

- I. Meeting called to order, determination of quorum, introductions
Executive Committee announced - BULLEY, ENGLE AND BROSTROM
- II. Fiscal Status Reports; Projects Status Reports; Planning Status Reports:
Announced would be dispensed with unless questions asked.
September 1976 - Local Agency Project Applications
SCORP - Inventory
 - 5 a. ATV Fund Distribution
 - 5 b. Statewide ATV Plan Study Proposal
 - 5 c. All-Terrain Vehicle Legislative Proposal
(10:20 a.m. - Quorum - arrival of Mike Ross)
 - 5 d. Biennial Projection of ATV Fund Allocations
 - 5 e. Inventory Clarification
- Quorum discussion - Chairman to obtain opinion.
- III. A. State Environmental Protection Act Guidelines - adoption
WAC 286-04-050 Compliance with SEPA - ADOPTED
- B. Procedural Guidelines and WAC changes - adoption
(Waiver of Retroactivity - Development - 05,06,000 ADOPTED
WAC changes accordingly ADOPTED)
Resolution - Honoring Dr. Adele Anderson's 2 1/2 years with Committee
- I. Approval of the Minutes - March 22-23, 1976; May 10, 1976 and June 11, 1976
- I. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda - as indicated
- II. A. (5) Land and Water Conservation Fund Report & LWCF Special Account info.
Motion authorizing request to OPPFM for BOR transition monies \$758,310 APPROVED
LWCF Amendments report
- III. C. Legislative Sub-Committee, IAC
 - (1) Legislation - as noted in memo
 - (2) Future funding of IAC - Bond Issue - oral report - Mil Martin
- III. C 2. Policy determinations - Administrator/Committee - draft
Referred to Executive Committee of IAC - to come up in Sept. 1976
- III. D. Evaluation System
 - (1) Clarification/changes/etc. discussed MOTION TO REFINE FOR SEPT. FUNDING
 - (2) Policy Questions - 11 - re Local Agency Evaluation System - Review.
Directions to staff -- to present in Sept. 1976
- III E. IAC 1977-79 Proposed Capital Budget
\$13,879,821 plus \$2,530,130 reapprop. -- \$16,409,951
Report by Fisheries
Report by Park and Rec. Commission
Report by Dept. Nat. Resources
MOTION - \$455,000 to be in 1977-79 budget for DNR because of their savings APPROVED

Region 10-- report on why no projects recommended within that region.

MOTION approving the Capital Budget - APPROVED

V. Administrator's Report

State Audit

NW State Liaison Officers Workshop May 2-3-4, 1976

Park Dedications

Assoc. of Wash. Counties meeting

Assoc. of Washington Cities meeting

Recruitment for Planner II and RRS III

Annual mtg. of Forest Svcs. and Park Svcs. July 14-15-16 - Ocean Shores

NASORLO meeting in Boston, Mass. Aug/Sept.

NRPA meeting October

Computer program

Madeline Lemere, former member, authorized to represent IAC at Freeway Park dedication July 4, 1976

IV. A. Salary of Administrator

Chairman to take action when communication recvd. from Governor

B. Technical Advisory Committee members appointed - APPROVED

TERMS:

1. William Fearn, City of Spokane, to expire May 22, 1979

2. Martin Carty, Cowlitz County, to expire May 22, 1979

C. BOR Technical Assistance Program

Motion to support BOR Tech. Assistance program APPROVED

D. Project Changes

- | | | | |
|----|--|------------|----------|
| 1. | (a) City of Olympia, Woodruff Park, IAC #73-063 D | Reinstated | APPROVED |
| | (b) Dept. Game 71-73 Boat Launch Dev. IAC 72-609D | Reinstated | APPROVED |
| | (c) Parks & Rec., Tolmie Park, IAC 71-503D | Reinstated | APPROVED |
| 2. | Town of Mesa, Poe Park, IAC 74-072D, Cost Increase | \$3,581.33 | APPROVED |
| 3. | City of Redmond, Grass Lawn Park 74-060A, Cost increase | | APPROVED |
| 4. | City of Lacey, Hicks Lake, IAC 75-044A Project withdrawal | | APPROVED |
| 5. | Parks and Rec. Comm., GRG, Jellum IV, IAC 75-505A Cost increase | \$6,935 | APPROVED |
| 6. | Parks and Rec. Comm., Fort Canby, Guideine Waiver | | APPROVED |
| 7. | King County, Lake Sammamish R. IV, IAC 70-008A, Utility Easement | | APPROVED |

E. Administratively approved state agency projects:

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|---|---------|
| (1) Toonerville 76-705D | \$32,650 |) | |
| (2) Twin Lakes 76-706D, | \$46,446 |) | |
| (3) Upper Clearwater 76-707D | \$23,854 |) | All DNR |
| (4) Hoh Oxbow 76-708D | \$32,890 |) | |

IV. 2. Department of Game projects

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|--|
| (a) Gloyd Seeps deleted | | | |
| (b) Wenatchee River - Aeq. 76-612A | \$ 3,600 | APPROVED | |
| (b) Fiorito Lake Devel - 77-602D | 40,810 | APPROVED | |

IV C. 3. Department of Natural Resources
Dougan Creek Dev. 77-705D \$ 42,322 APPROVED

III F. IAC 1977-79 Proposed Operating Budget MOTION - APPROVED

\$1,074,160 for 1977-79

Tour announced for Tues. a.m. - Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater parks - for IAC members interested.

Adjourned.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
TUMWATER, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

June 28, 1976
Monday

9:00 a.m.

Highway Commissioners Board Room
Wing D, Highways Administration Bldg.
Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Micaela Brostrom, Chairman	John A. Biggs, Director, Dept. of Ecology
Warren A. Bishop	W. A. Bulley, Director, Dept. of Highways
Honorable Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands (a.m.)	Helen Engle
Donald Moos, Director, Dept. of Fisheries (p.m.)	Ralph W. Larson, Director, Dept. of Game (p.m.)
	Michael Ross

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

John Larsen, Director, Commerce & Economic Development Dept.	(T. Evans Wyckoff, newly appointed as Director, Commerce & Economic Development Dept.)
Charles H. Odegaard, Director Parks and Rec. Commission	(NOTE: Vacancy on Committee re Adele Anderson resignation)

STAFF OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General
Murphy, Charles

Commerce and Economic Development
Smith, Merlin

Ecology, Department of
Laurence, Richard

Fisheries, Department of
Costello, Richard Dan Keller

Game, Department of
Brigham, James Dan Barnett

Highways, Department of
Myloie, Willa

Interagency Committee for Outdoor
Recreation

Bailey, Ron, RSS
Benner, Rebecca, Clerk-Typist II
Burk, Larry, RRS
Cole, Kenn, Agency Accounts Officer
Dalton, Edith, Secretary (Typing)
Francis, Stanley E., Administrator
Frazier, Marjorie M., Admin. Secretary
Leach, Eugene, RRS
Lovelady, Greg, RRS
Martin, Milton H., Assistant Admin.
Moore, Glenn, Chief, Project Section
Pelton, Gerald, Chief, Plan. & Coord. Section
Taylor, Ron, RRS

Natural Resources, Department of

Bell, Lloyd O'Donnell, Al Stolis, Howard
Wernex, Joe Patton, Terry

Park and Recreation Commission

Martin, Lynn Tveten, Jan Bush, William
Garrett, Thomas (Chairman, Park & Rec. Commission)
Mackey, Ralph (Member, Park & Rec. Commission)

Program Planning and Fiscal Management

Wieland, Carl

LOCAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carty, Martin, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Kent
Fearn, William, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane
Hutsinpillar, William, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Yakima
Lundy, Maurice H., Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Federal Government
McCartan, Art, Whitman County Parks Dept., City of Pullman
Webster, James, Director, Parks and Recreation, King County Dept. of Parks
Wilder, Robert, representing David Towne, Supt., Parks and Rec., City of Seattle

I. Meeting called to order, determination of quorum, introductions: Chairman Micaela Brostrom convened the IAC meeting at 9:15 A.M. Due to lack of a quorum, those items requiring no action of the Committee were initially discussed.

The following introductions were made:

Al Thomas - Vancouver Columbian - news reporter
Edith Dalton - Rebecca Benner - IAC clerical staff members
Ron Morganthaler, All-Terrain Review Committee member, and member American Motorcyclists Association
Martin Carty, P&R Director, Cowlitz County
Don Phillips, Assistant Director, Cowlitz County, Park and Rec. Department
Noel Christensen, All-Terrain Review Committee member and member Pacific NW 4-Wheel Drive Association
James Webster, Park and Rec. Director, King County
Howard Stolis, Deputy Supervisor, DNR
Al O'Donnell, Joe Wernex, and Terry Patton, DNR staff members
Willa Mylroie, Dept. Highways; Dan Barnett, Game Dept; Jim Brigham, Game Dept; Rich Costello Fisheries; Lynn Martin, Parks and Rec. Commission -- TAC members

Executive Committee: Mrs. Brostrom announced the appointment of an Executive Committee to assist the Chairman in executive matters: W. A. BULLEY, HELEN ENGLE, AND MICAELA BROSTROM.

II. A. Fiscal Status Reports; B. Projects Status Reports; and C. Planning Status Reports; The Chairman noted that the meeting which had been set for June 28-29, 1976 originally, would be only the one day - June 28th - therefore reports on the fiscal, projects and planning activities of the IAC would be dispensed with unless Committee members wished to question staff on any specific report. (All members had reviewed these reports prior to attending the IAC meeting.) Mr. Kenn Cole pointed out that the fiscal status reports did not include BOR transition monies which would be available to the State of Washington effective July 1, 1976 (\$758,310).

Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, "September 1976 - Local Agency Project Applications" within the Projects Status Report section, advising that:

- (1) Letters of intent, totaling 66 in number had been received by April 1, 1976, for the purpose of notifying the IAC staff that local applications would be forthcoming for consideration in September 1976;
- (2) Estimated total for the 66 project applications: \$30 million approximately.
- (3) Only 33 development project applications and 17 acquisition applications were actually received totaling \$14,236,217. Listing in the memorandum was briefly reviewed. \$3,716,270 for acquisition; \$10,519,947 for development.
- (4) Approximately \$3.4 million will be available for local agency projects in September 1976; \$1.8 of this will be LWCF; therefore, projects to be considered must qualify for federal funds in order to maximize the dollars.
- (5) With \$836,138 215 estimated as available, projects should also be boater-oriented.

Project Administrative Actions: The following project requests for either cost increase or reduction in scope were reviewed and approved administratively since March 5, 1976 to June 4, 1976:

- (1) Kitsap County - Salsbury Point - #74-068D: Cost increase of \$7,434 (4.2%) approved.
- (2) Okanogan Swimming Pool - #73-035D: Cost increase of \$21,091.76 (7.88%) approved.
- (3) City of Anacortes, Washington Park - #74-039D: A 5.3% cost increase in the amount of \$12,860.71 was approved. (Involved reduction of certain items.)
- (4) City of Lake Forest Park - LFP Tennis Courts - #74-076D: A cost increase of 2.9% - \$1,123 was considered justifiable.
- (5) Wahkiakum Co. Port District #2 - Skamokawa Park - #75-017A: Project agreement amended due to part of project lost to river erosion. Acquisition of 27 acres rather than 37 acres along Columbia River. IAC share decreased in amount of \$29,110.
- (6) Port of Brownsville - Boat Harbor - #72-002D: Cost increase of \$9,131.90 with request to delete pumpout facility was approved.
- (7) State Parks - Copalis Beach - #74-517A: 1% cost increase \$2,880 was approved re additional eligible relocation costs.

II C. 3. Inventory: Inventory of existing outdoor recreation lands and facilities was reported on by Mr. Pelton, Chief, Planning and Coordination. Forms have been mailed (June 25th) to cities, counties and will be mailed to Indian Tribes, Port Districts, Parks and Recreation Districts during the week of June 28-July 2. Arrangements are being made to distribute the forms to School Districts through the Superintendent of Public Instruction in September 1976. State agencies are to be contacted individually.

II C. 5. a. ATV Fund Distribution: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, "ATV Fund Distribution". The 1976 ATV funds in the amount of \$1,587,859.29 were distributed to state and local agencies in accordance with RCW 46.09, with state agencies receiving \$698,341.54 (44%) and local agencies

\$889,517.75 (56%). Thirteen counties participated in the program. Mr. Pelton also reported on use of the funds since 1972 and indicated that \$1,951,300, though distributed to agencies, had not as yet been used for actual projects. This represented about 57.8% of the total distribution of \$3,377,500. In response to questions, Mr. Pelton explained that the reason the approximately 47.8% had not been used was that under the funding formula most agencies have not received enough funds at any one distribution period to cover funding a major project and are therefore accumulating their funds in reserve for future use. It was brought out that the bulk of the money spent by agencies has been for planning. Mr. Bulley noted the fact that public opposition to ATV projects also is a factor.

Mr. Pelton then reported on the meeting of May 29, 1976 with representatives of Four Wheel Drive, Motorcycle and Sportsmen's Associations. Those present assisted in development of the following interim clarification relative to Section 2.000 of the "Guidelines for All-Terrain Vehicle Funds":

"No agency will be permitted claims for any one intensive use area where claims exceed 1,000 acres for that unit; that portion over this maximum amount shall be reallocated into the dispersed area category."

II C. 5. b. Statewide ATV Plan Study Proposal: The memorandum of June 28, "Statewide ATV Plan Study Proposal", was then reviewed by Mr. Pelton. A draft prospectus for the study was included in the memorandum proposal. Working with the ATV Review Committee, the Planning and Coordination Division staff issued this draft proposal to the sixteen participating ATV agencies (state and local). Comment and indication of support or opposition to the proposal was requested. To date, twelve of the sixteen have indicated support of the study draft with several giving conditional support, to contributing the necessary funds for the study; non-support has been indicated by four agencies. The principal condition given for funding participation was that all sixteen participating agencies contribute proportionately to the study cost (Study cost: \$80,000 plus \$15,000 for IAC study coordination and administration). Since it appears that unanimous support cannot be reached, IAC staff has included within the IAC 1977-79 IAC Operating Budget proposal \$80,000 for the actual study plus an additional \$35,000 to carry out the administrative staff requirements to administer the study and the ATV fund distribution program for the 1977-79 biennium.

Mr. Bishop inquired whether the funds used for administrative purposes by the IAC was a legal use. Mr. Pelton replied in the affirmative stating the language in the law for ATV purposes was very similar to that of Initiative 215. There followed discussion on recovering of the administrative costs of the IAC.

Mr. Bishop felt that every effort should be made by the IAC to replace those Initiative 215 funds used for ATV administration with ATV funds this biennium. Mrs. Brostrom asked Mr. Francis to pursue this and make the proper transfers within the Outdoor Recreation Account.

II C. 5. c. All-Terrain Vehicle Legislative Proposal: Mr. Ron Morgenthaler, All-Terrain Review Committee member and member of the NW Motorcycle Association, was then asked for his comments regarding the present ATV Law and the need for change. Points covered in his review were as follows:

(1) The ATV Act was to provide additional facilities for ATV use. However, funds are being segmented disproportionately for planning and administration. He felt

funds were being diverted from ATV benefits and not being used in the proper manner, i.e., to place actual projects "on the ground".

- (2) When ATV projects are broached to the public, there is vocal opposition. There needs to be a public education and orientation program to advise citizens of the projects and the needs.
- (3) DNR has provided some excellent facilities for ATV use.
- (4) The inventory funding system has not provided ATV projects as envisioned in the law.

(At this point, Mr. Michael Ross arrived [10:20 a.m.] making a quorum of 7 members.)

Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, "ATV Legislative Proposal", and noted the following:

- (1) Changes are needed to enabling legislation (RCW 46.09) which requires that funding allocations be predicated on present and proposed "inventory submissions."
- (2) General concepts of needed changes prepared by the ATV Program Review Committee are:
 - (a) Separation of fund allocations for non-highway roads from those for off-highway ATV trails and areas;
 - (b) Augmentation of the funding allotment formula to include "Project" grants.
- (3) IAC staff supports these concepts.
- (4) Preliminary draft of legislative changes was attached to the memorandum. Mr. Pelton corrected page (3), paragraph (6), bottom of the page of the draft on legislative changes "46.09.210". The first sentence was stricken; following sentence was underlined to indicate as new.

Mr. Noel Christensen, All-Terrain Review Committee member and member of the Pacific NW 4-Wheel Drive Association then presented the ATV Legislative Study Group proposal. The study group wanted to ensure that only one bill on ATV legislative changes goes forward to the State Legislature for consideration, and that this bill should:

- (a) Change words "All-Terrain Vehicle" to "Off Road Vehicle" (ORV);
- (b) Establish ORV use permits as the license system for off-road vehicles in the state;
- (c) Define ORV trails and ORV use areas;
- (d) Change ORV use permit charges for the non-highway licensed vehicles and vehicles licensed for highway use;
- (e) Change distribution method of the funds under new section 46.09.210 per draft proposal;
- (f) Change noise level;
- (g) Change motor vehicle gasoline tax refund to 1.333 percent of the motor vehicle fuel tax revenues collected, with 25% to DNR for non-highway roads; and 75% to Outdoor Recreation Account for ORV's.

Mr. Christensen also asked consideration be given to changing the WACS of the IAC

to coincide with the new legislation when approved.

Committee discussion followed. Mr. Bulley, Mr. Bishop, and Mr. Cole questioned Mr. Christensen on several points in the proposed legislation, particularly the change to one and one-third percent as noted in (g) above. It was brought out that the Department of Motor Vehicles' Fuel Tax Study had indicated significantly higher amounts of fuel being used on non-highways roads or trails within the state; yet, the Legislature had left the percentage at 1%. Mr. Cole thought the study should be redone and consider the DNR roads and private roads used by ATV Vehicles. He felt the Department of Highways was actually receiving income which should properly be diverted to the All-Terrain Vehicle program. Mr. Bulley replied there is extensive travel on the state highway system and funds are needed for repair and maintenance of all highways. He noted there has been distributed approximately \$2 million in ATV funds, which have not yet been used for the ATV program; whereas, the State Highways Department at the present time and through the 1977-79 biennium will not have enough funds to put into any new construction of highways, but will only be able to maintain those which are existing. He suggested the Committee consider the fact that perhaps monies could be generated through an increase in the motor vehicle gas tax from 9¢ to 11¢. He felt it would be better to work toward a type of program which would support the entire motor vehicle fund to generate needed revenue.

Mr. Ross suggested increasing the license fees, and was concerned that ATV monies were being used for a single purpose and did not include other types of recreationists. Mr. Christensen replied anybody can use an Off-Road Vehicle Trail and that the IAC has already funded other single purpose recreational projects, i.e., golf courses, swimming pools. Mr. Ross suggested there be some sort of limitation placed in the legislation in defining an off-road vehicle -- that it should have so much economy per mile -- thinking in terms of the energy crisis.

At this point, Mr. Morgenthaler pointed out that all recreationists use their vehicles for recreation purposes, therefore he felt that even 1.333% should be increased, that actually there was not enough money now for DNR to maintain the off-highway roads they currently have in public use. Future funding for these roads is very uncertain and obtaining public approval is extremely difficult. Mr. Morgenthaler and Mr. Christensen stated their willingness to cooperate in any way possible to further the proposed legislation. Mrs. Brostrom felt the Committee should first be concerned with the mechanism of insuring that the ATV funds are properly spent.

Mr. Bert Cole made the following points:

- (1) The Department of Highways does not have the responsibility to maintain the off-highway roads, and in actuality the amount of funds being requested for this use was very small in terms of the overall dollars administered by the Department of Highways;
- (2) He expressed his support for an additional gasoline tax, but felt this would not solve the Department of Highways' problem;
- (3) He stated he would be meeting with legislative groups and that DNR would be introducing its own legislation on All-T-V's in order to obtain a better expenditure of funds;
- (4) He further noted that the Motor Vehicle Department had made a similar study as that made for Initiative 215 (Marine Gasoline Tax refunds), and had determined that approximately 4.6% of the fuel tax collected on gasoline sold should be allocated to ATV purposes. However, the Legislature had agreed to the 1% as in the present law.

Mrs. Brostrom inquired how this study had been made, and Mr. Cole replied consulting people had been contracted and certain gas stations had been screened over a period of time as is done for the study concerning Initiative 215 (interviews with users, etc.) Mr. Bulley questioned this type of study -- whether it was really a typical example of those persons using the types of roads being considered.

Mr. Cole then brought out the fact that the amount of money going to the counties was the problem. The legislation did not specify this distribution process, but the IAC in its administration role found it necessary to set some guidelines and a distribution formula.

Mr. Brigham noted that the Department of Game should not be disqualified from receiving money to fund their non-highway roads.

Following this discussion, the Committee was asked by Mr. Pelton for direction to staff in three areas:

- (1) Should staff continue to work towards development of some form of legislative change concerning the ATV Act to bring to the Committee's attention in September 1976 (IAC meeting)?
- (2) Should the funding process be changed to include the "project" concept?
- (3) Should the IAC work towards development of the specific legislation per se as proposed in the memorandum or should the user organizations develop the legislation?

Mr. Ross suggested that off-road vehicle projects coming before the Committee be flexible, and that staff be directed to approach the new legislation with the concept of expending funds for all outdoor recreation projects rather than for single-purpose projects. Some of the money, he felt, should be used for multi-purpose projects. Also, Mr. Ross suggested there be persons on the ATV Review Committee not specifically All-Terrain Vehicle users who, not having a direct interest in ATV's, could serve as representatives of other recreationists.

(as amended 9.27.76)
He asked that staff be directed to make recommendations on the two policy options as discussed by Mr. Bulley and the user groups to ascertain what the impact would be if the legislation were tied into a proposed gasoline tax fund raise to 11¢ versus the percentage raise to 1.333%. There was no action taken on Mr. Ross's suggestion. However, Mr. Bishop then suggested the Committee direct staff to *consider* the 1.333% as proposed *considered for* in the drafted legislation. It was the consensus of the Committee that this be *con* incorporated into the draft for presentation at the September 1976 IAC meeting.

Following discussion, it was consensus of the Committee that:

- (1) STAFF SHOULD CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE USER GROUPS (ATV) AS IN THE PAST IN PREPARATION OF A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM;
- (2) THE COMMITTEE WILL REVIEW THE PROPOSED DRAFT OF LEGISLATION AT THE SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1976 IAC MEETING;
- (3) THE BULK OF THE BURDEN OF PREPARING THE LEGISLATION SHOULD BE ON THE USER GROUP, AND THEY, IN TURN, WILL WORK WITH IAC STAFF IN THIS RESPECT;
- (4) A CHANGE FROM FUND ALLOCATION ON THE BASIS OF INVENTORIES TO SOME OTHER METHOD SHOULD BE EXPLORED BY IAC STAFF;
- (5) 1.333% OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX SHOULD BE *considered for inclusion* INCLUDED IN THE RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION AS REFUND FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX REVENUES COLLECTED PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 82.36 RCW LESS PROPER DEDUCTIONS FOR REFUNDS

COSTS OF COLLECTION AS PROVIDED IN RCW 46.68.090. HOWEVER, THE OTHER OPTIONS PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED SHOULD BE EXPLORED BY THE IAC STAFF AND USER GROUPS FOR POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS.

Mrs. Brostrom thanked Mr. Morgenthaler and Mr. Christensen for their presentation and helpfulness, and assured them of Committee cooperation in the legislation process.

II C. 5. d. Biennial Projection of ATV Fund Allocations:

II C. 5. e. Inventory Clarification:

Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, "Biennial Projection of ATV Fund Allocations". In the ensuing discussion, the Committee opted to review the memorandum on "Inventory Clarification" as well prior to taking any action by motion. Mr. Pelton briefly covered the following points:

(1) Projection of ATV Fund Allocations by state agencies are required as a normal part of biennial state budgeting process. Due to fluctuation of the funds, it has been difficult to prepare budget documents with accuracy; therefore, as a result of meetings between DNR, IAC, and OPPFM and subsequent discussions with individuals from county and user organizations, staff recommended that the Committee take the following action:

- (a) Establish a special contingency fund with ATV monies; to be set at 10% of the available net monies;
- (b) Utilize the 10% ATV contingency to:
 - 1. Provide monies for approved upward inventory fluctuation; from 1975 levels and,
 - 2. Fund any additional agencies that may enter the program in 1976-77;
 - 3. Current method of point allocation to be employed.
- (c) Utilize remaining funds in ATV account to fund current ATV programs using 1975 inventory point levels and existing allocation procedures;
- (d) Specify that the contingency fund shall be effective until November 1978 at which time new and updated inventories and plans are due;
- (e) Request DNR, OPPFM, and User representatives to meet to resolve user concerns that excessive amounts of DNR-ATV Fund allocations are used for administration and non-highway road purposes.

(2) Objections to the above from local agency and user representatives indicated:

- (a) Future funding, if based on 1975 point levels, may benefit state agency recipients over local agency recipients;
- (b) DNR's budget charges for "administration" and "non-highway" road maintenance programs are excessive;
- (c) Existing system has functioned until present without a need to more precisely project anticipated income.

Following Mr. Pelton's explanation, Mr. Morgenthaler noted the following:

- (1) Some of the inventories made by counties were inflated in order to obtain the funds; some land included which would never be developed due to owner's reluctance to permit ATV use thereon;
- (2) Point system needed changing -- since it has no relation to the inventory basis. Land or facility receives the same monies whether it exists or whether it is in the

future, new construction, maintenance of existing trail, etc.

Mr. Ross inquired whether staff could proceed with changing the point system and was informed this would change the budget projections, that nothing could be changed in the point system until the following biennium. DNR concurred with IAC staff as to the matter of timing. Mr. Cole suggested the chairman instruct the staff to review the point system and make recommendations for changes. It was the consensus of the Committee that this matter be held in abeyance.

Mr. Pelton then referred to the memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, "Inventory Clarification - 'Guidelines for ATV Funds'", which outlined the problem of disparity in inventory submittals and the concerns voiced regarding the current structure of the point system employed in the distribution process. He read Section 02.122.160 of the ATV Guidelines which presently states that the Action Plan shall not only include information on coordination with other affected agencies, but shall also state compliance with RCW 43.21C, the Washington State Environmental Protection Act.

To clarify this section, Mr. Pelton read the motion recommended by staff which covered three points regarding submission of inventories. These are to be supported by (a) a letter from each landowner or manager of terrain included on the official ATV inventory that conveys a willingness to negotiate for ATV use of their land at some future date; (b) a completed environmental check list form as elaborated in WAC 197-10-365 (copy of check list form provided as attachment 2 to the memorandum), and three letters from appropriate representatives of the state's major user associations (NMA, PNW4 WD Assoc., and Sportmen's Council), which include their comments or statement of no comment, on each proposed inventory area or trail. These clarifications are to apply only to inventories submitted to the IAC between June 1976 and December 1977, and thereafter to all inventory entries retained or added to the proposed category.

It was consensus of the Committee that the staff recommendation should be approved; however, since user groups are concerned about the DNR portion of the funds being diverted to administrative overhead, the IAC staff should resolve this matter in a ^{conference} ~~confrontation~~ with user groups, DNR, IAC and OPPEM. Mr. Bishop and Mr. Cole suggested the Committee accept the general recommendation of the staff, insuring they work with the user groups and state agencies, utilizing the present inventories, and base the program on results of staff working with state and local agencies, bringing these recommendations before the Committee in September. *as amended 9-27-76*

Mr. Tom Fitzpatrick, Acting ATV Coordinator, King County, advised the Committee that the current guideline calling for SEPA compliance was too restrictive, and suggested that the eight-page form recommended by staff be simplified.

Mr. Pelton then noted the statements of various participating agencies and user organizations as stated in the memorandum and in particular read the statement of Charles R. Butler, Yakima County, ATV Program Coordinator, which he had specifically requested be made a part of this record:

"Yakima County does not believe that the proposed interim funding Guideline clarifications will solve the inventory problem. This County has submitted factual and sound inventory in the

past and intends to do so again. We do not feel that the users are best served by administrative additions to the system which are very costly and do not solve the problem. We further feel that the authority and ability to control the problem is available within the IAC staff. We wish to go on record as opposing these Funding Guideline Clarifications as proposed by the IAC staff."

The current point system was then discussed. IAC staff concurred with the need to re-evaluate the point system as it currently allows emphasis on future actions (proposed trails and areas) rather than on the efforts to increase and expand facilities and usage of existing areas. Mr. Francis stated the existing point system will be used through the 1978 fund allocations. New inventories to be used for 1979 funding could be under a revised point system.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS TO ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AS IN RECOMMENDED MOTION, STRIKING ITEM (2) WHICH REQUIRED A COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL CHECK LIST AS ELABORATED IN WAC 197-10-365 (COPY OF CHECK LIST FORM PROVIDED AS ATTACHMENT #2). MOTION DIED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.

Mr. Pelton then explained the reason for requesting an environmental check list on ATV sites. Environmental impact is essential in determining validity of the project in all respects.

MR. ROSS MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THE RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF AS IN THE PREPARED MOTION.

Mr. Bishop suggested that the Environmental Check List Form as recommended by staff be simplified in order that the counties not be burdened with unnecessary compilation of environmental information for the projects.

MR. ROSS INCORPORATED THIS INTO HIS MOTION, DELETING THE WORDING "AS ELABORATED IN WAC 197-10-365; (COPY OF CHECK LIST FORM PROVIDED AS ATTACHMENT #2 TO THE KIT MEMO.)"

THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS THEREFORE PASSED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION (IAC) IS REQUIRED BY RCW 43.09 TO ADMINISTER THE DISTRIBUTION OF ATV MONIES ON A BASIS DETERMINED BY THE AMOUNT OF PRESENT OR PROPOSED ATV TRAILS OR AREAS; AND

WHEREAS, THE "GUIDELINES FOR ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE FUNDS", PROMULGATED BY THE IAC, STATE THAT INFORMATION REGARDING THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PROVISIONS OF RCW 43.12C, THE WASHINGTON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT WILL BE MET;

AND, WHEREAS, THE GUIDELINES ALSO REQUIRE INFORMATION ON THE MANNER IN WHICH ATV COORDINATION HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED WITH AFFECTED AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT, PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS AND LANDOWNERS; AND

WHEREAS, CLARIFICATION AS TO THE INTENT OF THESE REQUIREMENTS IS NECESSARY IN ORDER THAT THE IAC MAY ADEQUATELY EVALUATE COMPLIANCE;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE IAC THAT THE FOREGOING GUIDELINE REQUIREMENTS BE CLARIFIED TO SIGNIFY THAT ALL INVENTORY SUBMISSIONS IN THE PROPOSED CATEGORY, BE SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF CLARIFICATION:

ADDENDUM
"A"

1. A LETTER FROM EACH LANDOWNER OR MANAGER OF TERRAIN INCLUDED ON THE OFFICIAL ATV INVENTORY THAT CONVEYS A WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE FOR ATV USE OF THEIR LAND AT SOME FUTURE DATE; (SAMPLE LETTER PROVIDED AS ADDENDUM A OF THESE MINUTES).
2. A COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL CHECK LIST FORM - SIMPLIFIED;
3. LETTERS FROM APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE'S MAJOR USER ASSOCIATIONS (PRESENTLY NMA, PNW4WD ASSOCIATION, AND SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL), WHICH INCLUDE THEIR COMMENTS OR A STATEMENT OF NO COMMENT, ON EACH PROPOSED INVENTORY AREA OR TRAIL;

AND, FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THESE CLARIFICATIONS SHALL APPLY ONLY TO INVENTORIES SUBMITTED TO THE IAC BETWEEN JUNE, 1976 AND DECEMBER 1977, AND THEREAFTER TO ALL INVENTORY ENTRIES RETAINED IN OR ADDED TO THE PROPOSED CATEGORY.

Quorum discussion: Prior to recessing for lunch, the question of a quorum was raised by Mr. Bert Cole since Mr. Biggs would not be attending the afternoon session due to other commitments, leaving six members for voting purposes. In response to an inquiry directed to him, Mr. Charles Murphy, Asst. Atty. General, stated it was his informal opinion the Committee could not conduct any official business without a quorum. Mr. Ross asked that a formal opinion in writing be obtained from the Attorney General's Office as to what constitutes a quorum and whether the Committee may continue to vote on official business after declaring a quorum at the beginning of its sessions even though some of the members leave during the meeting for other commitments negating the quorum.

Following discussion, the Chairman asked the Administrator to contact other members of the Committee who were known to be in Olympia and insure their presence at the afternoon's session for quorum purposes. The Chairman stated she would obtain an Attorney General's opinion on this entire matter.

QUORUM:

(1:40 p.m.) Following recess, the eight Committee members in attendance were: MICAELA BROSTROM, RALPH LARSON, DON MOOS, WARREN BISHOP, W. A. BULLEY, BERT COLE, HELEN ENGLE AND MIKE ROSS

The Chairman opened the afternoon's session stating a Public Meeting was now being called for the express purpose of adopting SEPA guidelines and changes to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) concerning the IAC (WAC 286) as in the following recorded actions:

III A. State Environmental Protection Act Guidelines - adoption: Mr. Francis reviewed memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, referencing the IAC meeting of March 22-23, 1976 and the Committee's adoption of the SEPA WAC 286-04-050 on an emergency basis, and the need to permanently adopt the WAC in compliance with the State Environmental Protection Act Guidelines and its WAC 197-10-800. The IAC had complied with the Public Disclosures Act in notifying the public of the meeting twenty days in advance thereof.

The motion was read to the Committee. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS THAT,

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS DETERMINED THAT ITS AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES ARE EXEMPT FROM THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS AND

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENTS, AND

WHEREAS, WAC 197-10-800, REQUIRES THAT AGENCY RULES INTEGRATING THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ACT OF 1971 BE ADOPTED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FINDS IT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE COMPLIANCE WITH WAC 197-10-800 BY ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING, AS A PERMANENT RULE:

WAC 286-04-050 COMPLIANCE WITH SEPA:

"THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, IN RESPONSE TO RCW 43.21C.120 CALLING FOR REGULATIONS INTEGRATING THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF SEPA, HAS DETERMINED AFTER REVIEWING ITS AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES THAT ALL OF SUCH ACTIVITIES ARE EXEMPT FROM THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 197-710 WAC, AS MORE PARTICULARLY NOTED IN THE EXPRESS EXEMPTION OF 'ALL ACTIVITIES' OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONTAINED IN WAC 197-10-175 (12) (1) AND THE CATEGORICAL EXEMPTIONS REFERENCED IN WAC 197-10-179 (7) (d) (3) AND (8).

PROVIDED THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR SHALL FILE SAID PERMANENT RULE WITH THE CODE REVISER.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III B. Procedural Guidelines - adoption - WAC Changes: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976 entitled, "Procedural Guidelines - Waiver of Retroactivity - Development - 05.06.000 (new)" which also had reference to WAC changes to comply with permanent rule-making procedures (WAC 286-16-080). Mr. Francis reviewed the need to amend both documents (Procedural Guidelines and WACs) to establish the Administrator's authority to grant a Waiver of Retroactivity for development projects as well as acquisition projects, which are already spoken to in both documents.

Mr. Larson asked if this would have an effect on federal funding of a project and was advised in the affirmative -- that such a waiver would automatically preclude federal funding as does a waiver on acquisition projects because the BOR will not grant waivers of retroactivity until such time as an application is in their office. Mr. Bulley then asked what the fiscal impact would be if the policy were invoked approximately six times per year. The one waiver presently pending is for the City of Seattle's Central Area Park. Mrs. Mary McCallum, representative of the City of Seattle, stated the fiscal impact would be \$650,000 in that instance. However, Mr. Francis pointed out that the action taken by an agency would not be a commitment on the part of IAC, but would merely be permission given to the agency to proceed with their development project at their own risk. If the project is then subsequently funded, a funding formula is worked out by the IAC not involving federal monies.

In reply to Mr. Bulley, Mr. Francis said he anticipated the need for waiver of retroactivities for development projects would increase even though there was only one in 1976; 1977 is speculation, but because of the once-a-year funding by the Committee for local agencies in order to take advantage of construction

seasons, there will be an increase in requests for this type of waiver.

Local funding was then discussed. It was brought out that planning, specifications, architectural costs are all retroactively eligible under present guidelines.

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

(1) WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS DETERMINED THAT IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO ADOPT A PERMANENT RULE FOR PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY IN REGARD TO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, THE FOLLOWING IS HEREBY ADOPTED UNDER WAC 286-16-080 - REIMBURSEMENT POLICY:

(2) RETROACTIVE COSTS. DEVELOPMENT. RETROACTIVE COSTS ON A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ARE DEFINED AS THOSE COSTS INCURRED AFTER RECEIPT OF AN APPLICATION BUT PRIOR TO EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT OR PROJECT CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

NEW (a) WHEN IT IS DETERMINED BY AN APPLICANT THAT AN EMERGENCY EXISTS, WHICH MAY JEOPARDIZE THE PROJECT'S PROGRESS AND/OR BENEFITS, THE ADMINISTRATOR MAY, UPON A SHOWING IN WRITING OF NECESSITY FOR ACTION PRIOR TO NORMAL PROCESSING OF THE APPLICATION, GRANT PERMISSION BY WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY, WHICH LETTER WILL NOT BE CONSTRUED AS A QUALITATIVE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT, BUT IF THE PROJECT IS SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED, THE RETROACTIVE COSTS THUS INCURRED WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.

NEW (b) NECESSARY COSTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT INCURRED PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL MAY BE ELIGIBLE, BUT MUST BE SPECIFICALLY LISTED IN THE PROJECT PROPOSAL.

NEW (c) AFTER A PROJECT CONTRACT FOR DEVELOPMENT, WHICH HAS BEEN FUNDED WHOLLY OR PARTIALLY WITH FEDERAL FUNDS HAS BEEN EXECUTED, NO COSTS WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR CONSIDERATION AS RETROACTIVE; EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN WAC 286-16-080 (2) (b), UNLESS THE FEDERAL AGENCY ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL FUNDS HAS ISSUED ITS OWN WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY AS PROVIDED UNDER ITS RULES AND REGULATIONS.

PROVIDED THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR SHALL FILE SAID RULE WITH THE CODE REVISER.

(II) AND, FURTHER, SINCE THE IAC HAS DETERMINED THAT IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO ADOPT PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR BOTH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES TO IMPLEMENT WAC 287-16-080 REIMBURSEMENT POLICY, (2) RETROACTIVE COSTS. DEVELOPMENT AS ADOPTED BY THE IAC ON JUNE 28, 1976, THE FOLLOWING IS HEREBY ADOPTED:

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE - NEW SECTION 05.06.000 WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY:

THE APPLICANT MAY SUBMIT A WRITTEN REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY TO THE ADMINISTRATOR, NOTIFYING HIM OF THE NECESSITY TO ACT PRIOR TO NORMAL PROCESSING OF AN APPLICATION AND GIVE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE REQUESTED ACTION. IF THE REQUEST IS APPROVED, THE RETROACTIVE COSTS WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING ASSISTANCE IF THE PROJECT IS LATER APPROVED BY THE IAC IN THE NORMAL COURSE OF APPLICATION PROCESSING.

A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY IS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION; IT DOES NOT IMPLY A QUALITATIVE APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT. THE COSTS ARE INCURRED AT THE APPLICANT'S RISK AND GRANTING OF THE REQUEST DOES NOT IN ANY WAY OBLIGATE THE IAC OR INSURE APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT.

AN APPLICATION, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, A COPY OF THE APPROPRIATE DEED OR LEASE, A COPY OF THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND THE COST ESTIMATES, MUST BE ON FILE WITH THE IAC AT THE TIME OF CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST FOR THE WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY. A STATEMENT OUTLINING THE WORK TO BE DONE AND THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SAME TO BE ACCOMPLISHED UNDER THE WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY MUST ACCOMPANY THE APPLICATION AND/OR REQUEST FOR THE WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY.

A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNDER ORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES. EXCEPTIONS WILL BE MADE ONLY WHEN IMMEDIATE ACTION IS NECESSARY AND THE TIME NECESSARY TO PROCESS AN APPLICATION WOULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT OPPORTUNITY BEING LOST.

AND, FURTHER, THE ADMINISTRATOR IS DIRECTED TO ADJUST RELATED STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES TO REFLECT NEW SECTION 05.06.000, AND

FURTHER, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS IT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PUBLIC TO GRANT THE ADMINISTRATOR INTERIM AUTHORITY TO REVIEW ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS REQUESTS FOR SUCH A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS PENDING ACTION BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT ITS SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1976 MEETING, AND TO GRANT SUCH REQUESTS AS HE MAY DEEM JUSTIFIED, WITH SUCH INTERIM AUTHORITY TO BE EFFECTIVE FROM MAY 1, 1976 THROUGH AUGUST 15, 1976.

MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE. MR. LARSON VOTED NO; MR. COLE ABSTAINED.

Introductions: Mrs. Brostrom and Mr. Francis introduced additional state and local agency representatives, as well as the following attendees:

Mr. Ralph Mackey, Parks and Recreation Commission member
Mr. William Bush, Parks and Recreation Commission, Planner
Mr. Jan Tveten, Asst. Director, Resources Develop., Parks and Rec. Commission
Mary McCallum, representative of the City of Seattle, Parks and Rec. Dept.
John Couch, Park and Recreation Director, City of Redmond
Mr. Sam Angove, Park and Recreation Director, Spokane County
Mr. Maurice Lundy, Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Resolution: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT

WHEREAS, DR. ADELE ANDERSON, FORMER MEMBER OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PAST TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, DR. ANDERSON SERVED AS CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE DURING 1976; AND

WHEREAS, THE SAID INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HER DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING HER TENURE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO DR. ANDERSON FOR HER SERVICE IN THE FIELD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION WHILE SERVING ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

AND, RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO DR. ANDERSON.

STANLEY E. FRANCIS, ADMINISTRATOR	JOHN S. LARSEN	MICAELA BROSTROM
BERT L. COLE	DONALD MOOS	RALPH W. LARSON
CHARLES H. ODEGAARD	W. A. BULLEY	MICHAEL ROSS
JOHN A. BIGGS		

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

I. C. The Chairman referred to those agenda items requiring action of the Committee which had been held pending a quorum.

Approval of the Minutes:

March 22-23, 1976: IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. ENGLE, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP THAT THE MINUTES OF MARCH 22-23, 1976 BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AS AMENDED ON PAGE 26 BY MRS. ENGLE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

May 10, 1976 Special Meeting: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING MAY 10, 1976, BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

June 11, 1976 Special Meeting: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BULLEY, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING JUNE 11, 1976, BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

I. D. Additions or deletions to the agenda: Mr. Francis advised of the following additions and deletions to the agenda:

Additions: IV. B. BOR Technical Assistance Program
IV. D. 6. State Parks and Rec. Commission, Fort Canby, Waiver of Procedural Guideline
IV. D. 7. King County, Lake Sammamish County Park - Easement

Deletion: IV. 2. a. Department of Game, Gloyd Seeps, WRA

Mr. Bishop asked the chairman to add as the first item under IV NEW BUSINESS, "Salary of the Administrator, IAC". The agenda item numbers were changed accordingly.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. ENGLE, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED BE ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II A. (5) Land and Water Conservation Fund Report: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, "Item A. LWCF-Transition Quarter - July/September 1976." Due to federal fiscal year change from July 1-June 30 to an Oct 1 - Sept. 30 cycle, an additional three months of LWCF monies are available during the 1975-77 biennium in the amount of \$758,310. These transition funds were not anticipated in the 1975-77 biennium budgets and as such are considered "unanticipated receipts".

Mr. Francis stated to secure use of the funds it would be necessary for him to be authorized to request the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management to approve use of the funds.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE IAC BE AUTHORIZED AND DIRECTED TO SUBMIT A FORMAL REQUEST TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF THE BOR TRANSITION PERIOD UNANTICIPATED LWCF MONIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$758,310 (\$379,155 -- IAC OPERATING BUDGET, LOCAL AGENCIES; \$379,155 - STATE AGENCIES - DIVIDED PROPORTIONATELY BETWEEN THE FOUR PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCIES) DURING THE REMAINDER OF THE 1975-77 BIENNIUM.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Francis referred to Item B "LWCF Special Account", stating that any state's funds which are deobligated after the expiration of the three year period of availability, may be reapportioned to the state on the basis of need by the Director of BOR, with proper justification being shown of such need. Any funds accumulated in this account and not reapportioned by the following March 31st will revert to the Secretary's Contingency Fund. Due to the transition period, the year-end notice will indicate a balance in this Special Account as of September 30th rather than June 30th. Total in the fund will be known by September 1976 IAC meeting and will be available for use at that meeting. Mr. Francis noted that as of March 31, 1976 the State of Washington had \$4,161 in this reapportionment account.

Mr. Francis referred to Item C. "LWCF Amendments", reporting on the current status of the LWCF amendments in the Congress. The House version of the LWCF funding level was as follows:

- FY 77 remains at \$300 million
- FY 78 increases to \$450 million
- FY 79 increases to \$650 million
- FY 80 increases to the full \$800 million

A Conference Committee has been appointed to study House and Senate versions to work out differences. In anticipation of dollar increases for 78 and 79 -- both 77-79 Operating Budget and 77-79 Capital Budget reflect the increased apportionments to the State of Washington. Mr. Francis noted that because of termination of Referendum 28 funds in 77-79 at a relatively low level (\$4.0 million for locals; \$5.8 million for state) and Initiative 215 funds, it would appear that almost all state and local projects will need to qualify for LWCF if the LWCF monies are to be fully used during the 1977-79 biennium. State agencies will need to use their maximum amount of LWCF during 75-77 biennium to prevent further compounding of the impact in 1977-79.

III C. Legislative Sub-Committee, IAC:

(1) Legislation: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum dated June 28, 1976 on the "Legislative Program - 1977 - Preliminary". Since Committee members had reviewed this during the past week, he briefly covered the eight items as noted in the memorandum:

- (1) The Marine Recreation Land Act of 1964 - RCW 43.99
- (2) SR 1976-214 - Continuing study of the IAC (Senate Park & Rec. Committee)
- (3) SR 1976-215 - Duplicative effort in parks field (S " " " ")
- (4) State Recreation Trails Systems Act - RCW 67.32
- (5) All-Terrain Vehicle Act - RCW 46.09
- (6) State Scenic, Recreational Rivers Act
- (7) State Recreation and Scenic Highway Act
- (8) New Legislation - A-95 type review mechanism for all projects requesting state funds

Following his review, it was the CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR STAY IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH THE LEGISLATIVE STAFF INVOLVED IN THE CONTINUED STUDY OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE (THE SENATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMITTEE) AND KEEP IAC MEMBERS INFORMED OF THEIR ACTIVITIES.

(2) Future funding of IAC - Bond Issue: Mr. Milt Martin, Assistant Administrator, reported on the status of future funding of the IAC through the bond issue process. Mr. Martin made the following points:

- (a) Meetings have been held with state agencies on regular basis in regard to the bond issue proposal.
- (b) Meetings are being set up with various support groups (Sportsmen's Council, Washington Park Foundation, Port Authority advisory groups, etc.)
- (c) Have met with other state agencies on other types of bond issues -- agencies that might be in concert with this type of funding: Cultural group; historic preservations group; private citizens interested in areas of statewide significance.
- (d) Met with representatives from the Office of the Governor, cultural and historical preservation groups recently. Preliminary discussions on continued funding are to provide a program from the current funding July 1, 1979 for state and local agencies to at least eight or ten years into the future -- possibly 1989 which is the 100th Anniversary of the State's existence and the year in which the federal dollars are to be maximized and terminated. There are hopes that the LWCF program may continue at the end of that twenty-five year period.
- (e) Suggested the bond issue approach be of the same type as that for Washington Futures, perhaps encompassing a "Quality for Life" theme with several bond issues within that framework -- historical preservation, cultural, outdoor recreation, preservation of areas of statewide significance -- with a resource enhancement approach to the funding.
- (f) Draft legislation for outdoor recreation bond issue and the other separate interests thru separate bond issues should be available by August 1976.
- (g) There is thinking that the cultural, historic preservation people may be interested in becoming involved in a program similar to the IAC for their particular endeavors. Could have similar committee arrangement appointed, amount of funds allocated, and distribute those funds through statewide planning and a grant-in-aid approach.
- (h) Workshops are being scheduled with July 7th being the first meeting with cultural and historical preservation groups to explain the IAC program.
- (i) Are moving in direction consistent with previous directions of the TAC and the IAC, and will be looking at a program which may last eight to ten years -- thru to 1989.
- (j) Will have complete package regarding continued funding for the IAC at the September 27-28, 1976 meeting for review of the IAC members.

III C. 2. Policy determinations: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum dated June 28, 1976, "Committee/Administrator Relationships Policy Determination". At the request of the IAC Legislative Sub-Committee on April 30th, the initial draft had been re-drafted for presentation to the full Interagency Committee, incorporating the suggestions and thoughts of the members at the April 30th meeting. Included in the re-draft was an overall statement delineating the responsibility and authority of the IAC Administrator in concert with that of the Committee. Mr. Francis recommended that the second draft be referred to the IAC Legislative Sub-Committee for review and a completed document be submitted to the Interagency Committee for voting purposes in September, 1976.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT THE MEMORANDUM (SECOND DRAFT) DATED JUNE 28, 1976, ENTITLED, "COMMITTEE/ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS - POLICY DETERMINATION" BE REFERRED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AND ACTION, WITH FULL IAC POLICY MANUAL DRAFT TO BE PRESENTED TO THE FULL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT THE SEPTEMBER 26-27, 1976 IAC MEETING.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IIID. Evaluation System: Mr. Francis reviewed memorandum dated June 28, 1976 "Local Project Evaluation System" calling to the Committee's attention the specific items which had been previously discussed by the Interagency Committee at the March 22-23, 1976 meeting, relating to proposed changes to the Evaluation System for local agency projects. There had been at that time expressions of need for change, additions to, or deletions from, further definition for clarity, etc., of the various criterion of the system. IAC staff addressed these expressions internally and discussed them with the Technical Advisory Committee on June 3, 1976. Mr. Francis stated:

- (1) Applications for the September 1976 funding session have been prepared with the present Evaluation System in mind;
- (2) Any major changes or emphasis realignment at this time could create problems for the local agencies; and
- (3) The present system is set up to accomplish the purpose of locating the best projects to fill needs in a community and it would take a complete overhaul of the system to change this emphasis.

The considerations were as follows:

- (1) Need to consider single facilities (new or added on): IAC staff felt A-3 gave adequate points, but there could be bonus question under Section E to give single facilities added competitive standing. IAC staff and TAC did not recommend this, however.
- (2) A-6 - clarification of "site" was given by staff as in the memorandum.
- (3) Aesthetic quality of the sites: In Section B, staff suggested adding "To what degree will the developed project improve the aesthetic qualities of the site?"
- (4) Access - adequate: Item B-2 - staff felt was adequate to cover modes of transportation, and B-6 adequately would cover several entrances, exits, physical barriers, etc.

- (5) Readiness to proceed on a project: B-4 adequately considers this criteria.
- (6) Natural Beauty element: C-2 refers to natural beauty inherent in the site and its surroundings. Both TAC and staff recommended this be deleted in its entirety. (B-1 of the Evaluation System already pertains to aesthetics [beauty element].)
- (7) Boating Access facilities - and boating destination facilities: Staff suggested combining E-1 and E-2 relating to boating access and destination facilities.
- (8) Preservation of Natural Estuaries and preservation of wildlife habitat access: Staff and TAC suggested these be combined for purposes of holding environmentally sensitive areas for preservation without development.
- (9) Special facilities for the handicapped: Staff recommended retaining in the system and define "beyond what is required by law" for the bonus points.
- (10) Phases or staging of projects: Staff recommended adding a new section to E for bonus points dealing with phases or stages of projects, emphasizing the contribution the phase or stage makes to that portion already developed.
- (11) Acquisition criteria and separate development criteria: Though the Committee had asked that this be addressed, staff and the TAC did not discuss this matter since it would require an overall revision to the Evaluation System.
- (12) Land-banking: Likewise, the question of land-banking had not been discussed for the same reason.

Mr. Francis stated the TAC had concurred in the modifications and clarifications as he had outlined for interim use to evaluate projects now in hand for funding in September. However, the TAC felt the entire Evaluation System would need a thorough review in light of the questions being asked, and therefore had appointed an Evaluation System Review Sub-Committee to work with the Administrator and staff to make the Evaluation System more receptive to these several factors. This Committee is chaired by WILLA MYLROIE, with BOB WILDER AND BILL HUTSINPILLER as members. Mr. Francis asked for approval of the above modifications to the Local Agency Evaluation System, and authorization and direction for the Administrator to refine these for purposes of evaluating the project coming before the Committee in September.

Mrs. Engle asked that C-1 wording be changed so that "unique" would not be subject to "degrees of". She objected to the semantics.

Mr. Ross wanted to have recognition and points for joint projects, and that there be maximum use of the park project by those involved in the joint effort. Mr. Francis stated this had already been provided for in the Evaluation System process.

Mr. Ross stated he would like to see some bonus points given to joint project efforts.

The definition of the word "site" was questioned by Mr. Larson - A-6. He asked that the explanation be re-worded omitting the words "site plan".

In response to questions, Mr. Merlin Smith, Chairman of the TAC, stated that group had approved of the modifications as temporary changes until such time as the TAC Evaluation System Sub-Committee could go through the Evaluation System and determine where changes should be made permanently.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO THE LOCAL AGENCY EVALUATION SYSTEM AS OUTLINED IN MEMORANDUM OF STAFF DATED JUNE 28, 1976, BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE; THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR BE AUTHORIZED AND DIRECTED TO REFINE THESE FOR PURPOSES OF USE IN EVALUATING THE PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING CONSIDERATION AT THE SEPTEMBER 1976 IAC MEETING.

MR. ROSS AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE BONUS POINTS ADDED FOR JOINT PROJECTS WITHIN E-6.

Mr. Bishop suggested the Evaluation Sub-Committee of the TAC should determine this type of input. WHEREUPON MR. ROSS WITHDREW HIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

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

Policy Questions re Local Agency Evaluation System: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, which presented 11 policy questions needing IAC Committee determination prior to revising the Local Agency Project Evaluation System to reflect these priorities. Following extensive Committee discussion of this memorandum, the following CONSENSUS WAS REACHED:

- (a) STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO MEET WITH THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE OF THAT GROUP CONCERNING THE 11 QUESTIONS.
- (b) STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO OBTAIN LOCAL AGENCY INPUT IN RELATION TO THESE QUESTIONS, PERHAPS HOLDING A SEMINAR WITH VARIOUS LOCAL AGENCIES.
- (c) FOLLOWING REVIEW OF TAC AND TAC EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE OF THIS INPUT, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WILL BE ADVISED AND HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE MATERIAL GATHERED. (A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE IAC WAS SUGGESTED AS A POSSIBILITY OF REVIEW FOR THIS MATERIAL.)
- (d) IAC STAFF WILL PRESENT STAFF RECOMMENDATION OR STATUS REPORT AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING.

ADDENDUM (See ADDENDUM "B" to these minutes for policy questions.)

"B"

Among those items discussed by the Committee or observed by a Committee member were:

- (1) Mrs. Engle personally desired to have input regarding land-banking.
- (2) She also inquired about maintenance and operation costs. Mr. Francis explained IAC procedures in this regard pointing out that buildings may be renovated thru IAC funds and this would reduce a local agency's maintenance factor in time, but maintenance and operation costs as such are not eligible thru IAC funding.
- (3) Mr. Ross was concerned with energy related factors in acquiring and developing parks and recreation facilities. This factor was not in the Evaluation System

according to Mr. Francis, but could be an item for discussion and resolution.

(4) Mr. Ross then asked if the IAC placed any emphasis on use of the parks and recreation facilities after acquired and developed in relation to the energy situation. It was his feeling perhaps in the future the areas being developed might not receive adequate use for the investment of dollars being put into them due to the energy crisis situation.

(5) Mr. Bulley asked that in the review of the entire Evaluation System there be an answer to his question: What are the local needs versus the statewide needs?

(6) Mr. Moos emphasized that the procedure should be for the Committee itself to establish the Evaluation System policy from staff recommendations and through the type of evaluating process discussed in the foregoing; that staff should not set the policy per se. The determined policy by the Committee is then placed in the WAC system and guidelines of the IAC, or the Evaluation System, whatever the case may be.

III E. IAC 1977-79 Proposed Capital Budget: Mr. Martin referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, "IAC - State Agencies Proposed 1977-79 Biennium Capital Budget". Attached to this summarized memorandum was the 19 page Capital Budget detailed memorandum which had been reviewed by the IAC Fiscal Sub-Committee on June 11, 1976. Briefly, the following proposal was made for the 1977-79 Capital Budget:

STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION	\$ 6,169,786	
DEPARTMENT OF GAME	4,399,875	
DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES	1,784,660	
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1,525,500	
	\$ 13,879,821)
	(d) below = + 2,530,130*) \$16,409,951

- a. \$120,000 will be deleted from the \$14,071,000** for State agencies planning purposes (\$30,000 to each state agency)
- b. 29,179 will be deleted from the \$14,071,000 for the IAC SCORP planning program
- c. 72,000 will be deleted for IAC projected 1% surcharge purposes.
- d. 2,530,130 consists of Agency Reappropriation projections:

\$ 710,000	Department of Natural Resources
254,350	Department of Fisheries
325,830	Department of Game
1,239,950	Parks and Recreation Department

(**\$14,071,000 = estimated available funds)

*as amended
9/27/76
the Committee*

Mrs. Brostrom asked for presentations from the state agencies, advising Mr. Bishop that even though the Fiscal Sub-Committee had reviewed the proposals and determined the dollar figures, the members of the Committee should also have the opportunity of hearing direct input from the state agencies concerned, *since under new procedures this was the Committee's only opportunity for review of the individual projects and the agencies' overall plans.* Fisheries: Mr. Richard Costello presented the Fisheries budget briefly and discussed the deletions which had been made. The Committee opted not to view slides of the Capital Budget program in the interests of time.

Mr. Ross asked the Chairman why the Fiscal Sub-Committee Chairman was not making the overall budget report to the Committee; that normally this is the procedure followed by committees having given the responsibility to a sub-committee for review and analysis of a given problem or situation. Mr. Bishop also felt the Committee should operate with the Fiscal Sub-Committee's determinations. Following explanation by Mr. Martin as to the procedure followed in outlining the budget for review and analysis of the Fiscal Sub-Committee, Mr. Bishop gave a detailed report on the findings of the Fiscal Sub-Committee. Mr. Ross thanked Mr. Bishop and suggested that in the future the IAC sub-committees should present the reports and findings to the overall Committee since they are responsible for their actions, not the IAC staff.

Mr. Larson complimented the Fiscal Sub-Committee and IAC staff on their outstanding work in compiling the 1977-79 Capital Budget.

Mr. Martin referred to pages (10), (11), and (12) of the memorandum indicating the three different areas of criteria and evaluation used in the analysis of the budget. He expressed his trust in the state agencies' own analysis of their budgets and noted the cooperation received by staff representatives of the four agencies in making additions and/or deletions thereto. He alluded to the conformance with the goals and objectives of outdoor recreation, specific components which are taken into consideration by staff, and noted the staff evaluation process which takes place in compiling the capital budget.

Parks and Recreation Commission: Mrs. Lynn Martin, Capital Budget Coordinator, Parks and Recreation Commission, called upon Mr. Thomas Garrett, Chairman of the State Parks and Recreation Commission, and Jan Tveten for the State Parks' Capital Budget presentation. Mr. Garrett expressed his confidence in the budget and noted it had received consideration of the Parks and Recreation Commission members. He stated there had been an increase of 329% in visitor use of the state parks over the past approximately twelve year period. State Parks is attempting to relate its parks and recreation facilities to the changing needs of the people, with all-terrain vehicle activities being one of these changing needs. On behalf of the Commission, he offered cooperation in working with the other state agencies to develop a bond proposal for continuation of funding for park and recreation facilities. Mr. Tveten commented on the funding program in the capital budget for State Parks.

Following State Parks' presentation, Mr. Bishop asked which alternative the Park and Recreation Commission members would favor in obtaining a bond proposal: (1) Through the legislative process or (2) through a campaign - referendum - as has been done in the past? Mr. Garrett replied the Commission would support either of these alternatives, but that the latter would be preferable since it would be possible to obtain the support of interested groups and associations.

Mr. Ross asked whether the Commission would support the concept of a large state agency encompassing Game, Parks, DNR, and those involved in natural resources or related land oriented matters. Mr. Garrett stated the Commission did not believe in super-agencies per se, but preferred a more partnership type of arrangement with the goal of state agencies working together to provide for the needs of the people in the recreational facilities field. Larger agencies, he felt, tend to become bureaucratic and it is difficult for decisions to be made on vital issues.

In reply to Mr. Ross, Mr. Garrett also noted the maintenance and operation costs of State Parks has always been a problem, but it has been possible to separate

the operating and maintenance aspects from the capital concern through the legislative budgetary process. He noted several joint projects which State Parks had assisted in funding: Luther Burbank, Mercer Slough, etc., and also commented on the legislative support given in relation to charging of fees for certain camping and recreational activities.

Department of Natural Resources: Prior to reviewing the DNR budget, Mr. Martin called to the Committee's attention that the Department had "saved" \$455,000 from its 1973-75 biennium completed capital projects and from the current biennium projects since some projects could not be completed for various technical reasons. He asked the Committee to consider including this amount in the 1977-79 Capital Budget Program and provide that sum to the DNR for three new projects. Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT

THE \$455,000 IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AS "SAVINGS" FROM THE 1973-75 BIENNIUM COMPLETED CAPITAL PROJECTS AND FROM THE CURRENT BIENNIUM PROJECTS WHEREIN FUNDS WERE PROVIDED BUT PROJECTS CANNOT BE COMPLETED FOR VARIOUS TECHNICAL REASONS, BE INCLUDED AS AN INCREASE TO THE IAC STATE AGENCIES 1977-79 CAPITAL BUDGET PROGRAM (THEREBY INCREASING THE BUDGET LEVEL BY \$455,000);

AND, FURTHER, THAT THIS AMOUNT BE OFFSET BY PROVIDING FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$455,000 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THREE NEW PROJECTS WHICH WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' 1977-79 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST;

AND, FURTHER, THAT THIS CONCEPT AND METHOD OF HANDLING SAVINGS OF THE PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCIES IN THE FUTURE APPLY TO ALL OF THESE STATE AGENCIES (DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF GAME, PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES) IN LIKE MANNER.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Martin made the following points about the Capital Budget:

- (1) There were 148 projects and programs within the budget; some involving as many as two or three additional projects or parcels within a program;
- (2) 60% are acquisition projects and 40% development, providing an additional 7,860 acres to the outdoor recreation inventory in the state;
- (3) All of the projects will of necessity need to be funded 50% with Land and Water Conservation monies due to the limited amount of Initiative 215 and Referendum 28 funds for matching.
- (4) Region 10: The Committee had asked during the March 1976 meeting why there had been no projects recommended for funding in Region 10. Following IAC staff meetings and consultations with state agencies, it had been determined that there were sufficient recreational opportunities in that region providing various types of recreation from IAC funded projects as well as other sources.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ADOPT THE 1977-79 IAC CAPITAL BUDGET FOR SUBMISSION TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT BY AUGUST 13, 1976, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$13,879,821, PROGRAMMED FOR THE INDIVIDUAL STATE AGENCIES AS FOLLOWS:

(see next page)

STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION	\$ 6,169,786	
DEPARTMENT OF GAME	4,399,875	
DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES	1,784,660	
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1,525,500	
	\$ 13,879,821) \$ 16,409,951
(d) below =	+ 2,530,130*)

WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT AVAILABLE ESTIMATED FUNDING CONSISTS OF:

1975-77 Supplemental Budget Funds	\$ 1,675,000
LWCF A. Transition Funds - FY, Change	379,000
B. FY 1978 - Adjusted Estimate	2,299,300
C. FY 1979 - Adjusted Estimate	3,167,700
Referendum 28	5,800,000
Initiative 215	750,000
	\$ 14,071,000

AND FURTHER THAT

- a. \$ 120,000 will be deleted from the \$14,071,000 for State Agencies planning purposes (\$30,000 to each state agency)
- b. 29,179 will be deleted from the \$14,071,000 for the IAC SCORP planning program
- c. 72,000 will be deleted for IAC projected 1% surcharge purposes.
- d.* 2,530,130 consists of Agency Reappropriation projects:

\$ 710,000	Department of Natural Resources
254,350	Department of Fisheries
325,830	Department of Game
1,239,950	Parks and Recreation Commission

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE PREVIOUS MOTION AS PASSED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE ADDITIONAL FUNDING OF \$455,000 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES WILL APPLY; AND THAT THIS CONCEPT AND METHOD OF HANDLING SAVINGS OF THE PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCIES IN THE FUTURE WILL APPLY TO ALL OF THESE STATE AGENCIES (DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF GAME, PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES) IN THEIR "SAVINGS" IN LIKE MANNER.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mrs. Brostrom asked the Committee members whether they would like to continue the IAC session through the evening or schedule a breakfast meeting for review of the Operating Budget, taking care of the other agenda items until 6:00 o'clock. The Committee opted to reconvene following a break and continue the meeting through the evening.

(Reconvened at 5:05 p.m.)

V. Administrator's Report: Mr. Francis reported on several items:

- (1) State Audit: Presently in process at the IAC. Results will be known in a few weeks.
- (2) Northwest State Liaison Officers Workshop, May 2-3-4, 1976: Mr. Francis, Mr.

Martin and Mr. Moore attended this meeting concerning grant-in-aid and State Liaison Officer matters. Had opportunity also to meet John Crutcher, new Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on May 5th in Seattle with local agency representatives present.

(3) Park dedications: Clark County, LaConner Marina, and DNR McLean Creek Trail dedications were held and attended by staff.

(4) Association of Washington Counties, June 16-17-18, Vancouver: Mr. Martin and Mr. Pelton attended the AWC meeting and participated in panel discussion on communications between state agencies and the Washington State Legislature.

(5) Association of Washington Cities, June 16-17-18, Spokane: Mr. Francis and Mr. Moore attended the AWC meeting in Spokane and served on a resource forum panel.

(6) Agency is presently recruiting for a Planner II to replace Mr. David Redekop who resigned to return to Canada, and an RRS III to replace Mr. Robert Lemcke, who transferred to the Department of Ecology.

(7) Announced there would be an Annual Meeting of Forest Service and National Park Service July 14-15-16 at Ocean Shores, to be attended by Mr. Pelton.

(8) Announced National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) Annual Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts to be attended by Mr. Francis in latter August and first part of September.

(9) Announced National Recreation and Park Association Annual Meeting in October 1976 in Boston, Massachusetts with Mr. Martin and Mr. Pelton scheduled to attend.

(10) Computer program: Explained the new computer program which has been set up to track projects by districts within the state, by fund source, etc. Computer document was sent to all eight of the Congressional delegation from Washington State; replies received were complimentary. Is available to Washington State legislators also.

Following Mr. Francis' report, Mr. Ross asked if it would be possible to recruit a female professional in one of the vacant positions on staff. Mr. Francis advised one had been interviewed, but had accepted another position elsewhere.

Mrs. Brostrom asked the Committee if it would be permissible for her to ask former Committee member Madeline Lemere to represent the IAC at the opening of Seattle's Freeway Park on July 4th, since Mrs. Lemere had been instrumental in forming the idea for such a park and was interested in attending. Committee members agreed this would be appropriate.

IV. A. Salary of Administrator: Mr. Bishop noted that all state employees will be receiving adjustments in salaries on July 1, 1976 and that the Administrator of the IAC as well as all state agency directors and administrators would be receiving an increase at that time through the State Salary Committee. He asked that the Chairman of the IAC authorize implementation of the salary for the Administrator as set by the State Salary Committee as soon as this decision is communicated to her by the Governor, to be effective July 1, 1976. *It would be recommended that the Administrator of the IAC as well as all state agency directors and administrators would be receiving an increase at that time through the State Salary Committee. He asked that the Chairman of the IAC authorize implementation of the salary for the Administrator as set by the State Salary Committee as soon as this decision is communicated to her by the Governor, to be effective July 1, 1976. IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE CHAIRMAN HANDLE THIS MATTER AS OUTLINED BY MR. BISHOP.*

IV B. Technical Advisory Committee appointments consideration: Following the review

by Mr. Francis of memorandum dated July 28, 1976, concerning appointments to the Technical Advisory Committee, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT

THE FOLLOWING APPOINTMENTS TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ARE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE:

1. REAPPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM FEARN, PARK AND RECREATION DIRECTOR, CITY OF SPOKANE - TERM TO EXPIRE MAY 22, 1979
2. APPOINTMENT OF MARTIN CARTY, PARK AND RECREATION DIRECTOR, COWLITZ COUNTY, TERM TO EXPIRE MAY 22, 1979

IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT THE WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CITIES AND THE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON COUNTIES HAD RECOMMENDED QUALIFIED PERSONS FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR PRIOR TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. C. BOR Technical Assistance Program: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum dated June 28, 1976, concerning the BOR's Technical Assistance Program. He explained the program and the coordination of the program between the BOR Regional Director, himself, and the respective staffs. In answer to an inquiry from Mrs. Brostrom, Mr. Lundy stated that local agencies could in no way receive LWCF funding from BOR without going through the Interagency Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT

WHEREAS, FUNDS TO MEET THE DEMANDS FOR ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES ARE NEVER SUFFICIENT, AND

WHEREAS, THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS AN ACTIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO OBTAIN DONATIONS OF LAND AND MONEY, FROM PRIVATE GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS, FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES TO USE IN MEETING THESE OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS, AND,

WHEREAS, THE ABOVE BOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM HAS BEEN COORDINATED BETWEEN THE NORTHWEST REGIONAL BOR DIRECTOR AND THE IAC ADMINISTRATOR, AND IS PROGRESSING ON A COOPERATIVE BASIS,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF SUCH A COOPERATIVE EFFORT AND DOES HEREBY ENDORSE THE BOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO OBTAIN DONATIONS OF LAND AND/OR MONEY FROM PRIVATE GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS TO AID STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN MEETING OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV D. Project Changes: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Administration Section, advised the Committee there were nine memoranda involving changes to projects.

1. The first three related to project contract reinstatements:

(a) City of Olympia, Woodruff Park, IAC #73-063D: Effect of this time extension was to allow the expense of the final payment to be eligible for reimbursement up to the IAC approved project cost. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON THAT,

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF OLYMPIA'S PROJECT CONTRACT HAS EXPIRED ON THE WOODRUFF PARK PROJECT CONTRACT (#73-063D), AND

WHEREAS THE COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT IS PRESENTLY BEING PURSUED BY THE LOCAL SPONSORING AGENCY, AND

WHEREAS, TO REINSTATE THE CONTRACT ON A RETROACTIVE BASIS TO THE DATE OF EXPIRATION (DECEMBER 31, 1975), TOGETHER WITH A TIME EXTENSION TO JUNE 30, 1976 WOULD PROVIDE FOR COMPLETION AND QUALIFY COSTS INCURRED FOR IAC REIMBURSEMENT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WOODRUFF PARK (73-063D) PROJECT CONTRACT BE REINSTATED RETROACTIVELY TO DECEMBER 31, 1975 AND BE EXTENDED TO JUNE 30, 1976, AND TO AUTHORIZE AS ELIGIBLE COSTS, THOSE COSTS INCURRED FROM THE DATE OF EXPIRATION, DECEMBER 31, 1975 TO JUNE 30, 1976, AND

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCESS THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO EFFECT THIS AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(b) Department of Game, 71-73 Boat Launch Development, IAC #72-609D: The extension will allow the remaining unexpended funds in the amount of \$41,500 associated with the two remaining sites in the Project Contract to be eligible for reimbursement up to the total approved project cost.

Mr. Ross questioned Mr. Taylor about the Department of Game's Boat Launch projects, on two points: (1) Would it be possible to remove the two sites not completed and thus close the project out? (2) Were the sites good sites and worthy of extension for completion? Mr. Taylor replied it would be possible to remove the sites, but the Game Department would then need to resubmit them for completion, and it was preferable to extend the project and complete the sites for public use. Also, the sites were considered good sites and necessary for completion having been approved by the Committee following submission by the Department of Game in 1972 (with construction starting 1973). Mr. Ross felt three years was a long time for projects to be in construction or development stage, and if the Department of Game was having problems in completing them, maybe the Committee should delete them.

Following further discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME 71-73 BOAT LAUNCH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CONTRACT (IAC #72-609D) EXPIRED, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT IS PRESENTLY BEING PURSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND IT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE STATE TO REINSTATE THIS EXPIRED CONTRACT ON A RETROACTIVE BASIS FROM THE DATE OF EXPIRATION TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1976, AND TO AUTHORIZE AS ELIGIBLE COSTS, THOSE COSTS INCURRED FROM THE DATE OF

EXPIRATION JULY 1, 1975 TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1976,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME 71-73 BOAT LAUNCH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, IAC #72--609D, BE REINSTATED RETROACTIVELY TO JULY 1, 1975, AND BE EXTENDED TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1976,

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCESS THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO EFFECT THIS AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(c) Parks and Recreation Commission, Tolmie Park, IAC #71-503D: The extension will allow the remaining unexpended funds associated with the remaining landscaping work in the Project Contract to be eligible for reimbursement up to the total approved project cost. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT

WHEREAS, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, TOLMIE STATE PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CONTRACT (IAC #71-503D) HAS EXPIRED, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT IS PRESENTLY BEING PURSUED BY THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND IT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE STATE TO REINSTATE THIS EXPIRED CONTRACT ON A RETROACTIVE BASIS FROM THE DATE OF EXPIRATION TO AUGUST 31, 1976,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, TOLMIE STATE PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, IAC #71-503D, BE REINSTATED RETROACTIVELY TO JUNE 30, 1975, AND BE EXTENDED TO AUGUST 31, 1976, AND TO AUTHORIZE AS ELIGIBLE COSTS, THOSE COSTS INCURRED FROM THE DATE OF EXPIRATION (JUNE 30, 1975) TO AUGUST 31, 1976.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCESS THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO EFFECT THIS AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Town of Mesa, Poe, Park, IAC #74-072D, Cost Increase: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, and explained the 17.9% increase (\$3,581.33) being requested by the Town of Mesa for the Poe Park concerned construction of restroom facilities which had exceeded estimated cost. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON JUNE 17, 1975, APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF MESA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CITY PARK, PROJECT #74-072D, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF MESA, POE PARK PROJECT, WAS APPROVED FOR \$20,000, WITH RESTROOM FACILITIES ESTIMATED TO COST \$15,000, AND

WHEREAS, BIDS RECEIVED AND ACCEPTED BY THE CITY TOTALED \$3,581.33 OVER THE APPROVED TOTAL COST, AND

WHEREAS, THE TOWN OF MESA IN GOOD FAITH AND BY AUSTERE BUDGETING ATTEMPTED TO KEEP THE COST WITHIN BUDGET LIMITATIONS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE CITY OF MESA FOR A COST INCREASE OF \$3,581.33 FOR THE POE PARK PROJECT (#74-072D) IS APPROVED INCREASING THE TOTAL PROJECT COST FROM \$20,000 TO \$23,581.33 AND THE IAC SHARE FROM \$15,000 TO \$17,686, AND THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. City of Redmond, Grass Lawn Park, IAC #74-060A, Cost Increase: Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, called upon Mr. John Couch, Park and Recreation Director, City of Redmond, for his comments. Mr. Couch verified that the indicated increase of \$4,300 over the adjusted appraised value is considered to be the fair market value predicted by (1) a 1% per month increase in property value from September 1975, to June 1976; and (2) the appraiser's failure to give adequate value to various accessories to the dwelling. Following explanation of the memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE THAT

WHEREAS, ON MAY 3, 1974, THE IAC APPROVED THE CITY OF REDMOND'S GRASS LAWN PARK PROJECT FOR THE ACQUISITION OF APPROXIMATELY 28 ACRES FOR A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$464,800, (75% REFERENDUM 28 - \$348,600), AND

WHEREAS, A COST INCREASE OF APPROXIMATELY 4% WAS GRANTED ADMINISTRATIVELY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PARCEL ONE (1) IN AUGUST, 1974, INCREASING THE TOTAL PROJECT COST TO \$485,800 (75% REF. 28 - \$364,350), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF REDMOND HAS ACQUIRED PARCEL TWO (2) FOR \$46,200, \$4,200 (10%) ABOVE THE ADJUSTED APPRAISED VALUE OF \$42,000 AFTER TWO YEARS OF NEGOTIATIONS, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF REDMOND HAS REQUESTED A \$9,200 COST INCREASE TOWARDS THE PROJECT BASED ON THE ACTUAL COST OF ACQUISITION FOR PARCEL TWO (2), AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS DETERMINED THAT AN INCREASE FROM \$37,000 TO \$42,000 (14%) TO BE THE FAIR MARKET VALUE FOR PARCEL TWO (2) IS AN ACCEPTABLE FAIR MARKET VALUE, AND

WHEREAS, THE VALUE OF THE DONATION VALUE TO BE UTILIZED AS A PORTION OF THE CITY'S MATCHING SHARE WOULD BE INCREASED BY \$1,667,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, THAT THE CITY OF REDMOND'S GRASS LAWN PARK (#74-060A) TOTAL PROJECT COST BE INCREASED FROM \$485,800 TO \$490,133 AND THE IAC'S PARTICIPATION TO \$367,560 (REF. 28), AND THE ADMINISTRATOR AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. City of Lacey, Hicks Lake, IAC #75-044A, Project Withdrawal: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, and advised it was not possible for the City of Lacey to negotiate the acquisition of the Gwinwood Church Parcel within the project, and thus the City was requesting withdrawal of the entire project. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY THAT

WHEREAS, ON JUNE 17, 1975, THE IAC APPROVED THE CITY OF LACEY HICKS PARK PROJECT

(IAC #75-044A) FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$319,000 FOR 75% FUNDING (\$239,250) FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, REFERENDUM 28 AND INITIATIVE 215 FUND ACCOUNTS, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO SUCCESSFULLY NEGOTIATE THE ACQUISITION OF A SIGNIFICANT PARCEL WITHIN THE PROJECT, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF LACEY HAS REQUESTED THAT THE PROJECT BE WITHDRAWN,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY WITHDRAWS THE CITY OF LACEY HICKS LAKE ACQUISITION PROJECT AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO NULLIFY PROJECT CONTRACT #75-044A BETWEEN THE CITY OF LACEY AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, AND TO WITHDRAW LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, BOR, PROJECT AGREEMENT #53-00306 FROM THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5. Parks and Recreation Commission, Green River Gorge, Jellum IV, IAC #75-505A, Cost Increase: Mr. Ron Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, and explained the need for a cost increase of \$6,935, 14% over the original approved project cost in the GRG Jellum IV project due to increase in appraised costs of certain property within the project. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP THAT,

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON JUNE 17, 1975, APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION FOR THE GREEN RIVER GORGE, JELLUM IV, PROJECT #75-505A, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY IN NEGOTIATING THE PURCHASE OF THE LAST REMAINING PARCEL IN THE ABOVE REFERENCED PROJECT AT THE ORIGINAL APPRAISED VALUE AND IT WAS DEEMED NECESSARY TO AUTHORIZE A SECOND APPRAISAL, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REVIEW APPRAISER HAS CONCURRED WITH THE MOST RECENT APPRAISED VALUE OF \$18,600 FOR THE PARCEL IN QUESTION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, THAT AN INCREASE IN THE TOTAL COST OF THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S GREEN RIVER GORGE, JELLUM IV PROJECT (IAC #75-505A) BE APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,935 (\$3,467.50 - REF. 28, \$3,467.50 - LWCF) CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR 50% OF THE REQUESTED COST INCREASE;

AND, FURTHER, THE REVISED FUNDING FIGURES APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>REFERENDUM 28</u>	<u>LWCF</u>
\$ 55,050	\$ 27,525	% 27,525

AND, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

6. State Parks and Recreation Commission, Fort Canby, IAC #71-504D, Request for Guideline Waiver: Mr. Francis presented the information on the project as contained in memorandum of June 28, 1976:

(1) State Parks had negotiated with the State Highway Dept. to have paving of lots, trails, and road to the interpretive center on this project done in conjunction with the other major highway work being done in Pacific County. This resulted in a savings of \$23,350.

(2) Under provisions of the State Standard Specifications, when State Parks deletes a major item from the contract, it is required to negotiate a settlement with the contractor and is required to pay the negotiated settlement -- \$5,000.

(3) This had been interpreted by the Assistant Attorney General of the IAC to be a penalty for withdrawing a major element from the contract, and required waiving of Procedural Guideline 05.05.000 (18), which stated that fines and penalties are ineligible costs.

Mr. Francis then asked Mrs. Lynn Martin for further information. Mrs. Martin corrected the figure of \$5,000 to \$8,707.50 as the cost of the negotiated settlement -- or a savings of \$19,642.50. IAC staff had not yet been advised of the new cost figure. Mr. Charles Murphy, Asst. Atty. General, when asked for his opinion, stated waivers of this type had not been granted in previous years, but in this instance the benefits would assist the public and a unique project would be available for use by the public -- therefore he recommended Committee approval of the waiver in this specific instance.

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

WHEREAS, WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS ACTED IN GOOD FAITH TO DEVELOP FORT CANBY IN A TIMELY MANNER, AND

WHEREAS, WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION DID LET A CONTRACT FOR PAVING OF PARKING LOTS, TRAILS AND ROAD TO THE INTERPRETIVE CENTER FOR \$51,975, AND SUBSEQUENTLY WAS ABLE TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE WASHINGTON STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME WORK FOR \$23,625, REPRESENTING A SAVINGS OF \$28,350, AND

WHEREAS, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE STATE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS WHICH GOVERN THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT, THE WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION MUST, AND HAS, NEGOTIATED A SETTLEMENT OF \$8,707.50 WITH THE ORIGINAL CONTRACTOR, AND WHEREAS, IAC STATE AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE 05.05.000 (18) - INELIGIBLE COSTS - FINES AND PENALTIES - HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO PROHIBIT PAYMENT OF SUCH A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT AS A PENALTY,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT STATE AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE 05.05.000 (18) - INELIGIBLE COSTS - FINES AND PENALTIES, IS HEREBY WAIVED IN RECOGNITION OF THE NET SAVINGS TO THE PAVING ELEMENT OF THE FORT CANBY PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$19,642.50, AND

FURTHER, THAT SUCH ACTION IS LIMITED TO THIS SPECIFIC INSTANCE AND SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED AS SETTING A PRECEDENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

7. King County, Lake Sammamish R. IV, IAC #70-008A, Utility Easement: Mr. Ron Bailey, Project Manager, outlined the need to grant a utility easement to King County as noted in memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976. It was determined the easement would have no impact on the recreation use of the site and did not constitute a conversion of use. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT WHEREAS, THE COUNTY OF KING HAS REQUESTED APPROVAL BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO GRANT A UTILITY EASEMENT THROUGH THE SAMMAMISH RIVER IV PROJECT (#70-008A), AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE GRANTING OF SAID EASEMENT OVER/THROUGH THE MENTIONED PARK SITE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONVERSION OF USE INASMUCH AS THE EASEMENT IS LOCATED IN AN AREA WHERE NO DEVELOPMENT IS ANTICIPATED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT KING COUNTY'S REQUEST TO GRANT A SANITARY SEWER LINE EASEMENT OVER/THROUGH THE SAMMAMISH RIVER PARK BE APPROVED WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE EASEMENT DOCUMENT STATE THAT THE COUNTY OF KING WILL RETAIN CONTROL OVER THE SURFACE AREA TO ASSURE MINIMAL IMPACT ON THE RECREATIONAL USES DURING INITIAL CONSTRUCTION AND IN FUTURE MAINTENANCE AND/OR REPAIR WORK ON THE SEWER LINE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV C. 1. Administratively Approved State Agency Projects: Mr. Moore reported the following Dept. of Natural Resources projects had been administratively approved consistent with the State Agency Capital Budget Project MASTER LIST - 1975-77:

- (1) Toonerville, #76-705D: \$32,650 (LWCF \$16,325/Ref. 28 \$16,325).
Development of four primitive camp units and two picnic units on 5.7 acre parcel along Tahuya River in Tahuya MUA, Mason County.
- (2) Twin Lakes, #76-706D: \$46,446 (LWCF - \$23,223/Ref. 28 - \$23,223).
Development of six primitive camp units and three picnic units on a 12.6 acre parcel on Twin Lakes in Tahuya MUA, Mason County.
- (3) Upper Clearwater, #76-707D: \$23,854 (LWCF \$11,927/Ref. 28 - \$11,927)
Development of 7 primitive camp units and two picnic units on an 11 acre parcel along Clearwater River, Jefferson County. Provide access and facilities for fishermen and the general public.
- (4) Hoh Oxbow, #76-708D: \$32,890 (LWCF \$16,445/Ref. 28 - \$16,445).
Development of five primitive camp units and two picnic units on 15 acre parcel along Hoh River, Jefferson Co., providing access and facilities for fishermen and general public.

IV 2. Department of Game: (a) Gloyd Seeps, WRA - deleted.

Mr. Eugene Leach, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, and reported on:

(b) Wenatchee River, Acquisition - Acquire approximately 1.2 acre parcel along Wenatchee River for access to river, Chelan County, near Peshastin, \$3,600, Ref. 28.

Mr. Ron Taylor referred to memorandum of staff and reported on:

(c) Fiorito Lakes, Dev. 77-602D: Develop project for access to upper/lower Fiorito Lakes, Kittitas Co., near Ellensburg, \$20,405 Ref. 28; \$20,405 Init. 215

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

WHEREAS, THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME ARE 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 HEREBY APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNTS LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

FIORITO LAKE DEVELOPMENT	REF. 28	\$ 20,405	LWCF	\$ 20,405	=	\$ 40,810
WENATCHEE RIVER-HIGHWAYS	REF. 28	3,600			=	3,600
					TOTAL	\$ 44,410

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. C. 3. Department of Natural Resources, Dougan Creek Dev. 77-705D: Mr. Ron Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976, presenting the proposal for development of a camp and picnic area on Dougan Creek, Skamania County, \$42,322. Mr. O'Donnell replied to questions of Mr. Ross as to estimated use and control of the site after it is developed. An additional DNR employee will be added to Yacolt area to assist in enforcement and maintenance & operations of the area. Mr. Larson pointed out there were steelhead spawning in the creek near that particular area and expressed his concern with concentrations of people at that locale. A density study recently completed for the area was mentioned by Mr. O'Donnell, who stated perhaps DNR would adjust its plans in site areas should it be necessary. The impact on fishing will be taken into consideration. Mr. Ross then asked that this project be set over for consideration in September. Mr. O'Donnell stated there was an available crew to start on the actual construction, and if delayed, the cost would rise, and crews might not be available later on. It was DNR's feeling that providing adequate facilities would help control the situation better rather than ignoring the overnight camping which is going on now. Mr. Ross felt the input from a public hearing should be known before proceeding with this project. He was informed that any substantial changes in the project would have to come back to the Committee for approval anyway. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY THAT

WHEREAS, THE DOUGAN CREEK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IS FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS DETERMINED THAT THE INCREASE IN THE PROJECT COST DUE TO INFLATION, HIGHER DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS THAN ORIGINALLY WERE ANTICIPATED, AND THE INCLUSION OF THE COST OF THE YACOLT MULTIPLE-USE AREA COMPREHENSIVE RECREATION PLAN, IS REASONABLE, JUSTIFIED AND WITHIN THE INTENT OF THE PROJECT AS ORIGINALLY

PROPOSED FOR THE CAPITAL BUDGET PURPOSES,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HEREBY APPROVE THE DOUGAN CREEK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT LISTED UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

DOUGAN CREEK REF. 18 \$8,564.14 REF. 28 \$12,596.86 LWCF \$21,161.00

TOTAL COST: \$ 42,322

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III F. IAC 1977-79 Proposed Operating Budget: The Chairman delegated Mr. Bishop to present the IAC 1977-79 Proposed Operating Budget. Complete operating budget details were outlined in the memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1976 within the kit material. A total of \$1,074,160 was being requested. Mr. Bishop noted:

- (1) Init. 215 funds are used for the Operating Budget of the IAC; therefore, the IAC Fiscal Sub-Committee had carefully reviewed the budget to safeguard utilization of 215 monies by offsetting to the degree it was possible to relate to purposes for which Init. 215 is to be used (boater-oriented projects).
- (2) The Fiscal Sub-Committee reviewed the budget on April 5, May 10 and June 11, 1976. A request for staff increase of three persons was made by the Administrator; the Fiscal Sub-Committee felt the duties and responsibilities of two of the positions could be incorporated into the functions of one additional staff person, while also authorizing a second Planner position. Thus, the Administrator had been asked to delete one of his proposed positions.

The Fiscal Sub-Committee had asked that the travel budget be pared; that the staff explore reductions in travel. This has been done and had been incorporated into the budget. *reflected to a certain extent in the*

(4) The completed Operating Budget proposal must stand the scrutiny and analysis of the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management. Staff had thoroughly reviewed the budget and, in fact, ~~it was actually an efficiency study of the entire operating procedures of the IAC.~~ *did an admirable job almost as their operations as a part of this operating budget*

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROBS, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE THAT THE 1977-79 IAC OPERATING BUDGET AS APPROVED BY THE FISCAL SUB-COMMITTEE BE ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.

Discussion followed. Mr. Larson questioned the increase in Personal Service Contracts. Mr. Pelton outlined the various studies required of the IAC in relation to ATV, boating, etc. Mr. Larson then asked how the Administrator could justify a 40% increase in travel. Mr. Francis outlined the travel of staff required for operation of IAC business, especially that in relation to the Project Administration Section. Mr. Larson then warned the Administrator that such an increase would need adequate justification to be approved through the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management and the State Legislature. The budget review process was then discussed.

Mr. Martin informed the Committee the budget would be sent to the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management by the middle of August; to the Governor by November; and on December 20th, it would be submitted to the Washington State Legislature within the Governor's Budget Proposal for 1977-79.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON MR. ROSS' MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND ADOPTS THE 1977-79 OPERATING BUDGET OF THE IAC IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,074,160 AS PRESENTED IN MEMORANDUM OF STAFF DATED JUNE 28, 1976, FOR SUBMISSION TO THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT ON AUGUST 13, 1976, WITH ESTIMATED FUNDING FROM:

BOR SURCHARGES	\$ 125,124)	
BOR PLANNING GRANT	58,385)	
INITIATIVE 215	746,000)	\$ 1,074,160
ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE FUND	115,218)	
STATE GENERAL FUND	29,433)	

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Adjournment: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP THAT THE MEETING OF JUNE 28, 1976 OF THE IAC BE ADJOURNED AT 6:35 P.M.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Committee Tour: Mrs. Brostrom announced there would be an IAC Committee tour on Tuesday, June 29th for citizen members and any others who might wish to participate. IAC funded parks in Lacey, Olympia and the Tumwater areas would be visited.

RATIFIED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE *as amended by Committee*

ON 9/27/76

Micaela Brostrom
MICAELA BROSTROM, CHAIRMAN

DRAFT - SAMPLE LETTER - ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE USE OF PROPERTY

Dear (Agency ATV Coordinator):

I am the owner of the following described property, and I am willing to consider the possibility of negotiating with (Agency) to allow All Terrain Vehicle Use of the property. The (Agency) has my permission to include said property in their ATV inventory. I understand this agreement in no way obligates me to allow ATV use of my property but only indicates my willingness to consider such use.

Property Description:

Acreage:

Sincerely yours,

Land Owner

Policy questions needing IAC Committee determination:

- (1) Emphasis on local needs or on statewide needs?
- (2) Emphasis on acquisition or development or equally important?
- (3) Does the Committee wish to allow and/or promote "land banking -- without development within a reasonable time (3-5 years)? (Land banking vs. development.)
- (4) Does the Committee wish to have developed separate evaluation systems for acquisition and development projects, but on an equally weighted basis so the end result is a valid ranking by final score results?
- (5) Does the Committee wish to place more emphasis on urban and inner city needs, than on rural, small town or city needs?
- (6) Does the Committee wish to give equal emphasis to a phase of a project as to a total project?
- (7) Does the Committee wish to give emphasis to single facilities, i.e., tennis courts, or horseshoe pits, or a restroom, etc. - equal to that of full development of a park?
- (8) Does the Committee wish to have the entire park system and its facilities of the applicant considered in relation to voids -- as represented by either single facilities or phases?
- (9) What emphasis does the Committee wish to place on partial redevelopment, renovation, or single facilities or elements, i.e., irrigation systems, in relation to full development?
- (10) What emphasis should be placed on reduction in m/o costs, increased participation, as result of (8) above?
- (11) What emphasis should be given to outside impact on the community by non-residents?