IN CONDEMNATION, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS FURTHER BEEN CLARIFIED THAT THE \$200,000 STIPULATED SETTLEMENT FIGURE RELATES TO ACQUISITION OF 22.27 ACRES PLUS A 1.3 ACRE NON-EXCLUSIVE ROADWAY EASEMENT INSTEAD OF ACQUISITION OF 33 ACRES AS PREVIOUSLY INDICATED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, RECOGNIZING THE CONTINUED NEED FOR A MAJOR BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY TO SERVE THE GENERAL EVERETT AREA, REAFFIRMS ITS APPROVAL OF THE \$200,000 TOTAL COST FIGURE FOR THE SUBJECT PROJECT (IAC 72-068A) AND FURTHER THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES A REDUCTION IN THE ACREAGE TO BE ACQUIRED TO INCLUDE 22.27 ACRES AND

THE 1.3 ACRE ROADWAY EASEMENT.

MR. ODEGAARD VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MARJORITY VOTE.

2. a. Department of Game, 1969-71 Boating Access Development, IAC 69-611D:
Mr. Glenn Moore, Rec. Res. Specialist, reviewed memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Department of Game 1969-71 Boating Access Development Project, IAC 69-611D" requesting that the total project cost be amended to provide an additional \$13,872 needed to complete rehabilitation of two sites which had received extensive flood damage (Klickitat [Ludlum] and Klickitat Turkey Farm).

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC HAS APPROVED THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S 1969-71 BOATING ACCESS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROJECT (69-611D) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 54 SITES FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$800,000, 100% STATE FUNDS, AND

WHEREAS, FLOOD DAMAGE TO THE LUDLUM AND TURKEY FARM SITES LOCATED ON THE KLICKITAT RIVER WILL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO REHABILITATE THE SITES TO THEIR ORIGINAL USEFULNESS, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$13,872 AND AN EXTENSION TO THE PROJECT AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE FOR THE REHABILITATION OF THE LUDLUM AND TURKEY FARM SITES AS INCLUDED IN PROJECT #69-611D AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(b) Department of Game, 1971-73 Boating Access Development, IAC 72-609D:
Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Department of Game, 1971-73 Boating Access Development", wherein the Department of Game requested \$235,507 cost increase in the project to complete seven sites under construction, to initiate & complete construction on 3 sites, pay for costs in excess of project estimates on 21 sites completed, to pay for repair on two sites, and to repair water damage and reconstruct launch site on the Potholes reservoir.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSEN, SECONDED BY MR. TOLLEFSON THAT

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE FOR THE 1971-73 BOATING ACCESS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (IAC 72-609D) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$235,507 FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- 1) TO COMPLETE SEVEN SITES CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION;
- 2) TO INITIATE AND COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION ON THREE SITES AT WHICH CONSTRUCTION HAS NOT YET BEGUN BUT WHICH WERE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT AS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE;
- 3) TO PAY FOR CONSTRUCTION COSTS IN EXCESS OF THE PROJECT ESTIMATES ON THE 21 SITES COMPLETED, AND
- 4) TO PAY FOR REPAIR ON TWO PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED SITES RECENTLY DAMAGED BY FLOOD WATERS,
- 5) TO REPAIR WATER DAMAGE AND RECONSTRUCT LAUNCH SITE ON POTHOLAS RESERVOIR,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME REQUEST

FOR A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$235,507, INCREASING THE TOTAL PROJECT COST TO \$979,500, 100% STATE FUNDS, AND HEREBY AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

Mrs. Lemere questioned whether the flood problems could again arise within the project area. Mr. Crouse replied there was a chance that the floods would occur periodically; however, the Department of Game usually takes care of "normal" flood damage on its sites but due to the extreme flood damage on this particular project, it had necessitated coming to the IAC for assistance. Mr. Brigham pointed out that the Corps of Engineers had already funded part of the repair on the four sites of the Klickitat River, and the Game Department has received Corps of Engineer assistance in other instances of flood damage.

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

Mr. Odegaard asked staff where there has been water, wind or other natural disaster damage on project sites, would the IAC fund replacement of the facilities subject to other factors being eligible for IAC funding? Mr. Francis replied this was acceptable to IAC and within the Procedural Guidelines. Mr. Bishop noted there are federal funds for flooded areas, and Mr. Crouse's department could apply for these within the limitations of the act controlling the funds.

(c) Department of Game, Request for Cost Increase, Lake Stevens Boat Launch, IAC 73-627D: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Department of Game, Lake Stevens Boat Launch" requesting a cost increase of \$13,006 for the project to enable inclusion of landscaping and paving and to assist with costs related to inflation.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$13,006 FOR THE LAKE STEVENS BOAT LAUNCH PROJECT (IAC 73-627D), AND

WHEREAS, A PORTION OF THE INCREASE REQUESTED RELATES TO INCREASING THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT TO INCLUDE LANDSCAPING AND PAVING, AND

WHEREAS, THE REMAINDER OF THE COST INCREASE REQUESTED RELATES TO INFLATIONARY CONSTRUCTION INCREASES AND WOULD NOT NORMALLY BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE AS A RESULT OF THE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE 4N(1)a ADOPTED AUGUST 23, 1971, AND SINCE DELETED, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE HAS DETERMINED IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE THAT THE ABOVE NOTED GUIDELINE SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE REQUESTED COST INCREASE IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$13,006 IS APPROVED AND THE NEW TOTAL COST FIGURE FOR THE PROJECT IS DETERMINED TO BE \$32,000.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(d) Department of Game, Klickitat WRA, IAC 72-510A, Exchange of Power Transmission Easements: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Exchange of Power Transmission Easements, Dept. of Game, Klickitat WRA", requesting an exchange of power transmission easements -- to grant a power transmission line right-of-way over a portion of the Klickitat WRA. The new easement (3,760 feet of right-of-way) would replace the existing easement (4,590 feet). Upon receiving the 3,760

feet of easement, the Public Utility District will quit claim the existing 4,590 feet to the Department of Game. Staff recommended relocation of the subject power line, stating it was not considered to be a conversion but an exchange that will benefit the recreation user of the WRA. Mr. Ketter, BOR, stated the exchange would be considered a conversion by his agency. Mr. Francis noted that he had already met with the BOR and resolved this issue and that the exchange of power transmission easements would be considered by the BOR as an exchange and thus be approved.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED THAT THE KLICKITAT P.U.D. BE GRANTED APPROVAL FOR REALIGNMENT OF ITS EXISTING 4,590 FOOT POWER TRANSMISSION RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM ITS PRESENT LOCATION WHICH IS TO BE SOME DISTANCE FROM THE RIVER AND WILL BE 3,760 IN LENGTH, AND

WHEREAS, THE PRESENT RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT IS TO BECOME AVAILABLE FOR RECREATIONAL USE IN EXCHANGE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THE SHORTER EASEMENT, AND

WHEREAS, IT APPEARS THAT THIS EXCHANGE WILL RESULT IN ADDITIONAL UNEMCUMBERED RECREATION LAND AND IS CONSIDERED TO BE OF GREATER VALUE AND BENEFIT TO THE USERS OF THE KLICKITAT WRA,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THIS EASEMENT EXCHANGE IS APPROVED CONTINGENT UPON THE EXECUTION AND SUBMISSION TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE IAC BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME OF THE APPROPRIATE INSTRUMENTS TO EFFECT THE EXCHANGE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

[Mr. Bishop acknowledged Mr. Geroge Andrews' presence at the meeting (arrived 3:25 p.m.) and introduced him to the audience.]

III E. Report on Nalley Estate - Parks: Mr. Francis summarized the staff memorandum dated August 26, 1974 dealing with the Nalley Estate and the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting in Clarkston on July 15, 1974. That Body had directed the Director of Parks and Recreation to join with representatives of the Interagency Committee to present the situation to the appropriate legislative bodies with the intent of having the project de-authorized and the funds not re-appropriated but returned to the Outdoor Recreation Account.

A meeting was held on August 2, 1974 between IAC staff and State Parks' staff to discuss the issue and decide upon the approach to be made to the legislative bodies concerned (OPPFM, House Ways and Means, Senate Ways and Means and the Legislative Budget Committee.) A meeting was held on August 23, 1974 with the House Ways and Means Committee which had been the first step toward resolution of the problem. Mr. Francis stated those at the meeting had been receptive to the facts and he would keep the Interagency Committee members advised as to future progress.

The Committee discussed reversion of the funds appropriated for the Nalley property to the Outdoor Recreation Account and the facts which need to be related to the legislative committees involved in the budgetary review for the State.

(Mr. Bishop introduced Honorable Gordon Sandison, State Senator, District #24, who had arrived during the Nalley Estate discussion.)

III F. Legislation: Mr. Francis reported on both state and federal legislation contained in memoranda dated August 26, 1974, as follows:

(a) Federal Legislation - Snake River/Hells Canyon, NRA, S-2233 and HR-2624: The Executive Senate Sub-Committee met in Washington, D.C., on Monday, August 19, 1974 to iron out last minute changes and technical language concerning the proposed legislation on the Snake River/Hells Canyon, National Recreation Area (S-2233 and HR-2624). Committee members were in accord as to the language in the bill and the legislation will be before the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs upon return of the Congressional members from recess of Congress. There were some changes made in boundaries, particularly in the State of Idaho, but the major objectives of the bill remain the same. Provisions directly affecting the State of Washington (the deauthorization of Asotin Dam and recreational classification of that part of the Snake River in Washington) are still intact and appear to be solid. The four sponsors of the Senate bill are explicit in their position that the Snake River be designated as a Wild, Scenic and Recreational River, and that the proposed designations remain intact.

Mr. Bishop inquired as to the status of the Tri-State Demonstration project which had been brought before the Committee at the May 29, 1973 IAC meeting. Mr. Francis stated this had not developed and there are other ways presently being explored to enable the three states (Oregon, Idaho, Washington) to obtain LWCF monies for special tri-state projects. The Assistant Attorney's General research concerning the Inter-governmental Act disclosed the Act would not provide for this type of funding, and he suggested specific legislation be written up to make such projects possible. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Washington, D.C., had advised the Congressional route would be the appropriate way to obtain Land and Water Conservation Funds for the three states. Mr. Bishop was anxious that the entire concept be pursued so that unique and outstanding projects within the three state area could be funded.

Mr. Larsen mentioned the Pacific Northwest Regional Commission evolved in May 25, 1972, by the Secretary of Commerce, designating the states of Idaho, Oregon and Washington as the Pacific Northwest Economic Development Region. Members of the Commission are the Governors of the three states. It is a joint federal-state effort to assist the overall economic development of the region through planning, research, technical assistance and grants. Mr. Francis stated the IAC had investigated the possibilities of applying for use of the Commission's funds, and would be discussing this with Mr. Larsen. However, for purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, there would need to be special enabling legislation for the use of the funds on a three-state basis. Mr. Bishop countered that the Northwest Regional Commission would have the greater ability to focus attention on the matter and pursue it, and he asked Mr. Francis to look into the matter.

Mr. Bell inquired concerning the \$4 million Forest Service Funds for the purchase of in-holdings on the Middle Snake River area. According to Mr. Francis, this effort is currently in a state of pending condemnation. The Secretary of Agriculture has made a declaration of "taking", which is the same as condemnation, and the proceedings are now in the federal courts to be adjudicated.

b. Proposed Legislation - 44th State Legislature: Four general areas of concern to the IAC were listed by Mr. Francis:

1. Amendments to the Marine Rec. Land Act of 1964 (RCW 43.99)
2. Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers System

3. Amendment to the All-Terrain Vehicle Act (RCW 46.09)
4. Continuation of a State Outdoor Recreation Bond program (IAC)

1. Amendments to the Marine Recreation Land Act of 1964 (RCW 43.99):

a. Elimination of the optional refund provision for marine fuel (gasoline) taxes: The IAC strongly endorses this concept and recommended similar legislation to House Bill #87 be supported by the IAC, and the Administrator directed to cooperate with any interested legislative sponsor(s) or to secure such a sponsor.

b. Results of any study determining proportion of motor vehicle fuel tax monies for IAC be effective as of the year of the study, survey or investigation: Mr. Francis explained the history of the Marine Fuel Tax Studies and recommended that the IAC support the concept that any study, survey or investigation shall become effective July 1 of the year in which it is conducted, and direct the Administrator to prepare the proper amendment to RCW 43.99.030 and secure a legislative sponsor.

c. Eliminate restriction on Init. 215 limiting capital improvement to not more 50%: Mr. Francis recommended removal of this arbitrary constraint and thus provide greater flexibility for maximum utilization of 215 funds in a timely and expeditious manner. This would necessitate repeal of Section 43.99.090 in its entirety.

2. Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers System: Mr. Francis recommended similar legislation to HB 582 of the last session be introduced in the 44th State Legislative Session and that the Interagency Committee endorse and support it, and direct the Administrator to cooperate with any interested legislative sponsor(s) or to secure such sponsor(s).

3. Broaden the Operating Budget Base of the IAC: Mr. Francis explained the need to broaden the Operating Budget Base of the IAC, and the staff analysis over the past few years. He proposed to amend Section 45.09.170 of the ATV (All-Terrain Vehicle) law to provide that the IAC may use one-half of one percent of those monies determined to be ATV fuel tax for expenses incurred in the administration and distribution of the ATV fuel tax. At present rate of tax, this would amount to approximately \$10,000 for the biennium. He recommended that the IAC support this concept and direct the Administrator to prepare the proper amendment and secure a legislative sponsor(s).

4. State Outdoor Recreation Bonds: Mr. Francis suggested that IAC consider a proposal for a \$90 million Outdoor Recreation Bond Referendum, and direct the Administrator to explore these possibilities with the appropriate sources and report back to the Committee at the December 1974 meeting.

Mr. Larsen felt that the IAC Sub-Committee on Capital Budgets had made the decision to postpone consideration of contacting the Legislature about bond monies until such time as it could indicate its accomplishments with the previous bond issue monies. Mr. Francis replied the Land and Water Conservation Fund monies would be substantially increased in the next year and with that in mind it appeared pertinent to bring this issue back to the Committee members and suggest they think in terms of a substantial bond issue as well as the possibility of smaller

bond issues being legislatively approved. The fact that there may be a substantial increase in Land and Water Conservation Funds by 1976 will require ability of the State to match and maximize those funds.

Mr. Bishop suggested discussing each legislative item separately and called for questions on item (1) Amendments to the Marine Recreation Land Act:

In response to Mr. Andrews' question, Mr. Francis stated the portion of funding was determined by the study and the IAC needs to know how much that total amount will be. Presently it receives only a portion of the 1.03%, but under the proposal made by the Administrator, IAC would receive the full amount of the 1.03% and four years hence a new study would be made to see if that percentage would still be pertinent. Mr. Andrews asked why the money for the study could not be produced also by the percentage system and be tied into the plan as formulated by the Administrator. Mr. Francis stated it could be tied together but experience has shown that the Department of Motor Vehicles would use that money and there needs to be some control set up so that the IAC would not be paying for a high-cost study done by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Mr. Andrews stated he was concerned about a yearly study and the costs involved. Mr. Francis explained updating of the survey would be very simple and the mechanics of it had already been worked out. The law itself, however, would still call for a more thorough and complete study to be made once every four years.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, SECONDED BY DR. ANDERSON THAT:

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE:

(1) SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT THAT RCW 43.99 SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ELIMINATE THE OPTIONAL REFUND PROVISION FOR MARINE FUEL (GASOLINE) TAXES (AS FORMERLY PROPOSED IN HOUSE BILL 87, 1974 LEGISLATIVE SESSION), AND DIRECTS THE ADMINISTRATOR TO COOPERATE WITH ANY INTERESTED LEGISLATIVE SPONSOR(S) OR TO SECURE SUCH A SPONSOR FOR THE 1975 LEGISLATIVE SESSION; AND FURTHER,

(2) SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT THAT ANY STUDY, SURVEY OR INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE THE PROPORTION OF MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX MONIES FOR THE IAC BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE YEAR OF THE STUDY, SURVEY OR INVESTIGATION (JULY 1 OF EACH YEAR), AND DIRECTS THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PREPARE THE PROPER AMENDMENT TO RCW 43.99.030 AND SECURE A LEGISLATIVE SPONSOR(S) FOR THE 1975 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, AND FURTHER,

(3) SUPPORTS THE REMOVAL OF THE ARBITRARY CONSTRAINT RESTRICTING INITIATIVE 215 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT TO NOT MORE THAN 50%, AND DIRECTS THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PREPARE THE PROPER AMENDMENT FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 43.99.090 AND SECURE A LEGISLATIVE SPONSOR(S) FOR THE 1975 LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers System: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. CROUSE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ENDORSES AND SUPPORTS THE WILD, SCENIC AND RECREATION RIVERS SYSTEM LEGISLATION (SIMILAR TO HOUSE BILL 582 OF THE 1974 LEGISLATIVE SESSION), AND DIRECTS THE ADMINISTRATOR TO COOPERATE WITH ANY INTERESTED LEGISLATIVE SPONSOR(S) TO SECURE SUCH SPONSOR(S) FOR THE 1975 LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. Broaden Base of Operating Budget for the IAC: Mr. Andrews stated he had

strong objection to the wording of the Administrator's proposal in regard to "one-half of 1% of the monies determined to be ATV Fuel Tax funds." Because of the formula, it would mean about one-half of 1% of approximately \$15 million per biennium, but it would not be possible to obtain that amount. Approximately \$2 to \$3 million would be obtainable per biennium. Mr. Crouse then suggested stating, "the percentage of funds for ATV Fuel Tax for operation may not be a flat percentage but shall be funds in the amount that the Interagency Committee would expend."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE SUPPORT AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 45.09.170 TO PROVIDE THAT THE IAC MAY RECEIVE FUNDS FOR OPERATIONS FROM THE ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE FUEL TAX IN THE AMOUNT THAT THE AGENCY WOULD EXPEND IN ADMINISTERING THE PROGRAM, AND DIRECTS THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PREPARE THE PROPER AMENDMENT AND SECURE A LEGISLATIVE SPONSOR(S) FOR THE 1975 LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. State Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITIES OF A \$90 MILLION OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND REFERENDUM WITH THE APPROPRIATE SOURCES AND REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE IN DECEMBER 1974 AS TO HIS FINDINGS.

Discussion followed. Mr. Bert Cole stated the motion should be passed with the understanding that the Administrator is not going to promote the legislation. Mr. Biggs stated there is a definite need to look into the legislation possibilities for a bond issue in order to continue the acquisition and development of outdoor recreation lands under the grant-in-aid program of the IAC; that the Administrator ought to examine this field and determine what can be provided, reporting back to the Committee. Mr. Bishop counseled the Administrator that he should be aware of the Constitutional Amendment which would provide for smaller bond issues without necessity of going to the voters, and that the thrust of his examination should not be entirely toward a large bond issue. There is a method of obtaining bond monies now through legislative action. Both alternatives should be analyzed by the Administrator.

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

There followed further discussion on the ATV funds, with Mr. Andrews stating it was his view the ATV legislation was actually no different than any other type of legislation dealing with roads, and the same type of formula should apply; that all the monies should not be exclusively diverted to ATV roads, but rather a system evolved wherein the taxes generated would be "split out" properly as is done with other tax monies used for Washington's road system.

Meeting recessed at 4:30 p.m.

TUESDAY AUGUST 27

The meeting reconvened at 9:05 a.m.. Chairman Bishop asked that the Administrator personally and by letter thank Mr. Dick Mullins, Superintendent, Park and Recreation, City of Port Angeles, for his assistance in the meeting arrangements for the IAC and express to him the Committee's sympathy in the passing of a close relative.

Honorable William Knapman, County Commissioner, Clallam County, was introduced by the Chairman.

IV A. SCORP - Local Agency Priorities: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, "Local Agency Priorities", and recommended that Priority #4, "Acquisition of Locally Significant Features" be deleted from the listing of priorities and that all other priorities be retained in present order of rank 1 thru 6. The Technical Committee had concurred with this recommendation which was based on the fact that no projects were submitted to the IAC for funding in this category during the current biennium, and most locally significant features can be classified under one of the other priority categories. Mr. Pelton stated that upon completion of the Demand Study and a run of the Distribution Model to update acquisition and development needs, further evaluation would be made of the Local Agency Priorities with a possible view of changing them.

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

WHEREAS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED LOCAL AGENCY PRIORITIES AS GENERAL FUNDING GUIDELINES, AND

WHEREAS EVALUATION OF THESE PRIORITIES HAS INDICATED A NEED FOR CHANGE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE LOCAL AGENCY PRIORITIES BE CHANGED TO DELETE PRIORITY #4,

"ACQUISITION OF LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT FEATURES"

AND THEREBY READ AS FOLLOWS:

PRIORITY #1	ACQUISITION OF SHORELINES
PRIORITY #2	DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL RECREATION AREAS
PRIORITY #3	DEVELOPMENT OF SHORELINES
PRIORITY #4	ACQUISITION OF LOCAL RECREATION AREAS
PRIORITY #5	TRAIL ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT
PRIORITY #6	ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL RECREATIONAL AREAS

AND, FURTHER, THAT NECESSARY ACTIONS BE TAKEN TO AMEND THE 1973 WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN (SCORP), FOURTH EDITION, TO REFLECT THIS CHANGE AS WELL AS THE LOCAL AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES, SECTION 03.07.000 "PARTICIPANT'S MATCHING SHARE".

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV B. IAC 1975-77 Operating Budget: Since the material on the 1975-77 Operating Budget had been carefully outlined in memorandum from staff dated August 26, 1974, and had been sent to the Committee members for review prior to the IAC meeting, Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Francis to briefly point up the essential features -- increases, basic justification, etc., -- due to the time element. Mr. Francis referred to the memorandum of staff, presented the history of the formulation of the budget, meetings which had been held, and noted that all Committee members had also received a copy of the complete budget prior to the IAC meeting.

- (1) Three new positions were requested in the current staff level:
 - (a) Rec. Res. Spec. II - to assist in compliance with BOR on-site inspection tri-ennially; to work in area of project review - Project Admin. Section (Begin 10-1-75)

- (b) Rec. Res. Spec. II - to assist Project Administration Division with liaison between IAC and State and local agencies to formulate, process, administer projects and bring to completion (close out) approved projects. (Begin 10-1-75)
 - (c) Secretary - responsible for workload generated by two new Rec. Res. Spec II's. (Begin 1-2-76)
- (2) Initiate program to recover from BOR/LWCF allowable charges which are direct cost of the IAC administration of the LWCF grant-in-aid program. (Approx. \$142,965)
 - (3) Total Budget - \$885,808.

Mr. Francis also discussed justification for increase in the budget from the previous biennium.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, THAT THE IAC APPROVE THE 1975-77 BIENNIUM OPERATING BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$885,808 AS PRESENTED IN MEMORANDUM OF STAFF DATED AUGUST 27, 1974, AND AS PRESENTED IN THE OPERATING BUDGET DOCUMENT FOR 1975-77 BIENNIUM TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT.

Discussion followed. Mr. Odegaard asked for an explanation of the cost related to the Demand Study and the Personal Service Contract. Mr. Pelton replied a portion of the Demand Study (the development of the questionnaire and type of program use) will be completed during this biennium and tested in this biennium. The rest of the Demand Study and survey will not be completed in this biennium, with the exception of the King County survey which will be done. The total cost of the entire Demand Survey, tying in both biennia, will be \$85,000. In 1967 the study cost \$92,110. Beyond salaries, the annual biennial cost for updating of the SCORP would be between \$30,000 to \$50,000 and during the current biennia, it will cost about \$10,000 to keep SCORP on-going.

In response to Mr. Odegaard's concerns, Mr. Francis stated that basically it would cost \$145,000 for the 1975-77 biennium to keep SCORP current, taking into account the planning grant of BOR. Mr. Bishop commented on the fact that the Fiscal Sub-Committee had carefully reviewed the preliminary 1975-77 Operating Budget of the IAC and had suggested several areas where it could be significantly cut. Staff had taken the Sub-Committee's suggestions well, and had pared the budget considerably, still maintaining an on-going program for the acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas and the overall management of SCORP. There was some discussion regarding the funds used to operate the IAC and the fact was brought out that the agency did not finance through the General Fund, but at some future time it might be necessary to request such funding if bond issues and Initiative 215 did not provide sufficient funds.

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

Mr. Odegaard asked if there would be any demands or any other items State agencies should reflect in their budgets for the coming biennium for SCORP other than those which had been discussed and acknowledged heretofore. Mr.

Francis assured him there were no other studies, etc., contemplated other than routine information from State agencies; however, it was not possible to prophesy special studies which might be asked of the IAC during the biennium. Any unforeseen study would be discussed with the TAC and the Interagency Committee prior to any action.

IV B. a. Management Review Sub-Committee: Mr. Bishop suggested to the members the appointment of a Management Review Sub-Committee, to work with the Administrator in assisting the IAC staff and Administrator to achieve a degree of efficiency in performance from the staff in those areas related to project administration and planning, budgetary program, and any other areas which could be better stabilized through the sub-committee working with the Administrator. The Administrator could consult with the sub-committee for advice and direction regarding any management functions of the IAC; and the sub-committee would likewise be able to consult with the Administrator on any matters relating to the agency it desired to discuss and/or formalize. Mr. Bishop stated the sub-committee would in no way interfere with the administrative organization of the agency nor the Administrator's responsibilities and duties in his position, but would have as its main role assistance to the Administrator and staff in achieving top level efficiency.

Mr. Biggs felt the appointment of such a sub-committee was a rather sensitive area. He did not want to see the Administrator hampered by undue policy instruction from the Interagency Committee members, and he stated he had serious reservations to the need of appointing such a sub-committee. Mr. Bishop then clarified the role of the sub-committee, stating it would relate only to assistance to the Administrator and to his staff, would not dictate how the agency should operate, but would merely be a guiding influence. It was his feeling the Committee members really did not know how the staff functioned and it would be advantageous to work more closely with them to ascertain some of the management problems, assist with budget proposals, etc., on a closer basis than it had up to this time. Mr. Odegaard pointed out that the Park and Recreation Commission of his department assists him as director in much the same manner and he has welcomed their input and direction. He felt the sub-committee would be an asset to both the Interagency Committee members and the Administrator and his staff.

Mr. Bishop then mentioned that the Governor looks to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation as he would a single department. The Administrator prepares budgets, presents these proposals to the Committee, to OPPFM, and thence to the State Legislature. Therefore, the Interagency Committee members must have an understanding of the IAC budgetary matters and be able to answer questions concerning them; thus, a thorough knowledge of the administrative processes within the agency itself is necessary if the Interagency Committee is going to perform its functions by law as it is required to do.

At this point Mr. Biggs acknowledged the meaning and intent behind the proposal for a Management Review Sub-Committee, and stated he thought it was an excellent idea especially in relation to budget proposals, with assurance that it would not interfere with the Administrator's role as director of the agency. Dr. Anderson approved of the proposal and asked that there be sufficient public members on the sub-committee. It was the consensus of the Committee that the Chairman had the prerogative to appoint the sub-committee if he so desired, and that the Fiscal Sub-committee could continue in its present role and assume the new role of acting as a Sub-Committee on Management Review. These members are:

GEORGE ANDREWS, JOHN LARSEN, LEWIS BELL, MICAELA BROSTROM, AND WARREN BISHOP

IV C 1. Department of Natural Resources: Mr. Glenn Moore and Larry Burk referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, proposing five acquisition projects and one development project be funded for the Department of Natural Resources. Slides were shown of each project and explanations given.

- a. Long Lake Indian Paintings, Stevens County: Acquisition of 50-yr. lease on 15 acre parcel in Stevens Co. \$ 2,141. *amended 12-9-74*
- b. McLane Creek: Acquisition of 50-yr. lease on 41.86 acres in Capitol Forest area. \$ 19,510
- c. Mima Falls Trailhead: Acquisition of 50-yr. lease, 2.8 acre parcel, Capitol Forest area. \$ 2,095
- d. Upper Clearwater: Acquisition of 50-yr. lease on 11 acre parcel, Jefferson County. \$8,900
- e. Hoh Oxbow: Acquisition of 50 yr. lease on 15 acre parcel, Jefferson County. \$ 12,135
- f. Chehalis Valley Vista: Development of vista and picnic area within 4.8 acre tract of land, Capitol Forest. \$10,500

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

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

75-705A	LONG LAKE INDIAN PAINTINGS	REFERENDUM 18	\$ 2,141
75-704A	McLANE CREEK	"	19,510
75-705A	MIMA FALLS TRAILHEAD	"	2,095
75-708A	UPPER CLEARWATER	"	8,900
75-707A	HOH OXBOW	"	12,135
75-703D	CHEHALIS VALLEY VISTA	"	<u>10,500</u>
		TOTAL REF. 18	\$ 55,281

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV C. 2. Department of Game: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated August 26, 1974, proposing for approval 7 acquisition projects and ten development projects for the Department of Game. Slides were shown & explanations given.

- a. Tippet Ranch: Acquisition of 6,451 acres of land, including 3/5 mile frontage on Grande Ronde River. \$720,000
- b. Gloyd Seeps WRA: Acquisition of 1,626 acres as addition to Gloyd Seeps WRA, Grant County. \$164,000
- c. Driscoll Island: Acquisition of 236 acres of land on Driscoll Is., Eynott Island chain in channel of Okanogan and Similkameen Rivers, near Oroville, Grant County. \$127,400

- d. Skagit WRA: Acquisition of 123-acre farm of which 70 acres are level farmland; 53 acres marshland. Addition to Skagit WRA, Snohomish County. \$102,000
- e. Cherry Valley, WRA: Acquisition of 386 acres of farmland, King County, to provide additional public hunting and wildlife-oriented recreation. \$494,500
- f. Acquisition of 835 acres, 195 acres of uplands and 620 of tidelands Grays Harbor County, Humptulips River and 12,906 lineal feet of tidelands on North Bay, Grays Harbor Bay. \$ 58,500
- g. Klickitat WRA: Acquisition of 160 acres - addition to Klickitat WRA, property adjacent to property approved at May 1974 meeting. \$28,000
- h. Desert WRA Fedesco & Gauging Stn. Pkg.: Redevelop two existing parking areas, develop a third, construct 2.5 miles roadway, Grant County, Winchester Wasteway. \$105,500
- i. Desert WRA - 645 Drain: Grant County, construct .5 acre parking lot, restrooms, fencing. \$17,000
- j. Desert WRA - Frenchman Hills Parking: Construct, redevelop, two parking areas located Dodson Road, Grant County, Desert WRA. \$51,000
- k. Moses Lake - Outlet Pkg. Areas: Construct 2 parking lot areas, restrooms, north and south outlet channels of Moses Lake. \$30,000
- l. L. T. Murray, Rosa Creek Rec. Site: Develop .5 acre site to provide primitive type day-use and overnight facility - serving 20-mile trail to be constructed. \$12,000
- m. L. T. Murray, Joe Watt Elk Viewing Area: Develop parking facility, primarily for winter use as viewing area for elk feeding program, and year around multi-purpose recreational uses. Kittitas County. \$35,000
- n. L. T. Murray, Umptanum Rec. Site #2: Develop parking area for primitive day-use facility. Construct log bridge over creek. Yakima County. \$39,000
- o. Skagit WRA, Dike Construction: Construct 2,300 feet of levee on segment of Skagit WRA to prevent flooding. Skagit County. \$11,000
- p. Bogachiel River Rearing Pond Boat Launch: Construct additional boat ramp with parking, restrooms, access road. \$40,000 - Clallam County.
- q. Bogachiel River Leyendecker Park: Improve and enlarge existing boat launch facilities on Clallam County property. \$16,000

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BELL, SECONDED BY MR. LARSEN, THAT

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE WASHINGTON STATE GAME DEPARTMENT 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 AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN:

(SEE LISTING ON PAGE 33)

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

75-600A	TIPPETT RANCH	REF. 18	\$360,000	LWCF \$360,000	\$720,000
75-607A	GLOYD SEEPS WRA		164,000		164,000
75-606A	DRISCOLL ISLAND		127,400		127,400
75-608A	SKAGIT WRA		102,000		102,000
75-609A	CHERRY VALLEY WRA		247,250	247,250	494,500
75-603A	HUMPTULIPS RIVER WRA		58,500		58,500
75-601A	KLICKITAT WRA		28,000		28,000
75-617D	DESERT WRA-FEDESCO ROAD AND THREE PARKING AREAS		105,500		105,500
75-619D	DESERT WRA - 645 DRAIN PARKING AREA		17,000		17,000
75-618D	DESERT WRA--WINCHESTER/FRENCHMAN HILLS PARKING		51,000		51,000
75-624D	MOSES LAKE - OUTLET PARKING AREAS (2)		30,000		30,000
75-610D	L. T. MURRAY WRA - ROZA CREEK		12,000		12,000
75-611D	L. T. MURRAY - JOE WATT VIEWING AREA		35,000		35,000
75-613D	L. T. MURRAY - UMPTANUM CREEK		39,000		39,000
75-621D	SKAGIT WRA - DIKE		11,000		11,000
75-622D	BOGACHIEL RIVER - REARING POND BOAT LAUNCH			INIT. 215 \$40,000	40,000
75-623D	BOGACHIEL RIVER - LEYENDECKER BOAT LAUNCH			INIT. 215 16,000	16,000

TOTAL: \$ 2,150,900

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V. Administrator's Report: Mr. Francis reported on the following matters:

(1) Available funds at December meeting: Only changes that would affect monies available in December would be those additional funds approved for Prosser, Ref. 28. Would reduce total in fund summary to:

Ref. 28	\$	264,000)	
Init. 215		498,000)	\$ 1,843,000 Local Projects
LWCF		1,081,000)	

About 40 projects presently received; deadline for development is Sept. 1; acquisition, October 1. May have considerably more projects by time of deadlines. (\$12 to 14 million dollars requested.)

(2) LWCF Funding percentages: Percentage fluctuation over the years was analyzed. Low of 27.3 to states in 1969 to high of 85.5 in 1974. In 1969 out of \$164.5 million about \$45 million went to states; \$117 million to federal. Also in 1969 there was a major special appropriation for the California Redwoods. In 1970 there was a rise in percent. Overall average from 1968 to 1974 has been

56.9 percent. Have held fairly close to the 60-40 split. Within that law there is a 15% leeway either way. In 1975, indications are 60% will be allocated to the states.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Francis to send the complete information on percentage funding of LWCF to the Committee members, and include complete information in the minutes (SEE APPENDIX A).

Mr. Odegard mentioned the meeting of NASORLO and possibilities of discussing LWCF increased funding with these representatives.

(3) 1974 - Tenth Anniversary of the IAC: At December meeting will expect to give a 10th Anniversary Report re the IAC activities and progress. Mr. Bishop suggested getting out information to the public and indicating appreciation for their support of the past Bond Issue programs.

(4) Personnel Changes: Barry Wenger - employed as Res. Analyst - working on the Demand Study aspects in Planning Division;
Fred Wagner - Resigned to return to Pennsylvania; placed on LWOP with possibility of returning to Washington State;
Kathy Scott - Taking maternity leave 60 days; possibility of returning to the office on November 1, 1974.

Mr. Francis indicated the Project Administration Section would be without two Rec. Res. Specialists for some time and the workload would increase in that section.

(5) Mercer Slough/State Parks/Bellevue - project: EIS review in Washington, D.C.

(6) EXPO 74: Will be coming to a close; IAC will continue to work with the City of Spokane as to residual -- buildings to be taken off the grounds and those left for public use.

(7) Capitol Lake Project: Senator Harry B. Lewis - formed Committee concerning Capitol Lake Project, Capitol City area.....major recreational plan envisioned for Olympia area. IAC asked to serve on this group with 17 or 18 other interested persons/agencies. \$25,000 was allocated from the Capitol Committee to obtain a coordinator. Mr. Jerry Bachmann employed; housed at IAC temporarily. Mr. Francis reported he had been appointed as Chairman of the total Committee and of the Executive Committee.

(8) IAC Assistant Attorney General: Reviewed lease agreements for the IAC. Mineral Timber agreement and others are in the offing -- Trails, Aquatic lands, etc. Also Mr. Francis reported he is working with DNR in regard to these leases and agreements.

(9) Public Records charge: IAC has established cost for copying public records at 10¢ per page. Form has been established for use of the public.

(10) Cypress Island and Whitworth College holdings - working with Nature Conservancy to hold these lands; also Swallow's Nest in Clarkston. Preserve for public use.

(11) Northwest Regional Commission: April 1975 will present to the Interagency a comprehensive plan regarding the Snake River; working with Northwest Regional

Commission re funding possibilities.

(12) BOR Federal/State Commission: BOR has written to Governor Evans concerning a Federal/State Recreation Commission whereby various entities (i.e., IAC, BOR, BLM, etc.) can get together and exchange information at least twice a year. One meeting could be prior to budget process and another following same.

(13) Oregon Marine Board: Mr. Francis reported that Mr. Martin is working with the Oregon Marine Board on a joint project consideration regarding the Columbia River and marine facilities.

(14) Washington Aeronautics Commission: Also, Mr. Martin is working with the Washington Aeronautics Commission regarding recreational facilities near air strips throughout the state - possibilities of.

(15) Local Agency Contacts: IAC staff contacted forty local agencies throughout the state regarding grant-in-aid program possibilities; sent out over 560 letters in conjunction with Washington Recreation and Park Society assistance.

(16) Park Maintenance Award Program: WRPS will now take over this program within its Park Practices Section -- Washington State may obtain future awards for parks IAC has funded, etc.

(17) NASORLO: Mr. Francis reported on the meeting Sept. 8-11 in Spokane, with 45 of the 50 states sending representatives. Director James Watt, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Dept. of Interior, Washington, D.C., will address the group. Other activities are planned. Gordon Harmstrom, President, will extend invitation to all IAC members to attend Monday's luncheon.

The concerns Mr. Francis will take to NASORLO included:

1. Funding levels
2. Federal/State Planning coordination
3. Conversion policy and implementation
4. Appraisal sequences/concerns/rigid application of the manual regarding same.
5. NW Regional Grant-in-Aid Officers meeting held at the Tye, Olympia - concerns expressed there will be brought before NASORLO. Need timely notification to the states of Federal legislation and implementation of same. Also need guidelines on legislation.

(18) Fair Employment Practices Act: Will be meeting with representatives of federal agency to learn how IAC should start implementing this program. Mr. Francis stated it would seem logical to devise a program in which the IAC could have its records kept on State agency level or Local agency level and still be accountable.

(19) Fort Worden, IAC, State Agencies Conference: Mr. Martin reported on the meeting held at Fort Worden recently. There had been excellent exchange of information; areas of responsibilities and concerns had been discussed; and IAC will continue to meet with state agencies up to the time of the December meeting on their proposed projects and the closing out of the older projects.

VI. Committee Members' reports: Mr. Odegaard (1) suggested that the Committee consider meeting at the Fort Worden State Park facility at some future time
(2) Mentioned EXPO -- and stated the Parks and Recreation Commission would be

conducting a meeting concerning the total Spokane River and its use following EXPO.

- (3) Advised of Ground-breaking ceremonies at Lake Sammamish.
- (4) Advised of dedication date for Steamboat Rock - Sept. 15, 1974
- (5) Noted there would be a Historic Preservations meeting at Walla Walla on September 6, 1974.
- (6) and advised of contract awarded on the Lake Wenatchee project involving IAC funds.

VII. Other Reports:

A. December 9-10, 1974 meeting: Mr. Martin reported the December meeting would take place in Olympia at the Department of General Administration Conference Room. However, the meeting location was subject to change and the Committee members will be notified of time and place.

Mr. Francis asked for 100 copies of informational brochures from each State agency on the Interagency Committee for use in distributing to members of NASORLO in Spokane. These were to be delivered to his office in Tumwater.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:25 A.M.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

8/26/75
(DATE)

Warren A. Bishop
WARREN A. BISHOP, CHAIRMAN

September 3, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Interagency Committee members

FROM: Stanley E. Francis, Administrator

SUBJ: LWCF - State/Federal Apportionment
8 year History

As requested by Mr. Charles Odegaard at the August IAC meeting, an 8 year history of the State/Federal apportionment has been compiled by BOR for our information.

In tabular form, the information is as follows:

		<u>In Millions</u>			
<u>FY</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Fed.</u>	<u>BOR</u>
	1975 (Not signed)	\$ 300.0	\$ 180.0 (60%)	--	--
***	1974	76.223	66.0 (86.6%)	5.0	5.223
	1973	300.0	181.8 (60.6%)	112.957	5.243
	1972	361.5	255.0 (70.6%)	101.669	4.831
	1971	357.4	185.239 (51.9%)	167.722	4.439
*	1970	131.1	61.832 (47.2%)	65.756	3.511
**	1969	164.5	44.938 (27.3%)	116.661	2.9
	1968	113.131	61.520 (54.4%)	48.771	2.840

August State % 1968 - 1974 = 56.9

- * Supplemented (Fed) for Point Reyes National Seashore (Calif.)
- ** Supplemental (Fed) for Redwoods (California)
- *** Supplemental for State of \$18 million (Special Contingency)

COMMENTS: The LWCF Act provides for a basic 60/40 State/Federal division, with a 15% deviation allowable in either direction. With the exception of FY 1974 -- a rather unique year in itself -- special appropriation bill language allowed the percentages to fluctuate highly in favor of the states.

On the eight (8) year average, the State's percent has been 56.9% -- almost "on the nose".

The greatest problem with the level of funding is not necessarily the State/Fed division, although that does cause considerable momentary concern during any given Congressional appropriation process, but the "yo-yoing" of the total amounts of LWCF monies from year to year. It gives little or no stability to states for matching requirements. This point will be discussed at the 1974 NASORLO meeting in Spokane.

Generally, as the IAC Administrator, I am satisfied that the states are getting their fair share, as is the State of Washington. However, I do believe we (the IAC) could be more active in seeking the Secretary's Special Contingency Funds.

SEF

SEF:mmf

cc: IAC Staff

APPENDIX "B" TO MINUTES 8-26/27, 1974

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES ADOPTION (NEW) AND REVISIONS OF OLD
GUIDELINES - AUGUST 26-27, 1974 MEETING - PORT ANGELES

NOTE: *These guidelines have been issued as
Revision #2 to the Procedural Guidelines, both state and local
Effective 8-26-74 (except where indicated)
To be mailed out 10-4 thru 11, 1974 - week or so.
All revisions or adopted guidelines are in ITALICS.*

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE CHANGES APPROVED AS FOLLOWS:

03.07.000	Participant's Matching Share - Locals	Revised
03.08.010	Donations of Goods and Services on Dev. Projects - Locals	Adopted
04.15.010	Formal Appraisal Requirements - S/L *	Revised (11-15-74)
04.15.020(13)	Abbreviated Appraisal Requirements - S/L (Copy of Preliminary Title Ins. Policy)	Revised/added
04.15.030	Easement Appraisal Requirements - S/L (Copy of Preliminary Title Ins. Policy)	Revised/added
05.02.010(11)	Eligible Development Projects - S/L (Support facilities, etc.)	Revised
05.02.010(12)	Eligible Development Projects - S/L	Adopted
05.02.010(13)	(Interpretive Centers) (& Redevelopment)	Adopted - S/L
05.05.000(20)	Ineligible development costs - S/L	Adopted
05.13.000	Underground Utilities - S/L	Adopted
05.14.000	Architectural Barrier Act - S/L	Adopted
08.05.000	Cost Increases - Dev. Projects - S/L (All approved 10% cost increases if elig.)	Revised
08.13.000	Submission of Final Billing) - S/L (Re escrow, etc.))	Adopted (10-18-73) Sent out 10-1974)
08.14.000	Post-Completion Inspection - S/L	Adopted
Chap. 09	Billing Procedures - State Agencies	Revised
Chap. 09	Billing Procedures - Local Agencies (Certain revisions made in 09.03.000; 09.04.000 (Cost Categories); 09.04.000 (2) Documentation of Payments; 09.04.000 (3) Force Account; and in 09.05.000 Inspections.)	Revised

* S/L == State/Local Procedural Guidelines

03.07.000 PARTICIPANT'S MATCHING SHARE (REVISED 8-26-74)

A local agency must provide, as a minimum, between twenty-five and forty percent of the total project cost as its matching share, depending on the classification (priority category) of the project. The local agency share must be available at the time application is made. The remainder of the approved project cost may be composed of state, or a combination of state and federal funds administered by the IAC.

Certain projects may qualify for federal funds not administered by the IAC, such as from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Army Corps of Engineers. In these cases, the federal agency normally grants fifty percent of the project costs, the local agency the required percentage for the project classification, and the IAC the remainder.

The funding formula for approved local agency applications is based on the following percentages for each classification:

Up to 75% - 25% Local sponsor for projects classified as "Acquisition of Shorelines"

Up to 75% - 25% Sponsor for projects classified as "Development of Local Recreation Areas"

Up to 75% - 25% Sponsor for projects classified as "Development of Shorelines"

Up to 60% - 40% Sponsor for projects classified as "Acquisition of Local Recreation Areas"

Up to 60% - 40% Sponsor for projects classified as "Trail Acquisition and Development"

Up to 60% - 40% Sponsor for projects classified as "Acquisition and Development of Regional Recreation Areas."

The IAC encourages the donation of goods and in-kind contributions to applicants by private parties. The value of the in-kind contributions may be used as all or part of the applicant's share of the project cost. The IAC must agree with the method to be used to determine the value of in-kind contributions of goods and services in advance of project approval in order for such contributions to be considered as part of the applicant's matching share. Specific procedures for placing the value on in-kind contributions from private organizations and individuals are set forth below:

- (1) Valuation of Volunteer Services. Volunteer services may be furnished by professional and technical personnel, consultants, and other skilled and unskilled labor. Each hour of volunteered service may be counted as matching share if the service is an integral and necessary part of an approved project. Records of in-kind contributions of personnel shall include time sheets containing the signature of the person whose time is contributed and of his supervisor verifying that the record is true and accurate.
 - (a) Rates for volunteer services. The time of a person donating his services will be valued at the current Federal minimum wage, unless he is professionally skilled in the work he is performing on the project; i.e., plumber doing work on pipes, mason doing work on a brick building. When this is the case, the wage rate this individual is paid for performing his service may be charged in the amount of that which governmental agencies in the immediate area pay their permanent employees for performing similar duties.
 - (b) Volunteers employed by other organizations. When an employer other than the grantee furnishes the services of an employee, these services shall be valued at the employee's regular rate of pay (exclusive of fringe benefits and overhead cost) provided these services are in the same skill for which the employee is normally paid.
- (2) Valuation of Materials. Prices assigned to donated materials included in the matching share should be reasonable and should not exceed the cost of the materials to the donor or current market prices, whichever is the less, at the time they are charged to the project. Records of in-kind contributions of material shall indicate the cost to the donor and the fair market value by listing the comparable prices and vendors.
- (3) Valuation of Donated Equipment. The hourly rate for donated equipment used on a project may be determined from State Highway Department Equipment Use Rate Schedules. Hourly rates in the annual edition of Rental Compilation or similar publications which provide the national average rates for construction equipment may not be used as the rates include a profit factor. Records of in-kind contributions of equipment shall include the schedules showing the hours and rates of use and the signatures of the operator of the equipment.

- (4) Documentation and Approval. The basis for determining the charges for donated personal services, material, equipment and land must be documented and must be approved by the IAC prior to project approval.

The in-kind contributions are eligible in a project only to the extent that there are additional development costs to be met by the State-assistance requested for that project, which must be fully described and explained in the proposal.

The amount of donation that is matchable is the value of the donation or the amount of cash spent by the applicant for additional development, whichever is less. Any portion of the value of a donation not utilized by the applicant for matching in the project is not available to subsequent projects.

IAC reimbursement on projects involving such donations will be limited to the amount of actual cash outlay by the grantee and dependent upon adequate documentation of the donation for the local share at that point in time.

The contribution and valuation of in-kind contribution must be recorded as expenditures in the financial records (separate project ledger form) of the grantee in such a fashion that they are readily identifiable for Federal and State audit purposes.

A formal appraisal report is required if the total value of the property is estimated to be \$25,000 or more. To qualify as a formal appraisal, the report must contain, as a minimum, the elements and documentation in the following list. A copy of this list should be given to the appraiser to insure that his report will qualify. All items appropriate to the particular appraisal must be included, together with any additional data to support the appraiser's conclusions.

The following guidelines will be used where they are reasonable and applicable: The text of the appraisal report shall be divided into four parts as outlined below:

- Part I:**
1. **TITLE PAGE:** *This shall include (a) the name of owner and location of the property, (b) the name of the individual making the report, and (c) the effective date of the appraisal.*
 2. **TABLE OF CONTENTS**
 3. **LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**
 4. **PHOTOGRAPHS:** *Pictures shall show at least the front elevation of the major improvements, plus any unusual features. There should also be views of the abutting properties on either side and that property directly opposite.*
 5. **STATEMENT OF LIMITING CONDITIONS:** *The appraiser should state that he assumes the title to be marketable, that he assumes no responsibility for legal matters, and that all data furnished him by others are presumed correct. He should also mention any other assumptions he has made.*

Part II. FACTUAL DATA

1. **PURPOSE OF THE APPRAISAL:** *This shall include the reason for the appraisal, and a definition of all values required, and property rights appraised.*
2. **LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** *This description shall be so complete as to properly identify the property appraised. If lengthy, it should be referenced and included in Part 4, Addenda - Title Report.*
3. **AREA, CITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DATA:** *This data (mostly social and economic) should be kept to a minimum and should include only such information as directly affects the appraised property, together with the appraiser's conclusions as to significant trends.*
4. **PROPERTY DATA:**
 - a. **Site:** *Describe the soil, topography, mineral deposits, easements, etc. A statement must be made concerning the existence or non-existence of mineral deposits having a commercial value.*

- b. *Improvements: This description may be by narrative or schedule form and shall include dimensions of principal buildings and/or improvements.*
- c. *Equipment: This shall be described by narrative description including the condition.*
- d. *Condition: The current physical condition and relative use and obsolescence shall be stated for each item or group appraised and, whenever applicable, the repair or replacement requirements to bring the property to usable condition.*
- e. *Assessed Value and Annual Tax Load: Include the current assessment and dollar amount of real estate taxes. If the property is not taxed, the appraiser shall estimate the assessment in case it is placed upon the tax roll, state the rate, and give the dollar amount of the tax estimate.*
- f. *Zoning: Describe the zoning for subject and comparable properties and, if rezoning is imminent, discuss under Part III, Item 1.*

Part III. ANALYSES AND CONCLUSIONS

1. *ANALYSIS OF HIGHEST AND BEST USE: The report shall state the highest and best use that can be legally made of the property (land and improvements and, where applicable, machinery and equipment) for which there is a current market. The valuation shall be based on this use.*
2. *LAND VALUE: The appraiser's opinion of the value of the land shall be based upon its highest and best use, regardless of any existing structures and shall be supported by confirmed current factual data (sales and offerings) of comparable, or nearly comparable, lands having like optimum uses. Differences shall be weighed and explained to show how they indicate the value of the land being appraised.*
3. *VALUE ESTIMATE BY COMPARATIVE (MARKET) APPROACH: All comparable sales used shall be confirmed by the buyer, seller, broker, or other person having knowledge of the price, terms and conditions of sale. Each comparable shall be weighed and explained in relation to the subject property to indicate the reasoning behind the appraiser's final value estimate from this approach. Use a minimum of five comparable sales.*
4. *VALUE ESTIMATE BY COST APPROACH, IF APPLICABLE: This section shall be in the form of computative data, arranged in sequence, beginning with reproduction or replacement cost, and shall state the source (book and page if a national service) of all figures used. The dollar amounts of physical deterioration and functional*

and economic obsolescence, or the omission of same, shall be explained in narrative form. This procedure may be omitted on improvements, both real and personal, for which only a salvage or scrap value is estimated.

5. VALUE ESTIMATE BY INCOME APPROACH, IF APPLICABLE: This shall include adequate factual data to support each figure and factor used and shall be arranged in detailed form to show at least (a) estimated gross rent or income; (b) an itemized estimate of total expenses including reserves for replacements.

Capitalization of net income shall be at the rate prevailing for this type of property and location. The capitalization technique, method and rate used shall be explained in narrative form supported by a statement of sources of rates and factors.

6. INTERPRETATION AND CORRELATION OF ESTIMATES: The appraiser shall interpret the foregoing estimates and shall state his reasons why one or more of the conclusions reached in Items 3, 4 and 5 are indicative of the market value.

PART IV. DOCUMENTATION

1. TABULATION OF HISTORY OF CONVEYANCE (PROPERTY SALES AND TRANSFERS): Include parties to the transactions, dates of purchase, and amounts of consideration for at least 10 years prior to appraisal.
2. CERTIFICATION OF APPRAISER:
 - a. He has personally inspected the property.
 - b. He has no present or contemplated interest in the property.
 - c. That in his opinion the market value of the taking as of _____ is \$ _____.
(valuation date)

(Signature)

(Date report submitted)

3. EXHIBITS AND ADDENDA:
 - a. Location Map (within the city or area)
 - b. Comparative Map Data. (Show geographic location of the appraised property and the comparative parcels analyzed.)
 - c. Detail of the Comparative Data. (Narrative)
 - d. Plot Plan.
 - e. Floor Plans (when needed to explain the value estimate).
 - f. Copy of Preliminary Title Insurance Policy and other pertinent exhibits.
 - g. Qualification. Statement of qualifications of all appraisers and/or technicians contributing to the report.

4. *INSPECTION WITH OWNER: A statement by appraiser that the owner was offered the opportunity to accompany the appraiser during inspection of the subject property including the date of contact and whether the owner accompanied the appraiser or declined.*

04.15.020 ABBREVIATED APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS

An abbreviated appraisal report is acceptable if the total value of the property is between \$1,000 and \$25,000. The abbreviated report need not be as detailed as a formal report, but must contain as a minimum all the elements and documentation in the following list. A copy of this list should be given to the appraiser as a basis for his report.

- (1) Certificate of opinion of fair market value.
 - A. Date of value estimate
 - B. Assumptions and limiting conditions
 - C. Statement that land-owner was offered opportunity to accompany appraiser.
- (2) Summary of conclusions
- (3) Photographs of all principal improvements and/or features affecting value
- (4) Tract map, including north arrow, street designations, and dimensions.
- (5) Purpose of the appraisal
- (6) A definition of fair market value
- (7) An adequate description of the real property and a legal description
- (8) Delineation of title (10 years). (Revised: 8-26-74)
- (9) An analysis and statement of the property's highest and best use
- (10) Estimate of value and the date the value estimate applies
- (11) Supporting data, including at least three comparable real property sales, a brief analysis of those sales, a map showing their locations relative to the land appraised, and photos of the comparables.
- (12) Statement that back-up material justifying the value is in the appraiser's file
- (13) *Copy of Preliminary Title Insurance Policy and other pertinent exhibits. (Revised/added: 8-25-74)*
- (14) A statement of the appraiser's experience and qualifications.

04.15.030 EASEMENT APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS

When easements are being purchased for public use, the following format will be acceptable:

- (1) Certificate of opinion of fair market value
 - A. Date of value estimate
 - B. Assumptions and limiting conditions.
 - C. Statement that land-owner was offered opportunity to accompany appraiser.
- (2) Summary of conclusions.
- (3) Photographs of all principal improvements and/or features affecting value
- (4) Tract map, including north arrow, street designations, and dimensions.
- (5) Narrative report
 - A. Owner
 - B. Address (or location) of subject property
 - C. Legal description and reservations
 - D. Delineation of title (10 years) (Revised: 8-26-74)
 - E. Assessed value and annual tax load
 - F. Physical description
 1. Site: soil, topography, mineral deposits, easements, accessibility
 2. Improvements
 3. Zoning
- (6) Land evaluation
 - A. A statement including all available information that will support or indicate the assigned value of the subject property.

04.15.030 EASEMENT APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

(7) Addenda

- A. Vicinity and location maps
- B. Property map
- C. Photograph: One photograph of the property, and an additional one of improvements, if necessary.
- D. Proposed utilization and justification
- E. *Copy of Preliminary Title Insurance Policy and other pertinent exhibits.*
(Revised/added: 8-26-74)

05.02.010 ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

- (4) Picnic areas with tables, fireplaces, shelters, paths and trash containers.
- (5) Camping areas with tent and trailer camp sites, utilities, tables and fireplaces.
- (6) Tot lots, play equipment, multi-purpose fields, and hardcourt game areas.
- (7) Boating facilities, such as launching ramps, loading floats, transient moorage, and moorage buoys,
- (8) Swimming facilities, such as outdoor and indoor-outdoor swimming pools, wading pools, natural swimming beaches, and bathhouses.
- (9) Fishing and hunting facilities, such as trails, fishing piers, impoundments, foot bridges and streambank access.
- (10) Observation and sightseeing facilities such as overlooks, turn-outs, and interpretive signs.
- (11) *Support facilities necessary to effectively administer, protect, and maintain a recreation area for the health, safety and welfare of facility users such as fences, signs, erosion control works, equipment storage, minor repair facilities, administrative control office, first aid station and information and interpretive signs. (REVISED: 8-26-74)*
- (12) *Interpretive facilities are eligible if they do not go beyond interpreting the project site and its immediate surrounding area. Such a facility may include an enclosed structure if its usage is secondary and supplemental to the primary outdoor use of the area. The proposed facility shall be designed and constructed to encourage participation in the outdoor recreational use of the area.*

An application for grant-in-aid assistance for interpretive facilities must include detailed information on the type and purpose of the interpretive devices which will be contained in the facility. Such a facility shall only contain basic devices necessary for the interpretation of the project site, not elaborate museum-type collections and displays. An enclosed structure should only be constructed to protect the interpretive devices from inclement weather and damage, and may be constructed in combination with other support facilities such as restrooms, visitor information facilities, etc." (ADOPTED 8-26-74)

- (13) *"Extensive renovation or the redevelopment of an existing facility. When the facility or area has deteriorated through normal use to the point where its usefulness is impaired (although not because of inadequate maintenance) or has become outmoded, renovation to bring the facility up to standards of quality and attractiveness suitable for public use or redevelopment to a more useful form is eligible.*

05.02.010 ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

"1. *Definitions*

1. *Maintenance* - Those functions required on a regular basis to keep a facility at the standard for which it was designed.
2. *Redevelopment* - renovation: Partial or complete reconstruction of an existing recreational complex or component to reestablish its original usefulness." (ADOPTED: 8-26-74)

05.05.000 INELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT COSTS (Continued)

- (11) Operation and maintenance costs of outdoor recreation areas and facilities.
- (12) The unsubstantiated value of materials contributed without cost to the participant.
- (13) The value of personal properties, unless specifically approved in advance by the IAC.
- (14) Cost of discounts not taken.
- (15) Equipment to be used for the maintenance of outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including but not limited to, automotive equipment, tractors, mowers, other machinery, and tools.
- (16) Employee facilities, including residences, appliances, office equipment, furniture, and utensils.
- (17) Donations or contributions made by the participant, such as to a charitable organization.
- (18) Fines and penalties.
- (19) Any losses arising from uncollectable accounts and other claims, and related costs.
- (20) *The purchase of recreational equipment such as basketballs, tennis rackets, horseshoe sets and tether balls. Fixed equipment such as basketball hoops and standards is eligible for reimbursement. (ADOPTED: 8-26-74)*

05.13.000 UNDERGROUND UTILITIES (ADOPTED: 8-26-74)

Overhead utility lines constitute a major detraction from the natural quality of many outdoor recreation areas. The participant will be expected to take all reasonable steps to (1) bury, screen, or relocate existing overhead lines at development or acquisition projects, and (2) to put all new electric wires under 25KV and telephone wires underground. (The existence of all overhead lines must be documented in the project application and the participant must indicate what measures are required to mitigate such environmental intrusions; if the participant feels that the overhead lines should not be removed, rerouted, or buried, the reasoning must be indicated.)

As a general policy, mass recreation use areas (swimming, picnicking, crowded spectator seating, etc) should not be located under electric wires on fund-assisted areas or facilities. Installation of electric wires over any area which has received fund assistance without the prior consent of the Administrator may constitute conversion to other than outdoor recreation use.

05.14.000 ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT (ADOPTED: 8-26-74)

Participants in the IAC Grant-in-Aid Program must comply with the requirements of the "Architectural Barriers Act of 1968", Public Law 90-480 and the "Public Buildings-Provisions for Aged and Handicapped", RCW 70.92, Laws of the State of Washington, to assure that physically handicapped persons are not precluded from the use of IAC assisted recreational facilities and that IAC reimbursement will not be jeopardized.

Preliminary design plans and cost estimates submitted with development Project Applications and plans and specifications submitted prior to construction should reflect and incorporate design modifications which permit use of park facilities by the physically handicapped. The following considerations should be reflected in the design of park facilities:

- (1) Designated area for handicapped parking
- (2) Ramps instead of or in addition to curbs
- (3) Graded paths instead of or in addition to steps.
- (4) Doorways designed to accommodate wheelchairs
- (5) Toilet facilities and drinking fountains at heights to accommodate occupants of wheelchairs.

If adequate facilities for the handicapped are already provided in the project area, it will not be necessary to construct additional facilities for the handicapped within the project. IAC staff will determine the need for facilities for the handicapped upon conferring with project sponsors.

Please refer to the "American National Standard Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible To and Usable By the Handicapped", published by the American National Standards Institute, 1430 Broadway, New York, N.Y., 10018 for a detailed coverage of design specifications.

08.05.000 COST INCREASES - DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The IAC recognizes that cost estimates for development projects are generally derived from preliminary plans and that cost estimates may be inadequate when, after IAC approval, the final construction plans are submitted for bid on a competitive basis. To provide assistance to the applicant when this happens the Administrator may, upon receipt of a written request from the applicant, approve up to a ten percent (10%) increase of the approved project cost under the following conditions:

- (1) The amount of the increase will not exceed ten percent (10%) of the approved project cost.
- (2) The amount of the increase or any portion thereof is to be used only for costs incurred on elements included in the Project Contract.
- (3) The amount of the increase or any portion thereof is not to be used for increased costs incurred as a result of design changes occurring after IAC approval of the project unless written approval of the IAC Administrator has been obtained by the applicant.
- (4) The approval for a cost increase for a project that includes federal funding assistance will not be considered for an IAC cost increase until federal approval is received.

Projects which have been granted the 10% cost increase are not eligible for additional cost increases through subsequent administrative action. Therefore, in the event that project costs exceed or will exceed the adjusted project cost, the sponsoring agency has the option of: (a) before construction begins withdrawing the project and resubmitting it as a new project; (b) requesting an amendment to the project contract which will maintain the original project scope but allow for construction within the approved total cost through modification of individual project elements; (c) absorbing these costs from its own sources; or (d) request a change in project scope, as provided in section 08.06.000.

All approved projects which are currently active are eligible for the 10% cost increase. (REVISED: 8-26-74)

08.13.000 SUBMISSION OF FINAL BILLING (NEW: ADOPTED 10-28-73)

1. Following project completion, the agency will submit final billing to the IAC within sixty (60) days, unless waived by the administrator.
 - A. An acquisition project is considered complete on the date deeds are recorded, OR the date the court decree is paid; OR the date when legally binding instruments acceptable to the IAC are placed in escrow.
 - B. A development project is considered complete on the date the final contract retainage is released or the date final IAC inspection determines the project has been developed in compliance with the IAC grant contract, whichever occurs last.
2. If an agency fails to submit final billing in accordance with the above direction:

The administrator will so notify the agency in writing by registered mail and if the agency does not comply within 15 days after receiving notice, the administrator may:

- A. In the case of local agencies - close the project at the existing funding level.
- B. In the case of state agencies - refuse to accept further applications until final billing has been submitted.

08.14.000 POST-COMPLETION INSPECTION (ADOPTED: 8-26-74)

In order to determine whether properties acquired or developed with IAC assistance are being retained and used for outdoor recreation purposes in accordance with the project agreement and other applicable program requirements, inspections will be made by the IAC at least triennially.

"The following points will be taken into consideration during inspection of properties that have been developed for public use:

- "A. Retention and Use. Is the property being used for the purposes intended.*
- "B. Appearance. Is the property attractive and inviting to the public.*
- "C. Maintenance. Is upkeep and repair of structures and improvements adequate. Is there evidence of poor workmanship or use of inferior quality materials or construction. Is vandalism a problem.*
- "D. Management. Does staffing and servicing of facilities appear adequate.*
- "E. Availability. Is there evidence of discrimination. Is the property readily accessible and open to the public during reasonable hours and times of the year.*
- "F. Environment. Is the quality of the area being maintained.*
- "G. Signing. Is the area properly signed to allow for user information and safety, with proper acknowledgment of the State assistance (and Federal if applicable).*

"Where lands have been acquired but not yet developed, the inspection should determine whether the interim use being made of the property, if any, is as agreed to by the IAC.

"Bureau Inspection. Properties acquired or developed with BOR fund assistance shall be available for inspection by the Director or his representative."

09.01.000 SCOPE OF CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to provide instructions for the preparation of vouchers that enable local governmental agencies to obtain reimbursement for funds expended on either acquisition or development projects, and to inform the participant agency of the supportive documentation that must be retained in their records to meet the State and/or Federal audit requirements.

09.02.000 COMPLIANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS

Inasmuch as local agencies' grants are normally handled on a reimbursable basis, those agencies should give careful attention to compliance with the billing instructions to insure that payments claimed for costs incurred will be made as promptly as feasible under the State's procedures. Billings that are not satisfactorily prepared will be returned to the sponsoring agency.

Agencies must comply with the billing instructions for another important reason: It is only upon the receipt of correct documentation that the IAC can develop the claims for Federal reimbursement on Land and Water Conservation Fund projects.

09.03.000 BILLING INSTRUCTIONS - ACQUISITION PROJECTS (REVISED: 5-2-74)

(1) The voucher form or a machine reproduction thereof should be submitted to the IAC in three signed copies after the subject property has been purchased. The following documents are attached:

- A. Recorded Deed - 1 copy
- B. Title Insurance Policy - 1 copy
- C. Ten Year History of Conveyance - 1 copy (REVISED: 8-26-74)
- D. Proof of Payment - 1 copy
- E. Recorded "Deed of Right to Use Land for Public Recreation Purposes" - 1 copy
- F. Copy of offer to property owner to accompany appraiser (per Appendix C)
- G. Copy of concurrence with appraised value by IAC contract Review Appraiser
- H. Copy of statement of just compensation as signed by the owner (per Appendix D)
- I. If relocation was required, submit a copy of the following:
 - 1. Relocation Plan
 - 2. Written Notice of Benefits to relocatee
 - 3. Statement of Right to Appeal
 - 4. Copy of appropriate claim form - Series D1-380 or equivalent
 - 5. Certification that replacement housing is decent, safe and sanitary

If eminent domain was used in acquiring the property, the three signed copies of the billing voucher should be accompanied by the following documents:

- A. Court Award Document - 1 copy
- B. Title Insurance Policy or Attorney's Certification as to adequate title - 1 copy
- C. Proof of Payment - 1 copy
- D. Recorded "Deed of Right to Use Land for Public Recreation Purposes" - 1 copy
- E. If relocation was required, submit copies of documentation per (1)I above.

In the event that any of the above documentaton has been submitted previously, there is no need to supply additional copies.

3. On billings subsequent to the first one submitted, the first date of incurred costs for which reimbursement is being claimed on that particular voucher. (It can be expected that there will likely be "overlap" between the first date appearing on these vouchers and the last date appearing on the preceding voucher.)

The last date shown on the voucher should be the last date of incurred costs for which reimbursement is being claimed on the particular billing, not the date of last payment claimed or the date of signing of the voucher.

- D. Cost Categories: Agencies must distribute project expenditures into the categories listed on the IAC voucher. Instructions relating to this requirement are as follows: (REVISED 8-26-74)
 1. Preliminary Expense: Enter amounts for eligible retroactive expense such as the costs of site investigation and selection, site planning, feasibility studies, preliminary design, environmental assessment, preparation of cost estimates, construction drawings and specifications, and similar items necessary for project preparation incurred prior to project approval (i.e., the beginning date identified in the Project Contract.)
 2. Architectural Engineering Basic Fees: Enter the amounts of direct costs for all architectural engineering services accruing after approval of the project including costs for site planning, construction drawings and specifications, and inspection and audit of construction.
 3. Construction and Project Improvement Cost: Enter the amounts of expenditures for construction, site improvement, demolition, utilities, landscaping, lighting, construction equipment rental, etc.; include costs of fixed and movable equipment exclusive of that used for construction (e.g., picnic tables, children's play equipment, etc.).
- E. Expenditures Since Last Billing: In this column list expenditures that have been made in the various cost categories since the last billing. This is the amount being claimed on this voucher. If this is the first billing, the figures will represent the cumulative expenditures through this first billing.
- F. Total Expenditures to Date: If the billing is the first billing for the project, enter the same figures listed under Expenditures Since Last Billing.

If there have been previous billings, enter the sum of the previous billings and the current billing. The figures in this column always represent the cumulative expenditures through the billing voucher on which they appear.

09.04.000 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BILLING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

G. The voucher must be signed by a legally qualified representative of the local governmental entity. Enter the title of the person who signed and the date the voucher was signed.

(2) Documentation of Payments:

The payment documents that support each of the expenditures claimed on the vouchers must be retained in the agency's files for inspection at time of audit. Payment documents for other than salaries, wages, and rental of agency-owned equipment normally consist of the standard form CORRECTION used by the agency to pay bills (identified variously as "Claim Voucher", "Voucher", "Claim", "Purchase Order", etc.) and the vendor's invoice to which the payment applies. To each pair of payment documents must be attached an "IAC Supporting Document Information Check Sheet" (see example) completed to show the following required information:

1. Name of vendor
2. Amount of payment claimed
3. Number of check or warrant issued in payment
4. Nature of commodities or services rendered
5. Purpose of purchase and identification with IAC project
6. Date or time span of receipt of goods or services
7. Number of IAC voucher on which claim was rendered

This information (other than the IAC voucher number) should already appear on one or the other, or both, of the supporting documents; the check sheet procedure is designated to assure that the elements are collected uniformly to facilitate review by the local agency and the auditor(s). Documentation required in support of salaries and wages and rental of agency-owned equipment will be described under the heading of Force Account.

NOTE: One copy (machine reproduction acceptable) of the supporting documentation applicable to payments to construction contractors must accompany the IAC voucher on which reimbursement for such payments is claimed, to assist staff in evaluating progress on the project and to verify the existence and impact of change and/or extra work orders, if any.

(3) Force Account: Force Account is defined by the National Committee on Governmental Accounting as "a method employed in the construction...of fixed assets whereby a governmental unit's own personnel are used instead of an outside contractor. This method also calls for the purchase of materials by the governmental unit and the possible use of its own equipment, but the distinguishing characteristic of the force account method is the use of the unit's own personnel". Each individual expenditure for goods or services must be supported by the payment document and vendor's invoice and covered by a Check Sheet. In addition, adequate detailed records must be kept of labor and equipment time distribution and the cost accounting thereof, to establish the charges attributable to the project and support the payments reported on the voucher.

a. Salaries and Wages: Required documentation for force account claims for salaries and wages include a summary report itemizing individual names, hours worked, span of time worked, rate of pay and extension of dollar amounts applicable to the project.

- b. Equipment Rates: Each governmental unit must determine a rate for the operation of each piece of equipment to be used on force account work. This rate must be substantiated by historical data attributable to each piece of equipment. The rate may include the cost for operation and maintenance (gasoline, oil repairs, etc.); and in addition a depreciation factor. If the historical data upon which the rate is determined does not include a depreciation factor, a factor not exceeding $6\frac{2}{3}\%$ per annum of the acquisition cost may be used in lieu of the historical factor. Once this rate is determined, it will be necessary to itemize the dates and hours the equipment is used for force account work on the IAC funded project.

If the governmental unit is unable to produce or maintain adequate records to verify historical data, for depreciation and/or operating and maintenance costs for the equipment to be used, reimbursements for that piece of equipment on force account will be disallowed.

- (4) Record Retainage and Audit: All records relevant to an IAC-funded project must be on file with the participant agency and are subject to audit by both state and federal agencies and inspection by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.

Audit: Audits will be conducted by the State Auditor's Office, Division of Municipal Corporations, as part of their regular audit program for local agencies of government. In addition, the Federal Government reserves the right to audit at local level those IAC-funded projects that include Land and Water Conservation Fund monies. The level of detail to which these audits are conducted will be prescribed by the auditing agency, except that the IAC and the State Auditor's Office will jointly develop a post-audit program whereby local agencies will be selected on a random sample basis to be subjected to a full and complete audit of a single IAC-funded project to verify all of the items of information identified in the foregoing sub-heading (2) Documentation of Payments.

If the auditor's inspection of the records discloses any charges incorrectly claimed on an IAC-funded project and subsequently reimbursed, the local agency must make cash restitution of such incorrect amounts to the IAC for deposit to the Outdoor Recreation Account. If Federal (LWCF) funds are involved, the IAC will cause correcting adjustments to be made to the federal allocation to the State of Washington.

- (5) Progress Reports - one copy: An interim progress report must be submitted with each voucher except the final one, and must contain a comprehensive description of the work accomplishments to which that billing pertains. It must also show the percentage of the physical completion of the project.

In addition, it should summarize progress to date and future anticipated progress. Any relevant comments such as problems encountered in construction, keeping within estimated costs, and so forth should also be explained. A final progress report, containing a post-construction certification, must accompany the last voucher submitted for a project.

09. BILLING PROCEDURES

09.10.000 SCOPE OF CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to provide instructions for the preparation of vouchers that enable state governmental agencies to account for funds expended from the Outdoor Recreation Account on either acquisition or development projects, and to inform the participant agency of the supportive documentation that must be retained in their records to meet the State and/or Federal audit requirements for IAC and/or BOR funded projects.

09.02.000 COMPLIANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS

State agencies make disbursements directly from Outdoor Recreation Account appropriations made to them. Nevertheless, it is important that State agencies comply with the billing instructions, for only upon the receipt of correct documentation can the IAC develop the claims for Federal reimbursement on Land and Water Conservation Fund projects. Nor can non-federal-assisted projects of the State agencies be certified as completed on the IAC records until satisfactory "billing" documentation has been received.

09.03.000 BILLING INSTRUCTIONS - ACQUISITION PROJECTS

(1) The voucher form or a machine reproduction thereof should be submitted to the IAC in two signed copies after the subject property has been purchased. The following documents are attached:

- A. Recorded Deed - 1 copy
- B. Title Insurance Policy - 1 copy
- C. Ten Year History of Conveyance - 1 copy (REVISED: 8-26-74)
- D. Proof of Payment - 1 copy
- E. Recorded "Deed of Right to Use Land for Public Recreation Purposes"
- F. Copy of offer to property owner to accompany appraiser (per Appendix C)
- G. Copy of concurrence with appraised value by IAC contract Review Appraiser
- H. Copy of Statement of just compensation as signed by the owner (per Appendix D)
- I. If relocation was required, submit a copy of the following:
 1. Relocation Plan
 2. Written Notice of Benefits to relocatee
 3. Statement of Right to Appeal
 4. Copy of appropriate claim form - "Series D1-380 or equivalent
 5. Certification that replacement housing is decent, safe and sanitary

If eminent domain was used in acquiring the property, the three signed copies of the billing voucher should be accompanied by the following documents:

- A. Court Award Document - 1 copy
- B. Title Insurance Policy or Attorney's Certification as to adequate title - 1 copy

09.03.000 BILLING INSTRUCTIONS - ACQUISITION PROJECTS (Continued)

- C. Proof of Payment - 1 copy
- D. Recorded "Deed of Right to Use Land for Public Recreation Purposes - 1 copy
- E. If relocation was required, submit copies of documentation per (1) I above.

In the event that any of the above documentation has been submitted previously, there is no need to supply additional copies.

- (2) Additionally, before the billing voucher can be processed for payment, one (1) copy of the Appraisal Report must have been submitted and reviewed.
- (3) Acquisition projects are normally billed only once. However, for complex projects involving several parcels, billings may be submitted for one or more parcels as they are purchased. The documentation supporting the billing for each parcel is the same as that described above. A separate "Deed of Right to Use Land for Public Recreation Purposes" must be recorded and submitted for these parcels covered by interim billings.
- (4) The Billing Voucher should be filled out as follows:
 - A. Agency, Project, IAC No., are self-explanatory
 - B. Voucher No.: This refers to the number of the current billing. If it is the first billing, the Voucher No. is one, etc.
 - C. Period Covered: The period covered by the billing is normally the inclusive period of actual transfer of rights of ownership for which expenditure is being reported on the voucher.

If a single parcel of land is involved, the "period covered" would be a single date: the date upon which the purchaser obtains the right of possession. This is usually the date of execution of the deed, but may be the date the deed is recorded (as is the case when escrow arrangements are made).

If more than one parcel and more than one seller is covered by the billing, the period covered would be from the earliest date upon which the purchaser obtained the right of possession of any of the parcels, to the latest date upon which the purchaser obtained the right of possession of any of the parcels being billed on the voucher.

In the event that more than one billing is rendered for a project, the period covered on each voucher will reflect the date or dates that apply to the acquisition(s) for which expenditure is reported on each particular voucher. (It can be expected that there may be "overlap" between the first date appearing on subsequent vouchers and the last date appearing on preceding vouchers.)

Note: The last date shown on a voucher should be the appropriate one of the dates defined above, not the date of last expenditure reported or the date of signing of the voucher.

- D. Expenditures Since the Last Billing: In this column list expenditures that have been made since the last billing (See "E" below).
- E. Total Expenditures to Date: If the billing is the first and final billing for the project, enter the same figures listed under Expenditures Since Last Billing. If there have been previous billings, enter the sum of the previous billings and the current billing.

09.04.000 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BILLING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Billings for development projects must be on vouchers supplied by the IAC or on machine reproductions of such vouchers. They may be submitted to the IAC after completion of the project or as phases of the development work are completed and paid, or may be rendered on an interim basis at intervals of not less than 30 days. The following documentation is required for all development billings.

(1) IAC Voucher Form - two signed copies

The voucher should be filled in as follows:

- A. Agency, Project, IAC No., are self-explanatory.
- B. Voucher Number: This refers to the number of the current billing. If it is the first billing, the Voucher No. is one, etc.
- C. Period Covered: The period covered by the billing is the inclusive period of receipt of services and/or commodities for which payment has been made as reported on the voucher. The first date shown on the voucher should be the appropriate one of the following:
 - 1. The first date of incurred costs in connection with development of site or construction plans and specifications if such retroactive costs are established on the IAC Application for Outdoor Recreation Grant-in-Aid Assistance document (costs incurred for these purposes prior to the beginning date thus identified on the application document are not chargeable to the project.)
 - 2. The first date of incurred costs (presuming no retroactive costs are established) after the authorized beginning date designated in the IAC Project Contract.
 - 3. On billings subsequent to the first one submitted, the first date of incurred costs for which payment is being reported on that particular voucher. (It can be expected that there will likely be "overlap" between the first date appearing on these vouchers and the last date appearing on the proceeding voucher.)

The last date shown on the voucher should be the last date of incurred costs for which payment is being reported on that particular billing, not the date of last payment reported or the date of signing of the voucher.

- D. Cost Categories: Agencies must distribute project expenditures into the categories listed on the IAC voucher. Instructions relating to this requirement are as follows:
 - 1. Preliminary Expense: Enter amounts for eligible retroactive expense such as the costs of site investigation and selection, site planning, feasibility studies, preliminary design, environmental assessment, preparation of cost estimates, construction drawings and specifications, and similar items necessary for project preparation incurred prior to project approval (i.e., the beginning date identified in the Project Contract.)
 - 2. Architectural Engineering Basic Fees: Enter the amounts of direct costs for all architectural engineering services accruing after approval of the project including costs for site planning, construction drawings and specifications, and inspection and audit of construction.

09.04.000 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BILLING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

3. Construction and Project Improvement Cost: Enter the amounts of expenditures for construction, site improvement, demolition, utilities, landscaping, lighting, construction equipment rental, etc.; include costs of fixed and movable equipment exclusive of that used for construction (e.g., picnic tables, children's play equipment, etc.).

E. Expenditures Since Last Billing: In this column list expenditures that have been made in the various cost categories since the last billing. This is the amount being reported on this voucher. If this is the first billing, the figures will represent the cumulative expenditures through this first billing.

F. Total Expenditures to Date: If the billing is the first billing for the project, enter the same figures listed under Expenditures Since Last Billing.

If there have been previous billings, enter the sum of the previous billings and the current billing. The figures in this column always represent the cumulative expenditures through the billing voucher on which they appear.

G. The voucher must be signed by a legally qualified representative of the governmental entity. Enter the title of the person who signed and the date the voucher was signed.

(2) Documentation of Payments:

The payment documents that support each of the expenditures claimed on the vouchers must be retained in the agency's files for inspection at time of audit. Payment documents for other than salaries, wages, and rental of agency-owned equipment normally consist of the standard form used by the agency to pay bills, (identified as "Voucher Distribution", "Invoice Voucher", "Field Order", "Purchase Order", "Service Contract") and the vendor's invoice to which the payment applies. Documentation required in support of salaries and wages and rental of agency-owned equipment will be described under the heading of Force Account.

NOTE: One copy (machine reproduction acceptable) of the supporting documentation applicable to payments to construction contractors must accompany the IAC voucher on which reimbursement for such payments is claimed, to assist staff in evaluating progress on the project and to verify the existence and impact of change and/or extra work orders, if any.

State Auditors, and Federal if LWCF Funds are involved, will review the accounting documents applicable to IAC funded projects at the State Agency's fiscal office. Monitoring of fiscal progress on projects will be carried through the review of the Budget Status Reports submitted monthly to OPPFM; participating state agencies must furnish IAC a copy of that portion of each month's report that contains the information on the status of projects funded from the Outdoor Recreation Account.

(3) Force Account: Force Account is defined by the National Committee on Governmental Accounting as "a method employed in the construction .. of fixed assets whereby a governmental unit's own personnel are used instead of an outside contractor. This method also calls for the purchase of materials by the governmental unit and the possible use of

-09.04.000 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BILLING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

its own equipment, but the distinguishing characteristic of the force account method is the use of the unit's own personnel". Each individual expenditure for goods or services must be supported by the payment warrant and vendor's invoice. In addition, adequate detailed records must be kept of labor and equipment time distribution and the cost accounting thereof, to establish the charges attributable to the project and support the payments reported on the voucher.

a. *Salaries and wages:* Required documentation for force account claims for salaries and wages include a summary report itemizing individual names, hours worked, span of time worked, rate of pay and extension of dollar amounts applicable to the project.

b. *Equipment Rates:* Each governmental unit must determine a rate for the operation of each piece of equipment to be used on force account work. This rate must be substantiated by historical data attributable to each piece of equipment. The rate may include the cost for operation and maintenance (gasoline, oil repairs, etc.), and in addition a depreciation factor. If the historical data upon which the rate is determined does not include a depreciation factor, a factor not exceeding $6\frac{2}{3}\%$ per annum of the acquisition cost may be used in lieu of the historical factor. Once this rate is determined, it will be necessary to itemize the dates and hours the equipment is used for force account work on the IAC funded project.

If the governmental unit is unable to produce or maintain adequate records to verify historical data, for depreciation and/or operating and maintenance costs for the equipment to be used, reimbursements for that piece of equipment on force account will be disallowed.

(4) *Record Retainage and Audit:* All records relevant to an IAC funded project must be on file with the participating agency and are subject to audit by both state and federal agencies. Where Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds are involved in a project, records shall be maintained for three years after reimbursement by the federal government, unless the state or political subdivision is advised in writing by BOR to maintain the records for a longer period.

If the auditors' inspection of the records discloses any charges incorrectly disbursed on an IAC funded project and subsequently reported on the billing voucher, the agency must make restitution of such incorrect amounts by deposit to the Outdoor Recreation Account. If Federal (LWCF) funds are involved, the IAC will cause correcting adjustments to be made to the federal allocation to the State of Washington.

(5) *Progress Reports - one copy:* An interim progress report must be submitted with each voucher except the final one, and must contain a comprehensive description of the work accomplishments to which that billing pertains. It must also show the percentage of the physical completion of the project.

In addition, it should summarize progress to date and future anticipated progress. Any relevant comments such as problems encountered in construction.

09.04.000 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BILLING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Continued)

keeping within estimated costs, and so forth should also be explained.

A final progress report, containing a post-construction certification must accompany the last voucher submitted for a project.

It should contain a brief description of the work actually accomplished, with particular reference to changes from the original proposal as approved.

09.05.000 PROJECT COMPLETION

Following completion, when federal Land and Water Conservation Fund monies are involved in a project, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation requires that a tri-annual inspection be made of the project by the IAC. There will also be occasions when the Administrator desires to inspect any project site, whether federally funded or not, to see that it is being retained, operated and maintained within the terms of the Project Contract. The participant shall be notified of these inspections and will be encouraged to accompany the Administrator or staff.

09.06.000 BILLING FORMS

Examples of the IAC forms to which reference is made in this chapter are presented hereafter. A supply of each form is available from the IAC upon request.