

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
TUMWATER, WASHINGTON

CONFERENCE CALL

8:30 a.m.

October 14, 1976

Fiscal Sub-Committee - Micaela Brostrom  
Warren Bishop  
W. A. Bulley

With: Stanley E. Francis, Administrator

SUBJ: LWCF - Additional funds - OPPFM decision in re

Mr. Francis outlined the situation arising through conversations with the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management (Carl Wieland) concerning the additional Land and Water Conservation Funds \$2.4 million. Noted the motion as passed at the Sept. 27, 1976 IAC meeting:

"BASED UPON THE PROJECTIONS OF FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS FOR THE NEXT BIENNIUM, THE IAC STAFF IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE AGENCIES CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST AND THE IAC OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST WHICH WOULD SET FORTH IN THE OPERATING BUDGET 50% OF THOSE ANTICIPATED ADDITIONAL REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISTRIBUTION ON THE USUAL BASIS AND 50% WHICH WOULD NORMALLY GO TO THE STATE AGENCIES SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE AGENCIES CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THOSE PROJECTS FOR THE AGENCIES THAT SHARE IN THE STATE DISTRIBUTION; WITH THE REQUEST IN THE IAC STATE AGENCIES CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE ADDITIONAL STATE MATCHING PORTION TO BE AUTHORIZED IN THE FORM OF EITHER GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS OR GENERAL FUND BONDS IN ORDER TO MATCH THOSE FUNDS."  
(BISHOP MOVED; ROSS SECONDED; MOTION WAS CARRIED.)

OPPFM has advised they will not recommend the General Fund or the legislative bond issue approach in the budget. This is their position and policy in regard to additional General Fund or bond issue monies. Mr. Bulley asked for the Administrator's recommendation re the additional monies. Four alternatives were given:

- (1) Place the funds over on the local agency side and use dollars for local agencies projects (as had been discussed at one point at the IAC meeting in September). Local would have ample opportunity to expend the funds and match same.
- (2) Use \$1.1 million to match all state agencies money up to the full 50/50 match with Land and Water Money -- but would put state agencies in very tight position. Transfer remaining money to the local side.
- (3) Leave funds in the state agencies budget -- basically floating, with no matching capability.
- (4) Withdraw funds and allow them to lie fallow for the biennium. This would concern the federal agency because state would not be using its apportionment in a timely manner. Written into law is provision for federal agencies to receive not less than 40% -- that language is intentional so that funds not expended by states could be picked up

Conf. Call - 8:30 a.m. October 14, 1976

and used by federal government in other programs. Would also compound the 79-81 budget.

Mr. Bulley asked whether alternatives 3 and 4 were really feasible. Mr. Francis replied actually these were not too viable. Mrs. Brostrom stated her suggestion to Stan had been to place the money with the local side, thus maximizing its use, then return it to the state agencies in 79-81 biennium...consider it a loan, and they will eventually get the benefit of it at a later time.

Mr. Bishop stated the Governor, as he understood it, would be proposing a bond issue for outdoor recreation as a part of his legislative package, and if that is true, there would be opportunity to match the funds. Mr. Francis noted there could be supplemental funds for matching. Mr. Bishop felt the approach suggested by OPPFM should be recognized as almost the Governor's decision as well as the Legislative process -- to move the funds into local side. Mr. Bulley asked if there would be any possibility of alternates 2 and 3 being combined. Go ahead with programming the money for state agencies and come up with matching thru state agencies funding sources.

Mr. Francis noted the comments made by Mr. Bishop at the September meeting -- to remain with the 50-50 split, not prejudge the Legislature, and his desire to have other people involved in this type of policy decision. This resulted in his motion (page 1).

Mr. Francis then noted (1) the indication he had received from Carl Wieland that OPPFM is inclined to want to transfer the monies to the local side; and (2) at a budget hearing, Charles Odegaard had indicated State Parks had plenty of money to match LWCF without General Fund or Bond Issue. He was referring to the Ref. 28 funds which State Parks has. However, projects would have to be sent thru the Committee -- whether or not they would qualify for LWCF would be a question. Mr. Odegaard's comments at the September meeting were then briefly reviewed by Mr. Francis; the explanation of insufficient ORA monies to match for state agencies. Mr. Bulley asked if there were be any possibility of having the state agencies use their other funds for matching; then coming back to the IAC for those funds. Mr. Bishop was concerned with an executive decision being made which would affect the funding proposals as passed by the IAC in September. Whereupon Mr. Francis noted there would be a recommendation made to the Executive offices from OPPFM that the money go forward on the local side.

Following discussion it was agreed that:

- (1) The Fiscal Sub-Committee approve placing the additional LWCF monies in the local side;
- (2) At the December 1976 IAC meeting, a resolution would be proposed that funds (50%) for the state agencies would be considered a loan to the local agencies and would ultimately be returned to the state agencies in the 79-81 biennium or succeeding biennia.
- (3) The 50-50 split be maintained throughout in this process.

Operating Budget - Planning - State Agencies: Mr. Francis explained that OPPFM had suggested dropping the \$120,000 for State Agency Planning purposes (\$120,000 had been thus programmed; \$30,000 each; for individual agency comprehensive plans in cocert with SCORP). The information which would be generated, Mr. Francis stated, was already being supplied to OPPFM through the capital budget process -

Conf. Call - 8:30 a.m. October 14, 1976

--six-year plans of state agencies. However, he was not aware of the actual input being made by the state agencies in these six-year plans. Following discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Francis should obtain this information when possible to ascertain whether or not it would meet the requirements the Committee had desired thru use of the \$120,000. Mr. Francis reported that \$60,000 of the funds would be placed back on the state agencies side for use regarding inflationary factors in projects of the state agencies; and \$60,000 would be placed on the local agency side for use by local agencies. The Fiscal Sub-Committee members agreed this would be appropos under the circumstances.

The Conference call was completed at 9:05 a.m.

SEF:mmf