

- I. Meeting called to order, determination of quorum, introductions
Announcements

II A. FISCAL STATUS REPORTS

1. Disbursement Record - Local Agency Projects 7-1-76 thru 8-31-76
2. Initiative 215 - Cumulative Report
3. LWCF - Cumulative Report
4. Fund Summary - 8-31-76
5. FY 76 Transition Quarter LWCF monies - \$758,310.
6. FY 77 Regular Apportionment - \$2,958,000
7. Deobligated Funds \$4,161
8. LWCF Amendments to law
9. BOR Funding - Additional \$2.4 million - MOTION SPLIT 50/50-CAPITAL/OP BUDGETS 1977-79

Corrections to minutes of June 28 - 1 thru 3

Additions to Agenda - 1

Deletions to Agenda - 2

II B. PROJECT STATUS REPORTS

Administrative Action:

1. No local agency admin. actions.
2. State agencies:
 - a. Parks, GRG Black Diamond 76-503A - DENIED cost increase
 - b. Parks, Twin Harbors 76-506A - APPROVED cost increase \$2,000.
3. State Agencies Master List Projects approved:
 - a. DNR - River Bend 77-701A \$ 14,276
 - b. " - Porter Creek 77-702D \$18,800
 - c. " - Long Lake 77-704D \$13,800
 - d. " - Fall Creek 77-703D \$58,100

DNR - Bella Tierra - progress report.

GRG, Black Diamond - and City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge Creek projects discussion...
Odegaard/Moore.

II C - PLANNING STATUS REPORTS

1. Planning Graph
2. Demand Survey - SCORP
3. Public Lands Inventory - SCORP
4. Action Program - September 1976 IAC Meeting
5. State Trails Advisory Committee MOTION TO ESTABLISH; REPORT TO BE ISSUED. APPROVED

III A. 1. PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

- 03.06.000 Conversion of Property - MOTION APPROVED. REMAIN THE SAME ON EASEMENTS.
- 04.10.000 - Real Property Acquired from Other Public Agencies - NEW SECTION APPROVED.
(04.10.000 thru 04.10.030)
- 05.02.010 Eligible Development Projects (14) Construc. of Residences for Employees.
COMMITTEE ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATIONS NOT TO CHANGE.

III A. 2. EVALUATION SYSTEM

MOTIONS approving concepts for review of Evaluation Sub-Committee - Recommendations #1 thru #10 - Mylroie, Sub-Committee.

III B. 1. QUORUM - Memo re seven constituting a quorum for IAC.

III C. Legislation:

1. S-1976 - 214 and S-1976-215 - Senate Study of IAC
2. House Parks and Rec. Committee Study - analyzing urban needs/distrib. of ORA
3. All-Terrain Vehicle Amendment - (to be in December)

III D. Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue proposal - 1977

Legislative Sub-Committee appointed:

MOOS, LARSON, COLE, ODEGAARD, WYCKOFF, ENGLE AND BROSTROM

III E. 1977-79 Operating Budget Report

Submitted to OPPFm 8-30 \$1,118,922
Included also 18,713,240 Grants to Public Agencies Program.

1977-79 Operating Budget

1. DNR's monies of \$455,000 6-28-76 actually amounts to \$419,778
2. \$475,520 addtl. funds thru updating were incorporated in budget.
3. Capital Budget approved 6-28-76 \$13,879,821 -- increased to \$14,775,119.

MOTION RE ADDITIONAL \$1.2 million - APPROVED

MOTION RE \$475,520 and \$419,778 and new cap. budget of \$14,775,119 - APPROVED.

IV A. 1975-77 Capital Budget State Agencies' Master List Amendments

MOTION TO APPROVE ADDING:

Park and Rec.	East Side North Cascade Highway A.	\$150,000
Fisheries	Pt. Whitney Access A.	200,000
	Sekieu Boat Launch A.	200,000
	Edmonds Artificial Reef Dev.	4,500
Game	Sinlahekin WRA - Fish Lake Dev.	
	" WRA - Blue Lake Dev.	37,000
	" WRA - Forde Lake Dev.	13,000
	Banks Lake Redev.	16,000
	Desert WRA - Strothers A.	4,600
	Tennant Lake WRA - Graham A.	8,100
	Gloyd Seeps WRA- Lawson A	93,000
Natl. Resources	Griffin Bay Dev.	46,000

IV B. PROJECT CHANGES

1. Douglas County, Eastmont Pool, Conversion - 73-024D
MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATOR TO FOLLOW-UP - MEET WITH BOR/ETC.
2. City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge 75-047A Decrease in scope/cost increase - REMOVED FROM AGENDA
3. Parks - Birch Bay, Blackwood 76-502A - Retroactive Req., Extension, Cost Increase - APPROVED \$12,850 cost increase
4. Game - a. Sinlahekin WRA 74-626D, Withdrawal APPROVED withdrawal
b. Naches Riv. 69-610A, Land Exchange APPROVED land exchange
5. DNR - Coxit Creek/Leader Lake - Land Exchange APPROVED land exchange
73-700A 69-708A
6. King Co. - Sammamish R IV - Utility Easement APPROVED easement

IV E. LOCAL PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS

Table I - Project listing by Priority Classification
Table II - Project Evaluation Ratings
Table III - Project Cost - Fund Breakdown
Table IV - Funding Recommendations

Comments on certain projects:

Yakima County Youth Activities Park, Yakima County	Brostrom
N. E. Lake Washington Beach Pk, King Co.	Merlin Smith
Genesee Park, Seattle	C. Odegaard
Granger School Dist., Tennis Court Complex	Odegaard
Ballinger Pk, Boat Fish. Access, Mountlake Terrace	Odegaard
Lynnwood Neighborhood Pk, Lynnwood	Brostrom
Parkway and Marina, Olympia	
Marina Showers and Restrooms, Friday Harbor, Port of	Odegaard
Dupont Village Pk, Dupont	Biggs
Chase Lake Bog project - Edmonds School Dist. - to remain on agenda (Brostrom)	
Mercer Slough II, Bellevue	C. Odegaard

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

#28 Port of Silverdale, Silverdale Waterfront Park)	
#34 Kitsap Co/Port of Silverdale, Silverdale Waterfront Park)	Suggested
#41 Kitsap County, Point-No-Point County Park)	fund 100%
#42 Kitsap County, Gordon Park)	TRIDENT

Fund #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #11, #12, #14, #16, #17, #21 and #25

Discussion on funding - Genesee Park/ Central Area Playfield/Seattle projects

COMMENTS FROM LOCAL AGENCIES:

- (before lunch) -Harvey Watanabe, Chrmn Sports Adv. Council, Seattle Genesee Park
1. Keith Kisor, Comm Public Works, Olympia Oly. Parkway and Marina
 2. Barbara Kenoyer, Parks Comm, Cedar River IV, Town of Albion
 3. Sand Point Park, Seattle:
 - a. Tom Wimmer, Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
 - b. Dorothy McCormick, Sand Point Community Liaison Comm.
 - c. Honorable Warren Peterson, State Rep., 43rd Dist., State of Wash.
 - d. Honorable Jeanette Williams, Member Seattle City Council
 - e. Martin Seelig - Sailing Center Comm. - not present
 - f. William Stafford, Office of Mayor, Planning Dept. - not present
 - g. Peter Bement, Chrmn, Sand Point Air Park Association
4. Siegfried K. Semrau, Director, P & R, Mercer Slough Phase II, Bellevue
 - a. Ernest and Doris Van Tine - not present
 5. Bill Evans, P & R. Director, Lynnwood Neighborhood Pk, City of Lynnwood
 6. John McAdam, Proj. Director, Edmonds School Dist., Edmonds Chase Lake Bog
 7. Honorable John L. O'Brien, State Legislature, Genesee Park, Seattle
 8. Dennis McMenamin, Consulting Engr., Dupont Village, City of Dupont
 9. Carl Stixrood, Park Planner, Christenson Greenbelt, Tukwila
 10. Martin Carty, P & R., Riverside Park, Cowlitz County
 11. Bud Parker, King Co. Div. of Architects, N. East Lake Washington, King Co.
 12. Robert Olander, City Superv., City of Selah - Wenas Park
 13. Richard Deming, City Mgr., City of Normandy Park - Normandy Park
 - a. Paul Barden, Co. Councilman, King County
 14. John H0rsley, Trident Coord., Kitsap Co. Trident Office -
Point-No-Point, Long Lake-Gordon Park, Kitsap County - Trident - Silverdale projects
 15. Mary Selecky, Admin. of TRICO - Metaline Park and Marina and Lone Pool Renovation
 16. Chris Allen, Director, Skagit Co., Steelehad Park, Skagit Co.
 17. Swinomish Indian Tribe Community Park:
 - a. Sam Gaston, Project Director
 - b. Fred Martin, Mayor of LaConner
 - c. Dave Edwards, Principal, LaConner High School
 - d. Marvin Wilbur, Exec. Director, Swinomish Tribal Community

18. Charles Klurich, mathematic teacher, Granger High School, Tennis Court Complex
19. Rod Linderman, John Gable Park - City of Hoquiam. Parks and Rec. Director

MOTIONS ON PROJECTS - LOCAL:

- (1) MOVED TO ACCEPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF.
- (2) MOVED TO AMEND AND ADD CITY OF NORMANDY PARK.
- (3) MOVED TO AMEND AND ADD GENESEE PARK
- (4) WITHDRAWAL OF AMENDMENT TO ADD GENESEE PARK.
- (5) MOVE TO AMEND BY REMOVING
 - (a) \$22,000 from Yakima Co. Youth Activity Park
 - (b) 20,000 from Riverside Co. Park, Cowlitz Co.
 - (c) 31,000 from Sand Point Park Project, City of Seattle

CARRIED.

- (6) MOTION TO AMEND AND ADD CITY OF NORMANDY PARK. CARRIED.
- (7) MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS WITH NORMANDY PARK AND AS AMENDED. CARRIED.

Condolences and sympathy resolution - Death of Elizabeth Bell. Resolution to survivors (husband, Lewis A. Bell, and children).

IV. STATE AGENCY PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS

Approved funding of all state projects:

Game

Sunnyside WRA - Johnson A	\$74,750	Ref. 28	\$74,750	LWCF	
Methow WRA - Brewster A	64,250	" "	64,250	"	
Sunday Lake - Kimball A	7,125	215	7,125	"	
Kalama Modrow Bridge D	8,635	"	8,635	"	
Lake Ketchum D	8,830	"	8,830	"	
Tennant Lake Claypit Pond D	5,050	Ref. 28	5,050	"	\$337,280

DNR

3-Corner Rock Trail D	25,520	Ref. 28			
Obstruction Pass D	61,450	"	61,450	"	
Leader Lake Exp. D	23,560	"	23,560	"	195,540

Parks

Grayland Beach II A	92,400	"	92,400		184,800
---------------------	--------	---	--------	--	---------

TOTAL: 717,620

V. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT - Audits - State and local

VI. Committee Member Reports - None.

VII. Other Reports - next meeting IAC Dec. 6-7, Highway Board Room, Olympia.

QUORUM - Moos' version of quorum - for analysis.

Appendix A - State/Local Procedural Guidelines adopted by motions

Appendix B - Condolences/Sympathy Resolution - Lewis A. Bell/Elizabeth Bell

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
TUMWATER, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

September 27-28, 1976
Monday-Tuesday

9:00 a.m.

Seattle Center, Food Center Bldg.
Seattle, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Micaela Brostrom, Chairman
Warren A. Bishop
Honorable Bert L. Cole (Mon.)
Commissioner of Public Lands
Donald Moos, Director, Dept. of
Fisheries

John A. Biggs, Director, Dept. of Ecology
Helen Engle
Ralph W. Larson, Director, Dept. of Game
Michael Ross
Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and
Recreation Commission

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

W. A. Bulley, Director, Dept. of Highways
T. Evans Wyckoff, Director, Commerce and Economic Development
(One vacancy on Interagency Committee - citizen member)

STAFF OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General

Dick, John (alternate for Charles Murphy)

Commerce and Economic Development

Smith, Merlin

Ecology, Department of

Snipes, Beecher

Fisheries, Department of

Costello, Richard

Game, Department of

Brigham, James Barnett, Dan

Highways, Department of

Mylroie, Willa

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

Bailey, Ron, RRS

Bowring, Ken, Planner

Burk, Larry, RRS

Benner, Rebecca, Clerk-Typist II (Tuesday)

Cole, Kenn, Agency Accounts Officer

Dalton, Edith, Secretary (Typing) (Tuesday)

Francis, Stanley E., Admin.

Frazier, Marjorie M., Admin. Secretary

Grant, David J., RRS

Leach, Eugene, RRS

Lovelady, Greg, RRS

Martin, Milton H., Asst. Admin.

Moore, Glenn, Chief, Project Section
Pelton, Gerald, Chief, Plan. & Coord. Section
Taylor, Ron, RRS

Natural Resources, Department of
O'Donnell, Al

Park and Recreation Commission
Martin, Lynn

Program Planning and Fiscal Management
None

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

Carty, Martin, Director, Parks and Recreation, Cowlitz County
Fearn, William, Director, Parks and Recreation, Spokane
Webster, James, Parks and Recreation Dept., King County
Wilder, Robert, Parks and Recreation Department, Seattle
Hastings, Barbara, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
Haskins, Dale, representing Lundy, Maurice, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Seattle

I. Meeting called to order, determination of a quorum, introductions: The IAC meeting was convened by Chairman Micaela Brostrom 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:

Gary Tranter, Staff member, Park and Recreation Committee, Senate
John Dick, Assistant Attorney General, alternate for Charles Murphy
Ken Bowring, Planner, IAC, new employee
TAC members: Lynn Martin, State Parks; Jim Brigham, Dept. of Game;
Jim Webster, King Co; Al O'Donnell, Department of Natl. Res.; Martin
Carty, Cowlitz County.
Dan Barnett, Department of Game
Dale Lonheim, Youth Hostels (formerly)
Lee Springate, Assistant Director, Parks & Rec., City of Bellevue
Loretta Slater, Sponsor of the State Trails effort

Announcements made concerned:

T. Evans Wyckoff appointed by the Governor as Director, Commerce and Economic Development Department, replacing John Larsen, former Director
David Grant, RRS, IAC, resigned to return to State of Georgia
John Biggs, Director, Dept. of Ecology, has announced his retirement from State service effective January, 1977.

Additional kit memos: Mr. Francis briefly reviewed the memorandum of instructions concerning the five kit memoranda to be placed in appropriate place within the meeting material. II 5. LWCF; III A. Procedural Guidelines; Evaluation System; III B. Quorum Question; III C. 1977 Legislative Session; and III D. IAC Proposed Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue.

II A. Fiscal Status Reports: Mr. Bert Cole requested a brief review of the Fiscal Status Reports. Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer, reported on the following:

1. Disbursement Record - Local Agency Projects - 7-1-76 thru 8-31-76
2. Initiative 215 - Cumulative Report
3. LWCF - Cumulative Report
4. Fund Summary - 8-31-76

He noted that the BOR LWCF Transition Quarter monies had been included in the LWCF Cumulative report in the amount of \$758,310.00 (apportioned to local agencies, Dept. of Game, DNR, Parks and the Dept. of Fisheries). An explanation was given concerning the redistribution of the 1976 LWCF funds to the four state agencies; the directors of each agency having received memorandum from Kenn Cole noting the new figures. In response to Mr. Bishop's inquiry, Mr. Cole stated 1977 LWCF money had not as yet been incorporated into the report and the agency was awaiting official word on the funds to be allocated to the State of Washington; however, the approximate figure was known, and these funds would be taken into consideration in the funding of local agency projects on Tuesday, September 28th.

II A 5 Land & Water Conservation Fund Report: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum dated September 27th, noting the following:

1. FY 76 Transition Quarter LWCF monies: Transition Quarter includes July-Sept. 1976, and totals \$758,310. Local agency share has been requested as unanticipated receipts from the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management; the State share has been utilized in the 1977-79 Capital Budgeting process.
2. FY 77 Regular Apportionment: Though no official letter had as yet been received, Mr. Francis reported it was expected Washington's share would be \$2,958,000. Both local and state shares have been programmed into IAC budgets, with local agencies share of \$1,479,000 (less local surcharge of 1%) to be available for allocation to local projects on Tuesday, September 28th. The state share has been programmed into the 1977-79 Capital Budget process.
3. Deobligated Funds of \$4,161 have also been programmed for use at the funding session September 28th.
4. LWCF Amendments: S-327 and HR 12234 were reported out of Conference Committee on September 2, 1976; House concurred September 9; Senate concurred September 20th. The Conference report increased the House version of total funding as follows:

For FY 77	from	\$300 million	to	\$ 300 million
For FY 78	from	450 "	to	600 "
For FY 79	from	625 "	to	750 "
For FY 80-89	from	800 "	to	900 "

Mr. Francis advised the Committee he would be meeting in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, September 28th, at invitation of the White House for the LWCF appropriations bill signing ceremony, and it would be possible for him at that time to check funding levels and other factors within the bill with Bureau of Outdoor Recreation officials.

(Quorum: A quorum was declared at 9:30 with the arrival of Mrs. Engle and Mr. Ross.)

BOR funding: Mr. Francis then discussed the additional \$2.4 million of LWCF monies which would be available to the State of Washington for the coming biennium, but which had not been programmed into the IAC budgets, since the original budgets had been based on an "assumed figure". He offered three alternatives in handling this additional \$2.4 million:

- (1) Place the total \$2.4 into the IAC Operating Budget as available for local agency funding during the 1977-79 biennium.
- (2) Follow the traditional 50-50 split of these funds, with \$1.2 placed within the IAC Operating Budget for local agency funding; and \$1.2 million placed within the IAC Capital Budget as an amendment to the budget, recognizing there are insufficient funds for matching purposes on the state agencies side in the 1977-79 biennium.
- (3) Hold either the total \$2.4 million or the State portion of \$1.2 million over to the 1979-81 biennium.

Discussion followed. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT AS A POLICY BASIS ANY TRADITIONAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FUNDS AVAILABLE IN THE 1977-79 BIENNIUM, INCLUDING THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS OF THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, BE DISTRIBUTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE 50% LOCAL AGENCIES/50% STATE AGENCIES.

Mr. Bert Cole felt the motion did not deal specifically with the funds under discussion -- the \$2.4 additional funding. He suggested the motion either be reworded or withdrawn.

MR. ODEGAARD WITHDREW THE MOTION; APPROVED BY THE SECOND, MR. ROSS,

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

BASED UPON THE PROJECTIONS OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS (\$2.4 MILLION) FOR THE NEXT BIENNIUM, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE STAFF IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE AGENCIES' 1977-79 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST AND THE 1977-79 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 REQUEST FOR THOSE PROJECTS FOR THE AGENCIES THAT SHARE IN THE STATE DISTRIBUTION; WITH THE REQUEST IN THE IAC STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET FOR 1977-79 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.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Corrections - Additions to the Minutes of June 28, 1976: At 10:25 a.m. the Chairman called for corrections or additions to the minutes of June 28, 1976.

- (1) Bert Cole asked that Page 9, paragraph 4, Line 4, be corrected as follows:

"It was the 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 confrontation conference with user groups, DNR, IAC and OPPFM."

(2) Mrs. Brostrom requested the following changes:

- Page 21 - next to the last paragraph: "Mrs. Brostrom asked for presentations from the state agencies, advising ~~Mr. Bishop~~ the Committee 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.
- Page 25, IV A. Salary of Administrator: "Mr. Bishop noted that all state employees would be receiving adjustments in salaries on July 1, 1976, and that it would be recommended that the Administrator of the IAC ~~as well as all state agency directors and administrators would be receiving~~ receive an increase at that the same time as the other state agency directors and administrators are increased through the State Salary Committee. He asked that the Chairman of the IAC ~~authorize implementation of~~ be authorized to implement the salary increase for the Administrator as recommended 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."
- IIIF. Page 34 - "(3) 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 budget."
- IIIF. Page 34 - "(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~~ did an admirable job of almost an efficiency study of the entire operating procedures of the IAC their operations as a part of this operating budget."

(3) Mrs. Brostrom also offered the following corrections which had been requested by Mr. Bulley, Director of Highways:

- Page 7 - 7th paragraph, last sentence: "Mr. Bishop then suggested the Chairman direct staff to accept consider the 1.333% as proposed in the drafted legislation. It was the consensus of the Committee that this be incorporated considered for incorporation into the draft for presentation at the September 1976 IAC meeting."
- Page 7 - 8th paragraph - within the MOTION:
- "(5) 1.333% OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX SHOULD BE INCLUDED CONSIDERED FOR INCLUSION IN THE RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION AS REFUND FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUNDetc. FOR POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 28, 1976 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Additions/Deletions to the Agenda: Chairman Brostrom advised of the following additions/deletions to the agenda:

Addition: IV C. Project Changes 6. King County, Sammamish River IV - Utility Easement

Deletions: IV. NEW BUSINESS A. - IAC Policy - Easements - Administrative Approval

IV B. - 1. Administratively Approved State Agency Projects
(To be included under Project Status Reports IIB.)

In response to Mr. Odegaard's inquiry, Mr. Francis explained that Item IV A, relating to an IAC Policy on easements would not be discussed at this time due to advice received from the Assistant Attorney General that setting a policy for administrative approval of easements was not within the prerogative of the Administrator. Each easement must be brought to the Committee for review and final decision. Item 6. King County, Sammamish River IV - Utility Easement - would present opportunity for discussion on this issue if desired.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS CARRIED,

II B. Project Status Reports: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Administration Section, advised the Committee complete status reports would be available at the December 1976 Special IAC meeting. He referred to memorandum of staff dated September 27, 1976, and indicated overall progress on state and local agency projects has been good. During June 1, 1976 to September 10, 1976, eleven (11) local agency projects and eight (8) state projects had been closed,

Administrative Action concerning cost increases during June 4 to September 10, 1976, included:

A. Local Agencies - No administratively approved cost increases were granted.

B. State Agencies:

1. State Parks - GRG Black Diamond 76-503A - Request for additional \$3,775 was denied based on the fact that approval of a 10% increase would in effect be an approval of the total negotiated settlement which was felt to be excessive, inflationary and unjustified.
2. State Parks - Twin Harbors Addition - 76-506A: Request for cost increase of \$2,000 approved. Based on error made in appraisal which was subsequently corrected and concurred in by IAC review appraiser.
3. Administrative Actions - State Agency Master List Projects Approved:

Four DNR projects received approval from the Master List:

River Bend 77-701A \$14,276 Ref. 18 \$7,138 LWCF \$7,138
Acquire approximately 12.5 acre 50 yr. lease - Suiattle River parcel, Skagit County. Camp, picnic area, boat access.

Porter Creek 77-702D \$18,800 \$9,400 Ref. 18 \$9,400 LWCF
Redevelopment of 5 acre lease site, Grays Harbor (Capitol Forest)
County; four additional camp units; two picnic units.

Long Lake 77-704D \$13,800 \$6,900 Ref. 18 \$6,900 LWCF
Develop interpretive trails and support facilities on 15 acre site,
Stevens County.

Fall Creek 77-703D \$58,100 \$29,050 Ref. 18 \$29,050 LWCF
Develop camp and picnic area, 8 acre site, Capitol Forest, Thurston Co;
provide trailhead for equestrian and general public use.

DNR, Bella Tierra: At the conclusion of Mr. Moore's report, Mrs. Brostrom asked for an up-to-date status report on the DNR Bella Tierra Acquisition project approved by the IAC August 26, 1975. Mr. Moore stated there were no further complications of which he was aware. Mr. O'Donnell, DNR, stated his agency was preparing development plans for the site. Mr. Bert Cole noted the public adversity to the project, though there was undeniably a need for boater facilities in that area. To clarify questions asked by Mr. Bishop, Mr. Francis reported he had been given the authority by the Interagency Committee to approve the project for acquisition at the August 26, 1975 IAC meeting, but this had taken six to seven months to resolve. A-95 requirements regarding the acquisition have been satisfied; however, the next step (development) will require a new A-95 review process to receive comments from the San Juan County Planning Department, as well as any other interested entities.

GRG, Black Diamond - and - City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge Creek projects: Mr. Odegaard referred to page (2) of the Project Status memorandum and asked Mr. Moore for an explanation why this project increase had been denied when the Committee would be asked today for approval of the City of Vancouver's cost increase request for the Burnt Bridge Creek project. Both projects had involved appraisal and negotiated settlements. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, replied that IAC had looked at the Black Diamond project in terms of the total negotiated settlement which was felt to be excessive, inflationary and unjustified. \$10,250 (27%) above the project cost and the appraised fair market value was involved. Whereas, the Vancouver Burnt Bridge Creek project involved a scope reduction and deletion of a portion of a parcel to be acquired which would actually reduce the project with no further parcels to be acquired. Mr. Odegaard felt the Black Diamond project was to protect a valuable watershed and State Parks Commission had felt the additional cost was justified. Following discussion, the Chairman asked Mr. Francis to note Mr. Odegaard's comments that the Administrator should review these types of cost increases more carefully.

II C. Planning Status Reports: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning and Coordination Section, briefly reported on the memoranda dated September 27, 1976, pertaining to the Planning and Coordination Section as follows:

1. Planning Graph - indicated Demand Study for SCORP - 50% complete; and Inventory - 65% complete.
2. Demand Survey - SCORP: The survey phase of the study has now been completed with 24,273 questionnaires distributed on a seasonal basis between July 1975 and June 1976; over 12,000 were returned for 50% participation. All questionnaires have been coded onto standardized forms and the data transferred to computer tapes. Work on preliminary survey tables will be underway by the 1st of October.

3. Public Lands Inventory - SCORP: Mr. Pelton thanked state agencies representatives for their assistance with the inventories -- especially Mark Olander, DNR; John Clark, State Parks; James Brigham, Game; and Richard Costello, Fisheries. Out of 384 public recreation lands inventory forms sent to state agencies, cities, counties, park and recreation districts, port districts and Indian tribes, 157 have been returned thus far.

Follow up calls will be made concerning the remaining 227 forms. Compiling and summarizing of the inventories commences in late October, with expectation that completed public lands inventory data will be available by January 31, 1977. The 304 school districts within the state will be mailed forms some time in September thru a cooperative effort with the Office of the Supt. of Public Instruction.

4. Action Program - September 1976 IAC meeting: No changes were reported from previous Action Program report except for small additions to the state agencies report. Mr. Pelton referred the Committee members to Tables I and IV which gave the historical picture of the Action Program. (1) Table I reflected the 1973-75 current biennium and 1977-79 anticipated funds; (2) Table IV reflected IAC 1977-79 Capital Budget as submitted to OPPFM for the state agencies. Mr. Bishop noted the high percentage of unobligated funds and was informed these figures decrease as they are committed to projects.

Mr. Biggs inquired whether the participating state agencies would be able to find acquisition opportunities to expend the funds. It was his feeling acquisition of outdoor recreation land was diminishing. Mr. Larson and Mr. Odegaard replied that their agencies have many potential areas which could be acquired for outdoor recreation purposes. Mr. Odegaard specifically mentioned ocean beaches, Puget Sound area, San Juans, Green River Gorge, and additions to already acquired park and recreation areas. The fact that it is sometimes possible to use a large amount of money for the purchase of just one available land area when the land becomes available was mentioned by Mr. Larson. He, too, stated his agency would have many opportunities to purchase land adjacent to Game lands; however, development of Dept. of Game areas was difficult. Mr. Larson also noted in developing the Capital Budget program, the state agencies look at certain recreational land opportunities but (1) there is no guarantee this particular land will be purchased; and (2) sometimes land which does become available has been overlooked but through transfer of funds, etc., it is possible to use funds from one planning region for another region and thus acquire valuable property. Mr. Pelton noted that the State Agency Action program no longer indicates fund distribution by planning districts but instead limits it to distribution by priorities.

At this point, Mr. Odegaard extended an invitation for all committee members and anyone interested to attend the dedication of the Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center at Fort Canby on October 10, 1976.

(5) State Trails Advisory Committee: Mr. Pelton introduced Mr. Ken Wilcox, of the Washington State Horsemen's Association and a member of the former State Trails Advisory Committee. He then referred to memorandum dated September 27, 1976, "State Trails Advisory Committee", making the following points:

- (a) In 1968 a State Trails Advisory Committee (STAC) had been created to assist in completion of the "State Recreation Trails Program" document of 1973.
- (b) There is now a need to re-establish the STAC formally as an official

advisory body to the Administrator of the IAC (similar to the Technical Advisory Committee).

- (3) Trail users feel there should be more positive actions taken by government agencies (including the IAC) to establish trails and assure adequate facilities for their use.
- (4) Staff therefore recommended that the State Trails Advisory Committee be re-established as a formal committee by motion of the Interagency Committee.

Discussion followed on the motion as recommended by staff, the make-up of the State Trails Committee in the past and proposals for the future, involvement of staff time on the work of the Committee, and monies within the budget of the IAC for use in the trails effort. Mr. Odegaard asked that when the Committee is appointed there should be some representation of land owners. Mr. Pelton replied there had been such representation in the past (Forest Protection Association; Weyerhaeuser, etc.) and that similar representation would be sought for the future.

Mr. Bert Cole suggested the motion be amended to include in the fifth paragraph that Committee recommendations also be made to the "Interagency Committee" as well as to the Administrator of the IAC.

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

WHEREAS, THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRAILS IS A STATEWIDE PRIORITY; AND

WHEREAS, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A STATEWIDE TRAILS SYSTEM IS PROVIDED FOR BY LAW (RCW 67.32); AND

WHEREAS, NO FORMAL BODY OF USERS AND AGENCIES PRESENTLY EXISTS TO ADVISE, REPORT, AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO IAC REGARDING THESE MATTERS;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT A STATE TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE BE ESTABLISHED; AND

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THIS TRAILS COMMITTEE WILL ADVISE, REPORT, AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE IAC ADMINISTRATOR, AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, ON SUBJECTS TO INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO:

- (1) THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STATEWIDE TRAILS SYSTEM;
- (2) PROPOSED TRAIL LEGISLATION;
- (3) LOCATION, PLANS, AND STANDARDS FOR TRAILS;
- (4) GENERAL ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION AND PROVISION OF VOLUNTEERS FOR TRAIL PLANNING AND LABOR;
- (5) TRAIL RELATED PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER SIMILAR MATTERS.

MR. ROSS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Bert Cole complimented Loretta Slater on her work with the Trails Committee and other activities performed by her on a volunteer basis. He expressed his appreciation to her stating she had done an admirable job in assisting the state agencies and trail enthusiasts in the necessary tasks involved in the basic legislation.

III A 1. Procedural Guidelines: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated September 27th, concerning Procedural Guidelines 03.06.000, Conversion of Property; 04.10.000 Real Property Acquired from Other public Agencies; and 05.02.010 - Eligible Development Projects (14) Construction of Residences for employees -- all of which had been reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee. The Committee elected to review each guideline separately.

03.06.000 - Conversion of Property: The TAC felt the present language was adequate and should not be changed. However, it was the consensus that underground utility easements not adversely affecting public recreational opportunities should not be considered a conversion. The Administrator had been asked to pursue this with the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers at its Annual Meeting and encourage BOR to adopt the same position. NASORLO delegates had adopted such a resolution.

On meeting with the IAC Assistant Attorney General, the Administrator had been advised that RCW 43.99.100 clearly places the determination of whether a non-recreational use, i.e., easement in this case, is a conversion directly upon the Interagency Committee; and such cannot be delegated. Staff recommended the present language of 03.06.000 remain the same; remain silent on the question of easements; and that the Interagency Committee handle each conversion matter on an individual basis.

Mr. Odegaard asked that staff confer with the federal government representatives to consider changing their regulations to allow simple easements (moving utility lines, underground utilities, etc.) -- perhaps federal guidelines could be altered.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT THE LANGUAGE IN PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE 03.06.000, CONVERSION OF PROPERTY, REMAIN THE SAME (SILENT ON THE QUESTION OF EASEMENTS); THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD CONTINUE TO REVIEW ALL CONVERSION MATTERS ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR WILL FOLLOW UP ON ANY CONTEMPLATED BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION GUIDELINE CHANGES WHICH WOULD AFFECT SPECIFIC TYPES OF EASEMENTS (I.E., UNDERGROUND UTILITY EASEMENTS, ETC.).

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

04.10.000 - Real Property Acquired from Other Public Agencies: Mr. Francis discussed the present guidelines which prevented acquisition of publicly owned non-recreational lands for recreational purposes unless sale of same is mandated by law. He stated the TAC had brought out the basic philosophy that the public should have the right to receive fair market value for any lands previously purchased for non-recreational purposes, similar to the right of the private owner to receive fair market value. To restrict the purchase of publicly owned non-recreational land to only those lands which must be sold by law, worked a hardship on both local and state governmental agencies due to restricted budgets, lack of capital replacement funds and the taxpayer resistance to additional or diluted taxing activity. Since the IAC had waived this guideline on several occasions to allow for purchase of lands not so mandated, staff recommended adoption of new guidelines 04.10.000 thru 04.10.030 (APPENDIX "A" TO THESE MINUTES).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS THAT THE PRESENT SECTION 04.10.000 IN BOTH THE LOCAL AND STATE AGENCIES' PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES BE DELETED, AND THOSE AS INDICATED IN "APPENDIX A" TO THESE MINUTES BE ADOPTED (04.10.000 THROUGH 04.10.030.)

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

05.02.010 Eligible Development Projects - (14) Construction of Residences for Employees. The Technical Advisory Committee had considered the language in 05.02.010 as adequate and did not recommend any change. The Committee accepted the recommendation.

III A. 2. Evaluation System: Mr. Francis briefly reviewed the memorandum of September 27, 1976, "Local Evaluation System - Policy Questions", which referred to the eleven policy questions presented to the TAC Evaluation Sub-Committee by the IAC for review and recommendations, as well as obtaining of local input. He noted that input was to be obtained from the "public" through the Washington Recreation and Park Society, Association of Washington Cities, Washington State Association of Counties, and the Washington Public Ports Association. He then called on Mrs. Willa Mylroie, chairman of the Evaluation Sub-Committee, for her presentation of the material attached to the memorandum. Mrs. Mylroie advised that the Sub-Committee members consisted of: Bob Wilder, Bill Hutsinpillar and herself. Merlin Smith, TAC Chairman, had also been involved in meetings regarding the questions. Jerry Pelton served as IAC staff liaison with other staff involved in some of the meetings. Further, she noted that the memorandum included CONCEPTS to be used in determining later firm guidelines for review of the Interagency Committee; that the recommendations being discussed today to re-evaluate the Evaluation System were being submitted only for consideration and discussion, with approval of the Committee being requested on the CONCEPTS only.

The Chairman suggested taking each item separately for discussion and decision.

#9 -- IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT RECOMMENDATION #9 (COMMITMENT TO A STRONG MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED) BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#6 - IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT RECOMMENDATION #6 (DEVELOPMENT AND RENOVATION SHOULD BOTH BE ENCOURAGED) BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mrs. Brostrom requested that definitions of "redevelopment" and "renovation" should be clearly stated in the guidelines.

#5 - IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT RECOMMENDATION #5 (PRIORITIES FOR SINGLE OR MULTI-USE FACILITIES SHOULD BE BASED ON LOCAL NEEDS AS INDICATED IN THE ADOPTED AND IAC ACCEPTED LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE RECREATION PLAN) BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#8 - IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ROSS, SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS, THAT RECOMMENDATION #8 (SOME RECOGNITION SHOULD BE GIVEN FOR JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND FOR JOINT OPERATING AGREEMENTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES, FOR PARK/SCHOOL, PARK/PORT DISTRICT, ETC.) BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM.

Mrs. Brostrom noted the recommendation did not include acquisition. MR. ROSS INCLUDED "ACQUISITION" WITHIN HIS MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS.

In resulting conversation on this recommendation, joint projects were discussed as well as areas involving Indian lands. It was brought out that the Planning

Division did not yet have a completed lands inventory form back from the Makah Indian Tribe, and Mrs. Brostrom asked them to pursue this; whereupon Mr. Moos offered his assistance to the Division in this matter.

Mr. Odegaard asked why the recommendation did not include public/private, public/public since it did include park/school and park/port, etc. He felt this should be included. Mr. Moos then suggested adding the wording "such as" within the recommendation so that the reading would then be:

"....recreation facilities, such as park/school, park/port district, etc."

Mr. Biggs felt it was not desirable to embark upon proposals which would contemplate the mergers of public and private entities, that this was a matter removed from the original objective of the Interagency Committee as set up by law. He agreed with the discussion recommending joint agreements and joint acquisitions, but not in terms of private bodies. It was his feeling this was an entirely separate subject and if the Committee contemplated such a change, it should be thoroughly explored by the members of the Committee prior to taking any action.

MR. BIGGS MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION AND SEND THE RECOMMENDATION BACK TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE FOR RECONSIDERATION. THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Mrs. Mylroie and Mrs. Brostrom reiterated the fact that the recommendations being discussed were concepts only -- not firm guidelines. The firm guidelines would be brought before the Committee later for final consideration as to whether or not they should be included in the Evaluation System.

The Committee then considered the restated motion of Mr. Ross as follows:

#8 - restated: THAT RECOMMENDATION #8 (SOME RECOGNITION SHOULD BE GIVEN FOR JOINT DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION PROJECTS AND FOR JOINT OPERATING AGREEMENTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES SUCH AS PARK/SCHOOL, PARK/PORT DISTRICT, PUBLIC/PRIVATE, PUBLIC/PUBLIC, ETC.) BE REFERRED TO THE TAC EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM.

MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE; MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Larson stated he disliked having to review and make decisions on matters of import at the IAC meeting when he had not received the material until the day of the meeting. Mrs. Mylroie apologized for the late receipt of the material. Mr. Biggs stated the members of the IAC had, in his opinion, discussed a major policy change of the Committee which would now be recognized and which would encourage partnerships with private industries for the acquisition and development of outdoor recreational projects. It was his firm position that this was a topic worthy of considerably more deliberation and discussion than given it today. He was assured by Mr. Ross and Mr. Bishop the concept as recommended by the Committee would be discussed further before being accepted within the Evaluation System.

Mr. Bishop noted, however, his feeling there would be more and more private and non-profit type foundations, corporations, etc., coming into the recreational picture and thought there should be some direction given to "not close the door" to a guideline that would allow a private group to enter into an agreement with a public governmental entity, if in so doing they would be able to provide areas of recreation for the public. He did feel care should be taken concerning the matter of the private entity deriving financial investment benefits from such

provisions, but that this could be reviewed by the Committee at the time it receives knowledge of the proposed project.

In response to further questions, Mr. Wilder explained that the Evaluation Sub-Committee had not tried to address itself to public/private or private/private; the intent of the recommendation being "who has primary park and recreation responsibility?"...and the encouragement of various jurisdictions to work with the IAC and their local governmental entities on these matters. He referred to Recommendation #7 (A local agency should be responsible for serving the recreation needs of those within its service area). He felt if the Committee now desired to have the Evaluation Sub-Committee refine Recommendation #8 to include public/private and public/public, then the Association of Washington Cities, Washington Association of Counties, and such organizations as the Washington Recreation and Park Society should be contacted for their input.

Mr. Ross stated it would be timely to confer with these sources and work with them on such a recommendation. Mr. Biggs suggested at the time the matter is formally and finally considered by the Committee that it be widely advertised the Committee is considering a major policy change and will now recognize these kinds of relationships.

Prior to recess at noon, Mr. Odegaard suggested that the Chairman call an Executive meeting for discussion of personnel matters with the Administrator beginning at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Ross asked that the record indicate the Executive session of the Committee had been called at the request of the Chairman. Chairman Brostrom set the meeting and called for re-convening of the Regular IAC meeting at 1:30 p.m.

Executive Session 1:00 p.m.: The Committee members suggested to the Administrator that he continue attendance at the IAC meeting on Tuesday, September 28th, rather than attend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Amendment Act signing ceremony in Washington, D.C. Under the circumstances stated, Mr. Francis indicated that he would remain and be present at the IAC meeting on Tuesday, September 28th.

The regular IAC meeting reconvened at 1:40 p.m., with continuation of discussion of the Evaluation System policy questions.

#1 - Chairman Brostrom read Recommendation #1 (Local projects should be evaluated on the basis of local needs and priorities as measured against open space and local adaptations of national recreation standards and as identified in adopted and IAC accepted local comprehensive recreation, action and capital improvement programs.) Mr. Larson was opposed to the use of certain standards as explained in the recommendation (population/facility ratio, service area, cost/benefit ratios, etc. based on capital improvement dollars/participant/year, etc.) Mrs. Engle agreed and following discussion, it was decided the recommendation would include only that portion as underlined in the memorandum and not the additional explanatory sentences which followed it.

With that understanding, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT RECOMMENDATION #1 BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#2 - Chairman Brostrom then read Recommendation #2 (Acquisition and development projects should be evaluated by separate questions but have the same number of total

points to allow total point ranking of all projects on an equal basis.) IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT RECOMMENDATION #2 BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#3 - Recommendation #3 was then read by the Chairman (Urban and rural emphasis should be eliminated as an issue) IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT RECOMMENDATION #3 BE REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM.

Mr. Ross proposed a substitute motion: THAT THE IAC CONTINUE WITH THE PRESENT CRITERIA IN THE EVALUATION SYSTEM. He did not feel there was an issue and that the Committee did not have to deal with this type of concept. Mrs. Mylroie stated the present Evaluation System provided for population density and whether emphasis should be given to urban over the other areas. Section B of the Evaluation System was discussed. Mr. Ross stated he was satisfied with the present point system, that it did give weight to urban density and therefore the IAC is in compliance with federal guidelines. Mr. Martin then read D-2 of the Evaluation System which dealt with the population density in the vicinity of a proposed project.

Mr. Bishop felt the Technical Advisory Committee should be encouraged to work out a better mechanism -- more meaningful guidelines in the point system on this entire matter, recognizing that it is a concept to be reviewed by the members of the Evaluation Sub-Committee and that further opportunity will be had for the IAC members to deliberate upon it.

Mr. Bob Wilder was asked for his comments as a member of the Sub-Committee. There was no second to Mr. Ross' substitute motion to continue with the present criteria within the Evaluation System. The Chairman therefore called for the question on Mr. Bishop's motion to refer Recommendation #3 to the Evaluation Sub-Committee. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR BY MR. ODEGAARD. MR. ROSS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

#4 - Chairman Brostrom then read Recommendation #4 (Total projects and first phase projects should stand on their own as viable projects.) Though Mr. Odegaard had some problems with this recommendation, following discussion it was agreed that the Evaluation Sub-Committee would be reviewing this matter further, and IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT RECOMMENDATION #4 BE REFERRED TO THE TAC EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#7 - The Chairman then read Recommendation #7 (A local agency should be responsible for serving the needs of those within its service area.) Mr. Odegaard asked for clarification -- was the intent that a service area within the city would receive low priority even though people outside of the city might visit and use the facility, i.e., a zoo, special type parks, etc.? Mr. Wilder explained the Sub-Committee was not referring to this type of facility, that it would encourage governmental cooperation with state/county, etc., on zoo projects and others which would service people other than those in the immediate area. With that understanding, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP, THAT RECOMMENDATION #7 BE REFERRED TO THE TAC EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS A REVISION TO THE IAC EVALUATION SYSTEM. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#10 - The last recommendation, #10, was then read by the Chairman (Access/energy does not need to be handled as a separate item in the evaluation system as it is now covered indirectly in many of the existing questions and could continue to be so in any revisions to the Evaluation System. Committee members agreed therefore there was no further discussion required on this item nor a vote.

Mr. Bert Cole expressed his concern that people needs in the outdoor recreation acquisition and development field be met, especially the low income group; those who are unable to travel for recreation and must utilize parks and areas which are in their immediate area. He mentioned Genesee Park, a project being considered by the IAC for funding at the Tuesday morning session (9-28), which was in a low income area and would provide recreational opportunities for persons requiring them, and he noted that the Sand Point Park was also to be considered -- yet it would not actually serve those people who don't have mobility. Mr. Biggs also expressed his concern in that regard and brought out the fact that the Committee might become too "enmeshed" in setting up guidelines and policy directives, and move away from its original purpose -- to fund park and recreation facilities/ to acquire-develop land for use of the people of the state.

At this point, Mr. Mylroie asked for IAC staff assistance in coordinating the results of the Committee's recommendations regarding the Evaluation System proposed changes. Mr. Francis suggested due to workload and absences of key personnel in October/November that the matter of review of the Evaluation System be held for a Special Meeting of the IAC the first part of the new year rather than December. Mr. Cole, Mr. Moos, Mr. Ross and Mrs. Brostrom felt the matter should be on the December meeting agenda. The proposed schedule for the TAC and Sub-Committee meetings were briefly mentioned. Mrs. Brostrom assured Mrs. Mylroie of IAC staff assistance, and thanked her for her presentation.

III B. 1. Quorum: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated 9-27-76, "Quorum", commenting upon the research undertaken to define more accurately what constitutes a quorum for the IAC Committee. The Assistant Attorney General opinion cited from Modern Parliamentary Procedure (Ray E. Keesey - 1974) "Presence of a Quorum", and summarized his opinion that it is the duty of the chairperson or any member of the Committee to question the presence of a quorum at any time. The IAC having twelve members should have a quorum of seven present to conduct its business.

It was concluded that the IAC should have a quorum physically present at all times when official action of any type is to be taken. As has been done in the past, discussions or consensus of opinion regarding agenda items are in order in the event of a lack of a quorum, but official action or position on matters could not be accomplished. Mr. John Dick, Asst. Atty. General, briefly commented on the opinion as summarized and agreed with it in principle stating the challenge of a quorum would automatically evolve if it were obvious that none existed. It would be the duty of the Chairman to ascertain whether a quorum existed, and take action thereon. Mrs. Brostrom read from the opinion she had received from the Assistant Attorney General (dated June 24, 1976). Following further discussion, it was agreed a QUORUM FOR THE IAC WOULD CONSTITUTE SEVEN MEMBERS PRESENT (OF THE TWELVE).

III C. Legislation: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum dated 9-27-76, "Legislation", and the four items therein:

(1) S-1976-214 and 215 - Senate Study of IAC by Parks and Recreation Committee: The meeting of August 7, 1976 (hearing) enabled the Administrator and IAC Committee

members present to comment on a list of questions sent out by the Senate Committee staff. Further information was requested on August 18th and September 13th - (statutory responsibilities by RCW reference). The study of the IAC will continue and legislation may be submitted to the next Legislative Session.

(2) House Parks and Recreation Committee: The House Parks and Recreation Committee is conducting a study of its own which may be related to the above cited study. It is analyzing urban needs for recreation and the distribution of ORA funds since 1965 throughout the state. Also, a draft of proposed legislation has been discussed at a House Parks and Recreation Committee meeting (September 10th) and includes direction for the IAC to revise its comprehensive plan for the development of outdoor recreation in a manner to place high priority on the development of state parks located in or near to urban areas, thus accessible to and used by populations of such areas. (To be implemented, if passed, by January 1, 1978.) The Administrator reported he is monitoring this effort and will follow-up with legislative staff on the draft.

The other two items in the memorandum were then addressed by Mr. Pelton and Mr. Martin (ATV Amendment and Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue - proposed legislation.)

(3) All Terrain Vehicle Amendment: Reference was made to memorandum dated September 27, 1976, "ATV Legislative Proposal", by Mr. Pelton. Staff requested further consideration of proposed ATV legislation be postponed and that time be provided at the December 1976 IAC Special Meeting for discussion of the ATV legislative proposals. Major concern of the ATV Program Review Committee was that there would be two or three pieces of ATV legislation. The Department of Natural Resources has consolidated its concerns with those of the user organizations and the Committee has been assured there will now be one legislative proposal as being drafted by DNR and user organizations with IAC staff involvement.

III D. Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue proposal - 1977: Mr. Martin outlined the current status of the proposed outdoor recreation bond issue for 1977. Kit material included a draft of the legislation as presently contemplated. Meetings held with personnel of the four state agencies, the IAC, a representative of the WRPS, and other support groups (State Sportsmen's Council, Washington Association of Counties, Association of Washington Cities, etc.) produced the drafted legislation. Disagreement was had on (1) use of funds for areas of statewide significance; (2) percent of funds designated for areas of statewide significance; and (3) the method by which the funds would be distributed to local and state agencies. Proposed legislation was previously reviewed by the Governor's administrative staff on September 8, 1976. Mr. Martin stated DNR was contemplating a separate, companion bill to the legislation which Mr. Cole would like to explain to the Committee.

Mr. Cole briefly outlined the DNR plans concerning natural preserve areas, which have been placed under the protection of the Department of Natural Resources. Since DNR has the responsibility through legislative direction for determining these areas, setting up standards, and managing them, he stated DNR would have a separate bill in the State Legislature for natural preserve areas. Definition of "natural preserve areas" and "areas of statewide significance" was then discussed: (A copy of DNR's proposal was provided to each Committee member.)

Mr. Martin stated the two types actually complimented each other and that both could be included in an overall bond issue. Mr. Biggs noted Senate hearings and the questions which had been asked concerning overlapping activities by various state departments. He felt the bond issue should therefore be carefully tailored

to meet those concerns of the State Legislature. Mr. Cole, in response to Mr. Ross' question, stated DNR would prefer to keep the natural preserve areas under control of the DNR, that there already are areas set aside and being managed under this program. Since DNR would be proposing a separate bill, Mr. Bishop proposed that the chairman of the Committee select a Legislative Sub-Committee and assign to it the responsibility for developing legislation and working with DNR. The Chairman then appointed the following as members of the Legislative Sub-Committee on the Bond Issue:

MR. MOOS, MR. LARSON, MR. COLE, MR. ODEGAARD, MR. WYCKOFF, MRS. ENGLE, AND MRS. BROSTROM

Following a short recess, Mr. Cole asked whether the bond issue "committee" which has been meeting on the proposal would continue to meet even though a Legislative Sub-Committee had been appointed by the Chairman. Mr. Martin agreed there were still several items to discuss and that a meeting would be set up the coming week.

Mr. Larson asked where the percentages within the bill had originated -- who had determined these? He was informed the bond issue committee had placed these within the proposal. Mr. Odegaard then discussed the matter of 50-50 state/local "split" of the bond issue funds and the fact that the projects considered "areas of state-wide significance" should be considered for funding in the same manner so that the funds would come "off the top" with the state agencies receiving additional assistance also as well as the local agencies. He noted (1) that state agencies are already restricted by the IAC in projects they may fund with their IAC ORA monies through the Capital Budget process; whereas local agencies do not have this same restriction; (2) the bond issue is the only opportunity the state agencies have for additional funding, whereas local agencies can propose bond issues of their own. He asked that the bond issue committee take these facts into consideration in their proposal for the legislation.

Mrs. Brostrom then set a meeting of the Legislative Sub-Committee on the Bond Issue for October 1st, to be confirmed by those involved on Tuesday morning, 9-28-76. Mr. Bishop asked if legislative staff could also be included in these meetings to become acquainted with the IAC and DNR proposals. The Chairman directed the Administrator to invite the following to the meeting: Gary Tranter, Senate Park and Recreation Committee; Tim Burke, House Research Committee, Park and Recreation, and representatives from the House and Senate Ways and Means Committees.

III E. 1. 1977-79 Operating Budget: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated September 27, 1976, "Operating Budget", noting the following:

- (1) August 30 - IAC 1977-79 Operating Budget was submitted to OPPFM - \$1,118,922.
- (2) Included also was Grant to Public Agencies Program - \$18,713,248.
- (3) September 8th - scheduled agency hearing had dealt with the need for two additional IAC personnel, purposes of statewide ATV study, reasons for the General Fund request. All were explained by the Administrator and staff of the IAC. Chairman Brostrom also attended this meeting. OPPFM did not give any indication of either acceptance or rejection of the total amount of money requested or of any specific elements within the Operating Budget.

2. 1977-79 Capital Budget: Mr. Martin referred to memorandum of staff, September 27, 1976, "IAC State Agencies' Proposed Capital Budget - 1977-79 Biennium", noting the following:

- (1) The addition of \$455,000 to the Capital Budget approved by the Committee at its June 28, 1976, IAC meeting, actually came to \$419,778 following DNR's review and analysis of their budget levels. This will add three projects to DNR (Cypress Island, Mima Mounds III acquisition, and Mima Mounds, Development).
- (2) Further, \$475,520 additional funds were provided through an August 1976 updating of projected fund source receipts and funds returned to the ORA from close out projects. These were distributed to State Parks and the Department of Game.
- (3) The Capital Budget amount of \$13,879,821 approved on June 28, 1976, was therefore increased to \$14,775,119.

The Committee was asked to approve the additional funds as outlined by Mr. Martin:

AGENCY	IAC APPROVED BUDGET AMOUNT		ADDED TO APPROVED AGENCY BUDGET		NEW AGENCY BUDGET TOTALS
Department of Fisheries	\$ 1,784,660	+	\$ -0-	=	\$ 1,784,660
Department of Game	4,399,875	+	171,106	=	4,570,981
Dept. of Natl. Resources	1,525,500	+	419,778	=	1,945,278
Parks & Recreation Comm.	6,169,786	+	304,414	=	6,474,200
TOTALS	\$ 13,879,821	+	\$ 895,298	=	\$ 14,775,119

Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE PREPARE A SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET TO REFLECT THE \$1.2 MILLION LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS AND \$1.2 STATE MATCHING MONIES FROM GENERAL FUND SOURCES RATHER THAN THE OUTDOOR RECREATION SOURCES, USING THE SAME PRIORITY PROCEDURES WHICH WERE USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE ORIGINAL CAPITAL BUDGET FOR 1977-79, AND THAT THIS ADDITIONAL FUNDING BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT FOR CONSIDERATION. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Martin then asked for a motion to clarify the \$475,520 funding for the Department of Game and the Parks and Recreation Commission as explained in the staff memorandum, and the additional \$419,778 to the Department of Natural Resources.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT AN ADDITIONAL \$475,520 TO THE STATE AGENCIES' 1977-79 BIENNIUM CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST BE APPROVED WITH \$304,414 PLACED IN THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S CAPITAL BUDGET AND \$171,106 IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S CAPITAL BUDGET, THEREBY INCREASING THE TOTAL 1977-79 BIENNIUM IAC-STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET TO \$14,775,119; WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' PROJECT SAVINGS HAD AMOUNTED TO \$419,778 INSTEAD OF \$455,000 AS PASSED AT THE JUNE 28, 1976 MEETING, AND THIS CORRECTED AMOUNT WOULD BE ADDED TO ITS CAPITAL BUDGET.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IV A. 1975-77 Capital Budget State Agencies' Master List Amendments: Mr. Ron Taylor, Assistant Supervisor, Projects Administration Section, reported on the memorandum of staff dated September 27, 1976, "Request for Amendment to the State

Agencies' Capital Budget Master List". Following his explanation of the addition of projects by the state agencies to expedite processing and approval of same prior to the end of the biennium, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON THAT,

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE ADOPTION OF A STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET MASTER LIST ON DECEMBER 8, 1975, AND

WHEREAS, THE STATE DEPARTMENTS OF GAME, FISHERIES, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAD REQUESTED THAT CERTAIN OF THEIR PROJECTS BE ADDED TO THE MASTER LIST IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THE PROCESSING AND APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS PRIOR TO THE END OF THE 1975-77 BIENNIUM,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE FOLLOWING LIST OF STATE AGENCY PROJECTS ARE HEREBY ADDED TO THE STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET MASTER LIST APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON DECEMBER 8, 1975:

THAT THESE PROJECTS ARE INCLUDED IN THE 1975-77 CAPITAL BUDGET PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND THE WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE, AND

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED THESE PROJECTS MAY BE ADMINISTRATIVELY PROCESSED, CONSISTENT WITH THE IAC APPROVED PROCEDURE FOR THE PROCESSING AND APPROVAL OF MASTER LIST PROJECTS BY THE INTERAGENCY STAFF THROUGH THE IAC ADMINISTRATOR:

ADDENDUM TO MASTER LIST OF STATE AGENCIES PROJECTS

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:

- 10 EAST SIDE NORTH CASCADE HIGHWAY -- \$150,000, PHASE I ACQUISITION OF AN ADDITION TO PEARRYGIN LAKE STATE PARK IN OKANOGAN COUNTY.
- 11 MERCER SLOUGH PHASE II -- \$280,000, JOINT ACQUISITION WITH THE CITY OF BELLEVUE OF APPROXIMATELY 40 ACRES ON WEST SIDE OF MERCER SLOUGH IN CITY OF BELLEVUE.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES:

- 4 PT. WHITNEY ACCESS ACQUISITION -- \$200,000, ACQUISITION OF SALTWATER SHORELANDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESS TO PUBLIC TIDELANDS EXTENDING TO THE NORTH FROM PT. WHITNEY.
- 5 SEKIU BOAT LAUNCH -- \$200,000, ACQUISITION OF BOAT LAUNCH AREA AT SEKIU POINT IN CONJUNCTION WITH ADJACENT PUBLIC BOAT HARBOR ACQUISITION BY THE PORT OF PORT ANGELES.
- 6 EDMONDS ARTIFICIAL REEF IMPROVEMENTS -- \$4,500, DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL ARTIFICIAL REEF COMPONENTS AND SAFETY FACILITIES IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE CITY OF EDMONDS' UNDERWATER PARK.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME:

- 2 SINLAHEKIN WRA - FISH LAKE -- \$28,000, TO DEVELOP PRIMITIVE CAMP AND DAY USE FACILITIES IN THREE LOCATIONS ON FISH LAKE, OKANOGAN COUNTY. ONE OF THE SITES TO INCLUDE A BOAT LAUNCH.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME (continued):

- 3 SINLAHEKIN WRA - BLUE LAKE -- \$ 37,000, DEVELOP PRIMITIVE CAMP AND DAY USE FACILITIES IN THREE LOCATIONS ON BLUE LAKE IN OKANOGAN COUNTY. ONE SITE WILL INCLUDE A BOAT LAUNCH RAMP AND ANOTHER WILL INCLUDE A WELL FOR SANITARY WATER.
- 4 SINLAHEKIN WRA - FORDE LAKE -- \$13,000, DEVELOP A PRIMITIVE CAMP AND DAY USE FACILITY, BOAT LAUNCH, TOILETS AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS ON FORDE LAKE, OKANOGAN COUNTY.
- 5 BANKS LAKE -- \$ 16,000, REDEVELOP AN EXISTING FACILITY BY DREDGING THE EXISTING BOAT LAUNCH CHANNEL, GRADING AND RESURFACING THE ACCESS ROAD, CONSTRUCT CAMPING UNITS AND REPLACE TOILETS ON BANKS LAKE, GRANT COUNTY.
- 6 DESERT WRA - STROTHERS -- \$4,600, ACQUIRE AN APPROXIMATE 20 ACRE ADDITION TO THE 26,000 PLUS ACRE DESERT WRA IN GRANT COUNTY.
- 7 TENNANT LAKE WRA - GRAHAM -- \$ 8,100, ACQUIRE AN APPROXIMATE 12 ACRE ADDITION TO THE LAKE TENNANT WATERFOWL PROJECT IN WHATCOM COUNTY.
- 8 GLOYD SEEPS WRA - LAWSON -- \$ 93,000, ACQUIRE AN APPROXIMATE 142 ACRE ADDITION TO THE GLOYD SEEPS WRA IN GRANT COUNTY.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES:

- 19 GRIFFIN BAY DEVELOPMENT -- \$46,000, DEVELOPMENT OF A BOATING DESTINATION POINT WITH CAMPING, PICNICKING AND BOAT MOORAGE FACILITIES ON A 14.42 ACRE PARCEL LAND LOCATED ON SAN JUAN ISLAND IN SAN JUAN COUNTY.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IV B. Project Changes:

1. Douglas County, Eastmont Pool, Conversion - 73-024D: Mr. Moore reported on memorandum of staff, 9-27-76, concerning this project and the conversion aspects. He gave an historical overview from the time of initiation of the project in 1968 to the present on-site compliance inspection of June 29, 1976, performed by an IAC Staff Compliance Officer. At that time it was determined that the County had installed a permanent non-removable enclosure over the swimming pool. This action had been taken by the sponsor without communication or notification to the IAC. A letter was sent to Mr. Ed Daling, Director of the Douglas County Parks, informing him that the enclosure was in violation of State Referenda 11, 18 and LWCF monies, as well as the Project Contract signed by the County with the IAC. Meetings were held by staff with the County officials and with the Asst. Attorney General. The Asst. Attorney General's opinion corroborated the IAC staff findings that the permanent enclosure was in violation of the IAC project and was not consistent with the original intent of the grant-in-aid approved for Douglas County. Staff asked review of the matter by the Interagency Committee and direction from the members for the Administrator to work with the County, the Assistant Attorney General, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation towards a solution of the conversion situation.

Mike Tabler, Douglas County Prosecuting Attorney, was recognized by the Chairman. He made the following points:

- (1) Understood that IAC was of the opinion Douglas County had violated paragraph (13) of the Project Contract and failed to comply with RCW 99.100. However, on

reading the law, he determined it governed only marine recreation property and that the Eastmont Swimming Pool could not be included in this category.

(2) Suggested the Committee consider the problem on an individual basis as reflected in the Procedural Guidelines in the flexibility and latitude authority of the Committee. Asked that the project be viewed on its merits; the practicality of using the swimming pool year round and the other logical arguments for its present situation.

(3) Pool is now both indoor and outdoor, serving people in the area. A number of skylights and daylight panels, with sliding doors do exist and there is a sundeck.

(4) Felt Douglas County has an attractive, viable facility and the covering of the pool did not seriously detract from the project.

(5) In considering these arguments, he felt Douglas County would be found to be in compliance with the requirements of the guidelines and contract.

(6) Should the Committee desire more detailed input from the County, written material could be prepared for a later meeting of the IAC.

Mr. Patrick C. Daling, Parks Superintendent, asked if there were any questions. In response to questions of Mr. Odegaard, he advised that (1) the pool rested upon one-half acre of the fifteen acres purchased with IAC funds; (2) the amount of siding included as sliding doors was 1/4th of the total area; and (3) the ceiling surface was one-tenth removable.

Mr. Biggs asked if IAC rules provided that once a structure has been completed and the project closed out the sponsor could make changes to it at his own expense. He was advised there were stipulations under BOR rules and Agreement and IAC Guidelines and Contract which would have to be taken into consideration.

Mrs. Brostrom stated the question with the Eastmont Pool project was not so much a change in nature of the structure but whether it was to be considered a conversion or an upgrade of the project. Her personal opinion was that it could be an upgrade because it had increased the use of the pool from four months to twelve. Mr. Biggs stated in his opinion if the community wanted to spend its funds to improve a project for increased use of the public, it would be considered an upgrade.

Mr. Francis then explained that the problem was not one of the practicality, but the manner in which it had been accomplished and the conditions of the contract under which the outdoor swimming pool had been built. He noted the BOR regulations on indoor facilities; that the IAC is in the same position; that Douglas County was aware of the restrictions when first coming to the IAC for acquisition of the fifteen acres on which the Eastmont Park had been developed. Fifty percent BOR (federal) funds were used in the project.

Mr. Merlin Smith noted that the new BOR amendments contemplated by Congress would be providing for certain "covered" facilities. However, Mr. Francis stated the language in the amendment to the LWCF Act concerning this matter does not say "covered facilities", but does state "sheltered", and this has not as yet been defined -- whether the facility must be open a certain percentage and retain its outdoor recreation aspect or whether it means a fully enclosed pool.

Mr. Biggs wondered if the Committee was not discussing a very rigid application of the ruling of the guidelines and policy of the IAC rather than a rigid

interpretation of the law. He said it would be personally difficult for him to censure the County for having obviously upgraded a facility with their own money thus making it more usable by the people.

At this point, Mr. Odegaard noted the Assistant Attorney General's opinion, commented that staff did have a legal responsibility in the matter and suggested that the Administrator be directed to work with Douglas County, the Attorney General's Office, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation by moving only the last portion of the proposed motion in the staff's memorandum.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR BE DIRECTED TO WORK WITH DOUGLAS COUNTY, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AND THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION TOWARDS IDENTIFYING ALTERNATES TO SOLUTIONS OF THE ~~CONVERSIONS~~^{DEVELOPMENT}* OF THE EASTMONT POOL, DOUGLAS COUNTY PROJECT, WITH A RECOMMENDATION AS TO SOLUTION OF THE ~~CONVERSIONS~~^{DEVELOPMENT}* TO BE PRESENTED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AT ITS DECEMBER 6-7, 1976 SPECIAL MEETING.

*Mr. John Dick, Assistant Attorney General, pointed out that the Committee would be passing a motion using the word "conversions" when in actuality it did not intend to recognize the matter as a "conversion" at this point in time. Whereupon, MR. ODEGAARD ACCEPTED THE CHANGE OF THE WORDING IN THE MOTION TO "DEVELOPMENT" RATHER THAN "CONVERSIONS". WITH THIS UNDERSTANDING, THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mrs. Brostrom then directed the Administrator to assure that staff bring to the Committee a solution or alternate solutions to specific problems on projects at the same time as it presents the problem. This will give opportunity for the Committee to discuss the matters and resolve them. Mr. Moos suggested to the Administrator that he personally meet with representatives of the BOR and describe to them some of the inadequacies of their guidelines in relation to projects such as the Eastmont Swimming Pool.

Mr. Bishop noted that the IAC is an enabling agency first, not an enforcing one; however, IAC staff should continue its compliance surveillance since this was a part of its job. Staff was commended for its role in compliance inspections.

(4:30 p.m. - Chairman Brostrom asked Mr. Warren Bishop to chair the meeting in her absence.)

Mr. Bishop called upon Mr. Moore for the next project change presentation.

2. City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge Creek 75-047A - Decrease in scope/cost increase: Mr. Moore, addressing Mr. Odegaard, reported on the difference between this particular project and that of the Green River Gorge, State Parks' project, discussed at the morning's session. The Vancouver request was supported by a recent appraisal versus the situation on the GRG where an increase was basically non-supportable (much needed piece of property and State Parks did not feel it wanted to resort to condemnation).

Mr. Larry Burk, Project Manager, reviewed memorandum of staff dated September 27, 1976, concerning the Burnt Bridge Project and recommended approval of the request for a reduction in scope by deletion of the 7 acre Olson parcel, and authorization of 17.5 acre Buker parcel for \$50,000. The total project would be reduced from

99.6 acres to 92.6 acres and the total cost \$232,242 to \$225,847, with no further cost increases to be granted. Mr. Odegaard asked for a map or slide of the project to be shown designating the Olson parcel and the Buker parcel. Since this was not available, he further questioned staff about the scope reduction and deletion aspects of the project. An appraisal dated in 1974 was the basis on which staff had based its value of land; however, recent appraisals by and for the seller had established a new selling price of \$50,000 for the remaining 17 acre Buker parcel. Mr. Odegaard was concerned with the appraisal having been accomplished by the seller on the Buker parcel and the deletion of the Olson ownership.

At this point, Mr. Francis as Administrator requested that the Scope Reduction/Cost Increase on the project be withdrawn from the agenda for further analysis and follow-up by staff, to be brought back to the Committee at a later time. Acting Chairman Bishop so ordered.

(Chairman Brostrom returned to resume chairmanship at 4:48 p.m.)

3. State Parks and Recreation Commission - Birch Bay, Blackwood 76-502A, Retroactive Req., Extension, and Cost Increase: Mr. Ron Taylor reported on memorandum of staff dated 9-27-76, dealing with this project, and recommended

- (1) reinstatement of the Project Contract retroactive to the IAC Contract expiration date and a time extension to August 25, 1977;
- (2) an amendment to the project scope to include acquisition of a .12 acre in-holding, and
- (3) a cost increase in the amount of \$12,850.

State Parks' appraisal of \$12,850 had been reviewed and concurred in by the IAC revise appraiser.

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

WHEREAS, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, BIRCH BAY ACQUISITION PROJECT CONTRACT (76-502A) HAS EXPIRED, AND

WHEREAS, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS SUBMITTED A REQUEST TO RETROACTIVELY REINSTATE AND AMEND THE SUBJECT PROJECT CONTRACT, BY ADDING TO THE PROJECT SCOPE, INCREASING THE PROJECT COST AND EXTENDING THE PROJECT ENDING DATE TO ACCOMMODATE THE ACQUISITION OF AN APPROXIMATE .12 ACRE IN-HOLDING AT BIRCH BAY STATE PARK,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, BIRCH BAY STATE PARK ACQUISITION PROJECT, 76-502A, BE REINSTATED RETROACTIVELY TO AUGUST 25, 1976, AND BE EXTENDED TO AUGUST 25, 1977, AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE IAC THAT THE PROJECT SCOPE BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE ACQUISITION OF AN .12 ACRE IN-HOLDING (GIBSON PROPERTY), AND THE PROJECT COST BE INCREASED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,850 (REF. 28 - \$6,425; LWCF - \$6,425), TO A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$214,550, CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR 50% OF THE REQUESTED COST INCREASE.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. Dept. of Game - a. Sinlahekin WRA 74-626D, Project Withdrawal: Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff concerning the withdrawal of the Sinlahekin WRA Phase I project. The primary intent of the project was to construct a dam to impound water in the Coulee Creek drainage and create a small lake for fishing. However, it was determined that the Department could not obtain the necessary water right permit to do so due to the adverse effect on the irrigation needs of private land owners downstream.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO OBTAIN THE NECESSARY WATER RIGHT PERMIT TO IMPOUND COULEE CREEK DRAINAGE TO FORM A SMALL LAKE FOR FISHING WHICH IS CRITICAL TO THE PROJECT SCOPE, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED THAT THE PROJECT BE WITHDRAWN DUE TO THE INABILITY TO OBTAIN WATER RIGHTS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE IAC HEREBY WITHDRAWS THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME SINLAHEKIN WRA PHASE I PROJECT AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO NULLIFY THE CONTRACT 74-626D BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND THE IAC, AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT CONTINGENT UPON REPAYMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT FUNDS EXPENDED ON THE PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,472.72, TO THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, THE FUNDS HEREBY RELEASED IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$85,000 (REF. 18) ARE TO BE RETURNED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S UNALLOCATED BALANCE AND ARE AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME TO OTHER PROJECTS AS SUCH NEW PROJECTS ARE SUBMITTED TO THE IAC FOR APPROVAL AND ARE OF THE SAME AREA TYPE WITHIN THE SINLAHEKIN WRA.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

b. Naches River 69-610A, Request for Land Exchange: Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff, 9-27-76, concerning the project and the request of the Department of Game to allow an exchange of approximately 13.75 acres of a 31.24 acre parcel for approximately 11.7 acres of privately owned land located in the same area. A trespass problem had arisen with the 13.75 acres of land in the original project in that a private land owner adjacent to the Game Dept. land, without the Department's consent or knowledge, made various improvements which rendered the land useless for wildlife habitat and related recreational use. Negotiations ensued resulting in the proposal for a land exchange. Staff recommended the exchange as a reasonable solution to the trespass problem.

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON MAY 24, 1970, APPROVED AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S STATEWIDE WATER ACCESS (69-610A) WHICH INCLUDED AMONG FIVE SITES, THE ACQUISITION OF THE 31.24 ACRE MCCORMICK PARCEL LOCATED ALONG THE NACHES RIVER AND,

WHEREAS, SUBSEQUENT TO ACQUISITION OF THIS PARCEL BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, AN ABUTTING PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER ENTERED UPON THE LAND WITHOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT AND CONSTRUCTED VARIOUS IMPROVEMENTS, CUT TREES AND BRUSH, REMOVED NATURAL SOIL, CUT CHANNELS, AND INSTALLED A CONCRETE AND STEEL IRRIGATION SYSTEM, ALL OF WHICH RENDERED THE LAND USELESS FOR WILDLIFE HABITAT AND RELATED RECREATION USE, AND

WHEREAS, THE STATE GAME DEPARTMENT AND THE PRIVATE OWNER HAVE AGREED THAT THE SUBJECT EXCHANGE OF LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE PROVISION BY THE PRIVATE OWNER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME OF \$1,000 WORTH OF FISH, A PERPETUAL 25 FOOT STREAMBANK FISHING EASEMENT OVER LAND NOW OWNED AND TO BE OWNED AS A RESULT OF THIS EXCHANGE, AND CERTAIN STREAMBANK STABILIZATION IMPROVEMENTS AS A REASONABLE SOLUTION TO THE TRESPASS PROBLEM, AND

WHEREAS, SAID LAND EXCHANGE DOES MEET REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE IAC STATE AGENCY PROCEDURAL GUIDELINE 03.06.000 - CONVERSION OF PROPERTY,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME TO EXCHANGE APPROXIMATELY 13.75 ACRES OF DEPARTMENT OF GAME LANDS ALONG THE NACHES RIVER, ACQUIRED UNDER THE STATEWIDE WATER ACCESS PROJECT (69-610A) FOR APPROXIMATELY 11.7 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND OF EQUAL VALUE AND UTILITY ALSO LOCATED ALONG THE NACHES RIVER, IS APPROVED AND THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5. Department of Natural Resources - Coxit Creek/Leader Lake, Request for Land Exchange: Prior to discussing this memorandum, Mr. Taylor made the following corrections within the memorandum of September 27, 1976:

- (1) In paragraph 1, reference to Referendum 11 monies should have been \$9,880 - rather than \$9,800.
- (2) In paragraph two, the acreage should have been cited as 61.63, rather than 61.83.
- (3) In the same paragraph, the dollars indicated as value of the Coxit Creek site should have been \$9,250 rather than \$9,284.50.

The Department of Natural Resources requested approval to exchange 61.63 acres of land at its Coxit Creek site for 33.62 acres of state land - of equal value - adjacent to its Leader Lake Park, thus accommodating an expansion of recreation facilities.

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

WHEREAS, ON AUGUST 29, 1972, THE IAC APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE ACQUISITION OF COXIT CREEK (73-700A), CONTAINING 80 ACRES, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS REQUESTED APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE 61.63 ACRES OF LAND AT THE COXIT CREEK SITE FOR 33.62 ACRES OF STATE LAND OF EQUAL VALUE ADJACENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' LEADER LAKE PARK TO ACCOMMODATE EXPANSION OF RECREATION FACILITIES; AND,

WHEREAS, SAID EXCHANGE DOES MEET THE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES 03.06.000 - CONVERSION OF PROPERTY,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES TO EXCHANGE 61.63 ACRES OF LAND FROM COXIT CREEK (73-700A) FOR 33.62 ACRES OF STATE LAND OF EQUAL VALUE CONTIGUOUS WITH LEADER LAKE PARK (69-708A), IS APPROVED, AND, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL BY THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

6. King County, Sammamish River IV - Utility Easement: Mr. Ron Bailey, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated 9-27-76, concerning this project. King County Parks requested IAC approval for granting of a water line easement as part of an expansion of water service near Woodinville.

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

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY OF KING HAS REQUESTED APPROVAL BY THE IAC 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 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 WATER LINE EASEMENT OVER/THROUGH SAMMAMISH RIVER PARK BE APPROVED WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE EASEMENT DOCUMENT STATE THAT THE COUNTY 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.

The Committee recessed at 4:55 p.m. until Tuesday morning, 9-28-76.

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 28, 1976

The IAC Regular Meeting reconvened at 9:06 a.m. A quorum was not available but the Chairman opened the meeting calling for project review until such time as a quorum was declared. She also confirmed the meeting on the bond issue October 1, 1976, 2 p.m., at the IAC offices in Tumwater. Members of the press were welcomed, and Honorable Warren Peterson, State Representative, State Legislature, was introduced.

LWCF: Mr. Francis announced receipt of the letter from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation allocating \$2,958,585 to the State of Washington for the coming biennium.

IV E. Local Project Considerations: Mr. Glenn Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated 9-27-76, "Local Project Funding", reporting that (1) 50 applications had been submitted by local agencies for funding consideration and (2) of these eight had been returned; (3) the remaining 42 local projects to be presented by staff constituted a total dollar value of \$12,478,423, of which \$8,568,252 would be the IAC share from the Outdoor Recreation Account.

However, currently, he reported, only \$3,714,963 of unallocated funds remained for expenditure in the 1975-77 biennium for local agency projects from Ref. 28, LWCF and Init. 215. Staff recommended total disbursement of the remaining balance of funds. All cost increases would be held in abeyance until the March, 1977 IAC meeting at which time they would be considered should there be available funds.

Mr. Moore cited the four tables included in the material:

- Table I Project listing by Priority Classification
 - Table II Project Evaluation Ratings
- (continued next page)

Table III Project Cost - Fund Breakdown
Table IV Funding Recommendations

Two corrections were made on Table III:

- (1) The City of Dupont - Total project cost being \$137,000 rather than \$125,000, with \$100,000 proposed from Referendum 28;
- (2) Deletion of project #35, Edmonds School District #15, Chase Lake Park, \$72,000 (did not meet IAC planning requirements).

Following this explanation, Mr. Moore and the Project Administration Division staff presented slides of the eligible local agency projects following the schedule of project #1 through project #42 as indicated on page 28 of these minutes (green page).

Comments of the Committee relating to specific projects were as follows:

Yakima County Youth Activities Park, Yakima County: Mrs. Brostrom asked (1) the previous scoring of the project, and (2) the changes made since the last time it had appeared before the Committee for consideration. Mr. David Grant, Project Manager, explained that the equestrian areas were not in the previous projects, and the roads had been redesigned to permit proper access to other areas of the park; also the archery range had been deleted.

(QUORUM: At this point, Mr. John Biggs arrived and a quorum was declared.)

N. E. Lake Washington Beach Park, King County: In reply to inquiry of Merlin Smith, staff stated the cost per square foot of the 650' pier was \$25.00.

Genesee Park, City of Seattle: Questions on this project were answered by Mr. David Grant, Project Mgr. Mr. Odegaard asked if the City of Seattle had advised IAC staff of their priorities on recreational projects and was advised in the affirmative. Concerning the site's present use for hydroplane race observation, Mr. Grant replied this had been discussed and the project would be phased over a three to five year period in order to provide other areas for this activity.

Tennis Court Complex, Granger School District: Mr. Odegaard inquired whether the school district would make the tennis courts available for the general public, and was advised there would always be one court available for public use at all times with the understanding that all of the other courts could be used when not in use by the school during school hours.

Ballinger Park Boat Fishing Access, City of Mountlake Terrace: Eugene Leach, Project Manager, stated the school district has offered sale of the property to the City and is not in a financial position to donate the property.

Lynnwood Neighborhood Park, City of Lynnwood: Mr. Bailey, Project Manager, responding to questions, reported that the project had scored 213 when considered by the Committee at the last Local Agency funding session; very few changes had been made in the project -- mostly in the planning area.

Parkway and Marina, City of Olympia: Mr. Leach, Project Manager, in replying to questions on this project, reported that 75% of the total project costs were Init. 215 funds; that there had been coordination in planning between the Port of Olympia and the City; and that staff was satisfied the project was needed in the area.

LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS CONSIDERED / IAC MEETING - SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1976

RANK	SPONSOR	PROJECT TITLE	SCORE	TOTAL COST	L.W.C.F.	REF. 28	INIT. 215	LOCAL
1	Spokane County	Little Spokane River	271	\$ 804,000	\$402,000	\$162,750	\$ -0-	\$239,250
2	Seattle	Sand Point	260	1,352,355	676,177	227,589	110,500	338,089
3	Yakima County	Youth Activity Park	258	650,000	325,000	162,500	-0-	162,500
4	City of Spokane	River Pk. Stage II	252	1,002,400	501,200	-	-	501,200
5	Port Dist. #2, Wahkiakum Co.	Skamokawa Park	242	262,300	131,150	65,575	-	65,575
6	Ione	Ione Pool Renovation	241	38,300	-	28,725	-	9,575
7	Town of Connell	Burlington-Northern Park	234	355,600	177,800	88,900	-	88,900
8	King County	N.E.Lk. Wash. Beach Pk.	229	519,700	259,850	-0-	129,925	129,925
9	City of Selah	Wenas Park	228	398,500	199,250	99,625	-	99,625
10	City of Seattle	Central Area Playfield & Pk.	227	750,600	375,300	-	-	375,300
11	Washougal	Hathaway Expansion	227	46,620	23,310	11,655	-	11,655
12	Cowlitz County	Riverside Co. Pk.	225	345,000	172,500	78,250	8,000	86,250
13	City of Seattle	Genesee Park	225	927,400	463,700	231,850	-	231,850
14	Granger School District	Tennis Court Complex	224	39,000	19,500	9,750	-	9,750
15	Town of Metaline	Park & Marina	220	131,000	65,500	23,793	8,957	32,750
16	City of Mountlake Terrace	Ballanger Pk., Boat Fish Ac.	216	124,600	-	-	93,450	31,150
17	Kitsap County	Long Lake	215	103,450	57,725	-	25,862.50	25,862.50
18	City of Normandy Pk.	Park Acquisition	214	120,000	-	72,000	-	48,000
19	City of Lynnwood	S. Lynnwood Neigh. Park	211	227,000	113,500	56,750	-	56,750
20	Royal City	City Park	207	102,300	51,150	25,575	-	25,575
21	Olympia	Parkway & Marina	207	573,410	-	-	430,057.50	143,350.50
22	City of Tukwila	Christenson Greenbelt	206	191,000	95,500	19,100	-	76,400
23	City of Hoguam	John Gable Park	203	240,000	120,000	60,000	-0-	60,000
24	Port of Friday Harbor	Marina Restroom	201	42,628	-0-	-	31,971	10,657
25	City of Chelan	Lakeshore Park III	200	97,300	-0-	-	72,975	24,325
26	City of Vancouver	Clark Community College	199	190,200	95,100	47,550	-	47,550
27	Skagit County	Steelhead Park	198	240,000	120,000	60,000	-	60,000
28	Port of Silverdale	Silverdale Waterfront Park	192	125,460	62,730	31,365	-	31,365
29	Aberdeen	Pioneer Pk. - Phase II	192	240,600	120,300	60,150	-	60,150
30	King County	Cedar River IV	191	164,500	82,250	41,125	-	41,125
31	Town of Albion	Front Street Park	189	12,600	-	7,560	-	5,040
32	Swinomish Indian Tribe	Community Recreation Park	189	142,500	71,250	35,625	-	35,625
33	City of Dupont	Dupont Village Park	186	157,000 125,000	62,500	31,250 100,000	-	31,250
34	Kitsap Co./Port of Silverdale	Silverdale Waterfront Park	182	162,500	81,250	40,625	-	40,625
35	Edmonds School Dist. #15	Chase Lake Park	181	72,000	36,000	18,000	-	18,000
36	City of Port Townsend	Cherry Street Park	176	51,300	25,650	12,825	-	12,825
37	City of Elma	1976 Park Development	167	31,300	15,650	7,825	-	7,825
38	City of Bellevue	Mercer Slough II	164	971,500	485,750	(242,875)x	-	242,875
39	Snohomish County	Silverlake Waterfront Park	164	100,000	50,000	25,000	-	25,000
40	Bainbridge Island	Eagle Park	159	47,200	23,600	11,800	-	11,800
41	Kitsap County	Point No Point County Park	144	206,300	103,150	51,575	-	51,575
42	Kitsap County	Gordon Park	138	151,000	75,500	15,100	-	60,400

September 27-28, 1976, page 20

Following a brief recess, Chairman Brostrom introduced:

Councilperson Jeanette Williams, City of Seattle
Madeline Lemere, former member of the IAC, Seattle
Paul Barden, King County Councilman, Seattle

Marina Showers and Restrooms, Port of Friday Harbor: In reply to Mr. Odegaard, Mr. Dave Grant stated there was no relationship between this project and the U. S. Customs facilities at Friday Harbor and the State Highway Dept. (ferry services), and that the Customs Office would not need to be involved in the restroom facilities funding.

Dupont Village Park, City of Dupont: In response to Committee questions, Mr. Leach, Project Manager, advised the project had been cleared through the Weyerhaeuser Company and that coordination had been made concerning the transportation element.

At this point, Mrs. Brostrom asked that the Chase Lake Bog project of the Edmonds School District be shown at the end of the presentation on local agency projects and not be deleted.

Mercer Slough II, City of Bellevue: Mr. Odegaard asked the difference between this project and the project rated as #1, Spokane County, Little Spokane River. Mr. Taylor advised the primary use of Phase II, Mercer Slough, is by way of a lease back program, which takes up about 60% of the project; therefore, recreationists would be limited in their use of a certain amount of the passive recreation area; whereas the Little Spokane River project offers opportunity for a variety of recreational activities (boating, canoeing, snow activities).

At 11:00 a.m. the Projects Administration staff completed presentation of the local agency projects with Ron Bailey presenting the Chase Lake Bog, Edmonds School District project. There were no questions on this project.

Mrs. Brostrom asked for any comments from the Technical Advisory Committee members on any individual project. Staff recommendations for funding of the projects were then given by Glenn Moore, referring to Table IV, "Recommended Funding for September 27-28, 1976 IAC Meeting". Staff recommended that projects #28, #34, #41 and #42 be forwarded to the BOR for consideration of Trident-related funding from the Department of Defense:

- #28 - Port of Silverdale, Silverdale Waterfront Park
- #34 - Kitsap Co/Port of Silverdale, Silverdale Waterfront Park
- #41 - Kitsap County, Point-No-Point County Park
- #42 - Kitsap County, Gordon Park

Mr. Moore corrected percentage of Trident funding as shown on the Table to 100% rather than 75% for each project.

Mr. Ross asked to discuss Genesee Park which had received a score of 225, yet five other projects receiving a lower ranking had been recommended by staff for funding. Mr. Moore noted the limitation of funding for Initiative 215, Ref. 28, and LWCF as being the main reason for taking some of the projects scoring less than others.

Mr. Odegaard questioned the need for equestrian facilities in the Yakima County project (Youth Activities Park) at \$21,000 when there were other equestrian areas

nearby (fairgrounds) for use of those persons in this recreational field. There followed discussion regarding the charging of fees for equestrian use at the other recreational sources near the proposed Youth Activity Park, and the fact that 4-H Clubs are not in a position to pay fees of this type.

Mr. Odegaard then noted the various costs of tennis courts in the local projects presented by staff -- from \$4,000 up to \$17,000, and asked why this disparity. Mr. Moore replied tennis courts were constructed depending upon the quality desired by the community. Mr. Odegaard felt these could be scaled down and thus provide more funds with which to fund other local agency projects.

In reply to Mr. Larson, Mr. Dave Grant stated it was difficult in this project to state whether use of tennis courts connected with the school would be used more by the public than the school; however, these would be the only courts in the town and the school district has worked out use of the facilities during school hours -- anyone can use any of the four courts, with one court being left open for the public during school hours regardless of use by the school. The courts are not to be primarily for interscholastic activity.

Little Spokane River Project, City of Spokane: Mrs. Brostrom asked the chances of obtaining Special Secretary of the Interior Contingency Funding for this project. Mr. Moore explained the usual process of applying for funds through the BOR but there would be no guarantee the funds would be forthcoming for the project.

Genesee Park - City of Seattle/Sand Point Park: In reply to Mr. Bigg's questions, Mr. Robert Wilder, Assistant Director, City of Seattle's Park and Recreation Dept., advised that the Sand Point Park project ranked as #1 priority in the City of Seattle requests for funding consideration at this time, and when that is funded, the Genesee Park would then become #1 priority. He also advised Mrs. Brostrom that the Central Area Playfield and Park which has begun construction with a waiver of retroactivity would be completed whether or not the City received IAC funding, but most likely would be resubmitted to the IAC.

The costs involved in the Genesee Park development project were then discussed (\$927,400); as well as whether or not certain elements could be deleted from it; its priority as #1 if not funded; etc. Mr. Moore cautioned the Committee that deleting elements out of projects would affect the Evaluation System requirements and could cause considerable problems. He remarked upon the Public Works Employment Act of 1976 and the fact that there would be funds available for development of parks from that source at an early date, and perhaps the City could investigate this possibility. Mr. Wilder replied this fund source was new and it would be some time before conditions could be met and funds obtained, if at all.

Mr. Ross suggested IAC funding of Genesee Park at 25%. Mr. Biggs agreed this would at least enable the City of Seattle to commence the project and provide some relief in this low income area. The fact that the City of Seattle already had some funds with which to begin the project was then brought out by Mr. Wilder. The City would be able to proceed with "clear and green" on the project and then resubmit it for consideration as #1 City of Seattle priority in September 1977.

Mr. Milt Martin noted that if the project were to be phased at this point, the IAC would have a problem with the intricacies of the Evaluation System as it related to SCORP. He suggested providing the City with a Waiver of Retroactivity and allow it to proceed with the project, returning later with the remainder of the project application, thus not jeopardizing the total project -- with the understanding that

there would be no BOR funds placed within the project.

Mr. Moos then asked if this type of waiver could be granted to the City of Seattle for its Genesee Park project, could it not also be given to the City of Seattle for the Central Area Playfield and to Selah for the Wenas Park project? He was advised the same opportunity could be provided any project sponsor, with the understanding that their project would need to be resubmitted for consideration along with other projects for the next local agency funding session of the IAC. Funding is not assured by the IAC and the sponsor proceeds through benefits of the waiver at his own risk.

Robert Olander, City of Selah (City Supervisor), was asked for his comments. He advised that the City Council had passed a resolution for \$100,000 in a Community Block Grant Fund for the development of the Wenas Park; however, this amount he felt would only provide for initial site preparation.

Mr. Odegaard asked the Chairman if local agency representatives could advise the Committee whether any information on their projects given by staff was inaccurate or whether they felt there was a misunderstanding regarding any aspects of them. In the interests of time, Mrs. Brostrom did not feel this would be convenient. She stated there were 36 persons who had submitted a "Participant Registration Card" to her asking to speak on twenty-three projects. In order that there not be repetition, she asked that those persons wishing to speak on the same project meet during the break for lunch and select one person to speak on the project concerned. Two minutes was the maximum time to be allowed for the participant.

Mr. Harvey Watanabe, Chairman Sports Advisory Council, City of Seattle, asked that he be allowed to speak on the Genesee project since it was necessary that he leave the meeting for another engagement at the noon hour. The Chairman acceded to his request. Mr. Watanabe made the following points: (1) Within the Rainier District corridor, there has been a strong effort by community groups to work towards making the area more liveable; (2) Adjacent to the Genesee Park the recreational fields are constantly in use, with not enough room for the amount of teams waiting to play -- approximately 180 youngsters are practicing football and baseball sports; (3) Need for the park is critical; emphasized that the City is willing to complete the park and assist in plans for it.

Mr. Moos asked if it appeared logical to proceed through use of a waiver -- would the City be able to start the work now? Mr. Watanabe stated this would no doubt be acceptable, but hopefully there would be funding for the project later by the IAC.

Mrs. Brostrom introduced Mr. Thomas Wimmer, former member of the IAC and presently a member of the Seattle Park Board.

The Committee recessed at 11:55 to reconvene at 12:30 p.m.

Upon reconvening the meeting, Chairman Brostrom introduced Mr. George Bostwick, from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and Mr. Brian Johnson, from KOMO.

Mr. Peter Bement, Sand Point Air Park Association, offered material on the Sand Point Park proposal which was distributed by the secretary to each IAC member.

COMMENTS FROM LOCAL AGENCIES: Mrs. Brostrom called upon the following persons for comments on respective projects:

1. Parkway and Marina, City of Olympia - Mr. Keith Kisor, Commissioner for Public Works, City of Olympia: Mr. Kisor stated the City of Olympia is the Capitol and therefore the host city to the Washington State Legislature and to all of the people of the state, as well as out-of-state visitors, who come to view the area. Olympia desires to open up the Puget Sound waters in Olympia to make them available to people who visit and provide a park facility in coordination with the Port of Olympia in its planning. Many private marinas and state officials have approved of the overall plan. The Interclub Association has voted in support of the project at its Annual Meeting. Boating facilities are needed and the entire project is conducive for use of all people, and even though it would be paid for by the boaters through Initiative 215, the park, itself, would be used by everyone.
2. Cedar River IV, Town of Albion - Barbara Kenoyer, speaking on behalf of the Parks Committee: Portion of the land will be donated to the Town of Albion by the SCS, Bank of Troy; town is contributing \$1,800 and requests \$7,000 to complete the project. If acquired, this will be only park property owned by the Town of Albion.

3. Sand Point Park, City of Seattle:

(a) Thomas Wimmer, speaking in behalf of the Seattle Board of Park Commissioners: Recognized Seattle had three projects being considered (Sand Point, Central Area, and Genesee Park). Recommendation is that Sand Point Park facility receive funding; citizens voted 58% for this facility. Realized constraints on IAC funding, but stressed urgency of placing this facility as #1 priority. Asked that Genesee receive consideration also. Aware of the controversy, but felt development of this park would solve critical park needs for the City of Seattle.

Mr. Ross referred to the material distributed by Mr. Peter Bement (Sand Point Air Park Assoc.) and the concerns of the NOAA (National Association and Atmospheric Association), and asked if there was a possibility discussed to use the area for an aviation center for light aircraft with the City of Seattle expressing its willingness to do so. Mr. Wimmer replied to his knowledge this had not been the case. He explained the initiative that came before the people and which had, in effect, defeated the question whether or not the aircraft were to be allowed in the park.

In reply to Mr. Ross, Mr. Wimmer agreed it would be most acceptable if the IAC were to grant one-half of the amount of funds requested for the Genesee Park.

(b) Ms. Dorothy McCormick, SandPoint Community Liaison Committee: The SPCLC was formed following the election when the park initiative was passed; appointments made of twelve members representing various communities from north to south surrounding Sand Point. Official role is to assure park is developed in accordance with desires of the people. Do not have any authority, but do have definite voice in what will be ultimate development of Sand Point. Will not be an "instant park"; will take considerable number of years to accomplish; but Liaison Committee is willing to assist in any way it can and is deeply interested in having the park facility for the people.

(c) Honorable Warren Peterson, State Representative, 43rd District, State of Washington: As State Representative heard pro and con from various people in the state regarding the Sand Point Park proposal. Felt the airport recreationists lost their "bid" for the use of the park when the people voted for a park facility sans aircraft. Overwhelming vote in favor of the park. 5,000 feet of waterfront is involved which should be available to the people. Worthwhile project; excellent opportunity.

(d) Honorable Jeanette Williams, Member, Seattle City Council: In favor of utilizing this historic piece of land for a park facility. Felt it met the needs identified in local agency presentations and especially in identifying those needs in the Seattle area. Has gone through the A-95 process; been signed off by the County and other agencies and the support is now for public park use.

Mr. Odegaard asked if the City Council would take the same position as was expressed by the Assistant Director for Seattle Parks and Recreation Dept. (Robt. Wilder), that Sand Point Park would be the #1 priority as adverse to the Genesee Park. Mrs. Williams stated Sand Point was considered by the Council as #1 priority also.

Chairman Brostrom called on Martin Seelig, Sand Point Sailing Center Committee member, and Mr. William Stafford, Office of the Mayor, City of Seattle, Planning Department. Neither gentleman was present though had submitted a participant registration form.

Peter Bement, Chairman, Sand Point Air Park Association: (Mr. Bement used a map demonstration during his talk.) Felt that two minutes to present the facts which he felt had been withheld from the public in the past was not enough time. Suggested the Committee study the material he had distributed to them. He felt the Committee had received from other sources incomplete and inaccurate data and requested the Committee withhold its decision on the project until all members had a chance to examine certain facts in the matter. Mentioned the City Council had not had a public hearing for provision of public input, and that GSA had spent one year and a half studying what should happen to Sand Point and had concluded it should become a park and airport facility. At that time NOAA wanted to also be included for use of the site. Initiative resulted. He was concerned about the ships which would be harbored there.

Mr. Ross asked about NOAA and its plans. Mr. David Grant, Project Manager, stated staff had analyzed the NOAA proposal and the recommendations that there was a possibility of three vessels being placed there with the Dept. of Research facilities. He felt there was good relationship between all parties on their planning. Mr. Ross noted part of the Committee's responsibility was in reviewing the use of shorelines involving piers, docks, and boats, and their effect on those shorelines.

Mrs. Brostrom asked if staff had had the detailed information Mr. Bement, King County, and the State Aeronautics Commission had given to the Interagency Committee today (Ltr. of State Aero. Comm. 9-24-76, and King County ltr. of Councilman Tracy J. Owen, Chairman of the Public Facilities and Utilities Committee, King County Council). Mr. Grant stated he was aware of the State Aeronautics Commission but felt staff had adequately answered all concerns. Basically, the staff felt the park as envisioned by the City of Seattle was one which would meet the desires of the people in that area, and the concerns expressed by Mr. Bement, the Aeronautics Commission, and Mr. Owen, had been resolved.

In response to question of the Chairman, Mr. Robert Wilder stated he had not seen the material presented to the Committee until this morning, and that most of the issues had been dealt with in one way or another. The City has processed the project through the A-95 procedure and an EIS. He felt the City had responded to the desires of the public and all transactions were a matter of record.

4. Mercer Slough Phase II, City of Bellevue - Mr. Siegfried K. Semrau, Director, Parks and Recreation: Mr. Semrau read his letter of September 24, 1976 to the Committee concerning this project. At the conclusion of his time, the Chairman

asked that he meet with IAC staff concerning his project and resolve some of the problems evident in it.

(b) Mrs. Brostrom called on Ernest and Doris Van Tine, owners of the blueberry farm, Mercer Slough Phase II, City of Bellevue project. Mr. and Mrs. Van Tine were not present though had submitted a participant registration form.

5. Lynnwood Neighborhood Park, City of Lynnwood, Mr. Bill Evans, Park and Recreation Director: Mr. Evans noted the site had been acquired with IAC funds, and had scored 215 points. In 1975 it had scored 213 points for development and been considered for funding under Title X program, which had not been forthcoming. The same project now scored 211 points and thus is a good project, ranking high enough to be considered by the Committee. Stated there had been no planning changes in the project. Basically was same as submitted in 1975 other than additional funds have been contributed to it and the site has been cleared. Construction plans are completed; project ready to go to bid. Was concerned that project seemed to be going "down hill" in the point system when the sponsor had attempted to keep it at a high priority level.

Mr. Merlin Smith, Chrmn., TAC, pointed out that the composition of the Evaluation Team changes each year and thus projects may receive different points. Further, he noted there had been some changes in the Evaluation System. Mr. Martin then stated he had explained to Mr. Evans the difference in scoring, particularly the rating for the Action Program compliance, and an explanation was also given him concerning the modifications which had been made in the Evaluation System.

Following discussion, the Chairman asked the staff to follow-up with the City of Lynnwood, working toward further consideration of their project by the Interagency Committee.

6. Edmonds School District, Chase Lake Bog - John McAdam, Project Director, Edmonds School District: Mr. McAdam explained the project had inadvertently been left out of the Park and Recreation Plan in April 1976; this was an oversight. It was assumed the County had corrected it, but it was discovered they had not; thus, the project was now in jeopardy at this point. Appreciated the Committee's attention and consideration given to the local agency projects; wanted to encourage their assistance to Edmonds School District for the Chase Lake Bog project. Noted the County Commissioners were meeting today (Sept. 28) to re-instate the project within the plan.

Mr. Francis noted the interest of The Nature Conservancy in the project to preserve the area. Mrs. Engle felt the project was deserving of attention and that there should be some way to preserve it until such time as the IAC could consider funding assistance. She asked if DNR could help under its Natural Area Preserves Program. Mr. O'Donnell replied that program could not assist at the present time. The Chairman then asked staff to follow-up with the Edmonds School District on this project and she also requested that a report on The Nature Conservancy's activities be sent to her by the Administrator.

7. City of Seattle, Genesee Park, Honorable John L. O'Brien, Speaker Pro-Tempore, State Legislature (36th District State Representative): Noted the need for Genesee Park in low income community. If IAC could assist, the City of Seattle had funds with which to match. Felt population in the area was critical -- many people there who would take advantage of use of the facility. Asked the Committee to give very serious consideration to partial funding of the project. Crime and vandalism in the area partly attributable to lack of recreational facilities.

Mr. Moos reminded the Committee there had been discussion earlier of possible funds available for the project from the City, and possible waiver of retroactivity through the IAC. The Chairman then explained to Mr. O'Brien the Committee's ability to grant waivers of retroactivity. Next year the project could come before the Committee for funding consideration and still be eligible. This would not be a commitment on the part of the IAC since it would have to be evaluated along with other projects being submitted to the IAC at that time. Mr. O'Brien asked questions on this process. Mr. Biggs noted the Committee had been advised the Genesee Project would be #1 priority of the City of Seattle following funding of the Sand Point Park facility, and he felt the project would be given consideration by the Committee later on.

8. Dupont Village, City of Dupont - Mr. Dennis McMenamin, Consulting Engineer: Primary problem with the project is ownership of land. Donation of land would be by Weyerhaeuser, but time element is involved. Mr. Moore stated IAC files indicated Weyerhaeuser had until 1979 to donate the property. The Weyerhaeuser involvement was then discussed. Mr. Biggs stated from his knowledge the transaction was a very complicated one and Weyerhaeuser is seeking from the state per se and from local governments various authorizations they will need to keep their industrial proposal. The company has not as yet been able to describe with any degree of exactitude what they propose to do. He did not feel the land would be donated immediately and there might be a three year waiting period involved.

9. Christenson Greenbelt, City of Tukwila - Carl Stixrood, Park Planner: Mr. Stixrood felt the project should be more accurately described as a "pedestrian esplanade" rather than a "trail" as had been classified by staff. Proposed development offered riverfront recreation, picnic areas, points of interest for local people, with estimated use of the shopping area nearby at about 25,000. Would request reduced funding level to encourage the City to develop this opportunity.

10. Riverside Park, Cowlitz County - Martin Carty, Park and Recreation Director: Mr. Carty stated it was no longer necessary for him to speak to the Committee on this project.

11. N. East Lake Washington, King County - Bud Parker, King County Division of Architects: Mr. Parker stated he was available to receive technical support questions and had no other comments on the project.

12. Wenas Park, City of Selah - Robert Olander, City Supervisor: Mr. Olander read the letter from Mr. John Snider, Jr., Chairman of Kittitas Resource Conservation and Development Project, Yakima, in support of the project. He related the need for the project and the "inequity" of the funding through the Evaluation System. Project had scored high, but excluded from funding; did not understand funding or projects system. Urgent need for this project; City of Selah rapidly growing and is highly recreation oriented. Reduced project from \$700,000 to \$400,000, then to \$398,500; have worked hard to reduce it to a fundable level. Asked that some of the larger projects be considered at a lower funding level to provide funds for other projects, thus having more equitable distribution.

Both Mr. Odegaard and Mr. Moos felt Mr. Olander's question on why Wenas Park was not funded was a valid one. Mr. Moore explained that one of the items reviewed in making staff recommendations is the Action Program. The staff had already recommended one major project in the Yakima County area, and because of very limited funding available, decisions had to be made; further, the extent of Init. 215 funds had to be considered; plus this, previous funding is taken into consideration

in the Action Program. Mr. Martin then reported the Evaluation Team had already reduced 5% out of the first three projects by considering 70% funding rather than 75% so that there would be more monies available to fund the projects which had ranked lower. Maximizing the money was the main goal, consistent with the Action Program which is approved by the Committee and the State Legislature. Mr. Biggs noted the Committee has discretion to fund projects over the staff's recommendations, but it preferred to adhere to them since they had been processed through the Evaluation System.

13. Normandy Park, City of Normandy Park, Richard Deming, City Manager: Mr. Deming complimented the staff on assistance to the City of Normandy Park. Noted the problems involved in the school district selling the property to the City for a park. A slide of the project was shown and indications of boundaries given. Mr. Deming outlined the problems with BOR regulations wherein no funds could be given toward the project from BOR for school district property since this type of property could be donated. The school district is not in a position to donate the land and must have the funds. Property will be bulldozed (destroyed) if not obtained by the City of Normandy Park.

Staff replied BOR had been contacted, but since 1965 their regulations had stipulated this type of property should be donated and thus the project could not be funded through BOR. Mr. Ross asked if the City could engage in a long-term lease with the school district and be in compliance with BOR. The financial situation of the school district was then discussed.

At this point, Mr. Paul Barden, County Councilman, King County, reported the County had given \$50,000 toward the project, thus leaving \$70,000 request to IAC. Mr. Odegaard asked if this money could be used within the project and have the school district take the rest on lease within the amount of dollars and receive their cash over a period of time. Mr. Barden was not able to respond to this. Mr. Odegaard then asked if DNR with the County could pick up \$100,000 -- trade land for land -- and thus preserve the site. Mr. O'Donnell replied something might be worked out, but it would affect the ultimate need for return dollars.

14. Point-No-Point, Long Lake - Gordon Park, Kitsap County - Trident - Silverdale, Mr. John Horsley, Trident Coordinator, Kitsap County Trident Office: There were no questions asked of or by Mr. Horsley on funding of the three parks. Likewise, Honorable Bill Mahan, County Commissioner, had no comments, though he had submitted a Participant Registration form.

15. Town of Metaline, Park and Marina and
Town of Lone, Lone Pool Renovation - Mary Selecky, Administrator of TRICO
Economic Development District: Ms. Selecky asked to speak for both communities (Metaline and Lone). Lone pool project will bring a pool presently in use up to health standards under the funding program. Metaline's project would provide park and marina and open the Pend Oreille River to boats. 200 residents in the community with no city park, playground, nor picnic area of any type.

Mr. Odegaard questioned whether City Light owned a certain area and if they could assist in recreational aspects for the community. He was advised the Federal Power Commission has signed easement agreement and City Light has been helpful with engineering designs, etc. - in-kind contribution. Mr. Odegaard suggested if the project was not funded that the Town should work with City Light on the Exhibit R factor to provide recreation for the area.

16. Steelhead Park, Skagit County, Chris Allen, Director, Skagit County Parks: Project was #1 priority, ready to fund, no problems in land ownership. The land was funded for acquisition by the IAC. Prime need is to provide recreation for those using North Cascades Highway. Received overwhelming support from questionnaire survey of over 1,500 questionnaires (approximately 70% returned). Would be only public camping facility on the Skagit River in Skagit County.

17. Community Recreation Park, Swinomish Indian Tribe, (a) Sam Gaston, Project Director; (b) Fred Martin, Mayor of LaConner; (c) Dave Edwards, Principal, LaConner High School; and (d) Marvin Wilbur, Executive Director, Swinomish Tribal Community: The four supporters of this project noted the following:

- (1) First attempt for IAC funding; worked over a year on the project and the planning; #1 priority; have funds set aside to match.
- (2) Felt public involvement had been high on project, yet rated low by IAC Evaluation Team.
- (3) Little League Field in LaConner is extensively used; expect it to increase in use; now have twelve teams; only two baseball fields.
- (4) Attempted to purchase land around the school for school use, but unable to do so. School decided to assist with Swinomish Indian project where there is adequate land; develop a baseball area. Will cooperate with Indian community.
- (5) Small area does not have a wide source of funds as does larger community; need to rely on IAC funding assistance.

Mr. O'Donnell stated in his recall of TAC action, there had been very strong community support for this project and if that was not recognized in the evaluation process perhaps it was a misunderstanding. Mr. Moore stated the project had not ranked too poorly in this category of the evaluation, but at the time of evaluation by the Team, it is only able to respond to information presented to it and material in the project file. Mr. Martin noted that testimony there is community cooperation and support should be in writing in order that the Evaluation Team has a record of it.

18. Granger School District, Tennis Court Complex, Charles Klurich, mathematics teacher, Granger High School: Stated Lower Yakima Valley is in center of the state and is only place with highest percentage of low income families. Commented on being service area for Yakima Indian Nation. Many recreational facilities have been put in by Granger (track, football field, etc.) and now they need assistance with tennis courts.

19. John Gable Park, City of Hoquiam, Rod Linderman, Parks and Rec. Director: City has requested assistance for development of this park the last two years. He asked how much money had been allocated to Region II in the last ten years. Mr. Odegaard asked that the answer to this question be supplied by IAC staff and sent to Mr. Linderman.

Local Agency representatives' comments ended at 2:50 p.m., and short recess was declared.

The Committee reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MOOS, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF FOR THE LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS FUNDING.

Mr. Ross opposed and suggested taking the projects one at a time. Mr. Bishop stated if there were specific projects needing consideration of the Committee -- or any one Committee member -- this could be done by an amendment to the blanket motion. -37-

Mr. Ross stated he would like to remove the Olympia Parkway Marina from the blanket motion and add the City of Normandy Park project. Mr. Biggs agreed on adding the Normandy Park project. Mr. Moos pointed out that the City of Olympia's Parkway and Marina called for expenditure of Initiative 215 funds and that those monies would then need to be programmed elsewhere into a project which could accommodate them. Whereupon Mr. Ross asked that the City of Olympia's project remain in the blanket motion.

MR. ROSS AMENDED THE BLANKET MOTION TO ADD THE CITY OF NORMANDY PARK PROJECT FOR FUNDING. SECONDED BY MR. BIGGS.

Mr. Odegaard, speaking in favor of the amendment to the motion, felt that the \$70,000 for Normandy Park could be located in other projects before the Committee. He suggested that the Yakima County Youth Activities Park had \$21,400 for equestrian areas within it and this could be deleted thereby adding \$22,000 to the Normandy Park project. The fairgrounds for equestrian activities are nearby and could be used rather than place this type of activity in the Yakima County Park.

MR. BIGGS OFFERED A FURTHER AMENDMENT TO THE BLANKET MOTION -- THAT THE COMMITTEE TAKE SOME ACTION ON GENESEE PARK RECOGNIZING THE FUNDING LEVELS OF THE OTHER PROJECTS.

Mr. Bishop advised him that this had already been taken care of through waiver of retroactivity for which the City of Seattle would apply through the IAC.

MR. BIGGS WITHDREW HIS AMENDMENT TO THE BLANKET MOTION.

The Chairman noted there still remained \$48,000 to locate for Normandy Park and asked if it would be possible to reduce the funding level of each project within the staff's recommendations by 1 1/4 to 1 1/2 percent, thus locating the additional funds. She called for a short recess in order that Mr. Moore could calculate the figures.

On reconvening the meeting, Mr. Moore replied it would not be practical to attempt to locate additional funds in the manner suggested since the funding of the projects varied with LWCF, Ref. 28, and Init. 215. It was his suggestion that the Committee examine only those projects being considered for funding through Referendum 28 in order to derive some savings for Normandy Park. He asked that the Committee recognize the first three projects had already been reduced by 5% as a result of an attempt to spread the funds. His recommendation was that the Committee review Cowlitz County, City of Connell, or City of Seattle's Sand Point Park projects.

Mr. Moos asked for clarification -- why did the amendment to the blanket motion deal only with Normandy Park when there were four other projects not funded which were in line for funding under the point system? Mr. Ross explained there was a need on the part of the Committee to encourage and support public agencies cooperating with other public agencies -- that Normandy Park was an example and there ought to be funds available to fund it since it would be unable to obtain BOR funding due to Federal Manual (BOR) regulations. There followed considerable discussion on the Normandy Park project.

Mr. Odegaard then suggested the Committee remove \$22,000 (Ref. 28) from the Yakima County project; \$20,000 (Ref. 28) from Cowlitz County project; and \$31,000 (Ref. 28) from the Sand Point Park project to make up a total of \$73,000 (Ref. 28 funds) -- ample to fund Normandy Park.

Dave Grant asked Normandy Park official if that City could locate an additional \$10,000 and come in 50-50 on their project. Mr. Barden said he did not know where any additional funds could come from, but if necessary the City would attempt to locate same.

At this point, MR. ODEGAARD MOVED AN AMENDMENT TO THE BLANKET MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS, THAT THE COMMITTEE:

REMOVE \$22,000 (REF. 28) FROM THE YAKIMA COUNTY YOUTH ACTIVITY PARK;
REMOVE \$20,000 (REF. 28) FROM THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY PARK, COWLITZ COUNTY;
REMOVE \$31,000 (REF. 28) FROM THE SAND POINT PARK PROJECT, CITY OF SEATTLE;

TO OBTAIN AN ADDITIONAL \$73,000 (REF. 28 FUNDS) -- \$70,000 OF WHICH WOULD BE USED TO FUND THE NORMANDY PARK PROJECT.

VOTING IN THE NEGATIVE WERE: MR. ROSS, MRS. ENGLE, AND MR. BISHOP.
VOTE WAS FOUR TO THREE - MOTION THEREFORE CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE BLANKET MOTION TO ADD THE CITY OF NORMANDY PARK'S PARK PROJECT TO THE LISTING FOR FUNDING BY THE IAC. MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REMAINDER OF THE LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AS RECOMMENDED BY IAC STAFF.

THE LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS ON PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES WERE APPROVED BY STANDARD MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BY ITS ACTION AT THIS MEETING, APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Condolences and Sympathy Resolution: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MRS. ENGLE, THAT THE COMMITTEE EXTEND ITS CONDOLENCES AND SYMPATHY TO LEWIS A. BELL, FORMER MEMBER OF THE IAC, UPON THE DEATH OF HIS WIFE, ELIZABETH BELL. (APPENDIX "B".)

IV C. State Agency Project Considerations: Mr. Biggs advised the Chairman of his concern for the time element to view each state project, and suggested since IAC staff had carefully reviewed each project, the Committee could have confidence in their judgment.

MR. BIGGS THEREFORE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS, THAT

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE AGENCIES INDICATED ARE FOUND TO BE

LOCAL PROJECT APPROVAL SEPTEMBER 28, 1976

<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>L.W.C.F.</u>	<u>REF. 28</u>	<u>INIT. 215</u>	<u>LOCAL</u>
Spokane County	Little Spokane River	\$ 804,000	\$402,000	\$162,750		\$239,250
Seattle	Sand Point	1,352,355	676,177.50	126,452	\$110,500	439,225.50
Yakima County	Youth Activity Park	650,000	325,000	111,250		213,750
City of Spokane	River Park Stage II	1,002,400	(501,200) Contingency			501,200
Port Dist. #2, Wahkiakum Co.	Skamokawa Park	262,300	(131,150) RCD	65,575		65,575
Ione	Ione Pool Renovation	38,300		28,725		9,575
Town of Connell	Burlington-Northern Park	355,600	177,800	88,900		88,900
King County	N.E. Lake Washington Beach Park	519,700	259,850		129,925	129,925
Washougal	Hathaway Expansion	46,620	23,310	11,655		11,655
Cowlitz County	Riverside Co. Park	345,000	96,665	134,085	8,000	106,250
Granger School District	Tennis Court Complex	39,000		29,250		9,750
City of Mountlake Terrace	Ballanger Park, Boat Fish Access	124,600			93,450	31,150
Kitsap County	Long Lake	103,450	51,725		25,862.50	25,862.50
City of Normandy Park	Park Acquisition	120,000		70,000		50,000
Olympia	Parkway & Marina	573,410			430,057.50	143,352.50
City of Chelan	Lakeshore Park III	97,300			72,975	24,325
		<hr/>				
		\$6,434,035	\$2,012,527.50	\$828,642	\$870,770	\$2,089,745.50
Port of Silverdale	Silverdale Waterfront Park	125,460	Trident Funding 100%			
Kitsap Co./Port of Silverdale	Silverdale Waterfront Park	162,500	Trident Funding 100%			
Kitsap County	Point No Point County Park	206,300	Trident Funding 100%			
Kitsap County	Gordon Park	151,000	Trident Funding 100%			

NOTE: Contingency fund request from Sec. of Interior Special Contingency Fund of the LWCF

RCD - Funding from Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture - Resource Conservation and Development Program

Trident - Trident Impact Funding Administered by Department of Defense.

Minutes - September 27-28, 1976, page 40

CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT WITH THE RESPECTIVE STATE AGENCIES AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNTS INDICATED UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE STATE AGENCY CONCERNED:

<u>DEPARTMENT OF GAME</u>						<u>TOTAL</u>
SUNNYSIDE WRA - JOHNSON	A	\$74,750	REF. 28		\$ 74,750	LWCF \$ 149,500
METHOW WRA-BREWSTER	A	64,250	"		64,250	" 128,500
SUNDAY LAKE-KIMBALL	A			\$7,125	215	7,125 " 14,250
KALAMA MODROW BRIDGE	D			8,635	"	8,635 " 17,270
LAKE KETCHUM	D			8,830	"	8,830 " 17,660
TENNANT LAKE CLAYPIT POND	D	5,050	"		5,050	" 10,100
						<u>\$ 337,280</u>

<u>DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES</u>						
3-CORNER ROCK TRAIL	D	\$25,520				\$ 25,520
OBSTRUCTION PASS	D	61,450			\$ 61,450	122,900
LEADER LAKE EXP.	D	23,560			23,560	<u>47,120</u>
						\$ 195,540

<u>STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION</u>						
GRAYLAND BEACH II	A	\$92,400			\$ 92,400	\$ 184,800
						<u>\$ 717,620</u>

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V. Administrator's Report: The Administrator reported the IAC had progressed through the State and Federal audits -- that presently the Federal audit was being carried out and results would be available later.

VI. Committee Member Reports: None.

VII. Other Reports: Mr. Martin advised the next meeting of the IAC would be on December 6-7, 1976, in the Highway Commission Board Room, 9:00 a.m., and would consist mainly of the Evaluation System review through there would be other items on the agenda for consideration of the Committee.

QUORUM: Mr. Moos brought up the subject of a quorum once again and read his version of same (as noted below). He asked that the Chairman and the Committee consider this definition of a "quorum" because the critical motion on funding of local agency projects today had been carried by only four affirmative votes -- or one-third of the membership. Four members of the Committee had, therefore, made appropriations. He asked that the responsibility of the Committee be strengthened in this regard and require an affirmative vote of SEVEN members -- being a quorum. Mr. Moos asked the Chairman to submit this to the Attorney General for analysis and comment:

"QUORUM -- A QUORUM SHALL BE THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS PRESENT, AND IS AUTHORIZED TO DISPOSE OF ANY BUSINESS OF THE IAC, PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT IN MAKING GRANTS FROM THE IAC OUTDOOR RECREATION FUND OR ANY OTHER FUNDS UNDER ITS AUTHORITY, OR ANY PERSONNEL ACTION, IT SHALL REQUIRE THE AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF SEVEN MEMBERS."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE MEETING ADJOURN AT 4:15 P.M. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

On behalf of the Committee, Chairman Brostrom thanked the IAC staff for their excellent presentation of local agency projects and other reports of the IAC meeting.

RATIFIED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

ON

December 7, 1976

Micaela Brostrom

MICAELA BROSTROM, CHAIRMAN

Appendix "A" State/Local Procedural Guidelines - Adopted by Motions
Appendix "B" Condolences/Sympathy Resolution - Lewis A. Bell/Elizabeth Bell

NEW 04.10.000 TO .030
STATE/LOCAL PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AS ADOPTED
BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

September 27-28, 1976 Meeting

04.10.000 REAL PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES

Acquisition of publicly owned real property may be eligible for funding assistance if (1) the real property was originally acquired for non-recreational purposes and (2) that current fair market value is established by a reviewed and concurred in appraisal conforming with Sections 04.15.000; 04.15.010; and/or 04.15.020 of the Local (State) Agency Procedural Guidelines.

04.10.010 INTERGOVERNMENTAL ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY

Intergovernmental acquisition of real property previously purchased for non-recreational purposes to be acquired from another public agency for recreational purposes must meet the provisions of Section 04.10.000 and must be in conformance with the provisions of Chapter 39.33 RCW, Intergovernmental Disposition of Property Act. Such acquisition must be by fee title, unless there are legal barriers or a legal showing of public necessity that make it imperative to lease in lieu of achieving fee title.

04.10.020 INTRA-GOVERNMENTAL ACQUISITION

Intra-governmental acquisition of real property previously purchased for non-recreational purposes to be acquired from another division or department within the acquiring public agency for recreational purposes must meet the provisions of Section 04.10.000. Such acquisition must be by fee title only.

The fair market value of such inter-governmental acquisition is eligible only when such is to be used as the matching share for immediate development for outdoor recreation purposes.

04.10:020.1 INELIGIBILITY OF ESTABLISHED RECREATION AREAS

Well established outdoor recreation areas and facilities previously developed on non-recreation lands under ownership or management of either a separate public agency or the same public agency, but separate division or department, are not eligible for acquisition funding assistance.

04.10.030 INELIGIBILITY FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND MONIES

Provisions of 04.10.000 through 04.10.020.1 shall apply only to funding assistance from state and local outdoor recreation funding sources. Acquisition of publicly owned lands through purchase fee title by public agencies for recreation purposes is ineligible for federal Land and Water Conservation Fund assistance through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, unless the sale of the real property is mandated by Federal or State Law.



RESOLUTION

4800 Capitol Blvd.
Tumwater, Washington 98504

Phone: (206) 753-7140

Daniel J. Evans, Governor

~~Adrian Anderson, Chairman~~
Micaela Brostrom
PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Department of Commerce and
Economic Development

~~James G. Brown, Secretary~~
T. Evans Wyckoff

Department of Ecology
John A. Biggs, Director

Department of Fisheries
Donald W. Moos, Director

Department of Game
Ralph W. Larson, Director

Department of Highways
W. A. Bulley, Director

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

State Parks and Recreation
Commission
Charles H. Odegaard, Director

CITIZEN MEMBERS
~~Adrian Anderson, Dr. D. W. W. W. W.~~
Warren A. Bishop, Pullman
Micaela Brostrom, Seattle
Helen Engle, Tacoma
Michael K. Ross, Seattle

ADMINISTRATOR
Stanley E. Francis

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DESIRES TO EXPRESS ITS DEEP SORROW AT THE DEATH OF MRS. LEWIS A. BELL (ELIZABETH), WIFE OF FORMER IAC CHAIRMAN LEWIS A. BELL,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE MEMBERS AND STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HEREBY PRESENT THIS FORMAL EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY IN THE DEATH OF MRS. LEWIS A. (ELIZABETH) BELL, AND DO HEREBY NOTE IN THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PASSING FROM THIS LIFE OF A WOMAN WHO WAS ESTEEMED AND LOVED BY HER MANY FRIENDS AND RESPECTED BY ALL WHO KNEW HER,

RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE TENDERED TO MRS. BELL'S IMMEDIATE FAMILY AS AN EXPRESSION OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S HEARTFELT SYMPATHY.

MICAELA BROSTROM, CHAIRMAN
WARREN A. BISHOP
HELEN ENGLE
MICHAEL ROSS
W. A. BULLEY
JOHN A. BIGGS
RALPH W. LARSON
BERT L. COLE
T. EVANS WYCKOFF
CHARLES H. ODEGAARD
DONALD W. MOOS
STANLEY E. FRANCIS, ADMINISTRATOR
STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

DATED THIS 28TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX.