

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

JUNE 6, 1974

SUB-COMMITTEE - BUDGETS

IAC

HIGHWAY BLDG.
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

Public Meeting

NOTES OF THE MEETING - NOT NARRATIVE MINUTES

Present:

- **John S. Larsen, Director, Commerce & Econ. Dev.
- *Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Rec. Commission
- *Bill Bush, Parks and Rec. Commission office
- *Lynn Martin, Parks and Rec. Comm. office
- **Warren A. Bishop, Chairman, IAC
- Mike Stewart, OPPFM
- *Jan Tveten, Parks and Rec. Commission office
- **Micaela Brostrom, IAC member
- **Lewis A. Bell, IAC member
- *Carl Crouse, Director, Dept. of Game
- *Lloyd Bell, Dept. of Natural Resources
- *Al O'Donnell, Dept. of Natural Resources
- Dan Keller, OPPFM
- *Jim Brigham, Dept. of Game
- *Dan Barnett, Dept. of Game
- *Frank Haw, Dept. of Fisheries
- *Raymond Buckley, Dept. of Fisheries
- *Al Schultz, Dept. of Fisheries
- *John DeMeyer, Dept. of Natural Resources

Stanley E. Francis, Administrator, IAC
Milton H. Martin, Asst. Admin., IAC
Glenn Moore, Project Section, IAC
Roger Syverson, Superv., Proj. Sec., IAC
Jerry Pelton, Chief, Plan. & Coord., IAC
Bob Lemcke, Coordinator (Budgets)

- *(State Agencies members listed above were present during their part of the presentations to the Sub-Committee.)
- ** (IAC Sub-Committee - Budgets) (Absent: George Andrews, Dept. of Highways (Director))

Called to order 9:05 a.m. Bishop - directors to give presentations; six-year improvement programs, allocated 45 minutes for each state agency - Parks, Game, DNR, Fisheries. Announced June 27 - Special meeting in the Board Room, Highways Commission, Highways Bldg., Olympia., 10:00 a.m.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:

Odegaard: Give overview of where we are -- clarify three words -- Preservation (saving the resources; Conservation (wise use of those resources); Enrichment (provide opportunity for park users to more fully develop their lives.)

Summarized past decade in Parks and Rec. -- \$7 million, 1960 to \$23 million 1970; next three years 73 -- \$26 million - total population 17.6% top over same period of time. State Parks usage is not tied to State of Washington population. Out of state visitors are using parks. Number State Parks 80 to 171.

Complexity of Administration -- various acts involved - Marine Initiative; bond issues; increased Session involvement; state legislative changes; mentioned various laws. Commission has responded to needs of citizens, etc. State Parks has several projects with IAC -- Now prepared thru 75-77 in accord with priorities - more recreational areas.

Goals and objectives: (1) Acquisition and disposal -- buying out in-holdings inside

page -2-

parcs presently privately owned. It is area inside of natural or manmade boundaries;

(2) Preserving areas unique to state or of fragile nature;

(3) Also, disposing of lands to other levels of government;

(4) Several in-holdings are in our new requests to IAC -- Birch Bay; Twanoh; Belfair; Deception Pass.

Preservation areas - Green River Gorge; Ocean Beaches;

New - Wallace Lake, Clallam, Cascade Highway; Haley; Cypress; Horsehead; Lower Crossing

Cooperative - Mercer Slough, Scenic Highway, Larrabee, Bellingham.

Development: Must comply with laws, etc. Also need to develop areas within existing parks. Compliance - Fort Ebey, Manchester; Fort Ward; Chief Joseph.

Fort Ebey - Manchester and Fort Ward - BOR compliance. BOR may take these away if they are not in compliance.

Chief Joseph - historical compliance.

Private and state park project -- Mount Spokane - ski area and day-use.

(Trails)
Intergovernmental cooperative: Fort Lawton - development of boating - Sand Point. Whatcom County, Larrabee - Bellingham. Swimming beach at Sand Point, boating facilities Sacajawea.

Future development: Only minimal standards -- Battleground Lake and State Park. Need to get more back-to-nature on our parks.

Need to retrench present type of development for a few years. Will therefore only have basic facilities. Private capital continue the rest. Crowded conditions of parks need looking at, etc.

Philosophy - Commission and staff - have greater cooperation with private capital. They would handle interpretive aspects. New campgrounds for private also. New concept at Ocean Beaches - acquire all available lands line 1889. 300 additional parking - Mount Spokane State Park; \$1 million for preservation for additional ocean beach frontage and day-use. Uniqueness of area should be adhered to. San Juan Islands are example. Also mentioned center area of cities. Need to work within metropolitan areas.

Trails: Commission recognizes need for variety of trails.

Water trails - acquire - with Game. Banks of rivers and launching.

Bikes - cooperative with Highways.

Foot paths - work from one end to another. Go federal/state recreational areas.

Horses - can't mix horses and walking.

Winter trails - snowmobiling, cross country skiing, etc.

Need overnights -- where do people stay and should we put these things in? Talked about hosteling. Cooperative with schools -- use of their facilities for small fee. Old military installations such as Fort Worden, etc.

Chapter II of Budget Program shows that IAC funding is needed here.

QUESTIONS --

Odegaard: We will supply this (what he was reading) to the Committee. Copies.

Bishop: You indicated that the rejuvenation of parks is a goal -- will be funded

from 26, 27, 28 -- etc.

Odegaard: Yes these bond issues are used -- water, sewage and 28.

Bishop: 28 -- how do you use that?

Odegaard: \$12 million for parks.

Jan Tveten: Ref. 26 is \$1.6 million. We are getting 27 for water system also.

Bishop: Would you expend any of these during this biennium?

Odegaard: Yes

Bishop: Will they go through the same process as water and sewage with approval thru Wash. Futures?

Jan: Yes, they will. We have spent 300-400,000 out of 26 today. Difficulty is we are in process of coordinating this with local agencies -- we don't want to be in utility business. Takes time to put this package together.

Bishop: Will budgets go through on 28?

Jan: Yes. We outline list of projects totaling \$12 million. Wash. Futures has this. Cost increase -- ours will be substantially revised. As we go from biennium to biennium we submit these thru Wash. Futures.

Bishop: Were any approved for this biennium?

Jan: \$2,100,000 out of \$12 million; \$1.7 is historic preservation; \$270,000 is for historic preservation now.

Larsen: Do you have any --- for types of cooperative projects at Fort Ward?

Odegaard: Yes. In 1946 or 49 the Legislature passed the law for these cooperative programs. Specific cooperation with a trail - no. But other developments - yes. Approved in May is most involved project -- the County Line Park. Five state agencies and two counties are in that one. All Corps projects are also cooperative projects.

Bishop: Do they share operation and management?

Odegaard: No. We are working through two national bodies I belong to to get federal government to share some of the operational costs.

Bishop: What do you express as your most pressing demand?

Odegaard: In state parks?

Bishop: Acquisition of either additions to some holdings you have or some of the in-holdings? Is that highest?

Odegaard: That's a tough one to handle. Yes, the in-holdings are vital because of management aspects. Lands going to be lost which may not be in-holdings -- they have a high priority, too. Lands may go to commercial development; they have a high priority. We can't pick one that is the highest -- its all separately considered.

Bishop: IAC impact has caused some problems -- to get funds to operate these. What has been impact of these IAC funds to State Parks and its relationship to your operating budget?

Odegaard: Legislature has looked with favor upon funding of our operating. Certain federal programs also helped to get outside funds -- Youth Corps; EEA; etc. We pay close attention to our federal programs and college work training programs. In addition, the Legislature has been fairly cooperative in our program.

Second category -- we don't always need to open up a particular area. We can acquire it and don't open it right away. Need to be in compliance. Where we don't have built in restrictions we feel it is best to let it sit. If we acquire the right lands, we can't do any harm in letting them sit. There will be those we don't mind having sit. Legislature has augmented our field staff; increased rangers; collective bargaining with two unions, etc. We are not sure at this moment what we are going to do with this new Minimum Wage Law, for one thing. City of Seattle - as example.

We have offered to do more with this City than has been discussed. City of Seattle is desirous of exploring more cooperative programs to State Parks and more State Parks in the City of Seattle. Pleased with their interest. King County has been cooperative -- Seattle not so for some time, but they are now coming around. Seattle is in serious position re bond funds, etc. Sand Point and Fort Lawton mentioned. Cost of maintaining these might close down bond parks in the city.

Bishop: What will be the project? What funding sources? You may have some significant parks?

Odegaard: I think compared with other state agencies -- percent not spent -- we are in good or better situation than other agencies.

Secondly, in pointing out our dollars we need to show which ones they are. Reduce Nalley property out of there and you knock out \$1.7 million. If you take Pacific County, you don't have much money left. We are close to a zero balance.

Bishop: You are saying that your regular commitments take care of etc.

Jan: Amount is \$2.5 million -- Add to that \$700,000 estimated BOR; we are around \$3 million -- out of that \$1.7 is Nalley, \$600,000 Ledbetter; \$600,000 Green River Gorge; \$50,000 Rock ?; and \$60-70,000 for Wallace Falls. That's the money not obligated at the present time and we can't go any further because second year BOR apportionment is not in yet.

We will have probably re-appropriation -- because many of our projects are large.

Bishop: They are re-appropriation - authorized projects and not in being at the present time.

Milt: You may have money obligated but projects may not be on the ground.

Jan: Mentioned Lake Wentachee, Fort Canby -- Social and Health Services and Ecology have to re-do entire sewage system; Flaming Geyser, local health district problem; just about every one will be under construction.

Odegaard: Not trying to find fault -- the ball game keeps changing as you try to

operate. Like Fort Canby - you get authorization to go ahead and then the other agencies change their minds. It's a block-buster.

Larsen: Refresh my memory re ocean beaches.

Odegaard: Acquisition: Acquisition of areas on ocean beaches -- in 1967 they were transferred to State Parks. Supreme Court held that certain lands - ocean beaches - belonged to upland owner instead of State down to mean high tide -- so, we are trying to acquire these lands. This is similar to Game's streambank program.

Larsen: You have the lands -- priorities now for these funds?
have gone

Odegaard: Yes, we have those that / / to the Commission but they have not come here. They will come here later. (Explained the IAC funding program.) But, we do have these on a map as to what lands they are.

Bishop: (1) How do you feel about our attempts to regionalize the resources available to the Committee? We felt we needed to get these funds out into various regions. I am not so sure that that is as applicable to the state agencies.
(2) What is your impression re Parks in trying to regionalize these funds? Should we consider those without any real reference to the regional needs?

Odegaard: As to needs -- no, that should not be regionalized at all. Lands are where you find them. Acquisition - regionalizing is absolutely impossible. It's just window-dressing.

Development -- Local communities -- two things take into consideration. IAC needs to consider the needs based upon lands that will be lost, serving the people, metropolitan areas, etc. Need to find these on total basis of IAC -- need to do this politically, if you will. Such as bond issues, etc. You don't need to pick a "bad" project to meet regionally. Regarding state land, it's impossible.

Brostrom: But you have to make a choice.

Odegaard: If the two lands are both going to be lost -- then you need to look into the region -- and that would be IAC prerogative. The IAC historically -- we talk percentages -- we really don't, but we really do -- that's a political situation. Check to see what you get this biennium against next biennium. We watch to see how much each department gets, etc. The percentage should never be thrown out. If DNR has all the needs, they should get every dime.

Bishop: It's also chartable. (Not sure of shorthand word.)

Larsen: But you do work within a State Plan?

Odegaard: Yes, we work within State Parks Plan and SCORP.

Milt: Does that planning effort extend into other states -- boundaries of same?

Odegaard: No. The document does not -- but the aspect does. Idaho and Lewiston -- Snake River -- Oregon and Reed Island. Northeast of Spokane -- Forest Service -- they developed and we backed off.

Larsen: I would like to have you provide me with a copy of your plan.

Odegaard: We'll be glad to do that.

Bishop: Thanked Odegaard, etc.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

Crouse: Slide presentation -- Jim Brigham and Dan Barnett

Game is only recipient to use IAC funds to acquire natural areas uniquely located re habitat and wildlife. Estuarine types and areas. Proper management of areas (human use).

1968 - User Survey -- 22 million man days of recreation fishing and hunting in the state. 16 million man days photographing or visiting the resource. Recreation days have tripled last few years.

Access - Site on 300 fishing lakes; 80 access on fish streams. Department has 260 miles streambank access on major rivers of state. Release of 6 million migrant steelhead and cut throat trout, etc. etc.

Referendum funds have accumulated total of 750,000 acres of nature lands; 450,000 acres - big game areas; 260,000 acres waterlife; 7,500 acres upland.

Crouse: Lands owned by Game Dept. Slides gave you over-view what our department does. Acquisition of land by Game Dept. has not and will not in the future be able to follow precisely what we set out in the budget. Game Dept. cannot contain land. All purchases are free sales. Cannot project year or two what lands will be available for free sale. Committee has recognized this and has made shifts of funds to allow us to meet the need and availability of land, etc. During next biennium we have identified major key areas in acquisition and as they become available, will move. But, we will have major shifts of funds as the land becomes available.

Example is Nisqually Flat. We didn't purchase Brown's farm. Reason we did not; cost of that land -- if federal govt. would buy it, would relieve us and we could use money elsewhere. 20 year program in 1965. Identified a need for additional 700,000 acres of land for critical resource. Only agency that attempts to acquire and preserve this particular type of land.

DNR manages its land for protection; State Parks does it for intensive recreational use; our programs do fit in well with both agencies, however. We have complete coordination -- our lands are not geared to be built for extensive camping use. We will not get into extensive camping business. Ours is primitive camping basis. We don't put in facilities that are needed to run it as a first class State Park. We need the land for wildlife use and protect areas and preserve them. We find out now these lands are used for non-hunter and non-fishermen. We identified 700,000 acres and we had 500,000 acres of land at that time. Base of our plan 1985 -- was somewhat total 1,200,000 acres to serve wildlife and people of the state. Identified also -- need for additional 250,000 miles of stream bank access; fee purchase of easement. We estimated \$43 million would be necessary for acquisition of the additional 700,000 acres of land we needed. Also identified -- we needed about \$10 million for development.

Have moved along -- we have acquired with IAC about 19% of the land we identified

as being needed for critical resource or wildlife. 130,000 acres of this type of land.

We have acquired land in other ways -- reluctant to get into this at this time -- we have about 100,000 acres that does not relate to IAC nor IAC funds. Includes: BLM land; B. Reclamation land; we have management on AEC land - 50,000 acres of that.

Critical resource area today, costs have been low -- this has not been high priced land -- averaged \$40.00 an acre. We have stayed out of high priced land. Spent over \$5 million in acquiring \$127,000 acres of land we have title to through IAC. Have programmed into immediate budget 75-77 -- enough additional money to acquire \$100 dollar an acre land -- about \$25,000 acres of additional funds next biennium.

I feel that land right now and in next year or two is going to be a little more readily available than in the past. This is personal opinion. Bloom has gone off of the developments that have been going on and people trying to pick up land, etc. Again, this is a personal opinion. Another factor - slowed down - is people have gotten bitten pretty bad by buying lots that have been turned out. Protection Island, Ocean Shores, Douglas County -- people will now look a lot closer before buying these lots. Some history on these -- not too good -- land speculation developments. Grand Ronde -- considerable talk of development -- but this will be purchased we hope soon by IAC money. And another in center of the state of about 17,000 acres -- Eagle Lake. They will come to state to sell these. Large corporations also will be looking for selling land.

(100 miles?)

New program -- stream bank. To date we have acquired _____ of easements on stream banks. Hard to tie down value for the state -- will be tremendous. In acquiring these -- have gotten them at \$3.00 front foot on average to date. I think price will go up. We are 40% of the way over what we intended on this -- may be a little bit ahead of schedule.

Streambank is not coming as easy as it was. In next six years we have attempted to cut back a little bit in this area -- and will emphasize our Wildlife and Critical Resource areas a little bit harder.

Lake access program.: Acquired 400 acres on various lakes. These are intensive use areas. Have been acquiring lake access for a number of years -- have about 300 acquired to date -- and we will be able to meet our goal of having all major recreational lakes in the state -- having boat access -- by 1985.

We feel our lake access program has been good. There will not be enough money to meet our long-range plans. We scheduled \$43 million with about \$5.5 million being committed to date. It will not meet the total requirements by 1985.

Next biennium programmed:

Critical resource	\$2,300,000
Freshwater Shorelines	\$ 200,000
Development	\$ 370,000
Critical Development	\$ 1/2 million

Think we can meet this goal and land will be available.

We will be able to spend it during the next biennium.

QUESTIONS --

Larsen: Re your attitude on your department's responsibility on intensive management of recreation Jamison Lake -- intensive use. What about another state entity assuming responsibility for managing that?

Crouse: We have no problem with that at all. They have these now. This is no problem with us. We have had some arguments with State Parks -- we don't want State Parks in hunting areas, for instance. Banks Lake is a classic example. Potholes Reservoir -- Two-Cannon. You get into these things to where you need an intensive park and this is State Parks' responsibility. These things -- we cooperate. Have talked with Odegaard about High Valley.

Larsen: Jamison Lake -- you must have difficulties there -- garbage, etc.

Crouse: I don't look at that as State Park problem unless they would like to acquire another land for campers, facilities, etc. This is only a boating access area. Not for people to stay a week. Yes -- we have a problem with garbage and people using these places -- on all of our areas.

Larsen: Is it forcing you into more extensive management? Should State plan for the impact in those areas?

Barnett: When you look at potential for State Parks and fishing and hunting uses -- there are criteria they look for for additional park sites -- it is not there on Jamison Lake. Primarily this is attraction for fishing.

It is not conducive to State Park user. That type of use is a one or two day overnight use. Most have self-contained campers.

Larsen: You don't mind assuming that kind of responsibility? Garbage, etc.?

Crouse: We feel they should pay some sort of maintenance for the garbage. I feel that the Legislature should pass a boating law that would allow for use of maintenance -- defray the cost.

Brostrom: What about installing compactors? Is that feasible?

Crouse: Our experience has shown this is difficult -- getting people to use these. Not littering has improved greatly, however. Cheapest way is litter barrels -- use drop off points -- etc. This is not a year round basis lake.

Brostrom: Can you control the amount of use in this area type?

Crouse: Yes. We limit the number of areas we have for cars. Our philosophy is to give people insofar as we can the right to use our areas with as little restriction as possible.

Brostrom: So, providing more sites -- you meet this?

Crouse: Yes -- we encourage parking on these sites -- only to the level of what the lake can take.

Brostrom: Your development is in response to the amount of use the area receives?

Crouse: We will never be able to develop an area to take care of opening season. Some places we have an overflow -- some we have parking.

Brostrom: Parks encourages use of their parks -- develop to limited use?

Crouse: Yes.

Bell: I don't understand the alternative we are discussing here.

Stan: Those come up this afternoon. Ours are in priority as submitted by the Dept. of Game.

Bell: In your request, does it take into consideration the priority schedule in the Plan (SCORP)?

Stan: Yes.

Dan Barnett: Previous biennium, water access and streambank was higher than critical resource. It has since been changed and critical resource is now higher. We have concentrated our request in the critical resource area. We have had easements on rivers and now we need critical resource areas that are coming up for sale and we are concentrating on these.

Bell: Critical resource areas doesn't fit into regional scheme of the 13 regions, does it?

Crouse: We attempt to put it in and follow the guidelines insofar as availability. Thirteen regions do relate to people and populations -- you cannot always relate to them in wildlife needs. We do have a lot of people who use these areas. We try to relate people to wildlife as part of the recreation.

During 71-73 we had accelerated funds -- reappropriated funds will come up this afternoon, no doubt. Accelerated program that we got into was -- -- this caused us some consternation when we went into it and we attempted to spend the funds. We have prepared a sheet on this for you.

(Passed out funding sheet.)

We anticipate should have \$500,000 available for reappropriation. This may not come within appreciated price we have to follow. This will be acquisition cost -- we have pretty well liquidated our reappropriation by the end of this biennium, but we may be caught with large purchases. We may have this reduced to 5-600,000 for reappropriation.

Bishop: You are limited in terms of your operating budget to designated sources from licensing. Operating funds are needed by your agency. You can have little bit of money for capital purchases. What is the situation with your operating budget, Carl?

Crouse: Yes -- There are burdens on operating funds. I think our management of the land itself is not as critical at this time, although it will be as our management of people in water-oriented things --- etc. Garbage and things like this. It has caused problem on what we are going to do on general operating funds at next session of the Legislature. What will the Legislature do about additional taxes? There is no question that inflation has eaten into our funds.

Bishop: You can't divert these special source funds to your Capital. You have to rely on IAC?

Crouse: 90% land acquisition are funds of IAC. We put in all man hours, man years, title reports, appraisals contracted out -- all of these are our funds. There has been little too narrow instruction on what goes in land purchase. We need to look at result of that program and maybe broaden it a little. IAC guidelines are a little strict. Need to review these things. We put a lot of money into working up plans, etc., re procuring land. Some relief in this area be proper for review. This was only a guideline of IAC as to where this cut off was. The program is maturing now and a broader look is desirable.

Bishop: I am interested in the extent to which lands are managed by DNR -- are there programs on trust lands? Are there ways this can be done for DNR and still carry on their responsibilities?

Crouse: No. To my knowledge we have not done this. DNR has not closed these lands. There has been and is continuing a cooperative on-going program with DNR as it pertains to lake accesses. We negotiate lease agreements with them, etc. -- good program. DNR because of their land base has land scattered in many areas and we have made many purchases: Colockum areas, about 15,000 acres; L. T. Murray, 25,000 acres; scattered sections of DNR land within that. We sit with DNR and go over this land. We work these things out. Have had outstanding cooperation with DNR. They have, in effect, -- we pay less on 50,000 or 75,000 acres of DNR land etc. that we own that is managed for wildlife. Going on since about 1940.

Bishop: Thanked Crouse.

Brigham distributed booklet -- to all.

DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Al O'Donnell, John DeMeyer, - overhead projector.

Expressed Bert Cole's regrets could not be at meeting. DDT - Tussock Moth project -- necessary that he be at meeting. Asotin.

O'Donnell: Will review actual land and resource base the DNR administers and how legislation fits in for the management of those lands. Complex legal authority pertains to DNR lands.

Distributed packet regarding the DNR program

(SEE BROCHURE FOR AL O'DONNELL'S TALK)

Overhead slide -- Multiple use plan of management. Other than income aspect can be accommodated on these statelands. Goals and objectives discussed.

ATV program - etc.

Slides: Capitol Forest Area 70,000 acres - primitive camping area. Trail system and site interpretive programs.

Merrill Lake -- cooperated with Game Dept. on this. 4-H Horse Group -- DNR -- stalls, etc...Helped design them for DNR.

Sultan Basin- Basic trail system -- close to urban area - tremendous use/response.

Page -11-

Mount Si, North Bend.

Multiple-Use area Yacolt.

Whidbey Is. - Partridge Point -- public tidelands.

DNR also has some state-owned upland in the smaller islands of San Juans. Have worked with State Parks on these.

Pt. Doughty -- interpretive program signs -- describes where in multiple use area you can find historic sites.

ATV funds - camps - Snomobile funds - very primitive sanitary facilities and marking trails for snomobiles.

Unique nature areas -- such as Mima Mounds -- near Olympia. Preserved -- trails

John DeMeyer: -- Overhead program --

Planning process chart - explained. What builds up to IAC request - how finally funded.

Summary of 75-77 Capital Budget DNR -- A level and B level.

A level -- projects can accomplish with minimum of trouble; etc. B level projects that if funded become available - would have list on which to proceed.

Exceptions of DNR budget as compared to the past:

(1) is introduction to nature area types (Mima Mounds)

(2) Have shifted the saltwater over to the B level. Saltwater acquisition program is difficult. Saltwater resource is a diminishing one. It's real critical.

We feel that perhaps saltwater acquisition should be in the A level with the idea that maybe we should acquire this critical resource and then as environmental thing simmers down, go for the development of it.

This should be higher in priority.

(3) Note absence of roads -- that's all under ATV now.

Next overhead - Six-year 1975-77 - March, 1973.

Total figures represent both A and B level. Funding level through six-year period is fairly constant.

Larsen: Are you building inflation in that -- in talking about increasing your program?

DeMeyer: Yes, these are today's dollars -- but we take this in account.

Next overhead: Mid-Term Objectives.

By 1986 we would like to accommodate -- number of users 5 million;
In the present inventory, now carries capacity to accommodate 730,000 people.

Gave more budget figures on the overhead chart.

Bell: How many do you actually accommodate -- do you have any figures?

DeMeyer: No -- unfortunately not at this time we don't have actual figures. But, we

page -12-

will be conducting another use survey -- in a year or so we will have better figures.

Bell: Can you make an educated guess? Do you feel that saturation is there with 730,000?

O'Donnell: We approach this on peak days -- during the week "no". This is hard to get a hold of because of the distribution of the land -- our statisticians will be doing this.

Larsen: How do they develop this?

O'Donnell: Traffic counts on primary access roads plus actual interview procedure. Also weighing of garbage -- they say this could be done and tell us -- our statisticians say this will work.

Bell: But the Dept. is satisfied that your progress to date and toward 1986 goal is on schedule -- in line with public demand for use of your facilities?

Al O'Donnell: Yes, I think so -- but on peak days, we see overcrowding. In general we will use these small developed areas in a larger area to disperse people. Most people drive through for viewing and not stop to use the facilities. It is exceptional area where we are not accommodating.

QUESTIONS --

Bell: I would like to compliment the Department on its program and relationship it has made to their particular problem in budgeting -- it's very well done.

Stan: Operating impact re IAC funds?

Bishop: You should explain to the Committee about return of money you receive for these DNR lands.

O'Donnell: Designated from the lease figure is a 25% return to the DNR, but this is basic^{ly} available for land management supervision and not the operation of a recreation facility. We can use it to control insect damage, etc., but actual operation of our recreation sites and trails, we largely depend on the General Fund appropriations.

Through a quirk in ATV Act a passenger car using DNR roads is in fact considered to be ATV vehicle under the law. So, we can use this money for sites that can be reached by ordinary passenger car.

Bishop: In management of all trust lands the state developed a policy of allocating to the Department 20% of the total proceeds of earnings on those lands for the management of those lands. So, now you have available at least 20% of that income toward that purpose.

Al O'Donnell: That goes toward reforestration keeping timber stands productive.

Bell: You have changed your acq. and deve. priorities to acquisition of saltwater shore-lands?

O'Donnell: Yes -- Approach by State Parks for sizeable joint project on Cypress Island of 100 acres - very choice saltwater front property -- Allow us to expend the dollars we have sitting there for tideland access.

Page - 13 -

Bell: Tidelands are owned by the State of Washington; Why do you have to spend \$500,000 to make them accessible?

O'Donnell: Ours comes to ordinary high tide -- many of these are in front of privately owned uplands. We acquire a very small tract of privately owned upland so that the people using the beach have an area to go to. Really no charge for use of state-owned tidelands themselves.

Bishop: Acquisition -- that's not outright acquisition -- it's 50 year lease, isn't it?

O'Donnell: Only acquisition we get into is the small tract of upland adjacent to larger stretch of state-owned tideland.

Lemcke: In Mima Mounds this would be a purchase in fee. They could waive their normal policies and actually sell them.

O'Donnell: In a few isolated cases we could do this. DNR would end up with title to the land utilizing IAC funds and it would be permanently set aside. They are on state school district lands.

Larsen: What percent of tideland is held in trust as opposed to that which the state sold to private ownerships?

O'Donnell: About 30% is in public ownership. We have embarked on tideland marking program -- we are putting in markers so that boaters can identify -- could enter into cooperative thing with Fisheries and Parks.

Bell: What about Fisheries?

O'Donnell: They have tideland tracts directly under Fisheries administration -- we could put markers out.

Brostrom: All tidelands? Or just upland access?

O'Donnell: All tidelands. Particularly those ^{which} ~~who~~ have recreational value.

Bishop: Thanked O'Donnell

FISHERIES

Frank Haw: Tollefson unable to be here. Explained.

Stan: Glad to have Fisheries with us again. They were appropriated some funds -- but they never used them and they reverted back and were used elsewhere, etc.

Haw: Explain who we are and what we do. There are two fisheries -- Game and Fisheries...Our business is: marine fish and shell fish that can be exploited for commercial purposes. We have been commercially oriented for years. Money comes from general taxation.

Management standpoint and in budget we have some recreational stand point -- etc. Game gets their money from hunting and fishing licenses.

Explained the licensing program.

Our involvement with IAC has been passive role to date. Tollefson has been Committee member several years, etc. Times have changed. Emphasis has changed -- razor clams -- have gone now to recreational. 50,000 people in weekend have been on Washington Coast after these razor clams. Recently we have 13 point program to enhance sport fishing in Washington. Also recently we have new unit and I am in this -- on recreational fisheries.

Legislative Session -- we were granted funds for staff of this new unit. One will be a Rec. Res. Spec. Need to provide more specific services to the recreational people. And, need to relate to the shellfisherman and fisherman.

First, need to provide access to existing places so people can get these clams and fish. Recent salmon program - explained.

Long-range goals - develop recreation potential of land and fisheries that we own already. Tidelands, etc. Access corridors to these places for clams, etc. Acquire and develop boat launch and shore fishing sites - - including fishing piers at locations where recreational potential exists.

General policy -- concentrate on access programs and segments of resource that provide these things. Potential for recreational is great.

Westport area; Sequim area; they provide the access -- and we would like to stay away from those areas.

We want to concentrate on the undeveloped areas. We want to stay out of operation and maintenance business.

Need agreements with other agencies - local agencies - counties, etc. We would turn maintenance over to them -- but we would operate facilities on fisheries property where we have facilities now.

Planning process: Rely on recreational experts in the field on this. Determine needs -- where they are now -- etc. Relied on individual experts within Dept. of Fisheries to do this for us. We want to refine our planning process and utilize our own people.

\$1.4 million Capital Budget request.

Have outdoor tour facilities at four hatchery sites -- 1. Green River in King County 2. Solduck Hatchery 3. Cowlitz Hatchery 4. Skagit Hatchery.

Trails, parking areas, toilets, various displays -- show what spawning looks like; describe relationship with hatchery and natural environment; etc. etc.

Need semi-nature areas and display native fishes found there. Displays include material that would inform the public where they could enjoy fisheries' resources.

Solduck - we could build a boat ramp; construct parking area, \$319,464.

Develop or acquire boat launching sites in Juan deFuca Straits.

Showed map -- green - existing public launching sites; county operated and five-mile radius of launching sites - and 3 mile radius of launching site.

red - Existing commercial operating facilities. Cape Flattery is principle area. \$200,000 - for acquisition of this property.

Develop access or acquire access: 1. Penn Cove - Whidbey Island 1.2 miles available beach;

2. Point Whitney - two miles beach available.

3. Oakland Bay - 243 acres owned. No upland access.

4. South of Penn Cove - 1.6 miles beach - no access.

5. Oyster Bay - 1,500 feet beach owned - no access.

Tideland development: Land we presently own. Point Whitney - erosion control and bulkhead - road modifications \$84,350 - and Penn Cove.

Improve the boat launching facilities - 1 county park and Pillar Point \$38,830.
Joint project Clallam County.

Slides were shown.

30 hatchery sites - development - four of them.

1. Cowlitz
2. Washougal - for handicapped people
3. Juan de Fuca straits
4. Pillar
5. Oyster Bay
6. Oakland Bay
7. Penn Cove
8. Pt. Whitney
9. Crab netting - etc.

Ray Buckley: Talked on fishing piers. Showed slides.
marinas and breakwaters - breakwaters form good fishing areas
Desirability of same - fishing piers.

Bishop: Thanked Fisheries for presentation.

QUESTIONS:

Brostrom: Claim ---- is entirely commercial? Isn't the Corps of Engrs. there?

Hay: No. There's a Coho resort -- it is privately owned.

Bell: You will not turn over your sites to private concessionaires?

Haw: Well, county would be eager to work with us on these.

Bishop: Will the county try to develop local kind of application or would this be strictly Department of Fisheries?

Haw: Have met with the county; they feel it would be a good deal.

Bob: Basically, it would be a State Fisheries application with a joint-use agreement for fishing pier complex -- Tell them about the Edmonds.

Buckley: Edmonds -- has passed joint resolution accepting concept behind the fishing pier and we are discussing this.

Haw: This is particularly wanted and needed -- so people are cooperative.

Bell: Get the State Highway Department to build ramps along Ferry docks and you could have a cooperative venture. Mentioned pier in his area.

Stan: Jerry and I met with National Marine Fisheries Service during one-day conference regarding fishing pier concept. Access to marine fisheries by non-bodies. There were user group representatives there. As indication of their interest they volunteered that they would have no objection to a saltwater license if it could be used for this fishing pier type facility.

At Edmonds -- we discussed possibility of using existing ferry piers, etc., to allow pedestrians to be there fishing without conflicting with ferry business.

Bell: Ports could let the public use their docks, too. But because of liability and increased traffic, they closed them to the public fishing.

Stan: Elaborated on Edmonds. IAC has waterfront park up there -- now there are lands available on the southside that could tie in the existing properties of IAC, Highways, additional beach frontage and uplands right into Pt. of Edmonds' fishing pier.

Brostrom: On Edmonds pier - any objections to allowing fishing on marina side?

Buckley: No, you could not use the marina side.

Haw: Breakwater is beautiful, artificial reef and attracts fish.

12:15 Recessed

1:15 Reconvened

Bishop: Briefly reviewed the morning's meeting. Called upon Stan.

Stan: Referred to preliminary 75-77 Capital Budget memorandum of May 31, 1974 and attached budget alternatives (in this file).

Introduced staff. Explained their inclusion in the budgets. Introduced Dan Keller and Mike Stewart of OPPFM. New man WSU student intern, Dick Boston - recreation major - introduced.

Referred to Page 2 - replacement distributed to members -- new figures.

Also will discuss Operating Budget direction today. Will need few minutes to discuss general direction in terms of funding level re Operating Budget. Tentatively set some further sub-committee meeting dates for the Operating Budget review. The presentations today were fine, etc. New information given this morning that even our own staff was not aware of -- for instance, material from the Game Dept. Bob has informed all agencies participating in the Capital Budgets of the three alternatives presented to you in this paper. Those alternatives are predicated on number of reasons and one is re-appropriation level.

That is why all agencies have talked about their reappropriations and how they feel they are already committed. They feel it will not be available because it will be used. Cypress Island -- will be discussed -- it may change the picture.

Regional concept and planning districts was commented upon. Some members of the Committee are familiar with standard thirteen regions for State Planning purposes. We recognize these do not have as much validity for state agencies as they do for local agencies.... Because people travel from all over the state and take advantage of facilities. But, it is the State Planning tool. It is valuable and advisable to us. Planning is in the SCORP). I would take adverse position to Mr. Odegaard that it is just "window-dressing". I think it is a very valuable tool. It is more than this. It is reality as it shows the needs portrayed in the various districts.

IAC State Agency priorities -- referred to instructions. On page 4 of the Capital Budget Document -- these were set in 1971 by the Committee. Serve as basis for capital budgets. Instructions were approved 10/73 and mailed 11/73 -- had to submit the budgets by 4-74. State agencies submitted them as asked. Quite well done -- but not on time in some instances.

Section 3, page 1 of Budget document is particularly important. Mentioned anticipated re-appropriation. We have been continually aware of this as we have gone to hat

for operating budgets in sitting in with member agency on their budgets as to questions of the Legislature. The Feds decided to cut back LWCF predicated on unobligated and unexpended money lying "idle" and not being maximized.

67-69 there was total \$1.6 carried forward in reappropriation funds.

69-71 \$900,000.

71-73 \$3.4 million

73-75 \$13 million.

Now, there was unique instance in latter part of 71-73 biennium insofar as additional monies were cranked up - \$7.5 to the state agencies and they couldn't get it out. But, if we take that away they would still have carried into current biennium \$3.4 million.

Look at sheet Bob has given you. When we talk about unobligated and unexpended funds, in terms of commitment or expenditure from -- \$17.5 million of carry-over for 75-77.

Assuming they get rid of a third of that, we will be still at \$13 million level to carry over.

We are concerned about this. This is one of the basis upon which we will make our pitch.

Larsen: Are they line-itemmed?

Stan: Only insofar as those approved and identified by project. We can look these up and tell you.

Larsen: We then have some responsibility to review funds of that magnitude?

Stan: We have done it and we are now bringing it to you. The unobligated monies -- Item 5 - represent balance currently available to state agencies for remainder of the biennium. Bob has held a number of meetings with these agencies. Analyzed budgets and processed -- arriving at alternatives.

Alternative three -- (see memo alternatives). There would be a zero balance because of reappropriation. The other would be \$3.2 million. The next was moved forward -- all bond receipts -- that was too close a program.

Alternative 3 -- this is recommended. We do this in confidence predicated on the fact that agency performance to date that they will maintain their operating level, maintain a level they can produce on and maintain there programs and, secondly, it anticipates the reappropriations and the very apparent reluctance and opposition to use of LWCF because of additional restrictions, etc., as evidenced by the fact that we can transfer close to \$1 million of that money in December for funding of local projects which has to be paid back from this next fiscal year's Land and Water Money...and lastly, the demonstrated ability and desire on the part of local agencies to use that money.

In May we had six to one demand for every dollar we had available. We moved forward that money.

Alternative 3 will (1) give state agencies a chance to catch up and maintain their programs.;

(2) Give additional resource to the local agencies to perform that function.

Larsen: If you choose an alternative, you are saying that we have to stick with that with each agency?

Bob: The alternative is to determine a total appropriation - could check -- but within that total we still have a lot of things we can do.

Stan: The alternatives are predicated on total funding available -- but we can shift within that -- and also we could shift the amounts of Ref. 28 and either one-half or whatever we want to do with LWCF insofar as there are no statutory regulations on that but a split of 50-50. Ref. 28, you think about what is left for the biennium. 215 is a standard amount all the way across -- has to be divided 50-50.

Bishop: Is this appropriate time to talk about the table you have? Otherwise I will wait. But, I don't know how we can address these questions -- need a better understanding of how you determine funds carried forward.

Stan:

We have just completed first fiscal year of biennium -- unobligated -- we need to anticipate the plans because we are not at end of biennium yet. You need to know what you expect to put -- unobligated balance at end of the fiscal year.

Referred to the chart on fiscal status of participating agencies. Line (1) total available each agency since inception of the program. Amounts they have obligated actually. Line (3) what they actually spent. Line (4) Obligated but not expended. Line (5) Unobligated and line (6) total working capital. Combination of unexpended and unobligated. Total \$17.5 is what they have to work with.

Game Dept. said this morning they will have \$595,000 left out of \$4.7 on the books. That does not coincide with our projects.

Looking at the history it doesn't look that way to us. I think this is first time I have seen this Game Dept. projection (sheet they passed out). I think it is very, very optimistic. We asked the Game Dept. to give us their anticipated reappropriation for the biennium earlier and then figured they had at that time \$2.5 million -- and now they have it down to 1/2 million.

I can't give you specific figure -- what they will carryover -- but my discussions would show it would be about \$2. to \$3 million. Mike Stewart, do you have a comment?

Mike Stewart: We confirm what you are saying that it would be somewhat unrealistic given the current projection for their budget in the second part of this biennium to think that they will be able to turn the program around as rapidly as they say to accomplish any sort of cleanup activity on this amount of money. But, emphasis we have on reappropriations -- there will probably be something on the part of Game to do something about this balance and it will be something that would lessen line (6) but not that much.

Stan: They say they will be unobligated \$1/2 million. That does not mean they are going to have it used. That means they will have it before this committee and obligated. Game cannot condemn -- they get their information from their regions as to availability of land -- pre-sale or re-sale -- data and then they have to go out and see if they can get it. Game has withdrawn some that have been approved by IAC.

They can probably commit that money through applications -- but what that means in terms of reappropriation is not necessarily germane. It could come close to \$4--or-\$5 million in money not expended.

Milt: Also the quality of the type of projects coming in -- Also the record -- current performance by all state agencies. Game hasn't started to obligate even their current funds.

Bob: Their 73-75 appropriations haven't been touched. Referred to Table III of 73-75 -- projects. Only one of these projects listed is listed as available. The others are listed as not available or not needed. So, what money we have obligated them will be at other sites in other regions. This gives you insight into why I believe Game will not be moving as fast as they say.

Stan: Compare Table III with our critical resource requests on page (8) of the same document. You can see that they are carrying forward some of this money. S. WRA \$125,000 -- it was their second priority for current biennium -- but says not available now. The money sits from year to year. Colockum for \$200,000--\$60,000 in present biennium is not available. What are the conditions which will make this available in next biennium? It would have to be coming from their regional people that it is desirable and they are still hoping.

Bob: Vancouver Lake -- Answer there is with Alcoa -- they have not yet determined if they want to sell. Project just doesn't come to fruition.

Somebody said: State Parks has power of condemnation and DNR operates within their own realm.

Bell: Do they want to fund these without any idea about how they are going to get them?

Stan: Yes...To put it frankly, Mr. Bell.

Larsen: Didn't they check this program of Game Dept., and aren't they going to do something about it?

Milt: We spent three days with Game and state agencies at Fort Worden facility. Discussed various problems and result was that in talking with Game and trying to review their program internally to bring future projects to IAC for consideration, we found their program was being originated in the field. We haven't seen evidence of that particular agency coming forth with any new restructuring within their internal operation to solve their problem.

Bishops: What about Parks?

Bob: They have (1) Nalley - \$1.7 million - but it's poor project. If they get bugs out of it and obligated it and actually buy it, OK. Remaining funds are Ledbetter Point - permits are involved there.

Larsen: What would happen if we took those two projects away from them?

Bob: Nalley -- is specifically line-itemmed by the Legislature. Ledbetter development we have a bet more flexibility there.

Stan: Resolve differences with county, they will be able to proceed. Fort Canby in same county -- not sure -- project has been on the books for five years. That is being carried over three biennia.

Bell: If we accept alternative (1) we will have a lot of projects that will not come to the Committee for approval?

Stan: It's possible.

Bell: They can bring in substitute projects then?

Larsen: If we go on alternative (3), what would it do to Nalley: We have no opposition as far as Nalley, do we?

Stan: We have opposition. Have advised re this project -- as we put forward our IAC Capital budget. There is option open to us to comment in there regarding the problems apparent in this. We could say the likelihood is it could not be consummated. Could request it be de-authorized and reappropriation reflect that deauthorization.

Keller: We've talked to Parks about this already. We can go back to the Legislature and ask them to do this if it appears this project cannot be consummated.

Stan: That would mean \$1.7 -- bring it back up to \$5 million again.

Bell: If we take attitude on basis they have not performed, what do we do as a matter of policy to their ability to perform in the coming biennium?

Stan: We just slow them down a little.

Bell: Alternative (1) would limit amounts available?

Stan: Alternative 3 -- we should go with that.

Bell: All right - alternative (3) -- it would slow them down?

Stan: And give chance to catch up -- but it would not deter.

Bell: It would put a ceiling on funding then. Substitutions could be made -- or other priorities - switch around. Lump sum budget to Legislature -- we don't go with line-item. For the benefit of the new members, we have here specific items which leads one to conclude we will fund these specific items in the biennium. But, that's not true, is it?

Stan: Yes, it is true.

Bishop: Well, if they add up to lump sum -- your total in 3 -- and you get it in lump sum -- then what do you do when these agencies come back and can't do it?

Stan: The agency submits capital budget -- screen, analyze and put together an IAC Capital Budget - now have four state agencies. It then goes to OPPFM and carries certain supportive data which will list certain projects. But, it goes from OPPFM as lump sum in the Governor's Budget. There may be some line-item on some of these; we've had it before. It is not approved on line itemmed basis, however, at Legislature. From that point, once it is appropriated it becomes a direct appropriation to the State agencies.

The procedure is that the state agency then comes back through the IAC for individual approval for the project as submitted to the IAC in that IAC Budget Request. They can come back to us for approval of those projects.

Bob: But sometimes we get back substitutions...and adjustments are made in that budget.

Bishop: But, this Committee and OPPFM has to approve it also. There has to be two levels of review here.

Stan: As in Game Dept. we can anticipate some major modifications from what they propose to us to begin with.

Bishop: Alternative 3 -- you want to discuss that one?

Bob: We can discuss all three if you want.

Bishop: It appears to me that you are saying this is really a double-barrelled situation as far as state agencies are concerned because alternative (2) advances restricted funding from Ref. 28 -- but local agencies would not be so restricted?

Bob: That's another subject.

Bishop: But you say that that would also restrict the local agency share then?

Stan: I basically laid out the six alternatives and then got down to the three. Warren is correct -- it is a double shot. Instead of having \$2.3 available next biennium, we are saying move it forward as 1/2 way measure on this -- and saying you are running behind schedule on your performance to date, so let's take that into effect and hold the \$4 million until later. We reduce their resource by that -- but the local side would still remain at \$8.6. \$8.3 million from Ref. 28; other approach is that we request \$8.3 Ref. 28, and let State agencies have other barrel and get LWCF to local side.

Bishop: What is total share?

Stan: About \$5 million -- \$8.6 to \$3.8.

Bishop: What is your budget document going to look like? With alternative (3)?

Stan: It will be two separate documents -- that will not be equal. Local will be substantially bigger.

Milt: But re-appropriation to the state agency side you close that gap a little bit. They may obligate funds but they won't spend them, but they still have that money to spend as much as what they get new.

Bishop: I understand your language re alternative (3) LWCF -- but, I can't go along with general obligation bond issue. It does not carry any commitment half local and half state -- but I don't think we should remove that portion from the bond issue.

Stan: This does require a 50-50 split.

Bishop: You will not deprive the state agencies from this?

Stan: No, we are saying, let's balance it up in the next biennium. Give locals \$5 million and state \$3.4.

Larsen: We seem to be using one general _____, but we are talking about Game Dept. Problem. Totally different problem with Parks. Alternative 3 - I don't think it should be applied to all of the state agencies. Ought to look at the individual agencies -- we ought to see what would best fit in within those three state agencies.

Glenn: 39 are open -- all in various stages -- roughly I show six of them not moving. Total on the 39 would be similar to obligated to unexpended, etc. \$3.5 million left -- majority approved at least two years ago.

Larsen: This is different from what Mr. Odegaard told us today.

Stan: Right. We learned something new also.

Milt: Sensing that, I asked them, do you expend them on obligated?

Jan -- listed the projects not ready -- Blake Island, Lake Samamish, Wallace Falls, Harper -- lots of them -- funds obligated. But, they will be constructing those the first year of the next biennium.

Bishop: Once this Committee approves commitment for a project we must think it is okay -- once funds are committed we shouldn't say those have to be expended in that biennial period. That's different than unobligated not committed balances. We have to direct our attention to those projects that are not going to be committed.

Larsen: The costs of some of these projects delayed year after year -- they will come up -- and we can then substitute.

Bishop: I don't know whether not authorizing future projects can help them get those done earlier. There may be other problems related to those projects.

Stan: If we can take on face value what Game has given us this morning -- re restricted funding -- he who has the gold rules. I think we can stimulate performance by perhaps being a little tighter with the money in the next biennium.

Bishop: You are proposing, Stan, a third alternative which is a pretty drastic change. We can't take it lightly. Re LWCF, we suggest that total amount in local sector and none into state sector -- that right?

Stan: Yes.

Bishop: That will not go beyond the walls of this room. This committee should not be led down the rosy path that that is easy to take. Once you decide alternative, the priorities are going to follow -- but our purpose today is to respond to that basic policy -- alternative.

Bell: I am sorry we didn't hear this first.

Roger: We didn't receive any applications from DNR for entire year -- last May until May meeting 74. They also have not obligated any of their 73-75 money. It is my opinion they are operating at capacity with their staff. DNR will not contract a development project -- they do it by force account or with the crews.

Game follows basically the same philosophy. To obligate further money without a change in their policy, without change in construction, etc.

On local side -- we only have \$1.8 million left for expenditure this biennium unless we get an increase over regular LWCF. We have 31 right now \$6.5 million to \$7 million. By December we expect to have 65-70 requests totaling \$12-15 million. We won't have more than \$1.8 million in funds. The demand is on local side.

Milt: At 3 day meeting, it was proposed to us by a state agency that what they may want to do and would consider seriously doing (Green River Gorge) -- Three biennium

approach is needed to complete projects. We haven't talked about this yet with OPPFM. They want to have a regrouping planning approach to acquiring in the second and developing in the third. You are now planning, acquiring and developing all at the same time.

Bishop: General obligation bonds always remain 50-50 -- state agencies catch up - locals use this money...etc.

Milt: Game doesn't have a plan, etc.

Mike Stewart: Alternative 3 -- react in biennium or two year periods. May have possibility of supplemental budgets on almost annual legislative process now. You have with third alternative and not commit all the LWCF but just for first year -- hold back 1/2 until next legislative session to see how state agencies are doing. Rearrange the program -- maybe you could give them some. Demand on local side is phenomenal -- perhaps you could give that money in supplemental budget back to locals.

Bell: When state comes in to get it -- etc -- the locals will scream -- and you can't explain it to them.

Stan: When next bond issue comes, we can --

Bell: How much is left? etc.

Stan: \$9. million local \$7.3 state -- or \$16.3 total. No limit on expenditure.

Larsen: What is our bonding capacity?

Stan: Authorized was \$40 million - \$12 million to State Parks; \$28 million to us -- \$11.7 was appropriated this biennium.

Bob: We have not discussed the alternatives with the state agencies.

Brostrom: Would they know what these are?

Bob: No, only in terms of total dollars.

Bell: Alternative (3) reduces their appropriation -- discussed this.

Brostrom: Could we accomplish the same thing by only recommending acquisition portions? Such as Game Dept.?

Roger: There are different problems with the different agencies, Mrs. Brostrom.

Stan: DNR already operates on a two biennia approach to this -- they lease in one and construct in the next.

Bishop: You made comment that Legislature might not meet -- by law they meet at certain times. But I am concerned that political consequences of a Supplemental Budget --- etc. State agencies can generate a hell of a lot of complaint on this.

Milt: Current leadership is offsetting factor on our Committee.

(much laughter.)

Bishop: We need to give state agency adjustment period by policy decision of diverting all federal funds to local sector at this meeting?

Bell: I wonder if full committee would consider this anyway.

Brostrom: Locals -- forcing cut back? By putting off next biennium?

Stan: No, we would be able to accommodate them to a greater degree.

Brostrom: By not allowing all LWCF to accrue?

Stan: Locals would still get what they would normally have gotten.

Larsen: Are we going to make a recommendation to the Main Committee?

Brostrom: Does this committee have responsibility to see that these projects are completed in reasonable fashion?

Bishop: Yes -- it does. We have monetary pressure. We can withdraw projects if we want to; Committee can deauthorize it.

Brostrom: Can state agencies make a report on a more current basis of these delinquent projects...why not done, etc?

Stan: We have this -- but it doesn't seem to accomplish any motivating factor -- our status reports are in each kit each time we have a meeting.

Bishop: If they could show us this --

Roger: They are operating at capacity now -- but they have to catch up.

Larsen: I would support alternative (3) if we can find a way to put funding off for one-year period allowing state agencies to show some progress.

Stan: For your consideration -- when we go with the operating budget as well as capital we do go on an annual basis. We could leave out of the operating budget that second fiscal year's LWCF money and then go back and ask for it all either state or local side. It is kind of like Russian roulette. We will have to show that second fiscal year LWCF on either state side or operating side when we go forward at this time. We would have to beg and ask for reduction in operating budget and increase of state agency side, would we not?

Keller: Technically speaking you could accomplish this by getting your money IN TOTAL and have all LWCF put in the operating side. If it's on the operating side, you could still hold it in an appropriate status for grants to state agencies if they could come up to your expectations.

Bishop: We should have a conversation with the state agencies then to see about these funds and we would put this in the local agencies. We could then move it. It doesn't have to say local - does it?

Keller: No, we write it up and say grants to public agencies.

Bishop: This would take care of if Legislature does not come back. Committee needs authority, power and ability to tell state agencies they can't do it.

Bob: What about putting the whole \$6 million there..and make them ask for it?

Bishop: Assuming OPPFM -- this Committee still has authority to determine if its monies are to be allocated. We don't really have to allocate them. We could say, this -- to state agencies -- we won't allocate them until you show us that you can get these things done.

Stan: The Committee does have that authority -- but we have not really done this. We have recommended this -- but the Committee has over-ridden this and allowed projects to go forward. We would be very pleased to see the Committee do this.

Bishop: State agencies are a little ahead anyway...

Stan: \$1.7 million -- by causing two year postpone that \$1.7 million has been taken from \$5 million appropriation so what it will leave is \$4 million for 77-79 -- state and local -- it should even it up and we come out with the 50-50-split.

Larsen: About Nalley. I subscribe to again asking the Legislature to review that specific line-itemmed project in view of what apparently are going to be difficulties of acquiring that property. Clearing the clouds etc.

Milt: We do not know at this time how far State Parks is on cleaning up those problems we pointed out to them. We don't have their reply yet. They may have a method to take care of most of those problems.

Stan: At August meeting, State Parks should make a report on that project.

Brostrom: Maybe State Parks should make recommendation on that project to the Legislature.

Keller: Taking two biennium look on where we are on Ref. 28 -- what happens after 28. 77-79 budget session, we will use up remainder of 28 and probably request authorization for continuation of a bond issue. IAC and member agencies would be in much better light if they do not have a huge appropriation going in at that time and that we need a new bond to continue it. We ought to consider not just the next two years, but the following two years.

Bishop: We have an opinion here that the state agencies can't really get that money spent very rapidly -- locals could very easily do it.

Stan: We only need 25% state money to match into federal money. That means we could handle with \$5 million of 28, \$10 million of LWCF -- extend that on and put in 215 and \$5 million of state money -- you are talking about \$12 million LWCF.

There is concerted effort in Congress now to raise LWCF to Billion (there are six bills - \$600 million up to billion) -- that would triple amount coming to the state. We don't know amendments re technical assistance grants, indoor facilities, etc. It could start coming in in 1976 or 1977. We would be then looking at roughly \$9 million a year or \$18 million a biennium of LWCF. We would be needing about the same amount on a biennial basis in order to maximize it on the local side. Whereas, state side is strictly 50-50 -- bond issue monies are not going to equal that amount when added to your 215 monies. So, if we continue this split, there is going to be money going back to LWCF state agency side.

Bishop: If it happens, we can take care of local needs.

Milt: Should dedicate funds to put strength on this.

Bob: Let me be sure that I understand where we are. Are we on Alternative (3)?

Bishop: If we are going to say that we are going to request the funds for the capital budget on the allocation being made to the state agencies, but administratively we would determine whether or not it would be released, we should have a program that would follow that and show how we would spend those funds? If you don't put them in there, then we are completely dependent on the Legislature meeting to do this.

Stan: If we take alternative (2), it would be appropriated directly to the state agencies as a part of the legislative program -- we would lose control -- but Alternative (3) and the LWCF in our operating budget, then we have the flexibility as an agency to grant that money to state agencies. Therefore, we should submit alternative (3) and keep as vest-pocket alternative if they produce, the possibilities of coming back to a portion of Alternative (2).

Bob: Yes -- you would have a capital budget \$3.8 plus \$3 million for operating budget -- but that totals \$6.9 -- and that's the amount of projects we would have under identification at this time.

Stan: I thought we were in accord that we would withhold LWCF for first part of 76 and 77 money would become available upon disposition of that committee.

Bob: I didn't think we were going to withhold -- we would just have better power to keep it and release it.

Larsen: We said hold it - allow period to give time to show us if they need it.

Bob: But, what will you do with it then?

Bishop: We did not articulate this very well. Bob says if in fact we are going to make the first year's source of LWCF for the locals, we conveyed awhile ago we would remain in a box for a year and not make it available for locals. In fact, the first year's estimate of LWCF would be used for locals and it is lost to the state for their projects.

Larsen: My suggestion would be that we allocate it to local government for the first year and then relate the option about it the next year.

Bishop: Bob would need to then present alternative (3). We would keep the money as administrative determination and not submit it as part of capital budget at all. OPPFM will have a problem because we will have to submit a state agency program to show them what we are doing. If we need to do this, we would need to set the second year of projects -- what we are going to spend.

Stan: There may be opportunity to utilize joint projects -- state agency puts up money and locals -- then it becomes money spent.

Bob: Page 4 - SCORP - and priorities -- discussed.

Stan: Mentioned percentages re SCORP.

Bob: Page (5) - 13 planning districts. Page (6) and (7) - Parks
Bob described each project.

Mercer Slough, Green River Gorge.

Bell: Didn't they feel they could do Green River Gorge?

Bob: Danger of that resource has been lessened -- the loss of it -- etc.
The remaining program is to buy easements.

Ocean Beaches - Birch Bay, acq.
Tawnoh, Acq., additional area
Wallace Lake - Fort Ebey - and Manchester
Haley property -- and eastside of North Cascades Highway - addition to
Perringer State Park.

Parks \$1,805,000.

Proposals for Fort Ebey and Manchester -- were at higher amounts than shown because they included Ranger residences -- they are not eligible.

Bishop: Give just the ones in alternative (3).

If your position is that Parks can't perfect the projects they have, before we fund any more we should find out that they are able to move on these projects.

If not, then they would have money to pick up other projects.

Larsen: If \$1.7 Nalley were released it would be available for other projects.

Stan: In a way -- but politically, it should be divided between the three state agencies -- It was a free gratis bonus.

Larsen: Portion of it would then go to State Parks?

Stan: Yes.

Bell: If we fund at such a low level, the incentive is pretty well gone in my opinion. Alternative (2) would be the better and take the LWCF and set them aside administratively because we have such a low level of expectation. As a matter of policy, I can't quite see you, Stan, holding it one year, etc.

Stan: Explained.

Bell: I see validity of using it -- cities and towns should get it if they can use it.

Stan: Is there any area here \$1.5 million you want to discuss?

Larsen: What type of state projects will be considered second year -- We need to have that list. Alternative is that we go 2 and one-half.

Bell: Your assumption is that they are so far behind that they cannot use any more money than that. Mine is more optimistic -- you haven't left any room if they do catch up. Then they would be ready to go and you would have no dollars to do it. State projects are tremendous -- they are probably of greater value in many respects.

Larsen: Under alternative (2) we could add this.

Bishop: Logistics of how that is accomplished would be through the OPPFM and staff of IAC.

Bob: We would still have \$5.3 million available to us.

Stan: You want alternative (2) - and one-half?

Bell: I don't want to get locked into a budget -- if opportunity is there to use this money, it should be used.

Bishop: At end of first year if it still appears they have problems, we would not want to have to go along with those first year projects. We don't take the crown away from them.

Bell: If we put in lowest level of funding and set aside LWCF in operating budget to play with it, then it turns out that state agencies have performed very well, how will they go about getting through that low level funding?

Bishop: We take LWCF funds and then go over there ...but we are still hung up as far as referendum money.

Stan: But, we are delaying the inevitable only the one biennium.

Bell: I think you should put the higher referendum level in the budget and then have it subject to reappropriation -- rather than putting the lower level in and then only having LWCF to match and you won't have anything in the referendum budget to use.

Stan: I think you will have funds. Dan said if we can go into Legislature and ask for authority for referendum monies with clean slate instead of full plan - money still left we will be in a better position.

If we are to follow what I think you propose, we would end up two years from now with a substantial reappropriation -- because the money would be reappropriated as now. Same position we are in today. Plus the fact that they would have all additional money again. Totally they are not expending \$8.6 a biennium. If it isn't expended, it has to be reappropriated.

Larsen: Would we have foreclosed the locals ability to spend that money?

Stan: Yes -- because it would have been appropriated to the state agencies.

Keller: Legislature is aware of reappropriation problem with agencies -- now having. We may have a harder time to sell these 28 monies -- because they know state agencies have reappropriated money. Discussed Wallace Lake.

Bishop: I think we should stick with delay for two years of the states' portion of referendum money. If we don't do it, the budget committee will take it away from us anyway because we don't have a very good record of spending it.

Question is how to identify what would be that second year LWCF projection assuming then that Parks could verify those -- it would be totally a third alternative.

Bob: That's my question -- do you identify the projects or do them later on?

Bishop: It would be better to identify them later on.

Bell: We haven't demanded these projects be finished before we allow more projects. It has come to me as a shock to see that they haven't used these monies.

Bob: Game Dept. \$312,500 Padilla Bay -- to acquire it...etc.

Bishop: Assume that under Alternative (2) -- Grand Ronde and _____ would be fighting for that money later on.

Larsen: Are the priorities here? Do they square with Game Dept. priorities?

Bob: Yes. It is within their priority list - critical resource. Development we have nothing.

Bell: That bothers me -- it's a high priority in our Plan.

Bob: We are doing this through other agencies.

Bell: Are they ready to go on any of these?

Bob: 73-75 - they had \$180,000 that same program and they have spent nothing. They indicate they will be doing this -- but -- have freshwater shorelands -- discussed this and freshwater lakes - discussed.

DNR - page 11-12 - Bob explained the ones being recommended in the capital budget.

Larsen: Trail types -- Do you want lower standard of trails? Or reduce the length of the trail?

Bob: We got down to lower budget levels, and we had to adjust.

Larsen: I can see where it is possible on a road or trail you are building to a standard -- and when you arbitrarily reduce that you have to think of what you reduce -- or reduce the standard.

Bob: You're right -- it would be a shortened trail. Will need to correct \$25,000 development -- for each state agency. Will be doing this before June 27th meeting.

Both Al and Jan - mentioned Cypress Island -- need to have flexibility to work in this with State Parks and DNR.

On Fisheries - alternative (3) - \$89,000 -- one hatchery site only.

Stan: Fisheries has these already cranked in and going to get them done -- we see State Parks trying for five years to accommodate and acquire boat launch sites on Puget Sound and they fell flat. Here comes another state agency that can come in and put them on the ground.

Bob: Part of their program will be taking a person through the hatchery building -- but our funding would be outside.

Larsen: We should develop one -- and see what it does and how it goes.

Bell: But have to be careful that we don't fund additional hatchery sites. Improving the county ramp -- isn't that taking state money to help a local?

Stan: I don't see anything different in this one and the Luther Burbank proj. -- that we put State Parks' money in.

Bell: What about LWCF funds -- when do they get that back the \$280,000.

Stan: They will get it back -- etc.
Discussed percentages on page (14)

Larsen: We need to do some very thorough staff work in preparing for that meeting.

Bishop: I would assume that these kind of recommendations are going to have to be discussed with the state agencies before we meet on June 27. There should be a check back with the other state agencies.

Stan: We did not discuss with them the details of the three alternatives until we could get the policy direction from this group here. Now we know that direction, we will go back and discuss it with them. They will want to boost this up.

Bell: Their attitude at former meetings.....etc. What do you think will be their attitudes now?

Bishop: We have to give some guidance to the staff and we have to stay with the kinds of recommendations that we have been talking about here. If this is handled correctly, I don't think they will take too much resistance to it. They are losing one year's LWCF funding.

Bell: State Parks will get thus and so (mentioned figures) for next three years.

Stan: There is one year between now and end of biennium that will be used. Explained. See listing of Parks -- percentages should be figured that way. Next three years plus the \$5 million which they have to clean up. So they have actually \$10.6.

Bell: They have tremendous appetite and I want to be ready for them.

Stan: You have \$804,715 Fisheries; \$10,644,756 Parks, \$5,722,505 Game, and \$3,241,140 DNR.

Second year is additional \$1.5 from LWCF; total for state agencies next three years is \$21,143,217.

On Operating Budget: \$9 million in next biennium - it will create a greater workload and greater demand on staff time. Possible pressure on getting ready for bond issue campaign in 1976. Delay \$4 million until 77-79, it would appear that at this time it would be a little shaky to wait until 78 to go after a bond issue. So, we should think of 1976 for the next bond issue. Also decisions as to whether go \$5 million or \$9 million. 1976 should be the year to go for bond issue.

Bishop: We have already decided to defer bonds for state agencies.

Stan: But, we have to be concerned with the 50-50 split in the years in which they are spent.

Bishop: You could carry over 77-79 -- how much?

Stan: \$9 million or \$5 million. Otherwise we would carry \$4 million state. We are now talking about local side in our operating budget. \$5 million 75-77 and \$4 million 77-79. Suggesting all of local into next biennium. Move it forward. Keeping in mind _____ dollars and dollars are shrinking -- escalating the money a biennium -- we may increase our purchasing power on local side. Have discussed with OPPFM and Wash. Futures. We are operating on double standard, hold back state agency and other--- locals, etc.

But, we have just shifted LWCF on that side to help locals - it follows that the advancement of the bond issues would also increase that to meet the local demand, too.

Milt: We think about it as outdoor recreation bond with 50-50....but there is another approach. Submission of bond issue (1) geared to provide dollars for activities regardless of where those \$\$ were spent - local/state -- trails; marine projects; lakes; etc. Put it in one big bond issue available for administration by IAC -- see IAC set up the division. Or, have whoever would come in with better projects on trails -- or coordinate on them and come to us as joint. It may be a little more desirable on this type. Calif. just passed a \$250 million bond issue. They used split approach -- X to state; X to locals and X to activities, and there are different ways you can approach these.

Secondly, we are talking about three times within next five years of bond issue -- 76 - 78 and 80 -- analyze requirements -- 78 does not look like most desirable time because of percentage of vote.

Bishop: Now, why in hell are you saying that? The voters already passed this legislation and all we have to do is justify a bond issue to them. The state can issue General Obligation Bonds now to a certain percentage -- and the capacity of that is great. I think we should consider this carefully. If we have justification and support we can do this ourselves. I don't see us going back to the voters for awhile.

Keller: I would tend to think that the Legislature might do some referring of bond issues.

Bishop: But, our request is not based upon voter approved bond issue any more.

Keller: They might very well go with it -- referring it.

Bishop: In the area of recreation or construction for state agency needs, etc., the Legislature will have tendency to use this.

Larsen: I would be hesitant to do this -- this is kind of policy area to be taken up with the full Committee. It doesn't need this sub-committee recommendation.

Stan: I need a feeling on this-- etc.

Bell: I don't grasp it at the moment -- I think I would let it ride and worry about it in 76.

Bishop: We are going to have to demonstrate that we can wisely commit and spend General Obligation Bond receipts before we can go to the Legislature and get more. When we have committed them wisely, the Legislature would authorize this for our kind of purpose. The voters approved that Constitutional Amendment.

Second, state agencies have shown inability to keep up. Impact on local planning is our staff and that has to be from Init. 215.

Stan: Unless we need to go to General Fund Monies.

Bishop: That's not going to fly, Stan. We've tried that before, and it just won't etc.

Stan: This is thinking we wanted re \$9 million.

Milt: We need to put our operating budget together now -- we need to know from you what we are faced with in expenditure of funds in the next biennium, so we can have that impact.

Bishop: We are suggesting that we don't double up.

Larsen: I find it difficult to talk this way today about speeding up the program after talking about slowing down the state agencies.

Bishop: There are two reasons:

- (1) The concept of continuing legislature which will apparently stay with us;
 - (2) The concept of voters having approved General Obligation capacity for this state.
- We have better basis now to determine the problems. I would like to see how our \$\$\$ go before we suggest we have an emergency.

Brostrom: We also want locals to develop their own source of funds without IAC.

Bishop: Some of the agencies are letting our parks go to pot now -- Seattle is also.

Stan: We haven't seen a application from Seattle in over a year. Some of these locals may switch over to land banking again.

This capital fiscal impact on operating monies and that in turn on quality of services to the public on projects we have funded, is of concern to us. We have not been able to do what we are supposed to do under BOR aegis and what we are doing for ourselves -- running a compliance check. See if things are maintained properly.

Bell: We need to put inspector on your staff, then?

Stan: We would like to do that in our budget. 200 local projects completed now -- we can't keep up without any more. Our man-years weren't for this purpose. Another concern is need for technical assistance. BOR objective is for technical systems people to serve as team effort with our state people. We want to have this kind of technical assistance in our budget.

Third concern is that we have one man in Project Division that works with three state agencies - Glenn Moore carries 150 plus state projects.

Fisheries is now coming in -- it is physically impossible for the one man to do this.

Larsen: I would like to see this formalized first.

Stan: What would Committee members like to see IAC do on budget?

Bishop: I would like to see some of this technical assistance cost reflected in project cost. We should not be too massive a staff to start going out and doing planning for local agencies.

Stan: At this time handled by staff -- planning division -- but it could be contract basis also -- we pay 50 they pay 50...etc. We would not do the plan for the community.

Bishops: What's our relationship with OCD?

Stan: They are not knowledgeable -- would create more problems, etc.

Jerry Pelton: We average about three or four calls per week regarding local planning -- generated by OCD -- telling the people to call us.

Bishop: It is unfortunate they are the agency that has that responsibility.

Jerry: We evaluate the plans now -- takes us 3 to 4 hours. Technical service -- all inventory and local plans could be exactly the same. We could put it into computer program. We could standardize the process by which they are done.

Bishop: You ought to have discussions with these other agencies to try to see if we can't work out some coordinated approach to this.

Larsen: I would like to see in detail your program plan and justification for any additions to your staff.

Operating budget meeting discussed by Stan.

Larsen: Why not take this detail to the June 27th meeting?

Milt: OPPFM needs budget by August 14; August 26 approval to IAC; final form first week in August.

Stan: What we could do -- put it out by mail for reaction. Talk this over with Warren and then if it is necessary to call a meeting, we can do it.

Bishop: We should give information on capital budgets. -- But I don't think operating budget is our proper role, Stan. We just need to see the number of people you need to carry on your work -- but we don't need a detailed operating budget presentation.

Brostrom: We do need feedback from the state agency meetings.

Stan: We will put this into a Conference Call - and let you all know what happened.

ADJOURNED: 4:15 p.m.

SUMMARY:

1. Alternative (3).
2. Send to Committee info. on State Parks presentation - Committee member requested a copy.
3. Send feedback on meetings with state agencies to Sub-Committee (should this go to entire Committee ?)
Conference Call on this, perhaps?
4. Not necessary for detailed operating budget; want to know staffing, and program in brief detail.

Meeting June 27 - info. on both budgets.