

I. Meeting called to order, determination of a quorum, introductions.

Corrections-Additions to the Minutes of September 27-28, 1976. None  
Additions to Agenda, - Deletions - Dec. 6-7, 1976 - None.

II. STATUS Reports

A. Fiscal Status Reports

- a. Init. 215 - Unclaimed Refundable Marine Fuel Tax Distribution
- b. LWCF, Cumulative Report of Apportionment 1965-77
- c. Fund Summary Report - October 31, 1976

B. Project Status Reports

- 1. Administrative Action - State project - State Parks  
Lake Sammamish 72-501D - \$400 cost increase

Master List Approvals - State Agency Projects:

Parks Twanoh Addition 77-502A \$74,850 Ref. 28 \$37,425; LWCF \$37,425  
 Game Tennant Lake-Graham 77-503A \$8,100 Ref. 28 \$4,050; LWCF \$4,050

- 2. State Agency Projects Status Reports

Table I - Progress by Fiscal Expenditure

C. Planning Status Reports

None in kit.

III OLD BUSINESS

A. IAC Operating and Capital Budget Status Report 1977-79

- (1) Capital Budget - accommodating additional \$400,000 and additional LWCF \$1.2. million - DNR, GAME, Fisheries, Parks.

Conference Call info.

State Agencies alternatives suggested - Parks and DNR.

MOTION confirming action of the Fiscal Sub-Committee. DEFEATED.

CONSENSUS of Committee: IAC to work with Legislature re  
 Capital Budget as submitted to OPPFM in first place.  
 (placing LWCF \$1.6 in State Agency Capital Budgets)

- (2) IAC Operating Budget 1977-79

Explanation by Administrator (Tuesday, 12/7 - action taken by Committee see next page.)

B. Legislation.

- (1) All-Terrain Vehicles legislation proposal. APPENDIX "A" - CHANGES  
Francis, Lovelady, Pelton explanation.
- (2) Jim Williams, Planner, WSA Counties comments.
- (3) Bob Wilder, City of Seattle comments.
- (4) Donald Phillips, Cowlitz Co. Park Dept. comments.
- (5) Tom Fitzpatrick, King Co. Parks and Rec. comments.

MOTION to take no position, etc. DIED FOR LACK OF SECOND.

III B. Legislation continued.

MOTION to have chairman oversee ATV legislation DEFEATED.

Staff instructed to re-review legislation and bring to Tuesday meeting, Dec. 7th - for consideration of IAC committee.

IV. A. 1. Project Changes - Dept. of Game Wynoochee River access - Land Exchange #68-604A MOTION to approve with PROVISIO staff to check easement situation.

B. 1. State Agency Project Considerations  
Dept. of Game

(a) Elwha River - Sisson and Elwha R - Hallberg - Acq. 77-619A

Mrs. Patricia Elofson, Chairperson, Lower Elwha Tribal Comm. comments.  
Attorney Russell W. Busch, Sumner, Washington comments  
MOTION - APPROVE - WITH PROVISIO TO CHECK INTO INDIAN TREATY RIGHTS.

2. (b) Elwha River - Highways - Acq. 77-618A  
MOTION - APPROVE - CONFIRM LEGAL ACCESS.

TUESDAY, DEC. 7., 1976

III D. Eastmont Pool, Douglas County, 73-024D, Status Report.

III B. 2. Proposed Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue - 1977 - \$90 mm.

Mrs. Brostrom's comments.

DNR comments.

Sam Angove, Director, Parks and Rec., Spokane Co. comments.

Barney Wilson, Pres. WRPA - comments.

Gary Feroglia, Park and Rec. Director, Mercer Island comments.

MOTION TO ACCEPT AND ADOPT WORKING DRAFT #4, DATED 11-22-76 - TO SUPPORT AS BOND ISSUE. CARRIED. APPENDIX "B" - Bond Issue

III C. Evaluation System Presentation.

Willa Mylroie Presentation.

Questionnaire responses

Jerry Pelton presentation.

MOTION TO GO WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS, IRONING OUT CERTAIN AREAS. APPROVED.

David Brink, Kirkland, comments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE IAC - 12:05 p.m. called by the Chairman.

IV C. Management Study - Organization and Admin. Suvery of IAC November 1976

Kreuger comments - outlining of Management Study findings.

Sub-Committee named - ROSS ENGLE BROSTROM Sub-Comm. on Management Study

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE STUDY. PROVISIO SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED WORK WITH ADMIN. ON THE STUDY. CARRIED.

III B. Legislation (continued)

1. ATV Legislation - APPENDIX C of minutes.

MOTION TO ACCEPT DRAFT - CONCEPTUAL AND TECHNICAL FRAMEWORK FOR LEGISLATION.

III A. IAC Operating Budget 77-79 - (continued)

- (1) EFSEC - clarification by Francis.
- (2) State Data Bank and Boating Study - clarification by Francis

CONSENSUS OF COMMITTEE - CONTINUE ON ENERGY FACILITIES SITE EVAL. COUNCIL - POINT OUT TO LEGISLATURE PROBLEM AREAS; LEAVE IT UP TO LEGIS.

III B. 3. Senate Park and Recreation Committee - House P&R.

- (a) Senate P&R - report by Francis.
- (b) House P & R - report by Francis.

V. Administrator's Report - S. Francis

- (1) Financial Reporting Form for Disclosures Act.
- (2) City of Seattle - possible project (Denny Regrade)
- (3) Wenatchee waterfront effort - Stewards of the River
- (4) Sportsmen's Council
- (5) NW State Liaison Officers' meeting - Seattle

Quorum - Brostrom advised quorum is 7 members of IAC - for voting purposes.

NRPA Annual Meeting - report from Mrs. Engle.

IAC 1977 Meetings-- April 25-26 Vancouver Inn at the Quay  
Sept. 26-27 Spokane - place to be located later

Motion to adjourn 4:05 p.m.

APPENDIX "A" - Changes proposed to ATV - first discussion

APPENDIX "B" - Proposed Bond Issue \$90 mm. - IAC Outdoor Recreation

APPENDIX "C" - Changes proposed to ATV legislation - second discussion.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
TUMWATER, WASHINGTON

SPECIAL MEETING

December 6-7, 1976  
Monday-Tuesday

9:00 a.m.

Dept. of Highways' Commission  
Board Room, Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Micaela Brostrom, Chairman	W. A. Bulley, Director, Dept. of Highways
Warren Bishop	Ralph Larson, Director, Dept. of Game
Honorable Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands (Monday - part of Tuesday)	Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks & Rec. Comm. Michael Ross (Monday and morning of Tuesday)
Helen Engle	Peter Wyman

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

John A. Biggs, Director, Dept. of Ecology  
T. Evans Wyckoff, Director, Dept. of Commerce & Economic Development  
Donald Moos, Director, Department of Fisheries

STAFF OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General  
Murphy, Charles

Commerce and Economic Development  
Smith, Merlin

Ecology, Department of  
Lawrence, Richard (representing Beecher Snipes)

Fisheries, Department of  
Costello, Richard

Game, Department of  
Brigham, James

Highways, Department of  
Mylroie, Willa Anderson, Lee

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

Bailey, Ron, RRS  
Bowring, Ken, Planner  
Burk, Larry, RRS  
Cole, Kenn, Agency Accounts Officer  
Francis, Stanley E. Administrator  
Frazier, Marjorie M., Admin. Sec.  
Leach, Eugene, RRS  
Lovelady, Gregory, RRS  
Moore, Glenn, Chief, Proj. Admin.  
Pelton, Jerry, Chief, Planning & Coord.  
Taylor, Ron, RRS

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

Park and Recreation Commission  
Martin, Lynn

Program Planning and Fiscal Management  
Mrkvicka, Bruce (representing Carl Wieland)

LOCAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT - AND OTHER AGENCIES:

Carty, Martin, Director, Parks and Recreation, Cowlitz County  
Wilder, Robert, Parks and Recreation Dept., Seattle  
Krohn, Michael, representing Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle  
Jacobs, Robert, representing Jim Webster, Parks and Recreation Dept., King County  
Wilson, Barney, Park and Recreation Director, City of Kent

I. Meeting called to order, determination of a quorum, introductions: The IAC meeting was called to order by Chairman Micaela Brostrom at 9:10 a.m. Following introductions as listed, a quorum was declared:

Peter Wyman, new citizen member appointed by the Governor, Spokane  
Dan Barnett, Department of Game  
Joe Wernex and Howard Stolis, Department of Natural Resources  
Bruce Mrkvicka, Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management  
Michael Krohn, Puget Sound Government Conference  
Tim Ryan, Department of Natural Resources  
Richard Lawrence, Department of Ecology  
TAC members as indicated in attendance, pg. 1 & 2 of these minutes

Mrs. Brostrom then read into the record the following announcement:

"I regretfully announce Milt Martin's resignation as Assistant Administrator of the IAC. As you know he has been with the IAC as Assistant Administrator for four years, and his dedication to the efforts and goals of the IAC has been instrumental in the success of the agency. On behalf of the Committee, I would like to thank Milt for his dedication and his professionalism in our behalf, and wish him every success in his future endeavors."

Corrections - Additions to the Minutes of September 27-28, 1976: There being no corrections or additions to the minutes of September 27-28, 1976 IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1976 OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Additions-Deletions to the Agenda, December 6-7, 1976: Mr. Francis announced the December meeting was considered a Special meeting of the IAC and therefore additions to the agenda could be discussed only, but action of a voting nature could not be taken. Deletions were permissible. There were no additions or deletions suggested by the committee. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE DECEMBER 6-7, 1976 IAC SPECIAL MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. STATUS REPORTS

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

1. Initiative 215, Unclaimed Refundable Marine Fuel Tax Distribution
2. LWCF, Cumulative Report of Apportionment 1965-77
3. Fund Summary Report - October 31, 1976

1. Initiative 215 report: Mr. Kenn Cole noted the changes made in balances for September for the departments of Game, DNR and Fisheries. Using the 1977-79 distribution formula (\$1,529,860) resulted in reduction of funds for these agencies. Mr. Francis notified the Committee that the Department of Motor Vehicles' Marine Fuel Tax Study would not be available until February of 1977.

2. LWCF, Cumulative Report: Mr. Cole reported that both the Transition Quarter funds and the 1977 BOR apportionment had been added to this report indicating \$783,310 available for projects from the first source, and \$2,958,585.00 from the 1977 apportionment.

3. Fund Summary: In response to Mr. Bulley, Mr. Francis indicated that BOR monies must be used within a three-year period -- the year of apportionment plus two to commit these funds. The IAC is fiscally current at the present time in respect to BOR monies.

II. B. Project Status Reports: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Project Administration Section, referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, giving the following information:

- a. Progress on local agencies indicates expenditures amounting to 70 percent (\$21,022,534) of the total dollar cost for local agencies (\$30,228,301).
- b. Project Closures from September 10, 1976 to November 23, 1976: 7 local agencies; two state agencies.
- c. Administrative Action - State project - State Parks, Lake Sammamish 72-501D: Cost increase in amount of \$400 was approved on October 7, 1976 to cover cost overruns in swim float equipment and landscaping.
- d. Master List Approvals - State Agency Projects:

- (1) Parks Twanoh Addition 77-502A Total \$74,850 Ref. 28 \$37,425  
LWCF 37,425  
Acquire approximately 18 acres in Twanoh State Park on Hood Canal;  
future development of 50 camp sites.
- (2) Game Tennant Lake-Graham 77-503A Total \$8,100 Ref. 28 \$ 4,050  
LWCF 4,050

Acquire approximately .12 acre addition to the 700 acre Lake Tennant Waterfowl Project.

Mrs. Brostrom commented that out of 101 local agency projects a total of 27 are held over from 1973 and prior years; some have been completed but are awaiting final billing. She specifically mentioned four other projects requiring attention:

1. Chehalis Stan Hedwall Park 72-021D
2. King Co. N. Green Lake Phase I 69-132A
3. King Co. N. Green Lake Phase II 72-042A
4. Spokane County Valley Mission 73-060D

She mentioned that twenty-three other projects dating back to 1969-1973 required attention of staff, and asked if staff could set a goal to have these projects completed by the April 25-26, 1977, IAC meeting. Both Mr. Francis and Mr. Moore replied this could be done.

**II B. 2. State Agency Projects Status Reports:** Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, which detailed the State Agencies project progress as requested by the Committee at its September 1976 IAC meeting. Table I indicated Progress by Fiscal Expenditure; Table II Progress by Number of Projects/Programs and Progress on Current Approved Projects. He also called attention to the project status reports contained in the meeting kit for each of the participating state agencies regarding current projects and those projects which are in essence completed but awaiting final billings (9 - DNR projects; 13 - State Parks projects; and 38 - Dept. of Game projects). IAC staff has found it difficult to analyze state agency progress from this material because staff did not know the depth of adequate method for collecting information. Staff is also not aware of the workloads of each state agency (planning, construction, etc.) in terms of knowing whether or not critical paths established by each state agency are yet viable in completing projects on schedule. Discussion followed.

(1) **Re Table I: (Progress by Fiscal Expenditure).** Mr. Bishop asked if state agencies should be concerned about the percentages indicated on the table -- should they not escalate their program of expenditure? Mr. Taylor replied it is difficult to know how state agencies will progress due to the fact that staff does not know the number of projects to yet be submitted by each agency to fulfill budget commitments prior to the end of this biennium. Mr. Bulley, Mr. Larson, Mr. Wyman and Mr. Bishop continued discussion of this matter. There was concern with development area of projects rather than acquisition. Mr. Bishop stated the Executive Branch of State Government is concerned with reappropriations to state agencies and the IAC should be aware of this fact.

(2) Mrs. Brostrom asked that state agencies prepare a "recap" on their current status -- a complete review of where the problem areas are in the state projects -- for the April 1977 meeting. Mr. Francis and IAC staff will assist in insuring that the material is in proper format, but the state agencies were requested to complete their own reports for IAC staff review.

(3) Mr. Bishop noted that the Master List program of the state agencies would assist in speeding up the program of expenditure.

At this point the Chairman introduced:

Mr. Sam Angove, Director, Park and Recreation, Spokane County  
Mr. Robert Wilder, Deputy Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Seattle

**II B. C. Planning Status Reports:** Mr. Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning and Coordination reported that the Demand Survey, SCORP; Public Lands Inventory, SCORP, and State Trails Advisory Committee appointments -- were all proceeding within the deadlines as set up in Planning's critical path. (There were no kit memoranda for the Planning Section.)

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. IAC Operating and Capital Budget Status Report - 1977-79:

(1) Capital Budget: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, paragraph 1, reporting on the IAC Capital Budget for the 1977-79 Biennium. Amendments had been made to the budget (a) to accommodate an additional \$400,000 of previously projected LWCF money which had not been utilized in the submitted Capital Budget, (b) to accommodate the 1977-79 LWCF apportionment of \$1.2 million (as authorized by the Committee by motion at its Sept. 1976 meeting). Thus, state agency Capital Budget amendments submitted to OPPFM were as follows

Dept. of Natural Resources	\$ 1,000,000
Parks and Recreation Commission	1,156,300
Dept. of Game	564,894
Dept. of Fisheries	442,175

At the same time, a request had been made for matching funds from the General Fund or from legislatively approved general obligation bonds. Upon submission to OPPFM the IAC was informed that the additional request for matching funds from the General Fund or the legislative bonds would not be recommended by OPPFM to the Governor. The recommendation was to transfer the LWCF monies to the Operating Budget for additional "Grants to Public Agencies" to be used for local agencies.

Conference Call: A Conference Call was held with IAC Fiscal Sub-Committee (Brostrom, Bishop, Bulley) and alternatives discussed. It was the unanimous consensus that the \$1.6 LWCF be transferred to the Operating Budget for use as "Grants to Public Agencies" with the understanding that these monies be "repaid" to state agencies during the 1979-81, or 1981-83 biennia. Proper revised Operating Budget forms were submitted to OPPFM.

State agencies request for alternative: Mr. Francis then reported on State Parks and DNR inquiries requesting consideration of an alternative to placing these funds as outlined above. They suggested having LWCF monies go into the Operating Budget, "Grants to Public Agencies", for either state or local agencies, with the understanding that each estate agency show it is capable of matching all of its available LWCF regular appropriation plus any budget revision; and accomplish this by December 1977. This concept was discussed with the Fiscal Sub-Committee and with OPPFM. OPPFM advised it would be difficult to have changes made to the budget once set, except through supplementary budget process (January 1978 Special Session).

Mr. Francis asked for official action from the Interagency Committee to either ratify the consensus of the Fiscal Sub-Committee or consider the request of Parks and DNR as to the alternate method.

Mr. Odegaard reiterated his position that the funds should be used 50-50 as in the past, adhering to the alternative broached by State Parks and DNR. It was pointed out by Mr. Bishop that the proposed bond issue would have impact also and was directly related to whether or not the funds being discussed should be allocated to state agencies or local agencies.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. WYMAN, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONFIRM THE ACTION OF THE FISCAL SUB-COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR 1977-79 AS PASSED AT THE SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1976 IAC MEETING, AND THAT IT BE REFLECTED IN THE IAC OFFICIAL RECORD THAT THIS ACTION IS TAKEN SUBJECT TO CONSIDERATION AS RELATED TO ANY REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SO THAT IF

THERE SHOULD HAPPEN TO BE ACTION TAKEN ON GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BY THE WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE, THIS POSITION OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CAN BE REVIEWED AGAIN AND THE FUNDS PLACED BACK IN THE STATE PORTION OF THE DOLLAR SOURCES THAT ARE AVAILABLE.

Discussion followed on the motion. Mr. Odegaard said he would vote against the motion since the state agencies are able to support their budgets when submitted and as submitted when they appear before legislative committees and can justify their requests at that time. He suggested the IAC request the 50-50 split, which is an historical factor, and use that as the vehicle for impetus in the request for a \$90 million outdoor recreation bond issue proposal. He felt the Interagency Committee could justify its own budget with the State Legislature.

Mr. Bulley indicated any action by the Committee should indicate the understanding there are matching funds available to support the budget requests. This was the basic goal. Mr. Cole agreed with Mr. Odegaard stating the Committee has the option to adhere to its own budget as submitted to OPPFM and is not bound by OPPFM decisions, but has the prerogative of supporting its own decisions and requests.

Kenn Cole mentioned the IAC Supplemental budget had, at Committee direction, been submitted to OPPFM.

Mr. Bulley raised considerable questions as to the timing of the IAC actions on the budget and the proposed bond issue, as well as the matching possibilities.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the Administrator and staff support the Supplemental Capital Budget of the IAC as approved at the September IAC meeting and as submitted to OPPFM -- placing the \$1.6 million of LWCF in the State Agency Capital Budget and requesting matching funds from either the General Fund or legislatively approved General Obligation Bonds.

(2) IAC Operating Budget 1977-79: Mr. Francis noted the following regarding the IAC Operating Budget 1977-79:

- (a) The Fiscal Sub-Committee discussed with OPPFM action to drop the \$120,000 item for State Agencies Plans. This was concurred in, pending investigation of how useful plans being received by OPPFM from state agencies would be to the IAC effort.
- (b) OPPFM dropped the two additional FTE's (ATV Coordinator and Planner II for EFSEC relief).
- (c) Only \$65,000 of the \$80,000 requested for the ATV Plan was included in the budget by OPPFM;
- (d) OPPFM deleted: \$5,000 for Tri-State Recreation Data Bank and \$30,000 for Puget Sound and Statewide Boating Study.

Mr. Francis asked consideration of the Committee regarding restoration of the two FTE's noted in (b) above, and the \$5,000 and \$30,000 items as noted in (d) above. He also requested the Committee consider beginning legislative efforts to have the IAC dropped from the EFSEC so that the IAC Planning and Coordination Division could carry out its primary mission -- SCORP planning.

Mrs. Brostrom requested the Committee defer any action on these matters until there had been discussion on Item IV C. IAC Organization and Administrative Survey on Tuesday, December 7th. She asked Mr. Francis whether there were funds to cover implementation of the study and was informed funds could be realigned to cover this factor.

### III B. Legislation.

1. All-Terrain Vehicles legislation proposal: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, "Proposed Revision to ATV Act RCW 46.09", and commented briefly on the special task force which had developed the proposal in order to resolve two primary and several secondary problem areas in the administration and fund distribution process permitted by the existing legislation. The task force had been composed of representatives of the Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive Association, the Northwest Motorcycle Association, and the Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Gerald Pelton and Mr. Greg Lovelady of IAC staff worked with the Task Force in a coordinative role.

Mr. Pelton presented a brief history concerning the ATV Act which had been passed in 1971, and mentioned the amount of dollars distributed to date -- approximately \$5,000,000. Thirty-one counties had participated in the program to date. Three state agencies (Game, DNR, Parks) received approximately \$2.9 million, with about \$2.5 allocated to the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Lovelady then referred to staff memoranda and noted the primary problem areas concerning the ATV legislation:

- (1) The need to identify and separate non-highway road funds from those intended for use on designated off-road trails and areas; and
- (2) The need to change the fund distribution system from one based solely on inventories to one which will permit the distribution of funds
  - (a) specified percentages and
  - (b) individual project evaluation.

Staff recommended Committee support of the following concepts:

- (1) Increase percentage of motor vehicle fuel excise tax allocated for these purposes to one and one-third percent (1 1/3%).
- (2) That a statewide ORV (Outdoor Recreation Vehicle) Plan be conducted with results of same to be considered as the basis for future alterations of pertinent ORV codes and guidelines.
- (3) That a "project" type funding system be investigated and implemented as the basis for future ORV fund distributions for acquisition and development.
- (4) That allowance for the continued maintenance and operation of ORV facilities be specified as an eligible use of ORV funds.
- (5) That funding of non-highway roads be separated from that for ORV trails and areas.
- (6) That in the future, a "fuel use study" be used as the basis for the allocation of motor vehicle fuel excise tax monies to ORV purposes.

Changes to the proposed revision on pages 8, 12, 13, were read (SEE APPENDIX "A" of these minutes), with correction being made in paragraph (2) to include Sections 19 sub-2 and 20.

Following staff presentation, the Chairman called for comments from the audience. Mr. James Williams, Planner, Washington State Association of Counties made the following points:

- (1) Questioned necessity for a study by DMV regarding the fuel tax, and felt 1 1/3 percent was adequate for program and should stand.
- (2) Statewide ORV Plan - the Counties agree such a plan is needed. Suggested there be emphasis in the legislation which would require counties ORV programs and state ORV programs to be in compliance with the overall Statewide ORV Plan.
- (3) Since the inventory system as a basis for funding distribution is not deemed workable, suggested a sub-committee be appointed for discussion of a funding formula and insure counties are involved in the sub-committee deliberations.
- (4) Felt there should be flexibility provided in use of the funds allocated to the counties so that these funds could be interchangeably used for law enforcement, liability insurance, maintenance, and other authorized uses.
- (5) Requested more time to review the proposed legislation since did not receive it early enough.

Mr. Wyman and Mr. Bert Cole queried Mr. Williams on several points, particularly the counties' apparent need for funds to use for law enforcement and liability insurance. Mr. Cole stated his concern with the inventory system and division of the monies without a workable inventory. He had no objection to limiting ORV areas to a Statewide Plan. It was his feeling the monies should be used for acquisition, development and maintenance of ORV areas, and that the counties should stand the expense themselves for law enforcement and liability insurance. He mentioned the City of Seattle documentary he had viewed which noted several city parks were being closed, which increased his concern for wise expenditure of funds throughout the state for park and recreation areas and facilities.

Mr. Bulley stated he had not had enough time to review the legislation adequately, but was interested in why dollars allocated to the ATV (ORV) program to the counties had not been used. Mr. Williams explained he did not have the breakdown on counties' use of the funds, but that some counties were placing these monies aside in order to gather additional funds for an ATV (ORV) program. When sufficient funds were available they would be expended in accordance with their ATV (ORV) plans to provide these types of areas.

Mr. Robert Wilder, Deputy Director, City of Seattle, asked to respond to Mr. Cole's comment concerning the closure of certain Seattle park areas. He explained that the documentary was not an accurate one, and no facilities in Seattle were being closed to the public. It was unfortunate that those persons who had written and photographed the documentary for public showing were not properly informed on Seattle's current park system.

Mr. Odgaard asked Mr. Williams if the proposed Statewide ORV Study would enable the counties -- and encourage them -- to develop ATV (ORV) areas close to metropolitan areas so that people would not have to travel too far for this type of recreation. Further, would there be encouragement of cooperation between the cities and the counties so that acquisition and development would be done on a coordinated basis as it would relate to the population of particular geographic areas? Mr. Williams felt the study would encourage counties -- and cities -- to develop the most advantageous and compatible areas through proper planning stages. He stated the

counties could abide by decisions of the public in regard to ATV areas on properties which the county already owned.

In response to Mr. Wyman's questions, Mr. Pelton stated about 49% of the total amount of ATV funds had been allocated to the counties; no cities have ever applied. There are presently thirteen participating counties -- three state agencies have received approximately 51% of the funding with DNR receiving the majority of that amount.

Mr. Donald Phillips, Cowlitz County Park Department, said he appreciated the efforts of DNR and the IAC in proposing this type of legislation. He felt that

- (1) A Statewide ORV Plan program was needed;
- (2) When developed, the funding formula level should also be established; and
- (3) Liability insurance should be identified as an appropriate maintenance expense for the counties.

Mr. Thomas Fitzpatrick, King County Parks and Recreation:

- (1) Stated he had sent a letter to the Administrator of the IAC November 22, 1976 expressing his views concerning the proposed legislation;
- (2) Appreciated efforts of Ron Morgenthaler and Lowell Christiansen in behalf of all ORV recreationists in assisting to draft the legislation;
- (3) Felt a Statewide ORV Plan was needed and is the key to the entire program;
- (4) Draft should more clearly state that a project based funding system is mandated rather than an inventory based system. (He stressed the word "mandated" as opposed to "optional".)
- (5) Suggested a language change in Section 10 of the proposed legislation -- a proviso stating that ORV funds may be used in conjunction with other park areas -- i.e., to finance multiple-use areas.
- (6) Suggested there be definitions of terms within the proposed legislation for "law enforcement", "liability", "Maintenance", etc.
- (7) Concerned about program structure and content more than distribution of funds.
- (8) Future provision of funding for projects DNR has presently "on the ground" needs to be addressed at some point.

Jerry Pelton noted the assistance of Joe Wernex of DNR in providing input to the drafted legislation.

Mrs. Engle brought out that the general public does not desire ATV (ORV) areas near urban park areas due to noise, etc. Mr. Fitzpatrick maintained that by proper land management and through communication with both users and non-users, much of this opposition could be overcome.

(At 1:12 p.m. - QUORUM: ENGLE, LARSON, BROSTROM, ODEGAARD, COLE, WYMAN, AND BISHOP. (MR. BULLEY ARRIVED LATER IN THE AFTERNOON.)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WYMAN THAT THE COMMITTEE TAKE NO POSITION ON THE ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE (OUTDOOR RECREATION VEHICLE) PROPOSED LEGISLATION; THAT ALL ACTION ON THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION BE BY THE USER GROUPS; AND, FURTHER, THAT 1/3% BE ALLOCATED FOR NON-HIGHWAY ROAD NEEDS.

Mr. Bishop and Mr. Cole again discussed the percentage item as well as how this legislation would affect proposed outdoor recreation bond issue legislation. Mr. Bishop suggested the IAC not commit itself to a percentage of the funds until the matter came before the Legislature. Whereupon Mr. Francis stated he needed Committee

direction in order to finalize the draft of the bill, and since IAC is involved in the distribution of funds, it has been necessary to aid in the legislation proposal process as well as setting of the percentages. The fact that the IAC would need to testify before the Legislature on the bill was then discussed. Mr. Bishop noted it was not going to be an IAC sponsored bill, but apparently IAC would be asked to support it and work with the user groups. Mr. Odegaard pointed out that staff had not been asked in the past to serve in an advisory capacity to some other group on legislation, and if the present ATV legislation was presenting a problem, perhaps the IAC should adhere to only those elements or changes required within it which directly affected IAC methods and systems of administering the funds. Mr. Bulley stated he was not prepared to comment on the legislation in total since he had not had a chance to review it and was not certain how the concepts #1 thru #6 as outlined by Mr. Pelton and included in the memorandum would affect other agencies.

At this point, Mr. Charles Murphy, Assistant Attorney General, asked the Administrator if it would be a handicap to work with the proponents of the legislation without Committee direction on the seven concepts. Mr. Francis replied it would be an extreme handicap, especially when the Legislature would ask for the opinion of the Administrator of the IAC on these several points. The Administrator needed direction from the Committee as the legislation moves through the legislative process.

THERE WAS NO SECOND TO MR. WYMAN'S MOTION, AND FOLLOWING THE ABOVE DISCUSSION, THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Mrs. Brostrom read page 16, paragraph (3), of the IAC minutes of September 27-28, 1976:

"Staff requested further consideration of proposed ATV legislation be postponed and that time be provided at the December 1976 IAC Special Meeting for discussion of the ATV legislative proposals. Major concern of the ATV Program Review Committee was that there would be two or three pieces of ATV legislation. The Department of Natural Resources has consolidated its concerns with those of the user organizations, and the Committee has been assured there will now be one legislative proposal as being drafted by DNR and user organizations with IAC staff involvement."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY, IF SHE IS WILLING TO ACCEPT IT, TO MAKE THOSE DECISIONS ON THE ORV LEGISLATION AS THEY APPEAR AND AS THEY NEED TO BE MADE; AND THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT THIS TIME NOT APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE CERTAIN FACETS OF LEGISLATION WHICH MIGHT APPEAR BEFORE THE STATE LEGISLATURE REGARDING ORV'S.

Mr. Odegaard mentioned there had been direction on legislation given to the IAC Administrator by the Committee at a meeting several years ago, and this should be adhered to by the Administrator. Mr. Cole repeated his feeling that the Committee ought only to approve those parts of the legislation which are of direct concern to the IAC.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. COLE, ENGLE, ROSS VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE; ODEGAARD, WYMAN, BROSTROM, LARSON, AND BULLEY VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE.

THE MOTION FAILED.

Staff was then instructed by the Chairman at direction of the overall Committee to separate out from the proposed ORV legislation those matters which directly affected IAC from those which did not, and bring them before the Committee for consideration at Tuesday's meeting, December 7, 1976.

There followed discussion on the fact that there may be two bills on ORV's presented to the legislature -- the user-DNR sponsored proposal and the IAC proposal.

IV A. 1. Project Changes - Dept. of Game, Wynoochee River access - Land Exchange #68-604A: Map of the area to be discussed was distributed to the Committee. The IAC had approved the project in December of 1967 with five sites proposed for acquisition. The project expanded to a total of 31 sites with the project under discussion as part of the amendment approved by the IAC on May 2, 1974.

Staff requested approval to exchange approximately 1.25 acres of the Game Department's Hughes/Schmidt parcel for approximately 1.25 acres of the Grays Harbor Development Corporation land, which is considered to be more compact in shape and has more frontage on the County road and the Wynoochee River, thus easier to develop parking and boat launch facilities.

The trade also benefits the company as well as the Department of Game since the Department of Game property bisected their land separating uplands from river frontage. Land values and comparable recreation utility of the property to be received by the Department of Game were acknowledged.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. WYMAN, THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR TRANSFER OF LAND BE APPROVED.

Mr. Odegaard was concerned about an easement for the land areas severed by the road which passed through the area and would affect future development.

MR. ROSS AMENDED HIS MOTION REQUESTING STAFF INVESTIGATE FURTHER THE EASEMENTS NECESSARY TO CONSUMMATE THE LAND TRANSFER ASSURING ACCESS OF THE PUBLIC AT ALL TIMES TO THE LAND BEING ACQUIRED. MR. BERT COLE ABSTAINED. THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MAY 2, 1974, APPROVED AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME STATEWIDE WATER ACCESS #2 (68-604A) WHICH INCLUDED AMONG TWENTY-SEVEN SITES, THE ACQUISITION OF THE HUGHES AND SCHMIDT PARCELS TOTALING APPROXIMATELY 1.25 ACRES AND 4,800 FEET OF STREAMBANK EASEMENTS ALONG THE WYNOOCHEE RIVER AND,

WHEREAS, THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND A PRIVATE LAND OWNER HAVE AGREED TO A MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL EXCHANGE OF LANDS OF EQUAL SIZE AND VALUE AS ESTABLISHED BY A DEPARTMENT OF GAME "FINDING OF VALUE" WHICH HAS BEEN CONCURRED IN BY THE IAC ADMINISTRATOR IN ACCORD WITH IAC PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES 04.15.040, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PRIVATE LAND TO BE RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME IS OF EQUAL SIZE AND UTILITY AND THEREFORE DOES COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE IAC STATE AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES 03.06.000 - CONVERSION OF PROPERTY,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME TO EXCHANGE APPROXIMATELY 1.25 ACRES OF DEPARTMENT OF GAME LANDS ALONG THE WYNOOCHEE RIVER, ACQUIRED UNDER THE STATEWIDE WATER ACCESS #2 PROJECT (68-604A) FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.25 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND OF EQUAL VALUE AND UTILITY ALSO LOCATED ALONG THE WYNOOCHEE RIVER, IS APPROVED AND, THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE DEED, DEED OF RIGHT, AND POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE FOR THE PROPERTY TO BE RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, WITH THE PROVISO THAT STAFF WILL INVESTIGATE FURTHER THE EASEMENTS NECESSARY TO CONSUMMATE THE LAND TRANSFER ASSURING ACCESS OF THE PUBLIC AT ALL TIMES TO THE LAND BEING ACQUIRED.

IV B. 1. State Agency Project Considerations - Department of Game:

(a) Elwha River - Sisson and Elwha River - Hallberg - Acquisition - 77-619A: Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, reported on the application of the Department of Game for acquisition of approximately 60.33 acres of land with 6,340 feet of river frontage in fee title, together with about 5,270 feet in streambank easements on the east and west banks of the Elwha River, Clallam County, for access to the river for sport fishing and hiking. \$83,700, Ref. 28 funds.

The Technical Advisory Committee expressed its concern over necessity of acquiring such large parcels of land for the sole purpose of streambank fishing without the provision of vehicular access directly to these parcels to accommodate other recreation uses. Staff felt the acquisition was, therefore, not justified.

There followed discussion on the project and the access to it. Mr. Odegaard asked for clarification of the Department of Fisheries' rearing pond site and their possible involvement in the project through lease agreements or other means. Discussion revealed there was a lease with the Department of Fisheries and the City of Port Angeles and a proposed lease between the Department of Game and the City of Port Angeles.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT THE PROJECT BE ACCEPTED AND APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE SUBJECT TO LEGAL COUNSEL REVIEWING THE EXISTING LEASE BETWEEN (1) THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND THE CITY OF PORT ANGELES AND (2) THE PROPOSED LEASE BETWEEN THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND THE CITY OF PORT ANGELES TO INSURE THERE IS NO CONFLICT.

At this point, the Chairman recognized Mrs. Patricia Elofson, Chairperson, Lower Elwha Tribal Community, and attorney Russell W. Busch, Sumner, Washington, representing the Tribe. A copy of Mr. Busch's letter on behalf of the Tribe, dated December 6, 1976, was distributed to each Committee member.

Ms. Elofson stated:

- (1) The tribe had recently learned of the proposed acquisition at a hearing held on October 26th by the Department of Game, and were not properly informed prior to that time;
- (2) The Tribe is concerned about the purchase because of Indian Treaty Rights to fish the river. Access must be provided to the Indian Tribe thru easements.
- (3) The Lower Elwha Reservation is located near the mouth of the river. Safety of the Lower Elwha Dam is a concern also. Until that is resolved, the investment of funds along the river by IAC might be considered inadvisable.

(4) Urged that the Committee vote against the purchase of this land at this time.

Mr. Russell Busch, in reference to his letter, noted the sensitive issue of the Indian Treaty Rights also. Since the 1898 Treaty the Tribe has had fishing rights including the right to cross riparian lands to use the river. The Governor's Indian Advisory Council has pointed out this fact also and that it should be respected. He suggested an Environmental Impact Statement might need to be instigated prior to any planning for this area.

Mr. Larson informed the Committee that the Elwha Indians have been attempting to purchase the entire area to control the lower four miles of the river, but that this proposed purchase has not been approved. Also, the Tribe was informed of the A-95 process.

There followed discussion on the Treaty Rights aspect. Mr. Ross expressed his concern and MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, TO AMEND HIS MOTION TO INCLUDE A REFERENCE THAT THE IAC LEGAL COUNSEL ALSO INVESTIGATE THE TREATY RIGHTS OF THE LOWER ELWHA TRIBE AS GIVEN IN "UNITED STATES V. WASHINGTON, 384 F. SUPP. 312 (1974) AND UNITED STATES V. WINANS, 198 U. S. 371 (1905)", AS WELL AS ANY OTHER PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE NATURE OF EASEMENTS TO CROSS NON-FEDERAL LANDS IN ORDER TO GAIN ACCESS TO INDIAN FISHING SITES.

MOTION WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE, MR. COLE HAVING ABSTAINED AND REQUESTING THAT HIS ABSTENTION BE SO NOTED IN THE MINUTES OF RECORD.

IV B. 2 (b) Elwha River - Highways - Acquisition - #77-618A: Mr. Ron Taylor outlined the memorandum of December 6th dealing with this project. Since legal access to the site was essential to the intended recreational use and the legal access was in question, staff reported the project as technically incomplete and recommended it not be approved. Mr. Larson and Mr. Brigham, Department of Game, reported to the Committee that as of Sunday morning, December 5, 1976, 2:30 a.m., the Department of Game area land agent had negotiated the access to the property and thus there would be no problem for the general public's use. With that information, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT WHEREAS, THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS SUBMITTED AN APPLICATION (77-618A) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,500 TO ACQUIRE AN APPROXIMATE SIX ACRE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS SURPLUS GRAVEL PIT ON THE ELWHA RIVER IN CLALLAM COUNTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING PUBLIC STREAMBANK FISHING, CAR TOP BOAT LAUNCHING AND PICNICKING; AND

WHEREAS, THIS PROJECT IS FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THIS PROJECT AS RECOMMENDED SUBJECT TO LEGAL ACCESS FOR THE PUBLIC BEING CONFIRMED, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE PROJECT'S SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,500 (REF. 28 FUNDS), UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 3:10 p.m.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1976

The Committee reconvened at 9:15 a.m., with quorum declared (BROSTROM, BULLEY, ODEGAARD, ENGLE, LARSON, BISHOP, AND WYMAN.)

Mr. Francis introduced:

Barney Wilson, TAC member, current President of Washington Rec. and Park Association (Director, P&R, City of Kent)  
Helen Adams, Secretary, Kent Park and Recreation Department  
John Couch, Director, City of Redmond, Park and Recreation Department  
Gary Feroglia, Director, Park and Recreation Dept., City of Mercer Island  
David Brink, Director, Park and Recreation Dept., City of Kirkland  
Mary McCallum, Parks and Recreation Dept., City of Seattle

Lloyd Bell, DNR, Special Assistant to State Land Commissioner

III. D. Eastmont Pool, Douglas County, #73-024D Status Report: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, on the Eastmont Pool project of Douglas County, noting that the BOR had assigned Mr. Don Ketter to work with the Administrator on the problem. An opinion has been requested from the Washington, D.C. BOR office as to the alternatives available to BOR in order to resolve Douglas County's actions with the IAC (Washington State). On November 17th, Mr. Milt Martin, Mike Tabler, Douglas County Prosecuting Attorney, and Mr. Ed Daling, County Park Dept. Director, with Mr. Bob Patrick, County Planner, met to discuss alternative methods which might be available to the County to resolve the action taken (alterations to the swimming pool cover, substitution of land as a replacement, etc.). On December 1, 1976, the Administrator reported he had met with the attorney and park and recreation director as a follow-up to the above noted meetings. Continuing dialogue and exploring alternatives involved will take place while awaiting the opinion from Washington, D.C., and the Committee will be advised of the results at a later date.

III B. 2. IAC Proposed Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue - 1977 - \$90,000,000: Mrs. Brostrom outlined the action taken thus far in proposing an outdoor recreation bond issue for decision of the 1977 Legislature:

- (1) Series of meetings were held by the IAC Sub-Committee on the Bond Issue, with Mr. Barney Wilson representing the local agencies; state agencies representatives; and representatives from the research staff of the State Legislature.
- (2) Purpose of the bond issue will be to provide continuation of the IAC program and to match federal source.
- (3) Specifically mentioned in the bond issue will be rehabilitation and redevelopment; acquisition and preservation of significant natural areas; and the need to continue acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities.
- (4) Wording of the bond issue needs to be clear, concise, simple, and easily understood.
- (5) DNR felt they should respond to their Natural Area Preserves responsibilities -- which led to discussions of the specifics concerning preservation of significant natural areas and how IAC could accomplish its goals in concert with DNR.

(6) The Committee felt DNR's responsibilities were not too different from that of every other state agency in this area; not unique to DNR. Since IAC has assisted in funding areas of this type in the past, the IAC Sub-Committee on the Proposed Bond Issue felt it could be included in the current proposed bond issue; not a separate bond issue by DNR. 15% of total bond proceeds would be set aside for these areas.

(7) Mr. Lloyd Bell and Mr. Al O'Donnell, of DNR, had suggested another bond proposal which DNR felt must be submitted to sufficiently cover the Natural Area Preserves Act under which they operate.

Mrs. Brostrom then called upon Mr. O'Donnell for explanation of the DNR bond issue proposal concerning Natural Area Preserves.

Mr. O'Donnell referred to the material distributed to each Committee member by DNR:

- (1) RCW 79.70 - Natural Area Preserves Act
- (2) Listing of members of the Natural Area Preserves Advisory Committee
- (3) Accomplishments of the Natural Area Preserves Committee
- (4) Proposed draft - legislation - bond issue

(1) Stated DNR has primary responsibility for the Natural Area Preserves -- preservation of same for educational, scientific and research purposes as stated in the law. (RCW 7.70 NAP Act of 1972).

(2) Referred to chart: Statewide study of NAP - "Activity Summary of DNR and Natural Area Preserves Committee as of April 1, 1976". Felt the Department was given clear instructions by the Legislature to establish this system.

(3) Noted that Natural Area Preserves Advisory Committee is made up of highly knowledgeable people with expertise in their fields.

(4) Felt there could be an addendum to SCORP of Natural Area Preserves.

(5) Recommended a referendum to the people rather than having the bond issue the sole action of the State Legislature itself.

In response to Mrs. Engle's question on "backlog" of Natural Area Preserves, Mr. O'Donnell referred her to the reference book, "Research Natural Areas Needs in the Pacific Northwest" which identified various habitats that should be preserved in the Pacific Northwest.

The Committee discussed the DNR draft and the IAC draft of legislation at considerable length. The following points are recorded for the official record:

(1) Mr. O'Donnell indicated DNR would be pleased to work with IAC staff in attempting to accommodate the four points mentioned by DNR into the draft of the proposed bond issue, thus insuring there would be only one bond issue proposal before the State Legislature.

(2) Mr. Ross stated the Legislature would be the determining factor in what legislation would eventually result from a proposed bond issue for outdoor recreation; they will incorporate, revise, and amend according to wishes of their legislative committees and the state agencies, etc.

(3) Mr. Sam Angove, Director, Parks and Recreation, Spokane County, pointed out that his County has a significant problem with the State of Washington -- would need to compete with the state and the political pressures to preserve western areas, and there would be less money for the eastern side of the state. He suggested the Committee keep in mind that with the fuel shortage increasing, people will be recreating closer to their homes and not traveling throughout the state. Therefore, urban areas will receive more use; other areas far from their homes will get less use. Local recreational demands are on the increase and should be recognized by the Committee. He was adverse to a continued 50-50 split of the IAC funds; his suggestion was for 60-40.

Mr. Ross agreed that local agencies were facing a revenue problem, but it was their own problem and they should therefore screen their projects and park areas as to which are necessary and which can be maintained adequately, etc.

Mr. Odegaard suggested state and local agencies receive a 50-50 split out of the total 100%, but that 15% of the local and 15% of the state would then be held for natural areas. Mr. Angove said this would not meet his needs for Spokane County.

(4) The need for a definitive Statewide Plan in the Natural Area Preserves area was evident from the discussion.

(5) Mr. Odegaard suggested to Mr. Angove a 50-50 split of the funds, but "off the top" of state agencies only, 30% of that money would be allocated for use on natural preserves areas only. Mr. Angove said this was much more favorable.

(6) The fact that redevelopment of parks does not rank high enough many times to receive funding was noted and discussed by Mr. Angove.

(7) Mr. Barney Wilson, speaking as President of the Washington Recreation and Parks Association, stated the proposed bond issue had been discussed with various directors of park and recreation in local agencies, and there was concern expressed about obtaining enough support to pass the bond issue. Also, in representing 265 different cities, he noted that smaller communities require assistance in applying for funds; will be competing with the larger communities for monies.

He emphasized the need for flexibility to insure that local agencies do receive funds -- should be the ability to shift the funds within the state wherever needed. Mr. Wilson did not feel that Natural Preserves Areas rated high enough in the recreational field to satisfy public use and need for outdoor recreation. In response to Mr. Odegaard's question, he said the WRPA would support the bond issue as presently before the Committee.

(8) Mr. Odegaard noted that though local communities can pass their own bond issues and still apply for IAC funding, this same avenue is not open to state agencies. The state share of IAC is the only vehicle open to them re additional funding.

(9) Gary Feroglia, Park and Rec. Director, Mercer Island, stated he was co-chairman of the Bond Issue Committee for WRPA assisting in promotion of the bond issue. He was interested in determining what the Association can do to promote the bond issue insure its passage. He stated he could support the bond issue as presently before the Committee.

(10) Mr. Bishop cautioned that the bond issue proposal should have a very careful review by Bond Counsel. He inquired whether the Committee would be investigating the method of getting the bill introduced -- whether Executive Request or Committee bill -- and had sponsors from the Legislature been obtained? Mrs. Brostrom replied the bond proposal would be an Executive Request proposal from the current governor. Mr. Bishop suggested a dual Executive Request on the proposal.

(11) Mrs. Brostrom informed the Committee there would be a steering committee for the bond proposal -- statewide -- and on regional basis. The Sub-Committee on the bond proposal will be following up on these matters.

(12) Mrs. Engle suggested revision in Section (6), Line 107, DNR legislation to state "The IAC shall coordinate the preparation of a plan as an addendum to SCORP, by December 31, 1979, identifying significant natural areas, and shall utilize advisory groups including DNR Natural Area Preserves Committee, and shall encourage public participation soliciting especially those persons throughout the state known to have an interest in the establishment of natural preserve areas." It was the consensus of the Committee there was no need to place this wording within the bond issue proposal. (As underlined.)

MR. LARSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, TO ADOPT WORKING DRAFT #4, DATED 11-22-76, OF THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ACT (PROPOSED BOND ISSUE LEGISLATION) AS THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO BE SUPPORTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION.

In the ensuing discussion, MR. ODEGAARD AMENDED THE MOTION, SUGGESTING THE WORDING "A SYSTEM" ON LINE 27 OF THE PROPOSED BILL BE STRICKEN. MR. ROSS SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

Following Mr. Bulley's suggestion, MR. ODEGAARD ADDED TO HIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION THAT THE WORDING "A REPORT AS" ON LINE 108 ALSO BE STRICKEN. HE THEN MOVED THAT WITH THE PROPER WORDING THE BOND ISSUE PROPOSAL BE AMENDED TO DIVIDE THE FUNDS INTO TWO EQUAL SHARES - STATE AND LOCAL - THIRTY PERCENT OF THE STATE AGENCY SHARE TO BE USED FOR SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS. MR. WYMAN SECONDED THIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

MR. ROSS CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON MR. ODEGAARD'S SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. MR. ODEGAARD AND MR. WYMAN VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE; THE REMAINDER OF THE COMMITTEE OPPOSED. THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

MR. ROSS THEN CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION (TO ADOPT DRAFT #4) AS AMENDED BY DELETION OF WORDING ON LINE #27 "A SYSTEM OF" AND LINE #108, "A REPORT AS".

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Francis then indicated that he would be incorporating a change in line 72 as a technical matter to properly indicate the interest earned on such proceeds was included in New Section 5. The wording of lines 71-72 would then read,

"The proceeds from the sale of the bonds deposited in the state outdoor recreation account of the general fund and any interest earned on such proceeds shall be administered, subject to legislative...."

With this technical correction, the Committee approved Draft #4, dated 11-22-76 of the Bond Issue proposal.

(SEE APPENDIX "B" - Copy of the Draft #4, Proposed Bond Issue legislation.)

III C. Evaluation System Presentation: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, "Local Agency Project Evaluation System". He thanked Mrs. Willa Mylroie for her efforts on behalf of the IAC in preparing and coordinating the proposed new evaluation system and outlining the problem areas which the Committee had asked be investigated.

Policy issues approved by the IAC September 27, 1976 were noted as Attachment 1 to the memorandum; Proposed Evaluation System Questions being Attachment 2, pages 2 through 9.

Willa Mylroie Presentation: Mrs. Mylroie reported on memorandum dated November 30, 1976, and recommendations of the TAC on Re-evaluation of the Local Project Evaluation System:

(1) Recommended that the revised Evaluation System be reviewed by the Inter-agency Committee and adopted with any desired changes for the local project funding session in September of 1977. Major changes should be accomplished no later than January 1977.

(2) Recommended that an outside agency be commissioned to:

- (a) Identify the IAC goals and objectives for local projects;
- (b) Study alternative evaluation systems for establishing priorities for local outdoor recreation project funding and revise the present system as needed or developed.
- (c) Explore possibilities of using standards and criteria based on Washington State experience for evaluating local agency comprehensive outdoor recreation plans and for establishing norms for classes of outdoor recreation facilities that may be used as identifying factors to review needs on which proposals diverging from such norm are based.
- (d) Test the recommended system and the developed standards and norms on completed projects.
- (e) Review the tested system with TAC and IAC.
- (f) Develop a plan for implementation of the new system.

The above principles and recommendations were submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee and concurred in by them.

Questionnaire responses: Mrs. Mylroie noted the questionnaire form distributed at the Washington Recreation and Park Association meeting on November 6, 1976, where a workshop session on the Evaluation System had been held. The questionnaires indicated the following:

- (1) General dissatisfaction with current Evaluation System and the manner in which projects are evaluated, ranked and funded.
- (2) Greater emphasis and priority on local needs and priorities was desired; less on statewide needs and priorities.
- (3) System to be based on how well projects meet needs of local citizens.
- (4) Consideration should be given for joint agency acquisition/development -- joint operating agreements, etc. (park/school, park/port, state park/local park,

Federal Soil Conservation/local park, etc.)

- (5) Priority should be given to urban areas and related population centers.
- (6) Acquisition and development projects should be evaluated by separate rating systems having same number of points to allow competition point ranking.
- (7) Local projects and first phase projects should stand on their own merits.
- (8) Concept of multi-purpose projects as opposed to single purpose projects is valid.
- (9) Strong need for redevelopment, renovation and rehabilitation funds is evident.
- (10) Should be strong evaluation of past maintenance practice and operation commitments; credit given agencies.

Jerry Pelton presentation: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated December 6, 1976, "Evaluation System - Staff Evaluation". He noted that staff generally agreed that the proposed system appears to have the potential to speed up the evaluation process for individual projects by:

- (1) Deleting a total of eight questions requiring individual consideration;
- (2) Introducing more objectivity into many of the remaining questions; and
- (3) Eliminating or simplifying some of the more time-consuming questions.

Major difficulties were:

- (1) A need to rephrase some of the questions to better accomplish the purpose of the question, and
- (2) More precise definitions of some of the terms used.

Those questions where most difficulty was experienced were:

B-1a Aesthetic Qualities, Acquisition; B-1b Aesthetic Qualities, Development; B-2 Site and Safety; and B-5a, Opportunities-development.

In addition, staff felt that:

- (1) "Service area" term needs additional definition.
- (2) In evaluating acquisition projects, need to consider relationship of the project to adjacent land or bodies of water;
- (3) Term "maximum multi-purpose concept" needs interpretation.
- (4) "Cooperative projects" in D-1 for bonus points differs from "coordination" in C-2 - "Cooperation with other agencies". Some confusion could result unless the difference is pointed out to local agencies who submit grant applications in the future.

Mrs. Engle was assured local agencies would be advised of the new Evaluation System for submission of their projects. Merlin Smith noted that the TAC in revising the Evaluation System was attempting to encourage cooperative projects.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE STAFF OF THE IAC IMPLEMENT THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS WHICH HAD BEEN DISCUSSED IN THE PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM WITH AN EXPRESSION OF DESIRE ON THE PART OF THE COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE TO WORK TOWARD FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF SOME OF THE POINTS OF NEED FOR FURTHER STAFF REVIEW.

Mr. Wilson stated he favored the changes to the Evaluation System. Mr. Odegaard and Mr. Wilson discussed distribution of IAC funds on a per capita basis. Suggestion

was made by Mr. Odegaard that perhaps the State of Washington should distribute its funds on block grant basis as is done in the State of Oregon. Mr. Bishop said he would oppose any such move on the part of the IAC.

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

David Brink, Kirkland: Mr. Brink mentioned that a local agency with considerable waterfront and the potential of beautiful park areas being developed was not given enough support in the present Evaluation System; yet people using these areas come from far away as well as within the immediate vicinity. Mr. Pelton replied this matter was considered in the proposed evaluation system changes and the question on local plans was rephrased with additional emphasis placed on the applying agency's position. If the local agency's plan includes waterfront parks as its #1 priority, it will rank higher than in the past when statewide needs were on an equal basis with local needs.

Mrs. Brostrom then proposed a special work session of the IAC to discuss the TAC recommendations for an outside agency being commissioned to look into the six areas broached by that body in the November 30th memorandum. Mr. Ross asked that at the same time there be discussion on funding systems in the other states since he would be opposed to an outside agency investigating the Evaluation System and problems pertaining thereto unless all information was at hand on the other 49 states. He also suggested inviting key people knowledgeable of IAC and its responsibilities to the workshop session, i.e., Marvin Durning, former chairman, Lewis A. Bell and Omar Lofgren, former chairman, etc.

The possibility of obtaining states' funding information from NASORLO was discussed. The Administrator was asked to obtain this information for the Chairman and committee members in the most expedient manner possible.

Executive Session - IAC: The Special Session recessed at 12:05 p.m.; an executive session was held at that time, with the entire committee reconvening at 1:20 p.m. following lunch.

IV. C. IAC Organization and Administrative Survey (Management Study): The Chairman introduced Mr. Eugene Kreuger, Harry J. Prior and Associates, Inc., Management Consultant, Seattle, for a report on the IAC Organization and Administrative Survey made by that agency in October-November 1976. Each Committee member had received a copy of the report and was cognizant of its contents.

Mr. Kreuger referred to the Proposed Plan of Organization (page -10) which indicated the proposed management structure of three divisions under the direct supervision of the Administrator -- Administrative, Planning and Projects. (1) The Administrative Services Division would be headed by a new position, and provide planning and support services to Planning and Project Services.

(2) The positions of Administrator; Administrative Services, Chief; and Administrative Secretary, would be given exempt status;

(3) A position of Secretary would be realigned to report to the Administrative Services Division; and an additional Planner would be included within the Planning Services Division.

(4) The position of Assistant Administrator would be abolished.

- (5) Capital Budget responsibility should be transferred to the Planning Services Division.
- (6) Title of Project Managers should be changed to Project Specialists.
- (7) Stress more assistance to local agencies within Project Services Division.
- (8) Definition of authority of project specialists should be in writing.
- (9) State agencies and IAC staff need an understood proposed policy on working relationship.
- (10) Compliance Inspection duties should be divided among all project specialists.
- (11) Chief of Administrative Services Division position should be created.
- (12) Planning Services Division should set its priorities and review its activities in a review of its goals, etc.
- (13) Project Resume Form needs to be re-designed.
- (14) Revision of Evaluation System recommended.
- (15) More emphasis should be placed on the Local Action Program.
- (16) A Contingency Fund for local projects should be established.
- (17) TAC needs more involvement in evaluation of projects.
- (18) Simplification of the reimbursement procedure to local agencies is recommended.

Following a brief review of the duties and responsibilities of the heads of each division services, Mr. Krueger completed his presentation at 1:50 p.m.

Mr. Odegaard asked for clarification of Item (5) on page (15) -- "Develop a policy decision on the role of the Project Services Division in relation to State Agency projects." Mr. Krueger felt the IAC needed to review its policy working relationship between state agencies; that at present there does not appear to be any authority for IAC to take definitive action; nor is there any established criteria for them to follow.

Mr. Odegaard inquired as to the reasoning for the Chief of Administrative Services being an exempt position, but not the other two divisional heads. Mr. Krueger replied the other two division supervisors were really in the category of workers who finalize technical actions and it is necessary to retain technical expertise in those two areas; whereas, the Chief of Administrative Services could function in management type position, and did not require expertise in a certain discipline. It was his belief the other two division heads were skilled in their fields.

Sub-Committee - Management Study: Mrs. Brostrom appointed a Sub-Committee to work with the Administrator as liaison in addressing the recommendations in the Management Study:

ROSS            ENGLE            BROSTROM

She suggested this sub-committee work with IAC staff on the recommendations and come back

to the Interagency Committee with a report. The Committee was therefore not asked to adopt the report, but merely to accept it at this time. Mr. Bulley felt the report should also be turned over to the Administrator in order that he might analyze it and consult with the Sub-Committee on those recommendations where he would have input. He also suggested that Mr. Murphy, Asst. Atty. General, might wish to be consulted on various aspects of the report.

There was some discussion on whether the consultant firm could be available also. Mrs. Brostrom stated the mandatory figure in the contract had been expended, but that she would hope the consulting service could be available and would work this out with their management. The Committee complimented Mr. Krueger on his presentation and the efforts put forth by Harry Prior and Associates, Inc.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY OF THE IAC (MANAGEMENT STUDY) DATED NOVEMBER 18, 1976, HARRY J. PRIOR AND ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED, SEATTLE, BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE IAC APPOINTED BY THE CHAIRMAN WILL WORK WITH THE ADMINISTRATOR IN COORDINATING THE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS, AND WILL ALSO COORDINATE WITH THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Moore inquired as to the time schedule for working on the report recommendations and was advised this type of activity was not to interfere with normal IAC responsibilities, that these are to come first. Mr. Francis brought out the changes in positions within the agency -- especially secretarial which created some problems for the Projects Services Division. Mr. Odegaard felt this was an administrative matter and could be handled by the Administrator.

III B. Legislation I. ATV legislation proposal - continued discussion: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff distributed December 7, 1976, "Proposed Changes to RCW 46.09", which indicated those changes (definitional, funding, new, and house-keeping) with needed amendments being recommended by staff which would directly affect the IAC. (SEE APPENDIX C OF THESE MINUTES.)

Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. ENGLE, SECONDED BY MR. WYMAN, THAT THE IAC STAFF DRAFT ORV LEGISLATION FOR IAC SPONSORING AT THE 1977 LEGISLATURE, BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE USING THE DOCUMENT DATED DECEMBER 7, 1976 (APPENDIX C TO THESE MINUTES) AS A CONCEPTUAL AND TECHNICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE LEGISLATION WITH SECTION II, SUB-SECTION C-3 (a) AND (b) BEING DELETED.

MR. BULLEY MOVED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO ADD THE WORD "PLANNING" IN SECTION D 1. SO THE NAME OF THE STUDY WOULD READ "STATEWIDE ORV PLANNING STUDY". MRS. ENGLE ACCEPTED THIS WITHIN HER MOTION.

Following discussion by Sam Angove on need for funds to allow DNR to carry out its program within the state as well as counties, and comments from Charles Murphy, who received assurance from the Committee that the legislation being proposed was satisfactory to them, QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bulley asked that the new draft of this legislation be sent to the IAC Committee members as quickly as possible for review and input.

III A. IAC Operating Budget 1977-79: (continued discussion)

(1) EFSEC: Mr. Francis asked for clarification on the Committee's recommendations

regarding the IAC role on EFSEC. Mr. Bulley felt it was obvious that there was a problem, but that the State Legislature had decreed that the IAC should be represented on EFSEC, and therefore it should advise the Legislature of the problem and obtain the necessary funds to handle the responsibilities entailed in the EFSEC activity. Following discussion, it was the CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE IAC CONTINUE ON THE ENERGY FACILITIES SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL (EFSEC), POINT OUT THE PROBLEM AREAS AT LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS, AND LEAVE IT UP TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE TO ANALYZE THE MATTER.

(2) State Data Bank and Boating Study: Mr. Francis reported on the two areas of concern he had regarding the Operating Budget -- the deletion by OPPFM of funds for the State Data Bank matter (\$5,000) and the Boating Study (\$30,000). Mr. Odegaard felt these two matters could be adequately handled at the time of presentation of the IAC budget before the Legislative committees. The IAC Administrator should support these as approved through the Interagency Committee as a whole and attempt to retain the funds.

III B. 3. Senate Park and Recreation Committee - House Park and Recreation Committee:

(a) Senate Park and Recreation Committee: Mr. Francis reported that the new chairman is Senator Peter von Reichbauer. The committee has directed its present efforts toward the statutory responsibilities of the various agencies involved in funding, planning, and provision of park and outdoor recreation services.

(b) House Park and Recreation Committee: Recently the House Park and Recreation Committee completed an analysis of the funding of the IAC since 1965. Mr. Francis reported that legislation will be introduced to "place a high priority on the establishment of urban state parks" and requesting State Parks to "revise its plan for future state parks to achieve this priority." The legislation also directs the IAC "to revise its comprehensive plan for the development of outdoor recreation in a manner which places a high priority on the development of state parks to be located in or near to urban areas and to be particularly accessible to and used by the populations of such areas."

Mr. Francis stated the latter statement has the potential of prejudicing the findings of the present Demand Study and creating a bias which could cast doubt upon the validity of the study. He has recommended to the Park and Recreation Committee of the House that this statement be deleted, and that a policy statement to the effect that emphasis should be placed on urban areas be substituted in the appropriate place. By doing so, the SCORP revision can reflect the policy of the state as it regards urban emphasis, without the bias of a pre-determined study finding.

V. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: Mr. Francis advised the Committee of the following:

(1) Financial Reporting Form for Disclosures Act. (Form was distributed to each citizen member of the Committee.) Deadline for request for a waiver is December 15, 1976. Report needs to be in between January 1 and January 31, 1977. No individual is required to file more than once in any calendar year.

(2) City of Seattle: Staff is currently considering a request from the City of Seattle to exchange land in return for a piece of land purchased by the Department of Community Development as replacement for this land along the old Denny Regrade. Wanted to apprise the Committee of this since Seattle has indicated some urgency and it may be recommended to the Interagency Committee in April of 1977 at the regular IAC meeting.

- (3) Wenatchee waterfront effort: Stewards of the River concept for the Columbia and its major tributaries has attracted attention of Senator Jackson and the Senate Interior Committee of the U. S. Congress. Meeting has been held with representatives. Senator Jackson is prepared to introduce a federal bill to name the Columbia and major tributaries as a National River.
- (4) Sportsmen's Council: Administrator met with this group regarding the bond issue proposal; and met with the Washington Recreation and Park Association for further discussions on same.
- (5) Northwest State Liaison Officers' meeting in Seattle: Met in Seattle to discuss positions being put forth for NASORLO Board of Directors' meeting in January 1977, Washington, D.C.

Quorum: Mrs. Brostrom reviewed Mr. Moos' suggestion as contained on page 42, Minutes of September 27-28, 1976, stating that Charles Murphy, Asst. Atty. General, had rendered his opinion a quorum must stand as previously indicated through Attorney General opinions. In respect to the IAC, seven members represent a quorum and must be present prior to official vote.

Mrs. Brostrom stated her term of office on the IAC would expire as of December 31, 1976, with possibility of reappointment. However, since she was not aware of a re-appointment as of this date, she advised the Committee she was appointing Helen Engle as Vice-Chairman to cover any contingency. Mr. Odegaard stated usually Committee members are to serve until someone is appointed.

NRPA Annual Meeting: Mrs. Engle thanked the Committee for providing her the opportunity to attend the National Recreation and Park Association meeting in Boston, Massachusetts, October 1976. She briefly commented on the workshop activities at that convention and commented there were tape recordings made of many of these which could be available for use if anyone was interested.

Mr. Odegaard notified the Committee of the illness of James Webster, TAC, recuperating from a recent operation. He stated whether or not Mrs. Brostrom was reappointed to the Committee, he extended his thanks and appreciation on behalf of the Committee for her efforts over the past three years.

IAC 1977 meetings: April meeting dates (25-26) were noted by Mr. Francis; as well as September 26-27, 1977 (local funding session). Development applications are requested by May 1, 1977; acquisition by June 1, 1977; and any letters of intent, by April 1, 1977.

Because some of those on the Committee might not be present at the next IAC meeting due to change in Administration of the State Government, Mrs. Brostrom extended her thanks and appreciation to everyone for their expertise on the Committee in the many and varied tasks it had been called upon to do. She particularly appreciated Mr. Bulley's efforts on the Executive Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON THAT THE IAC MEETING ADJOURN. MOTION WAS CARRIED. Adjourned at 4:05. p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

April 25, 1977  
DATE

Micaela Brostrom  
MICAELA BROSTROM, CHAIRMAN

5. Funding of non-highway roads should be separated from that for ORV trails and areas.
6. In the future a "fuel use study" should be used as the basis for the allocation of motor vehicle fuel excise tax monies to ORV purposes.
7. In addition, it is recommended that IAC support the following specific changes to the proposed revision;

- (1) Page 8, between lines 26 and 27; draft section 9 (3) will be amended to read as follows, in order that it may be consistent with pages 11-12, lines 33-2; Section 14.

Provided: That no more than thirteen percent of any of the above amounts may be used for general administration expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this chapter.

These monies shall be expended by each agency only for the acquisition, planning, development, and management of off-road vehicle trails and areas.

- (2) Page 12, between lines 5 and 6; draft Section 14 will be amended to read as follows to provide a sufficient appropriation to the IAC to carry the responsibilities of the act during the 77-79 biennium.

For the 77-79 biennium, only, prior to making the above distribution, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars shall be placed in the outdoor recreation account to be used by the interagency committee for outdoor recreation for the purposes stated in Sections 20 of this amendatory act.

*19 sub 2 and*

- (3) Page 13, line 2; draft Section 19 (1) will be amended to read as follows after the word "municipalities" to continue the role of IAC as a non-operational or management agency and to eliminate any such implied role:

Insert: These monies may be used jointly under the provisions of 39.34 RCW. The interagency committee for outdoor recreation may enter into intergovernmental agreements with federal agencies for the use of ORV funds. Such agreements shall outline the conditions on which these monies may be used.

- (4) Page 13, lines 13-15; Section 19 (2) will be amended to read as follows in order to maintain existing language consistency with RCW 43.99, and further to place a limit on the total:

The IAC shall retain enough money from ORV funds to cover expenses incurred in the administration of this chapter: Provided, that after the 77-79 biennium such retention shall never exceed thirty thousand dollars per year.

Amounts transferred to the outdoor recreation account pursuant to Chapter 46.09 RCW may be used for the necessary administrative and coordinative expenditures of the inter-agency committee for outdoor recreation in carrying out the provisions of this chapter: Provided that after the 77-79 biennium such amounts used by the committee shall not exceed three percent of the ORV fund.

SEF

OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ACT

AS APPROVED

(PROPOSED BOND ISSUE LEGISLATION)

1 SECTION 1 - DECLARATION OF PURPOSE. The increasing population of the State  
 2 of Washington and the increased population density within its urban  
 3 areas, make it imperative that action be taken to provide immediate and long-range  
 4 programs to permanently acquire and appropriately develop public outdoor recreation  
 5 areas and facilities; and, in recognition of the importance of certain lands and  
 6 water areas with natural features which are rare in Washington and subject to  
 7 alteration by human activity, it is necessary to establish a program which will  
 8 encourage and enhance the acquisition and appropriate development for preservation  
 9 of significant natural areas; and, to protect previous public investments,  
 10 maximize potential increased use, and relieve the high costs of maintenance and  
 11 operation, an emphasis must be placed on the redevelopment and rehabilitation  
 12 of existing outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

13 The State of Washington has unsurpassed natural wealth in a variety of land  
 14 forms, shorelines, and waters, which are determined to be ideal for providing  
 15 the needed public outdoor recreation areas and facilities, and significant natural  
 16 areas for the use and enjoyment of present and future citizens of the state and  
 17 for the development of the state's tourism and economy. Therefore, it is the  
 18 declared purpose of the State of Washington to meet these needs by providing a  
 19 continued source of funding to match the federal funds appropriated to the state  
 20 for these needs and to maximize the opportunities to satisfy the state's outdoor  
 21 recreation goals through the acquisition, development, redevelopment, rehabilitation  
 22 and preservation of outdoor recreation, educational, scientific areas and facilities.

23 NEW SECTION 2. GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AUTHORIZED + ISSUANCE, SALE, TERMS --  
 24 APPROPRIATION REQUIRED. For the purpose of providing funds for the immediate and  
 25 long-range planning, acquisition, development, improvement, redevelopment, rehabili-  
 26 tation and preservation of outdoor recreation areas and facilities, and for the

DELETED

27 establishment of ~~significant~~ significant natural areas, the state finance committee  
28 is authorized to issue at any time prior to January 1, 1989, general obligation  
29 bonds of the State of Washington in the sum of ninety million dollars (\$90,000,000)  
30 or so much thereof as may be required to finance the projects as described in this Outdoor  
31 Recreation Bond Act of 1977, and all costs incidental thereto. These bonds shall be  
32 paid and discharged within thirty (30) years of issuance. No bonds authorized by  
33 this chapter shall be offered for sale without prior legislative appropriation of such bonds  
34 to be sold.

35 NEW SECTION 3. PROCEEDS TO BE DEPOSITED IN OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT. The  
36 proceeds from the sale of bonds authorized by this chapter, and any interest earned  
37 on the interim investment of such proceeds, shall be deposited in the state out-  
38 door recreation account in the general fund and shall be used exclusively for the  
39 purpose specified in the chapter and for payment of the expenses incurred in the  
40 issuance and sale of the bond.

41 NEW SECTION 4. DEFINITIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS CHAPTER.

42 (1) "Planning, acquisition, development, improvement, redevelopment, rehabilitation,  
43 and preservation" shall be defined in accordance with the broad interpretation sug-  
44 gested in New Section 1 of this act. It shall include, but not be limited to the  
45 planning for, acquisition of fee simple or any lesser interest in land for the  
46 acquisition or preservation of significant natural areas and for the development  
47 of real property for the purposes of outdoor recreation, including the new con-  
48 struction, redevelopment or rehabilitation of all structures, utilities, and  
49 improvements necessary or incidental to the purposes of this act. The preservation  
50 of land and water areas in an unspoiled or undeveloped state shall be among the alter-  
51 natives permissible under this act.

52 (2) "Public body" means any political subdivision, taxing district or municipal  
53 corporation of the State of Washington, and those units of government now or  
54 hereafter recognized by the federal government as being eligible to participate  
55 in the federal land and water conservation program and which may constitutionally

56 receive grants or loans from the State of Washington.

57 (3) "Committee" means the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.

58 (4) "Significant Natural Areas" shall mean such public or private areas of land or  
59 water which have retained their natural character, although not necessarily un-  
60 disturbed, and which are significant for one or more of the following purposes:  
61 important for the preservation of rare, endangered, or vanishing plants, wildlife,  
62 or fish species; contains or presents either rare or typical natural systems  
63 which have recognizable research and environmental study/learning values; is neces-  
64 sary for the preservation or appreciation of major or special natural landscapes  
65 or natural systems of interdependency; possesses habitat important to fish  
66 and/or wildlife species; or contains outstanding geologic, paleontologic, or  
67 natural historic features; and such areas may have compatible recreational value  
68 or purposes.

70 NEW SECTION 5 - ADMINISTRATION OF PROCEEDS - DIVISION INTO SHARES - USE OF FUNDS.

71 The proceeds from the sale of the bonds deposited in the state outdoor recreation  
72 account of the general fund and <sup>ADDED</sup> any interest earned on such proceeds shall be  
administered, subject to legislative

73 appropriation, by the Committee and shall be divided into three shares as follows:

74 (a) One share of fifteen percent (15%) of the total bond proceeds shall be  
75 allocated for the acquisition and preservation of significant natural areas;  
76 provided that preservation, for purposes of this section shall mean such  
77 development or improvements as may be deemed appropriate to interpret and/or pro-  
78 tect the area so acquired.

79 Provided, that bond proceeds from this section 5(a) may be available on a  
80 one hundred percent (100%) grant basis to any public body; or any agency or  
81 department of the State of Washington subject to legislative appropriation; for  
82 the purposes of this section 5(a). The committee may also use or permit the use  
83 of any portion of such funds as the full matching funds in any case where federal,

84 state, local or other funds are made available on a matching basis for the  
85 purpose of this chapter.

86 Provided further, that application for such funds as are made available through  
87 Section 5(a) shall be submitted to the committee for review and funding from the  
88 funds made available through Section 5(a).

89 (b) One share of forty-two and one-half percent (42.5%) shall be allocated  
90 to public bodies for the planning, acquisition, development, improvement and  
91 preservation of outdoor recreation areas and facilities including redevelopment and  
92 rehabilitation of older, existing outdoor recreation areas and facilities, any  
93 or all of which are within the jurisdiction of such bodies. The committee may use,  
94 or permit the use of any portion of such share for loans or grants to public bodies  
95 including use as matching funds in any case where federal, state, local, or other  
96 funds are made available on a matching basis for purposes of this chapter.

97 (c) One share of forty-two and one-half percent (42.5%) shall be allocated  
98 to the State of Washington, or any department or agency thereof, subject to legis-  
99 lative appropriation, for the planning, acquisition, development, improvement,  
100 redevelopment, rehabilitation and preservation of existing outdoor recreation  
101 areas and facilities. The committee may use or permit the use of any portion  
102 of such share of matching funds in any case where federal, state, local, or other  
103 funds are made available on a matching basis for the purpose of this chapter.

104 In the event that the bonds authorized by this chapter are sold in more  
105 than one series, the above division into shares shall apply to the total proceeds of the  
106 bonds authorized by this chapter and not to the proceeds of each separate series.

107 <sup>COMM.</sup> changed → a plan NEW SECTION 6. PLAN REQUIRED - CONTENT - APPROVAL - FUNDING. The committee shall  
108 prepare a ~~report~~ as an addendum to the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor  
109 Recreation and Open Space Plan, by December 31, 1979, identifying significant  
110 natural areas.

111 The committee shall encourage public participation throughout the period of  
112 preparation of the report.

113 NEW SECTION 7. FORM, TERMS, CONDITIONS, ETC., OF BONDS. The state finance  
114 committee is authorized to prescribe the form, terms, conditions, and covenants  
115 of the bonds, the time or times of sale of all or any portion of them, and the  
116 conditions and manner of sale and issuance.

117 NEW SECTION 8. ANTICIPATION NOTES - PLEDGE AND PROMISE - SEAL. When the state  
118 finance committee has decided to issue such bonds or a portion thereof, it may,  
119 pending the issuing of such bonds, issue, in the name of the state, temporary notes in  
120 anticipation of the money to be derived from the sale of such bonds, which  
121 notes shall be designated as "anticipation notes". Such portion of the proceeds  
122 on the sale of such bonds as may be required for such purpose shall be applied to  
123 the payment of the principal of and interest on such anticipation notes which  
124 have been issued. The bonds and notes shall pledge the full faith and credit of  
125 the State of Washington and shall contain an unconditional promise to pay the  
126 principal and interest when due. The state finance committee may authorize the use  
127 of a printed facsimile of the seal of the State of Washington in the issuance of  
128 the bonds and notes.

129 SECTION 9. RETIREMENT OF BONDS FROM OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND REDEMPTION FUND  
130 OF 1977 - GENERAL STATE REVENUES - REMEDIES OF BOND HOLDERS. The outdoor  
131 recreation bond redemption fund of 1977 is hereby created in the state treasury.  
132 This fund shall be exclusively devoted to the payment of interest on and retire-  
133 ment of the bonds authorized by this chapter. The state finance committee shall,  
134 on or before June 30th of each year, certify to the state treasurer the amount  
135 needed in the ensuing twelve months to meet such bond retirement and interest  
136 requirements, and on July 1st of each year the state treasurer shall deposit such amount  
137 in the outdoor recreation bond redemption fund of 1977 from any general state revenues.  
138 The owner and holder of each of the bonds may by mandamus or other appropriate  
139 proceeding require the transfer of funds as directed herein.

140 NEW SECTION 10. LEGISLATURE MAY PROVIDE ADDITIONAL MEANS FOR PAYMENT OF BONDS.  
141 The legislature may provide additional means for raising moneys for the payment  
142 of the principal and interest of the bonds authorized herein, and this chapter  
143 shall not be deemed to provide an exclusive method for such payment.  
144 NEW SECTION 11. BONDS LEGAL INVESTMENT FOR PUBLIC FUNDS. The bonds herein  
145 authorized shall be a legal investment for all state funds or for funds under  
146 state control and for all funds of any public body.  
147 NEW SECTION 12. EFFECTIVE DATE. The effective date of this act shall be  
148 July 1, 1977.

118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400



4800 Capitol Blvd.  
Tumwater, Washington 98504

Phone: (206) 753-7140

Daniel J. Evans, Governor  
Adele B. Anderson, Chairman

**PARTICIPATING AGENCIES**

Department of Commerce and  
Economic Development  
John S. Larsen, Director

Department of Ecology  
John A. Biggs, Director

Department of Fisheries  
Donald W. Moos, Director

Department of Game  
Ralph W. Larson, Director

Department of Highways  
W. A. Bulley, Director

Department of Natural  
Resources  
Bert L. Cole, Commissioner  
of Public Lands

State Parks and Recreation  
Commission  
Charles H. Odegaard, Director

**CITIZEN MEMBERS**  
Adele Anderson, Ph.D., Walla Walla  
Warren A. Bishop, Pullman  
Micaela Brostrom, Seattle  
Helen Engle, Tacoma  
Michael K. Rcas, Seattle

**ADMINISTRATOR**  
Stanley E. Francis

December 7, 1976

IAC STAFF  
changes

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Interagency Committee  
**FROM:** Stanley E. Francis, Administrator  
**SUBJ:** Proposed Changes to RCW 46.09

**I. NEEDED ACTIONS**

**A. Definitional Changes**

1. Add definitions for ORV, ORV Trails, ORV use area and ORV Plan.
2. Add a definition for management so as to allow use of funds for maintenance, law enforcement, liability insurance, etc.
3. Delete the term "all-terrain vehicle" and replace with "non-highway vehicle".

**B. Funding Changes**

1. Provide a project type funding system for planning, acquisition and development of ORV trails and areas.
2. Provide a process for allocating funds for management purposes.
3. Separate non-highway roads from ORV trails and areas.

**C. New Additions**

1. Provide for a Statewide ORV Study.
2. Provide funding for IAC to accomplish the study and to administer the ACT during 1977-79.
3. Require the Statewide Plan to be the basic document for determining fund distribution.

**D. Housekeeping Changes**

1. Rephrase wording in Section .170 (Refunds from motor vehicle funds) to make it consistent with Section .110 (Disposition of ATV Use Permit Fees).

**II. NEEDED AMENDMENTS**

**A. Changes to Section .020 (Definitions)**

1

1. Delete the term "All-Terrain Vehicle" and replace with the term "non-highway vehicle".
  2. Add definitions for the following terms:
    - a. management
    - b. ORV (off-road vehicle)
    - c. ORV Trail
    - d. ORV Use Area
    - e. ORV Plan
- B. Changes to Section .110 (Disposition of ATV Use Permit Fees.)**
1. Delete present references to funding on the basis of present and proposed ATV trails and areas.
  2. Add phrasing which will allow new processes to be used in determining amounts to be allocated for planning, acquisition, development, and management.
    - a. "project" type system for planning, acquisition and development.
    - b. formula apportionment process for management.
- C. Changes to Section .170 (Refunds from motor vehicle fund-distribution-use).**
1. Delete present references to funding on the basis of present and proposed ATV trails and areas.
  2. Add phrasing (same as for Section .110) which will allow new processes to be used in determining amounts to be allocated for planning, acquisition, development, and management.
  3. Add phrasing to allow the distribution of fuel tax monies for use on non-highway roads only, as follows:
    - ~~a. 25% to DNR~~
    - ~~b. 3.5% to Department of Game (NOTE: Percentages based on present allocations.)~~
  4. Establish consistency of wording with Section .110 (housekeeping)
    - a. delete wording which requires review of funding distribution each biennium and replace with wording to require annually.
    - b. add wording which indicates that IAC will prescribe methods, rules and standards (same wording as now in Section .110).
- D. Changes to Section .175 (Transferred funds may be used for administration and coordination).**
1. Provide up to \$80,000 to accomplish Statewide ORV <sup>Planning</sup> Study during 1977-79 biennium.
  2. Provide up to \$70,000 for 1977-79 biennium to administer the Act in accordance with this section and to develop codes and guidelines for new funding processes.
  3. After the 1977-79 biennium, provide up to 3% of the amounts transferred to the Outdoor Recreation Account for the necessary administrative and coordination expenditures of IAC.

Deleted  
by IAC  
Committee

Added  
by  
IAC Comm.

E. New Section

1. Require the preparation and maintenance of Statewide ORV Plan which will determine and reflect user densities and preferences and the general suitability and availability of areas for ORV trails and areas within the state.
2. Require the use of the Plan as the basic guide for long range ORV planning and for ORV fund distribution and expenditures.

SEF

SEF:GWP:GWL:sr