

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
TUMWATER, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: March 27, 1980
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Transportation Commissioners' Board Room,
Highways Administration Building, Olympia.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Elizabeth Avery, Vancouver
Kirby Billingsley, Wenatchee
Ida Jo Simmons, Lynnwood
W. A. Bulley, Director, Department of Transportation

Honorable Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, DNR
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Sandison, Director, Department of Fisheries

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Wilbur Hallauer, Director, Department of Ecology
Ralph Larson, Director, Department of Game
Robert Anderson, Director, Commerce and Economic Development
Louis Larsen, Seattle
Peter Wyman, Spokane

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Harrington - 4-Wheel Drive
Chuck Butler - Eastside Counties
Stan Human - 4-Wheel Drive Assoc
Teri Bacon - 4-Wheel Drive Assoc
Al Hedin - Dept. Natural Res.

STATE AGENCIES' TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Morris Boles, Department of Natural Resources
John Clark, Parks and Recreation Commission
Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries
Doris Gambill, Department of Game
Willie Mylroie, Department of Transportation
Merlin Smith, Department of Commerce & Economic Development

APPENDIX "A" - Revisions
to Participation Manual #6
Grant-in-Aid Program, as
approved by the Committee

LOCAL AGENCIES' TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Fred Bender attending for Maurice Lundy, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
James Webster, King County Parks and Recreation, Seattle, Washington
Harry Laban, ex-officio, City of Seattle Parks and Recreation Department

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:

Rick Finnigan, Assistant Attorney General

1. Meeting called to order, determination of a quorum, introductions: In the absence of the Vice-Chairman Louis Larsen, Elizabeth Avery called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. A quorum was not present at the time of opening the meeting. The following introductions were made:

Ida Jo Simmons, Appointed by the Governor to replace Micaela Brostrom.
Term of office ends: 12-31-82
(Social Services Coordinator for Adult Programs, Region 4, DSHS)

State Representative Walter Sprague (House Parks and Recreation Committee member)
Mark Cooper, President, County Affiliates
Charles Butler, Yakima County Planning Department (Off-Road Vehicle Program)
Fred Bender, Assistant Regional Director, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (representing Maurice D. Lundy, Regional Director)

Technical Advisory Representatives as indicated on page one of these minutes.

Gloria Tarver, Recreation Resource Planner, new staff employee, IAC Planning Services
Byron Haley, Recreation Projects Manager, new staff employee, IAC Projects Services

In the absence of a quorum, the Chairman pro-tem advised that those items requiring a vote of the Committee members would be delayed until such time as a quorum was attained. She called for additions or deletions to the agenda. The following changes were made to the agenda by the Administrator:

- III. D. Project Changes - DELETED.
- III. A. 1. Participation Manual #9 - MOVED TO IV. B. with 1981-83 Budgets discussion

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SANDISON, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN THAT THE MARCH 27, 1980 IAC MEETING AGENDA BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Resolutions - Certificates of Appreciation: Mr. Wilder announced that the terms of Micaela Brostrom and Peter Wyman had expired December 31, 1979. Certificates of appreciation from the Committee were displayed by Mr. Wilder. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. SANDISON THAT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE:

WHEREAS, PETER WYMAN, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PAST THREE YEARS AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE SAID INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THAT TIME, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO PETER WYMAN FOR HIS SERVICE IN THE FIELD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION WHILE SERVING ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

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

WHEREAS, MICAELA BROSTROM, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR

THE PAST SIX YEARS, SERVING AS ITS CHAIRMAN FROM MAY 1976 TO THE PRESENT TIME, AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE SAID INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE HER DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THAT TIME, AND WISH HER WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HER ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HER RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND AS ITS CHAIRMAN FOR A PERIOD OF TWO TERMS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREWITH EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO MICAELA BROSTROM FOR HER SERVICE IN THE FIELD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION WHILE SERVING ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

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

FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION, BOTH RESOLUTIONS WERE UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

Mr. Wilder stated that the Certificates of Appreciation and copies of the resolutions would be sent to Mr. Wyman and Mrs. Brostrom as soon as possible.

II. A. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum dated March 27, 1980, "Annual Report Supplement" and flip chart presentation for the Administrator's Report to the Committee. The following items were covered:

1. Washington Administrative Code - 286, IAC - review and finalization accomplished in 1979.
2. Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP): Fifth Edition of SCORP completed. Updating is an ongoing process to maintain IAC's federal eligibility to receive Land and Water Conservation Fund monies.
3. Off-Road Vehicle Study - Off-Road Vehicle Study completed - basis toward preparation of a Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Plan.
4. Participation Manuals - Grant-in-Aid Program, Projects Services: Updating of procedures and application processing, etc.. Formed into nine mini-manuals simplifying information to sponsors.
5. Contingency Fund Grants - HCRS: IAC obtained three development projects through Contingency Fund Grants of HCRS:
People's Park, Tacoma; Green Lake Park, Seattle; and South Central Shoreline, King County. Total: \$316,000
6. State Bond Issue Monies 1979: Budget included State Bond money, \$10,000,000, for acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities (through legislative action authorized through State Constitutional Amendment #60). To be matched with LWCF monies.

7. Agency Visibility: Included news articles, IAC press releases, WRPA Bulletin articles, IAC Newsletter "Partners in Progress", and related official publications, i.e., Off-Road Vehicle Study and Statewide Plan. Speeches/appearances by staff before citizen groups, legislative committees, with continual liaison with the Washington State Legislature and Washington State Congressional delegation. IAC studied by House and Senate Parks and Recreation Committees with proposed legislation in the 1980 Session.
8. Local Agencies Planning: Have aided 34 cities, 5 counties, 1 port district, 2 park and recreation districts, 1 school district and 2 Indian tribes to receive or continue their planning eligibility.
9. Natural Heritage Study: Completed in 1979; now in final drafting stages. Partially funded by The Nature Conservancy through Steele-Reese Foundation grant of \$126,000. Will delineate flora and fauna of this state. Supplement anticipated to SCORP.
10. Advisory Committees Review - IAC: Roles, responsibilities and functions of the various advisory committees of the IAC was conducted in 1979. Item for discussion on the agenda.
11. Off-Road Vehicle Funding Program: Eleven projects approved for funding in an amount totaling \$669,755. For: development, acquisition, planning, management.

HCRS - Outdoor Recreation Achievement Award to the IAC: Mr. Fred Bender, Assistant Regional Director, HCRS, was called upon for his presentation of an Outdoor Recreation Achievement Award from the HCRS to the IAC. Mr. Bender expressed the thanks and appreciation of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service to the IAC members for their contribution and cooperation to the HCRS programs over the years since 1965. In so doing, the IAC has entered into a program of providing better outdoor recreation opportunities to the citizens of Washington. HCRS complimented the Administrator and staff for an outstanding job in the program and Mr. Bender stated the State of Washington's program ranks among the best nationally in administration and development of outdoor recreation programs. The Seattle Regional Office (Maurice Lundy, Regional Director) nominated the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation to receive its OUTDOOR RECREATION ACHIEVEMENT AWARD. Mr. Bender read the statement forwarded in support of the nomination to the HCRS in Washington, D.C. and presented to the pro-tem Chairman and the IAC members and staff the framed award. Mrs. Avery thanked the HCRS on behalf of the IAC members and staff.

Mr. Bert Cole mentioned that the IAC has come a long way since its inception, and recalled the early sessions where it had been discussed whether there should be this type of a program. Now it has shown its ability to work not only in the State of Washington but other states as well. Mr. Cole is the only member of the Committee who has served continuously since its inception.

11. B. FISCAL STATUS REPORT: Fund Summary -- Kenn Cole, Chief, Management Services, referred to the Fund Summary dated February 29, 1980. He stated the Fund Summary reflected for the first time a set of figures that is usable by the state agencies for comparing with what was appropriated to them by the State Legislature and available to them throughout the biennium. The appropriation is the controlling mechanism regardless of how many dollars are available, except with regard to the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund monies when the apportionments are less

than the amount appropriated by the Legislature. In response to Mr. Bert Cole's questions, Mr. Kenn Cole clarified that the figures were accumulated appropriations since the beginning of the program. Agencies are able to subtract projects' amounts approved by the IAC and arrive at a balance of the appropriated funds still available to be committed to projects from their Master Lists.

Mr. Kenn Cole noted that the column headed HJR 52 was actually a misnomer, and could better be titled "1979 G.O. Bonds" since each biennium it is anticipated there will be additional resources through the HJR authority (now Amendment #60 to the Washington State Constitution, entitled "State Debt") and each will have to be identified and managed separately. He also noted that the appropriation of bond money has been made contingent upon getting federal matching funds from LWCF (for Game, DNR, Fisheries, and State Parks; the sole exception is that State Parks has three projects wholly charged to bond proceeds). In response to questions from Mr. Tveten, Mr. Cole clarified that the Fund Summary indicates only those funds which have been given or apportioned to agencies and which are available for use. The 1981 apportionment of LWCF will be shown after October (or whenever it is apportioned to the State of Washington.)

Mr. Bert Cole asked for present status of Ref. 11, 18 and 28. Mr. Kenn Cole stated the following:

- Referendum 11 - All monies committed; last project involved in Ref. 11 was closed out recently;
- Referendum 18 - All bonds sold. State Parks has approximately \$75,000 left to commit to a project from the Master List: DNR and the Department of Game will have some savings offset the deficits shown on the Fund Summary.
- Referendum 28 - All bonds sold. DNR, Parks, Fisheries have some funds to commit; small amount of Local Agencies' funds left from savings to commit.

Mr. Tveten mentioned the stipulation in the State Budget document as passed by the State Legislature and approved by the Governor which gives authority to the Governor to transfer state funds within the budget in order to accomplish the use of federal dollars. In view of the possibility that federal funds for state projects might be reduced, he asked whether it would be possible to transfer state funds from a project in order to accomplish a certain project which would not be receiving federal funds as a match, thus giving state agencies the capability of reevaluating their projects in order to accomplish certain ones which in their opinion would be of higher priority than others. Mr. Wilder replied this possibility had already been explored with OFM and if, in fact, federal funds are limited or reduced for the State of Washington, the IAC would consider this method in order to maximize use of the state dollars in state projects.

There followed discussion of the 3% "reduction" requested by the Governor for state agencies. Mr. Cole stated the IAC did not have the 3% withheld as did other state agencies since it was not an agency funded through the State's General Fund. The intent of that reduction had been to protect the General Fund. He also clarified the recent news article about the 3% noting that it was not a "reduction" in the true sense since agencies had already been "reduced" by that amount at the outset of budget appropriations, and the 3% was in fact already in reserve under the Governor's budget planning through OFM. Mr. Cole also noted in response to

question from Mr. Bert Cole that the IAC budget was in good condition; however, the agency did not receive the amount of federal funds it had anticipated and this would limit the funding program. \$8.9 million had been programmed into the budget; \$5.033 was received by the state. The amount of the second year (1981) apportionment of the federal LWCF is not yet known; the OMB Office & the President of the United States are reviewing 1981 budget adjustments at this time. Mr. Robert Wilder stated he had received certain information as to amounts or allocations being studied by OMB in Washington, D.C.; one would be that there would be no LWCF dollars apportioned at all; another is that the amount of LWCF dollars could be reduced by as much as 50%. However, nothing concrete has as yet been decided upon.

11. C. PROJECT SERVICES REPORTS: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980 "Project Services Division Report" noting that some of the items to be reported on would be referred back to the Committee at such time as there would be a quorum. Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Project Services, reported on the following items:

a. Technical Advisory Committee: For the benefit of Mrs. Simmons as a new member of the IAC, Mr. Moore briefly explained the function and purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee. A meeting was held on March 5th to discuss the Participation Manual revisions on the agenda for the March 27th IAC meeting; also meetings were held with the State TAC members towards working out details on the State Agencies' Project Evaluation System.

b. Two grant-in-aid workshops will be held as follows:

Westside -	Mountlake Terrace Recreation Pavilion
APRIL 2-3	5303 - 228th St. S.W., Mountlake Terrace, Washington
	April 2 - 1:30-5 p.m.; April 3 - 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.
Eastside	Franklin County Public Safety Bldg.,
APRIL 8-9	1015 N. 5th Avenue, Pasco, Washington
	April 8 - 1:30 - 5 p.m.; April 9 - 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

These workshops are planned to assist in acquainting agencies with the IAC policies and procedures associated with the grant-in-aid program. Planning Services will also conduct sessions on Planning Eligibility.

c. Local agencies' projects: Currently administering 90 local agency projects.

d. Soap Lake Project withdrawal: The City of Soap Lake requested withdrawal of its project; since project contract was not completed (signed) the request has been administratively approved. \$131,000 has been returned to the IAC Outdoor Recreation Account.

e. State agencies' projects: Currently administering 111 state agencies' projects. Meetings have been held with the state agencies to identify target dates and figures for both obligating their allocated LWCF monies through project approvals and to establish interim reimbursement procedures whereby the expenditure rate of LWCF monies can be improved. Detailed report will be made to the Committee in June.

f. Conversion/Change in Scope Policy (Development Projects): Staff is awaiting an opinion from HCRS before responding to Committee's request for a review of this matter. Staff has, however, worked on a policy relating to handling of the changes made on a development project subsequent to its construction and reimbursement by the IAC currently being reviewed by HCRS.

g. Portage Island: Many details remain to be worked out on the Portage Island proposal in order that a conversion and change in jurisdiction from Whatcom County to the Lummi Indian Tribe can be presented to the Committee for action. This should be ready for the Committee by the June 1980 IAC meeting.

h. STATE AGENCY MASTER LIST PROJECTS APPROVED: The following State Agency Master List Projects were approved since the last IAC meeting:

					<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>FISHERIES</u>	Gedney Island Anglers' Reef	IAC #80-800D	\$5,000 STATE	\$ 5,000 LWCF	\$ 10,000
	Construct artificial reef for use by fishermen at Gedney Island, Possession Sound, near Everett, Snohomish County.				
<u>STATE PARKS</u>	1. Manchester Campground	IAC #80-501D	\$ 207,500 STATE	\$ 207,500 LWCF	\$ 415,000
	Construct additional campgrounds/support facilities-50 units, Kitsap County				
	2. Long Beach (Ocean Access)	IAC #80-502D	\$ 103,700 STATE		\$ 103,700
	Develop parking/restrooms/trails/signs and associated amenities for beach access, Pacific County.				
	3. Battle Ground Lake - Parking	IAC #80-504D	\$ 20,500 STATE	\$ 20,500 LWCF	\$ 41,000
	Construct 100 car parking lot/relieve overflow traffic problems at park, Clark County				
	4. Fort Worden Interpretive Center	IAC #80-505D	\$ 32,000 STATE		\$ 32,000
	Renovate site for Fort Worden Marine Interpretive Center, Jefferson County.				

DEPT. NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Cypress Head	IAC #79-718D	\$ 75,500 INIT. 215		\$ 75,500
Develop boat destination camp/picnic area/tideland access on 16 acre site, Skagit County.				
2. Blanchard Hill Trail	IAC #79-719D	\$ 38,500 STATE		\$ 38,500
Develop parking area and access trail to hike-in camps on each of Lilly and Lizard Lakes/near Burlington, Skagit County.				

				<u>TOTAL</u>
3.	Lizard Lake	IAC #79-720D	\$ 6,200 STATE	\$ 6,200
	Develop a segment of access trail and a hike-in camp for hikers and horsemen on Lizard Lake, Skagit County.			
4.	Lilly Lake	IAC #79-721D	\$ 24,838 STATE	\$ 24,838
	Develop a segment of access trail and a hike-in camp for hikers and horsemen on Lilly Lake, Skagit County			
5.	Siouxon Trail	IAC #79-722D	\$ 69,802 STATE	\$ 69,802
	Improve a 10 mile horse-hiker trail providing access to summit of Mt. Mitchell, Skamania County.			
TOTAL STATE FUNDING:				<u>816,540</u>

II D. PLANNING SERVICES REPORTS:

1. Recreation Guide - Status: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27th, 1980, stating that the Recreation Guide Task Force has been established to provide input and assistance to the Planning Services Division as part of the plan development process. The IAC has been directed through passage of ESH 2736 (now RCW 43.99.142) to prepare a plan for the production and distribution of a State Recreation Guide, for submission to the State Legislature on or before January 1, 1981. The Task Force met in February primarily for an orientation meeting to review past accomplishments and present responsibilities of all state and federal agencies relative to providing information for the recreating public. Agencies are reviewing their current publications and will prepare reports for review by the Task Force. Type and form of the Guide to be recommended to the Legislature, as well as number needed and processes to be undertaken for its distribution, will be future efforts of this Task Force.

2. Off-Road Vehicle Plan - Status: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980, concerning the Off-Road Vehicle Plan. A general plan outline and initial drafts of the Demand and Supply sections have been completed and drafts of these are currently being circulated throughout the state for recommendation and comments. Other sections, when completed by staff, will be circulated in the same manner. Copies of the first two sections will be available for IAC members and others as they are distributed. Comments are being solicited from: IAC member agencies, ORVAC members, local agency ORV program participants, Governor's Office, appropriate legislative staff, City and County Associations, federal agencies, other interested groups, organizations and individuals. Mr. Bert Cole commented his agency had received several letters from citizens who do not want to accept ORV projects in their areas. Though a controversial issue, Mr. Pelton stated off-road vehicle participation is one of the fastest growing forms of recreation in the state and the demand for use areas will increase. Mr. Bert Cole expressed his approval of the ORV program noting that he had assisted in its development over the past several years.

III B. ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF THE IAC: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980, reporting on the following:

1. A single Technical Advisory Committee with state and local representation is being used.
2. A single representative from each state agency will provide the primary liaison between that agency and IAC.
3. The IAC will request each state agency director on the IAC to appoint a state agency representative to all relevant committees of the IAC provided they wish to participate.
4. A State Evaluation Team for state projects similar in concept to the Local Evaluation Team has been established.

All of the above steps were taken as a result of the report of the Sub-Committee on Advisory Committees of the IAC, chaired by Willa Mylroie.

III C. LEGISLATION: Mr. Wilder, referring to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980, reported on the status of legislation pertinent to the IAC as of Sine Die of the State Legislature. Of particular import were:

Sub Senate Bill 2563 Renaming/reorganizing the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.

This bill died; however, it received considerable attention during the Session, with various meetings being called, and amendment being made. Since the IAC will be studied under the Sunset Bill, there will be further opportunity to indicate to the Legislature the IAC program -- its functions, priorities, and planning elements.

In response to Mr. Sandison, Mr. Wilder stated the bill had not been drafted by the staff of IAC, but had been a joint Senate and House Park and Recreation Committee proposal. Reorganization of the IAC has been an issue for four years or so, and there is some question whether such reorganization is appropriate.

Sub Senate Bill 3164 Authorizing and establishing priorities for urban state parks. Directors IAC and Parks and Recreation Commission to place high priority on establishment of state parks in urban areas.

This bill passed the Legislature with partial veto by the Governor of certain sections which would have funded a park area which had not yet been processed through the regular procedures.

Senate Bill 3371 Establishing Padilla Bay Estuarine Sanctuary, Skagit County; appropriating \$70,000 to Ecology for acquisition of certain tidelands, Padilla Bay, and administering establishment of estuarine sanctuary.

This bill passed the Legislature with reduced funding as indicated above.

Mr. Wilder reported on interim studies to be carried out by the State Legislature as follows:

1. House - Recreation Policy and Long-Range Planning.
2. Budget process for recreation projects will be studied.
3. Endangered species and special wildlife.
4. Milwaukee Railroad Right-of-Way as it relates to trails.

5. Senate - Trust land purchases;
White water safety and regulations;
Fees and charges schedules for state agencies;
Ocean beaches - problems/priorities.

Following a short break, the Chairman pro-tem called upon Charles Butler, Planning Division, Yakima County, for information to the Committee on the Off-Road Vehicle Education-Law Enforcement program in his area. Mr. Butler stated that certain counties, working with Greg Lovelady, ORV Coordinator of the IAC, had developed a system of evaluating the usefulness of the education/law enforcement programs within the ORV system. He presented for review of the Committee material prepared to instruct law enforcement in the ORV enforcement program, as well as information cards as to ORV use which are given to users to complete. He suggested that any Committee member interested in reviewing the material could do so as he would be available all during the IAC meeting.

10:04 - QUORUM: SANDISON, TVETEN, COLE, AVERY, BILLINGSLEY, BULLEY, SIMMONS
A.M.

The Chairman pro-tem declared a quorum at 10:04 a.m., and returned to the agenda for those items requiring Committee action.

IV A OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECT - KITTITAS COUNTY - 80-40D: The Committee referred to staff memorandum and resume' dated March 27, 1980, stating that the project had been presented as a request for a cost increase regarding ORV #78-11D, ORV Cooperative Trails Project, at the last IAC meeting. The Committee had asked staff to develop the request as a separate project since it presented a major cost increase. Staff worked with Kittitas County and prepared a separate project in the amount of \$44,000. Full details were as indicated on the resume. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE KITTITAS COUNTY ORV PROJECT #80-40D, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$44,000, AS INDICATED ON THE STAFF RESUME, WITH FUNDING FROM THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACCOUNT, KITTITAS COUNTY. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV B 1981-83 Budgets: 1. Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980, and recommended that no action be taken as to the appointment of a Subcommittee on the Capital and Operating Budgets at this time.

2. Instructions and Evaluation System - 1981-83 Capital Budget: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Division, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 27, 1980, concerning the instructions and evaluation system for the 1981-83 Capital Budget. The instructions will be a supplement to the Capital Budget Instructions issued by the Office of Financial Management. Mr. Pelton briefly reviewed the necessary steps toward finalization of a Capital Budget, noting particularly the proposed review of the budget by an Evaluation Team to be composed of state agencies' representatives, an IAC Projects Division staff member, IAC Planning Division member, and a Technical Advisory Committee representative to be appointed by the Administrator. The Chief, Planning Services, will serve as a non-voting Chairman.

Following Mr. Pelton's presentation, the Committee asked questions concerning the Evaluation System. Mr. Tveten asked if the legislative mandate that the IAC and State Parks place a high priority on parks in urban areas had been reflected in the system. He was assured that this had been included. In response to Mr. Bert Cole, Mr. Pelton stated some of the "concerns" from the Technical Advisory Committee had been in relation to specific details within individual questions. Some concern was also expressed with the Evaluation Team

concept. Mr. Wilder reported that the staff had reviewed the entire instruction material and the Evaluation System within IAC staff as well as with state agencies' representatives in order to put together the best approach possible for finalizing the Capital Budget. All questions were reviewed thoroughly. Mr. Bulley asked if the Evaluation Team concept would entail considerable time; would it be worth the effort to have the team approach. Mr. Wilder replied the approach was very similar to the budget finalization procedures in the past. The Office of Financial Management approved of the approach, and the State Legislature also thought it a commendable one. He felt it would be an excellent coordination-type function. Mr. Tveten stated that State Parks would participate on the team if that was the desire of the Committee; however, he personally was concerned as to the need for the team approach. State Parks was willing to have the IAC staff evaluate the Capital Budget projects rather than having State Parks on an Evaluation Team evaluating other state agencies projects. He felt the team might end up reorganizing the priorities of the state agencies, and this was not their concern. Mr. Wilder stated this would not be the case; there will be fairness and objectivity in finalizing the budget and an Evaluation Team approach can be even more effective in fairness. Mr. Bulley assumed the team would give credence to priorities as established by state agencies. Mr. Tveten stated he had expressed his concern, but would vote for the motion even though he felt there was a potential problem. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE IN CONCEPT THE 1981-83 CAPITAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS OF THE IAC AND THE EVALUATION SYSTEM TO BE USED IN CONCERT WITH FINALIZATION OF THE CAPITAL BUDGET, AND, FURTHER, APPROVE THE USE OF AN EVALUATION TEAM APPROACH IN ARRIVING AT THE 1981-83 CAPITAL BUDGET FOR SUBMISSION TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND THE GOVERNOR; AND, FURTHER, THAT THE SAID PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET BE REVIEWED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT ITS JUNE 26-27, 1980 MEETING IN OLYMPIA. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (By this motion, the Committee added to Participation Manual #9, State Agencies Procedures, the State Agencies' Projects Evaluation System.)

III A. MANUALS - REFINEMENT - Participation Manuals #3-4-6-7 - Grant-in-Aid:
Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services, referred to the several memoranda of staff (dated March 27, 1980) concerning changes to the Participation Manuals. The Committee passed each suggested change as indicated below:

1. Participation Manual 03.11(2) Ineligible Acquisition Projects:
To clarify that acquisition of land for future enclosed swimming pool construction is an eligible project for IAC funding.

"The following type of projects are not eligible:

2. Acquisitions which would provide for indoor recreation opportunities as the primary use. This applies both to the acquisition of existing buildings as well as the acquisition of bare land upon which major indoor facilities other than enclosed swimming pools will be constructed. Indoor facilities either existing or to be constructed on lands acquired with IAC assistance may be permitted if they are compatible with the outdoor uses for which the land was acquired."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SANDISON, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT PARTICIPATION MANUAL PARAGRAPH 03.11(2) INELIGIBLE ACQUISITION PROJECTS, BE CHANGED TO CLARIFY THAT ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR FUTURE ENCLOSED SWIMMING POOL CONSTRUCTION IS AN ELIGIBLE PROJECT FOR IAC FUNDING. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Participation Manual - 03.13 Waiver of Retroactivity (Acquisition Projects)

To require an application be submitted prior to issuing a Waiver of Retroactivity to assist staff in determining eligibility of the proposed project -- and to conform to adopted agency rule: WAC 286-16-080.

"03.13 WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY - paragraph three:

"Agencies must submit justification for the request together with an application including an Environmental Impact Assessment."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SANDISON, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS, THAT PARTICIPATION MANUAL PARAGRAPH 03.13 WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY, BE CHANGED TO REQUIRE THAT AN APPLICATION BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO ISSUING A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY TO ASSIST STAFF IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO CONFORM TO ADOPTED AGENCY RULE WAC 286-16-080. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. Participation Manual - 04.08(14) Eligible Development Projects - Enclosed Swimming Pools

To authorize the eligibility of swimming pools which may be permanently enclosed; the enclosure to be paid 100% by project sponsor in keeping with the intent of the outdoor recreation programs of the IAC and the intent of proposed federal legislation.

"04.08(14) ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS:

"14. Enclosed swimming pools - swimming pools which are intended to be permanently enclosed are eligible to the extent that the cost of the enclosure, other than bathhouse facilities, must be borne 100 percent by the project sponsor(s).

Mr. Moore then read the listing of swimming pool projects approved by the Committee since 1972 and which would be eligible for covering by local sponsors' funding:

73-003D Cathlamet	8/9/72	75-043D Waterville	6/17/75
73-024D Douglas County	8/29/72	77-026D Ione	9/28/76
73-035D Okanogan	5/30/73	78-012D Ellensburg	8/30/78
73-047D Yakima	10/30/73	78-072D Pullman	11/2/78
74-043D Brewster P&R D.	5/3/74	79-020D Cashmere	11/2/78
74-046D Everett	5/3/74	80-032D Richland	11/15/79
74-069D Lynnwood	6/18/75	80-025D Wenatchee	11/15/79
75-013D Rosalia	1/27/75		

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS, THAT PARTICIPATION MANUAL PARAGRAPH 04.08(14) ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - ENCLOSED SWIMMING POOLS, BE CHANGED TO AUTHORIZE THE ELIGIBILITY OF SWIMMING POOLS WHICH MAY BE PERMANENTLY ENCLOSED; THE ENCLOSURE TO BE PAID 100% BY PROJECT SPONSOR IN KEEPING WITH THE INTENT OF THE OUTDOOR RECREATION PROGRAMS OF THE IAC AND THE INTENT OF PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

*Corrected by IAC
6-26-1980 see pg 12-A*

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS, THAT PARTICIPATION MANUAL PARAGRAPH 04.08(14) ELIGIBLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - ENCLOSED SWIMMING POOLS, BE CHANGED TO AUTHORIZE THE ELIGIBILITY OF SWIMMING POOLS WHICH MAY BE PERMANENTLY ENCLOSED; THE ENCLOSURE TO BE PAID 100% BY PROJECT SPONSOR IN KEEPING WITH THE INTENT OF THE OUTDOOR RECREATION PROGRAMS OF THE IAC AND THE INTENT OF PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION;

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES OF THIS REVISED GUIDELINE APPLICATION RETROACTIVELY TO THOSE FIFTEEN SWIMMING POOLS CONSTRUCTED/DEVELOPED WITH IAC ASSISTANCE TO DATE AS FOLLOWS SHOULD THE SPONSORS ELECT TO ENCLOSE THEIR SWIMMING POOLS:

<u>AGENCY:</u>	<u>PROJECT NO.</u>	<u>DATE PROJECT WAS APPROVED</u>
CATHLAMET	73-003D	8-9-72
DOUGLAS COUNTY	73-024D	8-29-72
OKANOGAN	73-035D	5-30-73
YAKIMA	73-047D	10-30-73
BREWSTER P & R DIST.	74-043D	5-3-74
EVERETT	74-046D	5-3-74
LYNNWOOD	74-069D	6-18-75
ROSALIA	75-013D	1-27-75
WATERVILLE	75-043D	6-17-75
IONE	77-026D	9-28-76
ELLENSBURG	78-012D	8-30-78
PULLMAN	78-072D	11-2-78
CASHMERE	79-020D	10-2-78
RICHLAND	80-032D	11-15-79
WENATCHEE	80-025D	11-15-79

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(CORRECTED BY IAC MEMBERS - AMENDED MOTION, JUNE 26, 1980)

4. Participation Manual - 04.11 Eligible Costs (Development Projects)

To include special assessments as a specific eligible project cost. (Special assessments are defined as: legal charge against real estate by a public authority to pay cost of public improvements such as - street lights, sidewalks, street improvements, water and sewer utilities, etc.)

"04.11 ELIGIBLE COSTS (DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS) - ITEM 10 TO BE ADDED:

"10. Special Assessments - the eligible amount will not exceed the cost over and above the cost of the actual physical hookup to make the facility operational. In most cases, only those costs for improvements directly upon the park site will be considered."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SANDISON, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT PARTICIPATION MANUAL PARAGRAPH 04.11 ELIGIBLE COSTS (DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS) INCLUDE AN ITEM 10 TO INCLUDE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AS A SPECIFIC ELIGIBLE PROJECTS COST, THE ELIGIBLE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THE COST OVER AND ABOVE THE COST OF THE ACTUAL PHYSICAL HOOKUP TO MAKE THE FACILITY OPERATIONAL, AND IN MOST CASES, ONLY THOSE COSTS FOR IMPROVEMENTS DIRECTLY UPON THE PARK SITE WILL BE CONSIDERED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5. Participation Manual - 06.03 Local Agency Project Evaluation System Questions

To clarify the intent of questions for the project sponsors as well as the Evaluation Team. No changes have been made in Committee policy. (SEE APPENDIX "A" TO THESE MINUTES FOR CHANGES TO THE EVALUATION SYSTEM AS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE.)

Mr. Moore reviewed the adjustments made in the Local Agency Project Evaluation System questions which had been approved through the Technical Advisory Committee. A revised page (4) was distributed to the Committee members, changing some wording relating to a "destination site" ("one that boaters purposely go to and stay at for a fair amount of time because of the type of facilities or recreation opportunities offered.")

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT THE CHANGES TO PARTICIPATION MANUAL 6 - 06.03 LOCAL AGENCY PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM, BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE (SEE APPENDIX "A"). MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 15-16, 1979: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SANDISON, SECONDED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 15-16, 1979 BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II C. - PROJECTS SERVICES REPORT ADDITIONAL ACTION OF THE COMMITTEE: Mr. Moore referred back to the Project Services Report given earlier to the Committee:

- a. Withdrawal of Soap Lake - administrative action;
- b. Master List approvals - State Agencies' Projects.

Committee members not present when these reports were heard, signified their acceptance of the staff report in the presence of a quorum.

Mrs. Avery reminded the Committee members of the June 26-27, 1980 IAC meeting to be held in Olympia.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADJOURN. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (10:40 a.m.)

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE *as corrected in motion 6/26/80.*

6/26/1980
(DATE)

[Signature]

REVISIONS TO PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6 - LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECT
EVALUATION SYSTEM QUESTIONS - 3-27-80

APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE 3-27-80 WERE THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS/
REFINEMENTS TO THE CURRENT LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECT EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

A SECTION - LOCAL AND STATE NEEDS:

A-1 - Planning:

The proposed change involved the combination of the two planning document questions into a single question. The past maximum weight given to planning documents was 32 points (19% of the 171 point total). The proposed and adopted by the Committee maximum weight is now 25 points which is 17% of the 146 point total, nearly equal to the weight given planning documents under the past system.

A-2 - Needs: Editorial change only.

A-3 - Significance: An editorial change and shift from Section B resulted in an increased point value from a maximum of 15 points (9%) to a new maximum of 20 points (14%).

Total A Section value was increased from a maximum 60 points (35% of the 171 point total) to 65 points (44% of the 146 point total).

B SECTION - DESIGN AND USE FACTORS:

The aesthetic quality question (B-1A/B-1B) of 15 points maximum was deleted from the system (due to difficulty of accessing varying opinions of aesthetic quality).

B-1 - Access: Editorial change only.

B-2A- Suitability: Editorial change only.

B-2B- Design: Editorial change only.

B-3 - Project Location: An editorial change and shift from Section A resulted in a reduced maximum point value from 20 (12%) to 15 (10%) due to the difficulty in assessing measurement.

Total B Section value was reduced from maximum 75 points (44% of the 171 point total) to 45 points (31% of the 146 point total).

C SECTION - OTHER FACTORS:

C-1 - Population: Editorial change only.

C-2 - Underprivileged: Editorial change only.

C-3 - Readiness: Editorial change and shift from Section B resulted in a reduced point value from a maximum of 15 points (9%) to 12 points (8%) -- the ratio to the total score of Sections A, B, and C remains about the same.

Total Section C is 36 points - with no change in point total. However, percent of impact is increased from 21% to 25%.

D SECTION - BONUS QUESTIONS:

- D-1 - Editorial change only.
- D-2 - " " "
- D-3 - " " "
- D-4 - " " "
- D-5 - DELETED (was not used in the vast majority of local projects)
- D-6 - No change (became D-5)
- D-7 - No change (became D-6)
- D-8 - No change (became D-7)

All points in D Section were reduced to the same percentage of impact under the past system score levels.

EVALUATION SYSTEM QUESTIONS

SECTION A. The objectives of this section are to identify and emphasize those local and state needs and related factors which should be of primary consideration and/or influence on the scope of each project prepared for Grant-in-Aid funding consideration.

Question A-1: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROJECT MEET OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS AS IDENTIFIED IN:

- A. The sponsoring agency's Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan; and
- B. The Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)?

This question will be scored in advance by the Planning Services Division.

Part A will be worth 60% of the total score for this question. Scoring will be based on the relative need for the type of project submitted in relationship to all needs identified within the sponsoring agency's Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan on which their planning eligibility was granted.

Part B will be worth 40% of the total score for this question. Scoring will be based on the relative need for the type of project submitted in relation to all needs identified within the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) for the Planning District within which the project is located.

Maximum Score 25 Points

Question A-2: TO WHAT EXTENT DO EXISTING FACILITIES SERVE RECREATION NEEDS IN THE PROJECT SERVICE AREA? Those areas either urban or rural that have existing outdoor recreation needs which are not being served by existing outdoor recreation facilities, within the service area of the proposed project, should be given priority over other areas that have existing facilities which meet existing needs. The service area of the project is that defined in the project proposal.

Excellent	17-20
Very Good	13-16
Good	10-12
Fair	5-9
Poor	1-4

Question A-3: HOW SIGNIFICANTLY DOES THE PROJECT SCOPE INCREASE THE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN THE SERVICE AREA? Consider new opportunities; consider significance of recreation opportunities provided (i.e. number of participants); consider versatility (i.e., age, groups, sexes, accommodated; group and/or family vs. individual participation).

Excellent	17-20
Very Good	13-16
Good	10-12
Fair	5-9
Poor	1-4

SECTION B. The objective of this section is to identify and emphasize those design and use related factors which should be of primary consideration and/or influence on the project.

Question B-1: IS ACCESS TO THE SITE SUFFICIENTLY SAFE FOR PUBLIC USE? Evaluate the safety of access to the site. In assessing access, the service area defined for the site should be used, as well as the predominant mode(s) of transportation dictated by the type of park.

Excellent	13-15
Very Good	10-12
Good	7-9
Fair	4-6
Poor	1-3

Question B-2A: DOES THE SITE BEING ACQUIRED PROVIDE PROPER CAPABILITY FOR THE FUTURE USES TO BE MADE OF IT? (Use this question for ACQUISITION projects only.) Evaluate the quality and adequacy of the site for the future intended uses. This evaluation will include consideration of such factors as soils, natural terrain, slopes, vegetative cover and adequacy of site size for proposed usage. Those sites which appear to require the least amount of transformation to accommodate the proposed future usage will be awarded higher point values.

Excellent	13-15
Very Good	10-12
Good	7-9
Fair	4-6
Poor	1-3

Question B-2B: DOES THE SITE PLAN DEMONSTRATE THE APPLICATION OF PROPER DESIGN? (Use this question for DEVELOPMENT projects only.) Evaluate the quality and adequacy of the site development plan. Those projects which show maximum effort to provide facilities whose design will allow for a variety of uses within the same space will be awarded higher point values.

Excellent	13-15
Very Good	10-12
Good	7-9
Fair	4-6
Poor	1-3

Question B-3: TO WHAT DEGREE IS THE PROPOSED PROJECT LOCATION APPROPRIATE TO SERVE THE PURPOSE? The location of a recreational facility should be proximate to the expected user population within the service area as established in the project proposal.

Excellent	13-15
Very Good	10-12
Good	7-9
Fair	4-6
Poor	1-3

SECTION C: The objective of this section is to emphasize other factors which are important in overall project consideration but which are secondary considerations in determining the viability of the project.

Question C-1: WHAT IS THE POPULATION DENSITY IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT? If the project is sponsored by a city or town, use the population of the sponsoring agency. If the project is sponsored by a county or a special district, use the population of the largest incorporated city within the service area of the project.

a. 100,000 over	<u>12</u>
b. 30,000 to 100,000	<u>9</u>
c. 10,000 to 30,000	<u>6</u>
d. 10,000 or less	<u>3</u>

Question C-2: TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THE PROJECT PROVIDE RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE UNDERPRIVILEGED? The intent of this question is to evaluate the recreation opportunities and experiences the facility will provide for the underprivileged. The underprivileged are defined as the economically depressed.

Excellent	10-12
Very Good	7-9
Good	4-6
Fair	1-3

Question C-3: HOW "READY" IS THE APPLICANT TO PROCEED ON THE PROJECT? Evaluate the applicants readiness to undertake and complete the project. Consider the complexity of the project - i.e., number and type of elements in development projects and number of parcels in acquisition projects; consider degree of completeness of bid plans and specifications/number of options attained or negotiations complete (verified in writing); consider applicants management commitment to the project.

Excellent	10-12
Very Good	7-9
Good	4-6
Fair	1-3

SECTION D: The objective of this section is to give "bonus" points to those projects which provide consideration of statewide goals or include factors which because of their nature and type are not applicable to all projects submitted for Grant-in-Aid consideration.

Question D-1: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE FOR COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTIONS? A project providing specific evidence that a cooperative effort does exist between governmental jurisdictions, and/or between a unit of government and private enterprise in the provision of outdoor recreation facilities may be awarded bonus points. Bonus points may be awarded for,

1. Cooperatively provided facilities that serve a significantly larger population base and geographical area than normally would be served by the lead applicant agency, or
2. Provide outdoor facilities and activities for a broader more general participation than would be the normal role of the lead applicant agency, or
3. Which provide a saving of public funds in acquisition, development and management of the park facility.

0-17 Points

Question D-2: PROVIDES CONTRIBUTION TO EXISTING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ON SITE. If the project contributes to the greater utilization of the existing facility through contribution to opportunity, activity, and completeness of total park, or for renovation or partial redevelopment of an existing park for purposes of additional opportunity, modernization and reduction of m/o, bonus points may be awarded.

0-17 Points

Question D-3: PROVIDES SPECIAL FACILITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED. All projects are expected to make adequate provisions for use by the mentally and physically handicapped. Minimum provisions are considered to be those required by law and no points shall be awarded. Maximum points will be awarded only when the project has totally integrated provisions for use by the handicapped of all facilities in concert with use by the non-handicapped.

0-10 Points

Question D-4: PROVIDES OR WILL PROVIDE BOATING ACCESS FACILITIES AND/OR BOATING DESTINATION FACILITIES. Boating access facilities are defined as facilities which allow for the physical transference of boats from land to water. Traditionally, this would include launching ramps and other launching devices, and supporting facilities such as docks, parking areas, and restroom.

- Points should be awarded according to the scope of the project and the significance of the body of water.
- A destination site is one that boaters purposely go to and stay at for a fair amount of time because of the type of facilities or recreation opportunities offered.
- Projects which provide boating access and destination facilities should be awarded maximum points.

0-10 Points

Question D-5: PROVIDES FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS AND/OR SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS. Such areas shall include, but not be limited to, natural estuaries, swamps, marshes, other wetlands or uplands which provide critical habitat for ecological communities, wildlife, birdlife, etc., as well as opportunities for scientific, educational and recreational experiences. Areas containing natural, geological, or hydrological phenomena shall also be included. Projects which help preserve these natural resources in their natural or existing state may be awarded bonus points.

0-10 Points

Question D-6: IF A PROJECT HAS SOME PARTICULARLY DISTINCTIVE VALUE, INTRODUCES AN INNOVATIVE CONCEPT, OR PROVIDES FOR A UNIQUE OR UNUSUAL EXPERIENCE, BONUS POINTS MAY BE AWARDED.

0-17 Points

Question D-7: IF A PROJECT REFLECTS NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS WHICH UNDULY WEAKEN ITS VIABILITY OR PURPOSE, MINUS POINTS MAY BE SCORED AGAINST IT.

0-17 Points