

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 3, 1981 PLACE: CITY OF VANCOUVER, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
TIME: 9:00 a.m. 210 E. 13TH STREET, VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Elizabeth Avery, Chairman, Vancouver Mr. Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation
Commission
Mr. Kirby Billingsley, Wenatchee
Mr. Virgil E. Magruder, Redmond Mr. Rolland Schmitt, Director, Department
of Fisheries

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Frank Lockard, Director, Department of Game
Honorable Brian Boyle, Commissioner of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources
Mrs. Ida Jo Simmons, Lynnwood

Meeting called to order, introductions: The meeting was called to order by Elizabeth Avery, Chairman, without a quorum. Committee members present: AVERY, BILLINGSLEY, MAGRUDER, TVETEN. The Chairman stated the meeting would begin with status reports from the Interagency Committee Director and staff. She welcomed those present and announced there were Participant Registration Cards available in the lobby for those persons wishing to testify before the Committee on any agenda item.

Various members of advisory committees to the IAC were introduced by Mr. Robert Wilder, Director; Mr. Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning Services; and Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services. Mr. Ted Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Vancouver, was recognized by Mr. Wilder and extended thanks and appreciation for his assistance in providing the facilities for the meeting.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder called upon Mr. Pelton for a brief slides presentation on the "IAC Story". This presentation is available for use in meetings and lectures. On the conclusion of this program, Mr. Wilder reported to the Committee on the following:

(1) The IAC meeting in Vancouver was planned in conjunction with the Washington Recreation and Park Association's Annual meeting, taking place November 4-5-6; giving an opportunity for Committee members and others to attend both sessions. WRPA's meeting included assistance from the State of Oregon; the theme, "Building Bridges".

(2) NRPA Congress: Held in Minneapolis, Minnesota; dealing with major issues and legislation. Presented an opportunity for approximately 6,000 delegates to get in touch with their Congressional delegations in regard to the Land and Water Conservation Fund program. Due to their interest and active participation, the Senate Bill passed 87 to 8 - \$100,000,000 is still in the LWCF program. However, a Conference Committee will deliberate on the LWCF fund as well as many other budgetary factors in reaching a final budget figure. The fact that the Senate did go on record stating this program is important and vital, and that it should continue, is significant.

APPENDIX "A" - APPROVED ORV PROJECTS
APPENDIX "B" - ORV PROJECTS PRO/CON LTRS
attached to official minute book
copy of minutes only.

(3) Washington State Budget: Many problems and concerns; various scenarios on how to save money in state government. One dealt with elimination of certain commissions and committees, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation being among these. These are merely discussion items at this point in time; IAC was not alone since many other ideas have been broached and IAC was not singled out for individual attention; Governor has released an Executive Order asking that all commissions, committees and state agencies be examined carefully. Probably will not come up in November Legislative Session, but will in January 1982. Will be calling upon members of the IAC Committee for assistance.

(a) Budgetary Cuts: The Governor had asked state agencies to cut 10.1%. Though the IAC is not a General Fund agency but is funded from dedicated funds, the agency cut 10.5% and is holding that line and maintaining a very frugal operation.

At this point, Mr. Tveten asked if the 10.5% "saved" was being put back into projects for acquisition and development. Mr. Wilder answered in the affirmative, stating it was a saving to the total IAC program.

II B. MANAGEMENT SERVICES. 1. FUND SUMMARY: Mr. Stan Scott, Chief, Management Services, referred to the Fund Summary in the kit material dated September 20, 1981, and distributed to the Committee a revised, updated Fund Summary as of October 30, 1981. He pointed out various changes in relation to the Land and Water Fund figures and the total ORA account. He explained to the audience that the Fund Summary consisted of information as to funding expenditures since 1965, since ORA funds were authorized, and gave balances for each source from which monies had been received. He further explained the meaning of the word "approved" in referring to projects funded. This is that point in time at which the project proposed for execution has been contractually signed by all parties involved. In the case of those projects containing LWCF, the "approved project" means both contracts have been signed: IAC with sponsor; NPS with IAC. He explained if a project is very close to having contract approval and there are no apparent problems, this has been taken into consideration in the Fund Summary; if, however, there are problems resulting in delays, then that project will not be included in the approved totals.

Mr. Scott noted that LWCF funds have almost "zeroed out". There is a small balance of one project not contractually signed. In HJR 52, he explained the differences, and noted the \$3.5 million in DNR for the "John Wayne Trail". Several state projects had been considered as approved: All Areas Account, St. Helens project, and others. The \$550,000 for Ecology was noted, which indicates that that project is about to be contractually committed. Balances were briefly noted.

2. Off-Road Vehicles Fund Summary: Mr. Scott referred to the Off-Road Vehicles Summary Report dated October 21, 1981 - with figures as of September 30, 1981. A brief explanation was made of the report as to Revenues from 9/21/1977 to 9/30/81 and expenditures. He noted that the estimated income from Oct. 1981 to Feb. 1982 would be approximately \$400,000, with a total estimated funding balance on February 28, 1982 of \$852,294. Added to this would be \$55,000 returned ATV monies from Franklin County. Mr. Scott stated if the Committee were to approve \$800,000 in ORV projects at this session, then there would be approximately \$470,000 available on February 28, 1982.

On completion of Mr. Scott's presentation, Mr. Tveten asked for clarification on availability of HJR 52 monies, and whether the IAC was not subject to future bond sales to obtain these funds. Mr. Scott stated the IAC is subject to future bond sales but only in the actual cash dollars that will be available. Commitments have been made that certain projects will be funded from HJR 52. OFM has been working with the IAC on cash flow and has been advised the total amount of contractual commitments made by the IAC in behalf of the state so that they, in turn, can analyze whether a bond sale will be necessary. Mr. Wilder advised there was a very real problem at present concerning cash flow; that the IAC was dealing with this situation on a daily basis and attempting to meet commitments. A recent committee session of the Legislature which he had attended discussed bond sales, and it was his impression no bond sales would be forthcoming for some time. Mr. Tveten then asked if each state agency could then assume that if a C-8 Capital Budget allotment request had been approved the cash was available. Mr. Scott stated it could be assumed that the contractual commitments had been made, but that these would continue to be analyzed through OFM as to future bond sale needs.

II C. PROJECT SERVICES: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Project Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1981, "Project Services Division Report", noting the following:

(1) 75 project applications totalling in excess of \$31.6 million have been received for funding consideration in March 1982. Financial needs of local agencies continues to grow at a much greater rate than available funds.

(2) A simplified application form has been devised to assist project sponsors in reducing their expenditures towards submission of applications to the IAC. Several federal mandated requirements have been eliminated; appraisal requirements have been modified.

(3) Local sponsors are being assisted by the Projects Services Section in completing their ongoing projects.

(4) Administrative Action:

City of Langley - Langley Harbor Development (#78-045D): \$10,781 additional Initiative 215 monies were approved as a cost increase for the City of Langley Harbor Development Project. This will cover a portion of the costs incurred towards adding additional piling and support to the moorage floats. (Total project cost increased from \$320,000 to \$334,375.)

(5) State Agencies' Master Lists Projects Approved: Corrections were made to items #5, #7, and #8 on the Master List prior to a review:

#5 - \$400,000 to acquire Beards Hollow changed to \$800,000;

#7 - Thurston County locale changed to Pierce County;

#8 - Auburn Game Farm locale changed from Thurston County to

King County.

The approved projects were as follows:

11-3-81 APPROVED STATE AGENCIES' MASTER LIST PROJECTS

<u>STATE PARKS</u>			
--	1.	St. Edwards King County	Remodel and renovate existing facilities \$ 297,000
--	2.	St. Helens View Point - Cowlitz County	Construct information center, viewpoints, parking lot and sanitary facilities 100,000
--	3.	Region 3 Headquarters Chelan County	Purchase and renovate building 145,000
--	4.	All Areas A/C	Various counties - meet unanticipated requirements 350,000
81-504A	5.	Beards Hollow Pacific Co.	Acquire approx. 107 acres adjacent to Fort Canby State Park 800,000
81-512A	6.	Lower Green River, King Co.	Acquire approx. 104 acres along Green River near cities of Kent and Auburn. 750,000
82-500A	7.	Puyallup Trust Lands, Pierce County	Acquire approx. 40 acres of School Trust Land from DNR near Puyallup. 400,000
82-501A	8.	Auburn Game Farm King Co.	To acquire approx. 160 acres of surplus property from Dept. of Game 1,500,000
82-502A	9.	Seaquest Cowlitz Co.	Acquire Dept. of Natl. Resources land at Seaquest Park. 80,000
81-513A	10.	Green River Gorge, King County	Acquire approx. 100 acres in four locations within Green River Gorge Conservation area 1,032,000
81-508A	11.	Pearrygin Lake Okanogan Co.	Acquire approx. 88 acres of Mack Loyd Ranch adjacent to Pearrygin Lake St. Park 524,000
		80-605D	<u>\$ 5,978,000</u>
<u>GAME DEPT.</u>	1.	Campbell Lake Skagit County	Develop boat launch, dock, parking area, restrooms on Campbell Lake, four miles south of Anacortes. \$ 68,000
80-603D	2.	Glynn Williams Grant County	Redevelop public access with restrooms, extend boat ramp length, improve approach to ramp on site located on Potholes reservoir. 22,250
			<u>\$ 90,250</u>
<u>DNR</u> 82 701A	1.	John Wayne Trail	Spokane, Whitman, Adams, Grant, Kittitas counties; to acquire approx. 213 miles of Milwaukee Railroad Right-of-Way from Easton to Tekoa. \$ 3,500,000

<u>FISHERIES</u> 81-001D	1. Ruston Way Pier Pierce County	Construct public fishing pier, marine habitat enhancement structures and restroom service bldg. on east end of City of Tacoma's Marine Park, Commencement Bay.	\$ 877,000
<u>ECOLOGY</u> --	1. Padilla Bay Skagit County	Acquire approx. 11,600 acres of privately owned tidelands and uplands for purposes of establishing an estuarine sanctuary. (Total project cost \$1,100,000; with \$550,000 from Coastal Zone Mngmt. Funds)	\$ 550,000

11. D. PLANNING SERVICES. 1. STATE TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Mr. Pelton reported that the State Trails Advisory Committee had met October 27, 1981 for discussion of future legislation to fund trails. Approaches currently used or being considered by other states were reviewed -- the idea of dedicated funds for non-motorized trail purposes was discussed. There was unanimous agreement that there is a need in the State of Washington for this type of funding. Basic questions were considered: How much money do we need to generate for trails; what sort of needs will these funds address; who will benefit from the funding; what kind of trail system do we want and how would it tie in with the State Trails Act; and, finally, how can we ensure an equitable cost to all users? Status reports on further deliberations of the STAC will be made to the IAC Committee toward presentation to the Committee of satisfactory, proposed trails legislation.

2. STATE INVENTORY PROGRAM: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1981, "State Inventory Program", noting that the response to the inventory forms sent to local, state and federal entities had been commendable, and that it is anticipated the initial update of the inventory program can be completed by the end of the current year. Follow-up will be emphasized during November and December. The data will be added to the IAC computer data bank in December 1981, with completion of the inventory by next March.

3. LOCAL AGENCIES' PLANS - TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff, "Local Agency Plans--Technical Assistance", dated November 3, 1981, reporting the following:

- (a) Seventy-five applications involving sixty-six agencies were received by the IAC for the March 1982 funding session. Thirty-two agencies are in various stages of planning and are receiving technical assistance from the Planning Services Division in order to be eligible by March 1982.
- (b) Thirty-four agencies are currently eligible, nine of which had updated their plans or developed them in 1981. Another nine agencies have developed Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plans for eligibility for future funding session. Fourteen agencies are receiving technical assistance in development of their plans.
- (c) Of the 34 eligible agencies, the Capital Improvement Programs have been updated or newly developed by 16 agencies and 18 agencies are in the process of developing and adopting CIPs.

4. COUNTY RECREATIONAL PROFILES: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1981, "County Recreational Profiles", and commented on the revised form to obtain from each county in the State information on certain recreation related data and trends. The revised form will include recreation supply information in addition to census information and vehicle registration statistics. Supply information is provided through the Public Lands Inventory System of the IAC (an element of SCORP).

III. OLD BUSINESS. A. LEGISLATION: Status of legislation was then reported on by Mr. Wilder, referring to memorandum of November 3, 1981, and attached material: Memorial resolution of 9-10-81, IAC; memorandum to Fred Hellberg OFM on the memorial 10-21-81; Copy of the proposed Memorial; Fiscal Note and narrative in relation thereto, and a memorandum to Fred Hellberg for the Governor's Office review - a draft letter to Washington's Congressional Delegation and the Honorable Mark Hatfield, Senate Appropriations Committee - concerning support for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Wilder commented on his recent contacts with Washington, D.C. and the cooperation particularly of Congressman Norm Dicks who had assisted in reporting to the IAC the current situation in regard to the Land and Water Conservation Funding. A Conference Committee will be meeting November 4th to determine funding levels.

ORV Legislation: Mr. Wilder also reported that it was not opportune to draft legislation concerning Off-Road Vehicle funding as had been discussed at the September 11, 1981 IAC meeting. However, he will be watching this and should the climate change, legislation could be proposed.

Columbia River: Mr. Billingsley brought to the Committee's attention the several public recreational projects being developed through utility districts funds. He felt he should at some time give a report to the IAC Committee members on how these dollars are being invested for public recreation. Mr. Pelton stated many of those projects are considered within the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and data related to them is used to justify the need for recreational areas along the Columbia River. The Chairman stated this would make an interesting report at some future IAC meeting.

(The Committee recessed at 9:52 a.m., and reconvened at 10:24 a.m. with a quorum upon the arrival of Mr. Rolland Schmitt, Director, Department of Fisheries;
QUORUM: AVERY, BILLINGSLEY, MAGRUDER, TVETEN, SCHMITTEN.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1981: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MR. MAGRUDER, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1981, BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA, NOVEMBER 3, 1981: The Chairman called for additions or deletions to the agenda for November 3, 1981. There being none, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MAGRUDER, SECONDED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 3, 1981 IAC MEETING AS PROPOSED BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. A. PROJECT CHANGES. DNR, SHARK REEF, MULTIPLE-SITE CONVERSIONS: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1981, "Department of Natural Resources - Shark Reef, Request for Concept Approval", which had been distributed to each Committee member. Mr. Moore outlined the request for review and approval in concept of a series of conversions requested by DNR which would ultimately result in the lease of up to forty acres of Trust Lands known as Shark Reef, on Lopez Island. DNR has experienced difficulty to develop six leased sites and proposed to convert those sites, and in turn, obtain a fifty year lease of up to 40 acres of the Shark Reef Trust Lands. Staff recommended the Committee approve the conversion in concept, with final approval by the Committee at a later date when information is at hand.

Mr. Tveten asked if there would be any difficulty in obtaining permits for the Shark Reef project, and was informed the planning commission of San Juan Island is in favor of this particular development and has no objections. In response to other questions, Mr. Moore stated there had been only a small sum of money spent on one of the six sites.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MR. SCHMITTEN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS UTILIZED FEDERAL LWCF AND STATE BOND FUNDS TOWARDS THE LEASE ACQUISITION OF SIX SITES FOR RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS POINT LAWRENCE (73-714A[3]), GREENWATER (70-701A[6]), MYSTIC FALLS (73-713A[3]), COXIT CREEK (73-700A[1]), NASELLE RIVER (74-705A), AND INDIAN CAVES (73-700A[4]); AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN UNABLE TO DEVELOP ALL OR A PORTION OF THE SITES FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES DUE TO A VARIETY OF REASONS AND HAS REQUESTED THE LEASES TO BE CONVERTED; AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT HAS IDENTIFIED THE SHARK REEF TRUST LANDS SITE AS REPLACEMENT FOR THE LEASED SITES TO BE CONVERTED, AND

WHEREAS, THE FACTUAL DATA NECESSARY TO APPROVE THE CONVERSIONS IS NOT YET AVAILABLE AND THE DEPARTMENT IS REQUESTING APPROVAL IN CONCEPT ONLY;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY APPROVES THE CONVERSIONS IN CONCEPT WITH FINAL APPROVAL BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO BE MADE BASED UPON THE RECEIPT OF NECESSARY FACTUAL INFORMATION IN KEEPING WITH SECTION 07.19A ACQUISITION PROJECTS - CONVERTED, AS CONTAINED IN PARTICIPATION MANUAL NUMBER 7.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV.B. PRESENTATION - OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS: The Chairman reminded those wishing to speak before the Committee on any ORV project to complete a Participant Registration Card.

Mr. Pelton, referring to memoranda of November 3, 1981, "1981 Off-Road Vehicle Projects Proposals", and "Off-Road Vehicle Evaluation System", reported the following:

- (1) Twenty-six ORV projects were initially received for consideration. These went through initial staff review, initial ORVAC review, followed by the continuing review process by staff. (\$4.4 million in total.)

- (2) ORVAC:
Evaluation of the projects was made on October 6, 1981; projects were reduced to twenty-one at \$1.8 million. Ten sponsors presented their respective projects and were available to answer questions. ORVAC recommended 19 projects for funding consideration at a total cost of \$1.1 million.
- (3) Staff considered available information and such matters as: available funds; ORVAC recommendations; actual evaluation scores; IAC ORV Guidelines; and other factors such as: other areas in the ORV Plan that were not considered in evaluation system, organizational commitment, and whether the sponsor had had previous ORV projects.
- (4) Staff recommendation: 16 projects at a total of \$800,381.

Project presentations were then given by Gregory Lovelady, ORV Program Coordinator. Twenty-one projects were shown in the slide program. There were ten different sponsors.

At the end of the presentation, Mr. Lovelady presented the Committee Chairman with a packet of letters and other correspondence concerning the projects both pro and con for review of the IAC members. The members reviewed these during the meeting, and the Chairman asked that the copies of the correspondence be added to the official minutes as an appendix (office copy of the minutes only). The correspondence was also to be made available to anyone wishing to review same. Mr. Lovelady noted there were twenty-seven letters and cards, as well as a petition with nearly 100 signatures concerning the Thurston-Grays Harbor ORV Sports Park located near Olympia. He selected some at random which were in favor of the park and some "against" it. Some were from individual citizens; others from groups such as the Pacific Northwest 4-Wheel Drive Association, and the ORV Impact Association, and still others from various adjacent landowners, users of the park, and certain state agencies (Department of Game, Department of Ecology, etc.). Another file given to the Committee was in support of the Spokane ORV projects favoring development.

Recommendations of staff: Mr. Lovelady distributed memorandum dated November 3, 1981, "Off-Road Vehicle Projects Funding Recommendations", to the Committee as well as the audience. Staff recommendations by category were as follows:

Development	\$ 326,200	<u>SEE PAGES 8-A, 8-B, 8-C</u> <u>ORV PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED</u> <u>BY STAFF</u>
Maintenance & Operation	80,516	
Acquisition	110,000	
Education/Enforcement	162,260	
Planning	65,805	
ORV Coordinator	<u>55,600</u>	
	\$ 800,381	

Referring to the tabulated "ORV Project Recommendations" with the memorandum of November 3, 1981, Mr. Lovelady reviewed each project noting the ORVAC recommendation and the recommendation of staff. Comments of the committee on specific projects were as follows:

81-22M/E State Parks, Beacon Rock State Park \$29,312 - not recommended for funding

Mr. Schmitt concurred in recommendation not to fund due to the fact the area experienced minimal use and the need to carefully scrutinize use of

ORV PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

(November 3, 1981)

Project/Element Number Sponsor Project/Element Title Amount Requested ORVAC Recommendations Staff Comments

I. OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROJECTS (Blue Sheets)

81-22M/E State Parks
Beacon Rock State Park \$ 29,312 Do not fund. \$ 0 Low evaluation score. Minimal use area.

81-23M/E State Parks
Riverside State Park 26,951 Do not fund; insufficient information. 18,600 Staff recommendation reduces requested FTE level from 8 to 6 mos.

TOTAL \$ 56,263 \$18,600

II. PLANNING PROJECTS (Green Sheets)

81-2P Colville National Forest
Batey-Bould Comprehensive Plan \$ 15,055 Supports \$15,055 Good potential; new development, close to large population (Spokane).

81-3P Wenatchee National Forest
Naches Basin Comprehensive Plan 12,000 Supports 12,000 #1 Planning priority on this National Forest. Heavy use area.

81-4P Wenatchee National Forest
Chiwawa Trails Survey Plan 19,100 Supports 19,100 #2 Planning priority. Add existing opportunities in heavy use area.

81-5P Wenatchee National Forest
Klone Peak--North Tommy Survey Planning 4,650 Supports 4,650 Necessary preliminary work to further development in area.

81-6P Wenatchee National Forest
Negro & Shazer Creek Plan 12,000 Supports 12,000 Necessary planning to add to and compliment existing trail system in area.

81-7P Wenatchee National Forest
Table Mt. 4X4 Drive Route 3,000 Supports 3,000 Trail closed but use exists. Project will determine future status.

TOTAL \$65,805 \$65,805

III. DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (Yellow Sheets)

Project ID	Project Description	Amount Requested	Recommendations		Comments
			ORVAC	Staff	
81-1D	Okanogan National Forest Cady Pass Trail #475	\$ 16,000	Do not fund.	\$ 0	Remote location. Perhaps reconsider in future.
81-8D	Wenatchee National Forest Bighill Loop--Natapoc 4X4 Trail	4,000	Supports	4,000 (w/proviso)	No existing 4x4 trail in area. Volunteer labor. Proviso: Acceptable environmental assessment report completed.
81-9D	Yakima County Trail #964 Coop. Dev.	32,179	Do not fund.	0	Recommend delaying until study completed. (See Project 81-2)
81-11A, D.M	Spokane County County ORV Facility	846,700	up to \$400,000	Defer until March meeting	Lease agreement needs further work. Heavy use area. Close to metropolitan center.
81-12D, M	City of Richland Horn Rapids Development	400,000	Supports	400,000	No existing ORV areas in either Benton or Franklin Cos
	TOTAL	<u>\$1,298,879</u>		<u>\$404,000</u>	

IV. EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS (Pink Sheets)

81-16E	Yakima County Education/Law Enforcement	\$ 32,340	Supports	\$ 32,340	Excellent support from both non-users and users. Continuation of existing program.
81-17E	Yakima County Joint Educ./Law Enforcement	30,500	Supports	30,500	Provides needed program in lower valley. Continuation of existing program.
81-18E	Chelan/Douglas ORV Board Education/Law Enforcement	25,536	Do not fund; FTE time not used effectively	25,536 (w/proviso)	Proviso: Report on actions taken to increase efficiency in user contacts made in field
81-19E	Kittitas County Education/Law Enforcement	63,903	Supports	58,000	Heaviest use county in state. Request for advance on vehicle replacement <u>not</u> recommended for funding.
	TOTAL	<u>\$152,279</u>		<u>\$146,376</u>	

V. ORV COORDINATOR PROJECTS (White Sheets)

	<u>Amount Requested</u>	<u>ORVAC</u>	<u>Recommendations</u> <u>Staff</u>	<u>Comments</u>
81-13C Kittitas County ORV Planning Coordinator	\$ 5,100	Supports	\$ 0	1/6 time of staff person. No established work program.
81-14C Yakima County ORV Planning/Coordination	28,600	Supports	28,600	Very effective ongoing program
81-15C Spokane County ORV Program Coordinator	27,000	Supports	27,000	Ongoing program. Good safety/education element.
TOTAL	\$ 60,700		\$55,600	

VI. ACQUISITION PROJECTS (Gold Sheet)

81-21A Grays Harbor County ORV Park Addition	\$ 110,000	Supports	\$110,000 (w/proviso)	<u>Proviso</u> : Certification by managing authority that an active enforcement program exists to ensure all park users comply with at least 86 d BA at 50 feet throughout the Thurston/Grays Harbor ORV Park at all times.
TOTAL	\$ 110,000		\$110,000	
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,743,926		\$800,381	Staff recommended amount would commit estimated ORV revenues through February, 1982.

ORV dollars. Mr. Tveten also did not take exception to the recommendation, but pointed out that the funds being considered did not go entirely to salaries but to such other items as equipment and material to complete the work. He felt it should be pointed out in reviewing the "cutbacks" on the ORV projects that there was no intent to short circuit the General Fund monies, but that the staff is taking a more critical look at reducing the ORV program in order to fund the most needed projects within the dollars available.

81-23M/E State Parks, Riverside State Park \$ 26,951 Fund at \$18,600
(reduce FTE level from 8 mos. to 6 mos.)

Mr. Tveten concurred with staff recommendation.

81-11 D/M Spokane County, County ORV Facility \$ 346,700 - recommended
deferral until March 1982 IAC meeting to allow time for lease agreement to be worked out.

Mr. Schmitt asked the meaning of "The property concerned.....will be option leased to the County for twenty years." Mr. Lovelady replied the property lease could run for twenty years with the County having the option of renewing after fifteen years. This application requests funds for leasing the first five years.

Mr. Tveten noted the original funding request was for \$2,845,765; now it is \$846,700. He asked for an explanation. Mr. Lovelady stated initially the project was most elaborate and elements had been included which would have made it an A-1 ORV use facility. Due to funding limitations, the County worked with staff in reducing the project down to a more "bare-bones" facility but still containing sufficient elements that would allow the County to have a financially self-sufficient project.

81-12D/M City of Richland, Horn Rapids Development \$ 400,000 - recommended.

in response to Mr. Tveten's inquiry as to whether or not the project would be self-sufficient, Mr. Lovelady said the project would produce income, that it would have the capacity to hold large Pacific Northwest 4-Wheel Drive conventions with approximately 1,000 persons attending. There will be activity areas for both motorcycle and four-wheel drive recreation. The maintenance/management/enforcement program will include 2.5 FTE through 1983.

81-18E Chelan-Douglas ORV Board, Education/Law Enforcement \$25,536
recommended.

Mr. Lovelady presented staff recommendation for funding of the project at the full requested amount with the proviso that the ORV Board report on actions taken to increase efficiency in user contacts made in the field. Mr. Schmitt asked if the IAC Committee members would have the benefit of reviewing the report. Mr. Lovelady said that because of timing, it was intended that staff would review and consider approval of the report. It could be brought back for Committee review if it so desired. Both Mr. Wilder and Mr. Pelton felt the problems could be worked out and that the project should be funded at the \$25,536 level.

81-21A Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition \$110,000 recommended.

Mr. Lovelady presented staff recommendation for funding of the project

at the full requested amount with the proviso that there be certification by the managing authority that an active enforcement program exists to ensure all park users comply with at least 86 dBA at 50 feet throughout the Thurston/Grays Harbor ORV Park at all times.

Mr. Tveten asked how those standards complied with those set by the Department of Ecology. Mr. Lovelady briefly explained that competitions at the park were specifically excluded by DOE from meeting these standards. However, under the requirements as set forth in RCW 46.09.120 "Operating Violations", most users in the park are required to meet the 86 dBA at 50 feet for noise emissions. He noted there is a type of vehicle now using the ORV Park -- certain alcohol fueled sand dragsters which, because they are not ORVs, are not required to meet the 86 dBA as noted in RCW Chapter 46.09.120. It was believed that staff's proviso would close this "loop-hole". Staff does not want to restrict them from use of the park, but it is felt they should comply with the noise levels established for all ORV facilities throughout the state.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE - PARTICIPANT REGISTRATION:

The project recommendation presentation ended at 11:26 a.m. The Chairman called for audience participation as noted on the Participant Registration cards. Those speaking and the projects involved were as follows:

Robert Salter, Chelan-Douglas ORV Coordinator

81-18E - Chelan/Douglas ORV Board, Education/Law Enforcement Project

1. Concurred with recommendations of staff with the proviso as indicated.
2. Program in existence four years; going well. At first had strong opposition, but through this type of funding the people have become adjusted to ORV's and it is felt the education and enforcement program has been a success.
3. Asked approval of funding \$25,536.

Walter Peck, Department of Game

81-18E - Chelan/Douglas ORV Board, Education/Law Enforcement Project

1. Supported the request from Chelan/Douglas ORV Board; submitted letter from Department of Game to the IAC Committee.
2. Recommended approval, \$25,536.

Ruth Resta, Recreation Supervisor, City of Richland

81-12 D/M - City of Richland, Horn Rapids Development

1. Thanked Committee for consideration of the project.
2. Noted that City Manager had requested that the City recognize the need for a place for the ORV people to recreate. Citizens solidly committed to the project; land is owned by City; are planning carefully and eager to proceed.
3. Project to be self-sufficient by end of 1983.
4. Asked approval of funding \$400,000.

Mr. Tveten asked concerning certain operating costs for staff and maintenance. Ms. Resta replied \$40-to-\$61,000; that money to be partially generated by user fees from events, etc., in the future.

Sam Angove, Spokane County Parks and Recreation Director

81-11 A/D/M - Spokane County, County ORV Facility

81-15C - Spokane County, ORV Program Coordinator

1. Informed the Committee that Spokane County was withdrawing its projects, and was withdrawing from the ORV program of the IAC.
2. Have attempted to develop an ORV program the past nine years; unable to continue; appreciate staff work up to this point in time.

Mr. Tveten asked the main reason for Spokane's withdrawal and was informed that delay in funding for the 81-11 A/D/M facility was not understood by the County. They have been dealing with the landowner attempting to iron out difficulties, have tried to negotiate a lease acceptable to all, but there is reluctance to respond to the County's offers. Further, Mr. Angove felt there were simply not enough funds to make the project self-sufficient -- doing only half of the project would not be helpful. It is difficult to provide ORV areas in Spokane County because there is no state land available nor federal land, thus the County is at the whim of the private sector. Unless it is possible to make a project self-sufficient, it is not worth beginning development. With funding offered to Spokane County, it would be 1984 before the project could be self-sufficient. Mr. Angove also noted that the County was reducing its budget by 60%, and another twelve percent was being contemplated, thus restricted monies would cause a hardship on the project.

(Liberty Lake)

Mr. Tveten asked if the existing ORV park would be closed due to the withdrawal of the County from the program. Mr. Angove stated it was under consideration, except for certain acreage purchased by ORV funds.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Angove for his information to the Committee.

Jeff Treder, Kittitas County ORV Coordinator

81-13C Kittitas County, ORV Planning Coordinator

1. Staff recommended against funding because proposal as submitted was "too fuzzy" as to what would be actually done and what the job description would lay out. Agreed with this since he was not on staff at the time the proposal was made up.
2. Since coming on the job, looked into the program and the justification for an ORV Coordinator in Kittitas County. Noted several groups and individuals involved in the program: Kittitas County Residents; ORV participants, etc. Also County Sheriff's Department is involved in the education/enforcement. Users of Kittitas County ORV areas are predominantly from out of the county (westside citizens).
3. Stated Coordinator position is the liaison between the above; works with them in any conflicts, questions regarding the program, etc. Must develop working relationships and maintain understandings between residents and property owners and the ORV users.
4. Discussed method used to maintain communication; how contacts are made; follow-up work.

5. Recommended project be approved for the coordinator's position to continue; better to have "spider in the center of the web".

In questioning Mr. Treder, it was brought out that the ORV contacts currently number six. Mr. Schmitt noted staff had not recommended the project due to the fact that there seemed to be no established program for the coordinator, and he asked how Mr. Treder would handle the job if the funds were to be approved. Mr. Treder reiterated his responsibilities as ORV Coordinator, stating he would make contacts and find out specifically what problems were involved and study how to solve them for the users and for the residents of the area.

Robert A. Barret, Kittitas County Sheriff
81-13C - Kittitas County, ORV Planning Coordinator

1. Since termination of last ORV Coordinator there has been lack of communication and contacts with ORV people and residents. There appears to be poor rapport with the County Commissioners; no rapport with the Office of the Sheriff.
2. Requested that the funds be extended from this year into the next to provide needed coordination services. If not funded at full level, Committee should consider funding it at a level to balance out with the unused funds that have not been expended as it is essential to maintain the program.
3. With ORV Coordinator, it will be possible to have proper contact with the County Commissioners, and the Sheriff's Office deputies will be able to more actively be involved in the field than they have been.

Mr. Schmitt asked about the unused funds and was informed these amounted to over \$5,000. Mr. Schmitt stated those unused funds should be applied to the program for next year, and was staff aware they were available? Mr. Lovelady responded that there is still ORV money committed to the current coordination project, but it is paid to the County on a reimbursement basis; most has not been used.

Sheriff Barret then referred to a brochure and maps which had been distributed to the IAC Committee members:

- (a) "Off-Road Vehicle Enforcement and Education", Kittitas County Program - 11-1981;
- (b) Kittitas County Road Vehicle Recreation Guide - 2 maps.

The Sheriff stressed the need for continued support of the Kittitas County ORV Program; noted that his County would be putting on a program presentation for the Washington Recreation and Park Association's convention meeting in Vancouver this week; he outlined some of the ongoing programs in the County as presented in the brochure (a) above-mentioned.

Jerry Shuart, ORV Education and Enforcement Program, Kittitas County
81-13C - Kittitas County, ORV Planning Coordinator

(Though he had filed a Participant Registration Card, Mr. Shuart opted not to address the Committee.)

Roger Dovel, Thurston County Facility Education Coordinator
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Stated he was available for any specific information following the discussion of this project.

Jeanette Willis and William Willis, ORV Impact Association
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Mr. Willis presented a petition signed by 400 citizens in opposition to the addition to the ORV Park. (SEE APPENDIX TO OFFICIAL MINUTE BOOK)
A number of people are users of the park who do not wish to see it expanded to include professional races. Their petition states:
 - (a) Further professionalism would result if park approved;
 - (b) There would be ecological damage;
 - (c) Would have detrimental impact on livability of the surrounding area;
 - (d) Would further concentrate state and national ORV activity in this area including the Capitol Forest.
2. Mrs. Willis demonstrated to the Committee using a map of the area being considered for expansion and those areas surrounding the ORV Park itself.
 - (a) Stated the Game Department has sent a letter suggesting that the Committee carefully review the project because of the need to protect a Class 3 stream nearby.
 - (b) Commented there would be some development occurring in the area; plots to sell for about \$4-to-\$5,000 per acre.
 - (c) There is no direct access to the proposed new addition which would make the development feasible.
 - (d) Asked that the Committee take the adverse impact off the area, retain a 100 acre buffer zone for this new development area which is being contemplated.
 - (e) Commented on the "loophole" concerning the noise levels; stated that between March and Sept. the ORV race track is leased to sponsoring groups who use vehicles not under the noise level regulations. As machines are more sophisticated, the noise level goes up.
 - (f) Concerned about night lights, causing increased use of the park. Concerned about the expansion - vehicles using it without noise regulations.
 - (g) Neighborhood banded together in an ORV Impact Association to look into the matters of concern and see if they could work out some answers. 18 local persons share financial responsibility for an attorney to assist them.
 - (h) Felt there had been little effort to have any lines of communication with the homeowners in the area.

Suggested that in developing ORV parks, should contact the landowners in the surrounding area and discuss the intentions; involve the residents. If that had been done, would not now be in this controversial situation.

- (i) Mr. Willis stated the ORV program was fairly new, and until there was a better understanding of the long-range impacts, there should not be an expansion of the area. It is easy to destroy the livability of an area and it is difficult to restore it once it has been changed.
- (j) Noted that property has been devalued because of ORV park nearby. Stated the Impact Association was not out to "do away" with ORV parks; it is not a radical association; but each person has invested a considerable amount in his/her home and property and has every intention of protecting that investment.
- (k) Two reasons for not supporting expansion:
 - (1) Sand Dragster Competitions - noise levels register extremely high;
 - (2) Expansion would mean just one more step to making the ORV Park a center for professional racing, bringing with it congestion, traffic, etc. Sand Dragsters do not support the park, yet use it. If trend continues rather than having a family-oriented ORV Park, there will be a professional race-track park.
- (l) Supported the park in the beginning because were assured noise level would be monitored; would have day hours of operation; maintenance of grounds, etc.
- (m) View the acquisition as pushing out the family-oriented type ORV park going into professional racing.
- (n) Urged the Committee not approve expansion of the park at this time.

Following the Willis' presentation, Mr. Tveten asked if the neighborhood citizens were represented on the Off-Road advisory committee concerning the park. Mr. Willis stated he had not been aware there was such a committee, but would like to serve on it and be of assistance.

Mrs. Avery asked if the noise level was reduced, would the Willis' and the Association find the park addition acceptable. Mr. Willis replied no, because it was felt the present park is more than adequate for the ORV users (both bikers and 4-wheelers). It is also, he said, adjacent to 80,000 acres of state timber land, and during the last three years DNR has constructed 150 miles of bike trails through their forest land to accommodate users and users have access to those areas. Whereas, the Thurston-Grays Harbor ORV Park has only a single access, and further expansion would create congestion on the freeway for people turning in to use the park. In regard to the noise levels, Mr. Willis stated he did not believe with the funds available that it would be possible to police the need for 86 d BA at 50 feet as required by the law. Every single vehicle would need to be checked. The history of the park, he said, would indicate that this is not being done.

At this point, Mr. Schmitt stated he was confused with Mr. Willis' answer. The primary problem he had understood from the Willis' presentation was that of noise in the park, that expansion would generate the noise problem; now, if assurance were given that this could be controlled, Mr. Willis had said he would still disapprove of the expanded project.

Mr. Willis clarified his statement -- noise was only one of the major concerns; others were as Mrs. Willis and he had noted. He felt it would be extremely difficult to police this situation and have noise control. He stated certain ORV users would not line up for such inspections.

Dorothy Blake, ORV Impact Association
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Lives directly across from the ORV park. Objected to acquiring any more property mostly to protect her home and homes of others in the area from the noise level and increased use of the park.
2. Did not feel that property owners in the vicinity should have to listen to the noise in the evening with lighted facility when they have put up with the noise during the day.
3. There is going to be development in the area; and there are also presently miles of Capital Forest lands for bikers use.
4. Worked on the petition process; most people felt it was not necessary to spend more money for this project to expand it.
5. Suggested if there is money to spend, that a dome could be built and keep the noise within it; or give the money to some other area for ORV use.

Walter Peck, Department of Game
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Read a letter from the Department of Game concerning the project, (August 20, 1981).
"Proposed facility will negatively impact fish and wildlife. The Mox Chehalis Creek would be impacted from siltation as a result of ORV use of banks and hillsides. Stream is known to support substantial populations of rainbow and cutthroat trout and small numbers of Coho and Chum Salmon. All forms of wildlife would be affected by noise, encroachment, harrassment, soil erosion, and pollution from dust and exhaust."
2. Recommended approval be denied since potential for substantial environmental impacts still remains for this project.

Don Jensen, Pacific NW 4-Wheel Drive Association
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Reported approximately 2,500 members of PNW4-Wheel Drive Association in the State. Addition would be of great benefit to these users.

2. Are family-oriented group; have worked hard with the ORV Park people to help build fences, have a safety and education program, etc.
3. The area to be added will spread the users out and do a great deal to increase the usability of the park. Four-Wheel Drive Association is in the middle of this controversy; vehicles do not cause a great deal of noise, and users try to cooperate wherever possible.
4. Felt the purchase would be an excellent "buy"; would serve as a buffer; could do with it whatever would be desired by the users.
5. To understand the park, Committee members should see it; how it is family-oriented; trail riding which takes place; the children able to have events of their own. Felt it was a tremendous facility.

Mr. Schmitten said it had been most interesting to read every letter included in the file passed to the IAC members. It would appear, he said, most of the controversy is through misunderstandings. Some of the letterwriters object to "closing" of the area, when it is not being closed. Perhaps they are unaware of the expansion proposal. The public should be informed that this is not going to close, but is going to expand if the project were to be approved. He asked Mr. Jensen if there were national or statewide events taking place at the ORV Park. Mr. Jensen stated this was so, but the Pac. 4-Wheel Drive Assoc. did not sponsor these events.

Mr. Schmitten asked if there was any sort of a public relations program with the surrounding landowners thru the Pac. 4-Wheel Drive Association, and was informed by Mr. Jensen there was none to his knowledge. Mr. Jensen said he would like to discuss the expansion and problem areas with Mr. and Mrs. Willis, and he felt the landowners should be represented in discussions.

Thomas Durham, Competition Chairman, Safety/Education Program for ORV,
Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive Association
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Stated it would be easy to police the noise levels. During competitions all registrants must pass a stringent safety test and sound levels could be taken care of at the same time.
2. The acquisition of the 101 acres is very important; there is a need for it. Has been involved with the ORV program at this particular park site since its inception.
3. Commented on the over-crowding of the park; there are motorcycle users; 4-Wheel Drive users; etc., and it's now becoming a problem to handle them all. Need more room in order to serve all of the people who come to use the area.
4. Felt noise level problems could be solved, and urged the Committee to approve the project.

Mr. Tveten asked what type of fuel was used by the Sand Dragsters and was informed it was not a pump gas but Nitromethane. Mr. Tveten then asked

if those using nitromethane contributed through the gas tax portion which is placed in the Off-Road Vehicle Program for ORV funding use. Mr. Wilder replied in the negative

Larry Otos, Director, Parks and Recreation, Thurston County
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Explained was representing the Grays Harbor County Commissioners in regard to the ORV Park Addition under discussion.
2. Stated there had been many public hearings and avenues for public input and testimony on this issue. Hearings were held July 6, July 8, August 5, August 18, and October 5th of this year -- all dealing with different issues of the ORV Park.
3. If the piece of property is acquired, there is a Continual Use Permit which will go through the Planning Commission in Grays Harbor County and an Environmental Impact Statement has been written which will assist the Department of Game and resolve its concerns.
4. Distributed a diagram indicating the input levels-discussion levels the park project proposal must go through. Two counties are working together on the project which is unique; the ORV Park was started about six years ago, the idea having begun with needs of the ORV users for a place to recreate.
5. An ORV Advisory Committee was appointed at that time to purchase the park lands -- 3 representatives from 4-Wheel Drive; 3 from Motorcycle Assn., and 3 from Thurston County and Grays Harbor County. Meetings were held; recommendations made to the Park Boards of both counties
6. Landowner approached the Advisory Committee regarding the 101 acres available. Started with ORV users; discussed this through the Operations Manager; and followed channels as indicated on the chart. Held public meetings; had heard testimony; and it was felt it was time to move ahead with the proposal for acquisition of the 101 acres.
7. Location is unique; within hours drive of communities; 8 counties can use the facilities; a population of 2,167,000 in this area -- people are bound to use it and require it for ORV purposes. As population grows the need will become more evident.
8. Statement in reply to concerns expressed by others testifying:
 - (a) Noise aspect. Department of Ecology has worked with the Willis'; Thurston County staff persons have worked with Ecology staff plus an individual from the Sheriff's Department.
 - (b) Read portion of Sheriff's Department report regarding noise levels. Noise does carry, but does not carry at same level to Willis' property. Tests made at the main highway are comparable to the noise levels that the Willis' receive on their property. It is not a direct loud noise.
 - (c) Decrease in property value. The ORV facility did not just happen; there was a facility privately owned located there on privately owned land prior to Thurston County's purchase.

It was a motorcycle race track and it had night lighting with attendant noise. This facility was built in 1973 or 1974, and was purchased by the County in 1976.

- (d) Thurston County Park and Recreation Department had no contact from the Willis' then - nor for two years. National Sand Dragsters had used the facility previously, but the Willis' had not objected to it at that time.
- (e) The County Commissioners want to work with the Willis' and have moved to do so. Commented on letter to the Willis' from the County Assessor regarding their property which had not received devaluation because of the new ORV Park, but because there had been and still was an off-road vehicle - four-wheel drive - park nearby. That evaluation had been made some time ago. Further, the freeway close by devaluates property.
- (f) Have made honest effort to contact people and admit mistakes in not getting residents and others involved at the beginning. The County did not hear any objections until it became involved in the expansion of the facility.
- (g) Department of Game: Thurston County has on file a letter from the Department of Ecology which should allay the concerns of the Department of Game. Have worked with Ecology on various ecological matters; have from them a statement that the County is in compliance with their regulations and there are no problems. Thurston County is willing to work with the Department of Game in ironing out their concerns.

Mr. Schmitten asked if there was a movement from recreational use to professional use in the ORV Park. Mr. Otos said most people using the park do so as a hobby or family-oriented sport; that there is no movement toward making it a professional facility. Noted that the term "professional" as used by racers refers to skill level, not prize money earners. However, there had been a national event for Sand Dragsters held, a gold cup race was held, and this year there is planning for a national Sand Dragsters event. These occur infrequently and it is not an every weekend sport. The Willis' sent a letter to one of the users of the park (August) stating a meet had been held very competently, with little noise or friction.

Mr. Schmitten asked what the use would be for the expanded portion. Mr. Otos stated the intent of the park is for some additional 4X4 trails for family-oriented use; do not intend to have any competitive races in that particular area. Mr. Schmitten then asked about the access and Mr. Otos said this would need to be resolved.

Mr. Tveten inquired whether there was one single activity which was causing the most trouble and was advised it was the use of the facility by the Sand Dragsters. Revenue from the Sand Dragsters is 50% of the amount of dollars Thurston County received last year for the park.

It was pointed out by Mr. Tveten that correspondence had indicated

the County had been in contact with the Prosecuting Attorney and his interpretation had been the acquisition of the land would not be in conflict with ORV legislation. Also Mr. Tveten asked if both Counties' Office of Commissioners had been in agreement as to the need for the expansion and had approved of those plans. Mr. Otos stated the Grays Harbor County Commissioners had endorsed the proposal, but it had not yet gone to the Thurston County Commissioners. It does have the endorsement of the Thurston County Park and Recreation Board.

In response to Mrs. Avery's inquiry, Mr. Otos stated for competitions the County issues a contract to allow certain organizations to lease the Park for their events. Mrs. Avery then asked if the organizations leasing the park complied with the noise level regulations and was advised that all did except the Sand Dragsters.

Mrs. Blake pointed out that on a map in the Park and Recreation Office of Thurston County it is indicated that three other pieces of property are outlined to be acquired, including her own. Mr. Otos explained that staff had identified areas on this map which if they become available at some future time could be purchased to enhance the park area. It is clarified as good planning only and there is no present intent to purchase those properties unless offered by the owners.

Morris Boles, Department of Natural Resources
81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Clarified the use of Department managed lands adjacent to the ORV Park. DNR discussed this matter with the Willis'. The Department of Natural Resources does have considerable trails which are all motorcycle trails, hiking trails or horse trails. There are none for the 4-Wheel Drive groups to use.

Mr. Schmitten called upon Mr. Dovel for an explanation of the noise level situation.

Mr. Dovel stated he had attended the Department of Ecology's training sessions for use of noise testing equipment. Throughout the summer and fall months, Mr. Dovel said he had made a series of tests on noise levels for the motorcycles, 4-Wheel Drives and the Sand Dragsters. Other noise levels of other machines using the park were also tested. It is possible to test these types of vehicles, but it is not possible to control noise emissions of Sand Dragsters since equipment does not exist which could handle them. Testing occurs at most national events and on weekends individual vehicles are checked.

Mr. Schmitten asked the findings of noise levels. Mr. Dovel stated that noise levels across the highway were not nearly as loud as in the park. The Willis' had said the noise was very disturbing, but Mr. Dovel stated the human ear sounds and findings on the equipment are two entirely different matters.

Mr. Tveten asked if the park managers were deputized, or did the Sheriff's Department provide some aid in ensuring that users met the noise level standards? Mr. Dovel stated if there is an organized event

then the Sheriff's Department is called upon for assistance. However, if a user's vehicle is found not to meet the standards through the testing equipment, that vehicle and owner are restricted from competition events.

Ron Morgenthaler, ORVAC and NW Motorcycle Association Trail Division, Land-Use
Coordinator Chairman

81-21A - Grays Harbor County - ORV Park Addition

1. Available for questions only; did not wish to testify.

At the conclusion of audience comments, Mr. Schmitt asked when the Thurston-Grays Harbor ORV Park expansion would be approved if the Committee approved the funding at this meeting. Mr. Lovelady stated the project has been reviewed by staff and the sponsoring agency has certified to the IAC that all of the problems have either been cleared up or involve impacts which are acceptable to the County. Mr. Schmitt then noted the request for disapproval from the Department of Game - had this been taken under advisement and has the County over-ruled their request? Mr. Lovelady said that it was felt the Department's concerns had been adequately addressed by the County. In the past, staff has worked closely with Game in including additional wildlife protections into the contract. It is expected that such cooperation will continue.

Mr. Tveten asked the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Rick Finnigan, for clarification whether or not an acquisition was exempt from the state's Environmental Policy requirements. Mr. Finnigan said he did not know, but that a public project acquisition would probably not be subject to an EIS. At this point, Mr. Willis stated that question had come up before and his attorney had investigated this matter. An EIS is not required at the time of acquisition, but is if the property is going to be developed.

Mr. Tveten then asked Mr. Finnigan if within the ORV Enabling Act legislation there was any regulation which would prevent the IAC Committee from funding an ORV Park which would be used by Sand Dragsters and for competitive events. Mr. Finnigan stated that Sand Dragsters may not be an ORV Vehicle, and therefore it would not be possible to fund such a project from ORV funds. It would be an inappropriate expenditure to develop a race track for that purpose. Mr. Tveten then asked if there would be a need to determine what portion of the park was being used for Sand Dragsters and what portion eligible for ORV funds? Mr. Finnigan stated that statute does not provide a formula for that type of determination. Mr. Wilder felt it was question of semantics - 4-Wheel Drive users, Jeep Users, and alcohol burning Sand Dragsters; the dragsters use a different type of fuel than the ORV's; however, the law does not deny the ORV's from dragging or racing at an ORV facility.

Mr. Lovelady then pointed out that the Sand Dragster facility at Thurston County ORV Park was not funded with ORV funds. However, in the case of the Richland proposed ORV Park, there will be discussion about funding a Sand Dragster facility. The IAC could be out of order if it created an ORV Park strictly for ORV Sand Dragster use.

Mr. Jensen noted that vehicles from out-of-state use the ORV facilities -- but these may be about eight to ten vehicles per year and is out of proportion when talking about the overall use of an ORV park.

The Committee recessed at 1:17 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES FUNDING: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SCHMITTEN, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVE THE FUNDING OF THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH THE EXCEPTION OF FOUR PROJECTS TO BE CONSIDERED SEPARATELY BY THE COMMITTEE:

1. 81-11 A/D/M Spokane County, County ORV Facility Staff recommended deferral to March 1982
2. 81-15C Spokane County, ORV Prog. Coordinator \$27,000
3. 81-13C Kittitas County, ORV Planning Coord. Staff recommended -0-
4. 81-21A Grays Harbor County, ORV Park Addtn. \$110,000 with proviso noted by staff

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (SEE APPENDIX "A" FOR APPROVED PROJECTS)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, SECONDED BY MR. MAGRUDER, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ACCEPT THE WITHDRAWAL OF PROJECTS 81-11 A/D/M AND 81-15C FROM SPOKANE COUNTY AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIRECTOR, PARKS AND RECREATION, SPOKANE COUNTY.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY THAT THE COMMITTEE FUND ORV PROJECT 81-21A, THURSTON COUNTY-GRAYS HARBOR ORV PARK EXPANSION AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THERE BE CERTIFICATION BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITY THAT AN ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM EXISTS TO ENSURE ALL PARK USERS COMPLY WITH AT LEAST 86 d BA AT 50 FEET THROUGHOUT THE THURSTON/GRAYS HARBOR ORV PARK AT ALL TIMES.

THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Hearing no restated motion on that particular project, Mr. Schmittten asked the Chairman to consider ORV Project 81-13C, Kittitas County, ORV Park Addition.

MR. SCHMITTEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE CONTINUED FUNDING OF AN ORV COORDINATOR FOR KITTITAS COUNTY THROUGH USE OF UNEXPENDED FUNDS REMAINING IN THEIR CURRENT ORV PROJECT, THAT NO NEW MONIES BE COMMITTED TO THE PROJECT AT THIS TIME, BUT THAT IT BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO USE THE UNEXPENDED FUNDS TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONTINUED SERVICES OF THE ORV COORDINATOR.

MOTION WAS CARRIED. (Mr. Schmittten reiterated his intention in the motion that no new monies be approved.)

The chairman called for a motion concerning the Thurston County-Grays Harbor ORV Project 81-21A. There was no response from any individual Committee member and the chairman therefore announced that the project would not be funded at this time.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS. None.

VI. MEETINGS OF THE IAC - APPROVAL FOR 1982: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated November 3, 1981, noting the IAC Committee meeting schedule for 1982. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SCHMITTEN, SECONDED BY MR. BILLINGSLEY, THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES THE FOLLOWING MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 1982, TO BE OFFICIALLY ENTERED IN THE WASHINGTON STATE REGISTER:

MARCH 25-26, 1982	IAC GRANT-IN-AID FUNDING SESSION CITY OF OLYMPIA
JUNE 24-25, 1982	REGULAR MEETING CITY OF OLYMPIA
NOV. 18-19, 1982	IAC GRANT-IN-AID FUNDING SESSION PLACE TO BE DETERMINED AT A LATER DATE

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Wilder thanked the Interagency Committee for its deliberations, the Off-Road Vehicle Committee for its assistance in review and evaluation of the projects, and the IAC staff for its continued efforts in behalf of the state. He extended his congratulations to Greg Lovelady for a job well done. Mr. Wilder noted that the IAC is far more than a federally aided agency; that only 23% of federal dollars had been included in the IAC's funding program since 1965; that other fund sources have been historically used for various recreation acquisition and development projects; and that the agency has a lot of ability and talent to give in the future for funding these types of projects for the citizens of Washington.

Mrs. Avery added her thanks and appreciation to all and adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE ON

Elizabeth B. Avery
3-25-82

CHAIRMAN
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR
RECREATION