

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

---

DATE: MARCH 25, 1982 PLACE: City of Olympia, Council Chambers  
TIME: 9:00 a.m. 8th and Plum Streets, Olympia, Washington

---

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Elizabeth Avery, Chairman, Vancouver  
Mr. Virgil E. Magruder, Redmond  
Mrs. Ida Jo Simmons, Lynnwood  
Mr. Ron Pretti, Gig Harbor  
Mr. Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation  
Commission  
Mr. Rolland Schmitt, Director, Dept. of  
Fisheries  
Honorable Brian Boyle, State Land Commissioner,  
Dept. of Natural Resources

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Frank Lockard, Director, Department of Game  
Mr. Kirby Billingsley, Member

-----  
Meeting called to order, introductions: Elizabeth Avery, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a. m., with a quorum of five:

AVERY, MAGRUDER, SIMMONS, PRETTI, TVETEN (SCHMITTEN & BOYLE ARRIVED SHORTLY THEREAFTER).

Chairman stated the meeting would begin with staff status reports and at 10:00 a.m. the Local Agencies' Projects Presentation would be given by Projects Services. 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.

The following introductions were made:

Honorable Karen Fraser, Thurston County Commissioner  
Honorable Lorraine Wojahn, State Senator, Pierce County  
Fred Bender and Ruth Anderson, representatives from the National Park Service  
Various members of advisory committees to the IAC as introduced by Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services and Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services  
Anna Mueller, Intern serving with the IAC (from Augustana College, Rock Is., Illinois)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES, NOVEMBER 3, 1981: The Chairman corrected the minute's roster to indicate that Mr. Ron Pretti was absent. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MAGRUDER, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR NOVEMBER 3, 1981, BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA: Mr. Bob Wilder, Director of the IAC, called for the deletion of the following items from the agenda:

- (1) III. OLD BUSINESS. 3. Dept. of Natural Resources, Shark Reef. Withdrawn by DNR.
- (2) III. OLD BUSINESS. 2. Port of Langley, Langley Harbor Development, IAC #78-045D. Withdrawn by Port of Langley.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PRETTI, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE MARCH 25, 1982 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

---

APPENDICES: Letters concerning  
Local Agencies' applications.

---

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder introduced Mr. Andrew Harvard, Assistant Attorney General, State of Washington, and in recognition of his accomplishments in a recent climb of Mt. Everest and other expeditions, presented a Certificate of Appreciation from the IAC along with a commemorative poem to him. Mr. Harvard thanked the Committee, stating recreation was the most important human resource we have in the State of Washington, and that his award and recognition helped to underscore the need for recreation facilities throughout the state.

Mr. Wilder then noted the following in his report to the Committee:

- (1) Present time is chaotic and a busy one in regard to parks, recreation and conservation. Attempting to meet the burgeoning needs and provide facilities.
- (2) LWCF: The Memorial authorized by the Committee (SJM 120) has passed out of the Senate, and there appears to be great support for the LWCF funding program to state and local governments. Governor Spellman sent a letter to the Washington Congressional Delegation supporting continued LWCF. It is important that each and every agency receiving support from ORA funds do likewise. Those that have benefited from the projects' grant-in-aid program, Off-Road Vehicles program, trails, etc., need to be assured of continued funding, and can assist in this endeavor by encouraging Congress to continue the program.
- (3) Legislation: State Legislature is presently contemplating various pieces of legislation of import to the IAC...John Wayne Trail, a reorganization bill, others dealing with parks and recreation services.
- (4) Governor's Conference on Recreation: With increased interest in parks, recreation and conservation and the need for continued funding, Governor Spellman has called for a Conference on Recreation. Mr. By Haley will be working as coordinator of this conference for the IAC.
- (5) Referred to memorandum dated March 25, 1982, "Meetings in Washington, D.C...." and briefly commented upon those held with: James Watt, Secretary of the Interior, NRPA, APRS, NASORLO; and the nine congressional members from the State of Washington. These meetings occurred February 17 through 23, 1982. Mr. Watt was not too sensitive or interested in the needs of states or local governments, and stressed that he thought the States' expenditure rates were exceedingly poor. Explanation of the current expenditure rates was given to Mr. Watt.

NRPA: Will be focusing on preparation of a "NATIONAL ASSESSMENT FOR PARKS AND RECREATION. Also involved in a "LIFE. BE IN IT." national program to highlight the value of recreation in America today.

APRS: National "Partners in Progress" program presented to this group for action. APRS works directly with NRPA on legislative matters also.

NASORLO: Working through governors of the various states, this group is emphasizing the need to continue to press for support of LWCF.

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: All nine offices were contacted and were provided information on the IAC and the Washington State program for use of LWCF.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: Mr. Stan Scott, Chief, Management Services, referred to IAC Fund Summary, March 16, 1982, and outlined the updated features:

- (a) Report expanded to two pages to include full delineation of funding programs for the state agencies, including General Administration and Ecology, and to include additional information concerning a State Agencies' total, as well as a State and Local Agencies' total.
- (b) Have added a pending category to account for Committee and administrative approvals. When contracts are signed, those projects go into the approved column.
- (c) Glossary of terms: Defines "cumulative available", "pending", and "approved".
- (d) Footnote definition of HJR 52 has been expanded to include 100% state funded projects.

C. PROJECT SERVICES STATUS REPORT: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1982, "Project Services Division Report", commenting on the following:

Local Agencies' Project Applications: 70 applications were received for this funding session; 25 were subsequently withdrawn, leaving 45 for funding consideration by the Committee. Withdrawals were due to: uncertainty of local share, reconsideration of needs, priorities, and maintenance costs.

Technical Advisory Committee: Chaired by Ted Brown, Vancouver, the TAC met February 1 and 2 to review and assist with each project application.

Evaluation Team: First week in March, each application was reviewed and scored by an Evaluation Team, resulting in an evaluation ranking for each applicant's project. John Clark, State Parks; Jim Webster, King County, Barney Wilson, Kent, and Bryan Snell, Skamania County were thanked for their contributions while serving on the Evaluation Team.

Approved Project Administration: All fifty-six local agencies' projects are proceeding well towards completion except City of Langley, Harbor Development, #78-045D. Damage was caused to the concrete moorage floats, and the City Council has voted to take legal action against the engineering and construction firm involved in the project. The seventy-five state agencies' projects are all proceeding well.

National Park Service, LWCF: Program review of Project Services was received; the management of LWCF was determined to be most acceptable; certain file deficiencies have been corrected. The State's responsibilities in the SCORP program was likewise satisfactory. Due to staff reductions on the part of NPS and IAC, management of the programs will be more difficult in the future.

Administrative Actions:

Withdrawals: (1) DNR - Howell Lake Trail #81-702D. DNR accomplished this project with other funds. \$35,500 Ref. 28 will be used on future DNR projects.

- (2) State Parks and Recreation Commission, Pearrygin Lake #81-508A. State Parks unable to reach a negotiated settlement with the property owner. Project was approved in June 1981 at a total cost of \$524,000 (50% LWCF/50% HJR 52).

Project Cost Increase: City of Tumwater, Historical Park Acquisition #81-046A. 10% cost increase approved in order to assist with additional land costs. \$3,750.

State Agencies' Master List Projects Approved:

Game: Fazon Lake, Whatcom County, 82-601D - \$38,000 to redevelop existing boat launch facility and parking area to improve user conditions.

Wenas Lake, Yakima County, 82-602D - \$54,000 for partial development to provide public access and boat launching at the lake. Cooperative project with Wenas Irrigation District.

Fisheries: Oakland Bay, Mason County, 82-801A - \$115,750 to acquire approximately 4.5 acres of upland area adjacent to state-owned tidelands on Oakland Bay - provide access to beach for public clamming, fishing and viewing.

II D. PLANNING SERVICES STATUS REPORTS: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, reported on the following:

- (1) State Recreation Inventory Program: All public sector inventory forms have been coded and forwarded to Western Washington University for input to the Recreation Data Bank. 222 new sites have been added since the last inventory; however, 244 sites have been deleted from the various categories. Coding of trails segments has commenced; to be completed by late April 1982. Work has commenced on the private sector segment and further reports will be made at the next meeting.

Mr. Tveten asked what caused the loss of the sites in the current inventory. Mr. Pelton replied the largest portion was the closing of federal camp grounds. DNR was the only state agency with site closures. Several were at the local levels; however, these were primarily smaller grass plots. In some cases locals have consolidated several small plots into a single site for reporting purposes.

- (2) Local Agencies' Plans - Technical Assistance: Certain local agencies' plans will be expiring, and Planning Services staff will be working with these agencies to ensure their eligibility for participation in the grant-in-aid program. 93 plans will have expired prior to October 1982; all agencies will be notified and assisted in maintaining their eligibility through updating of their plans.
- (3) Outdoor Recreation Action Program: The Outdoor Recreation Action Program document - Part II - was distributed to each IAC Committee member. The program document was approved by the National Park Service and State of Washington planning compliance has been extended to June 30, 1983. The input from state agencies was recognized, and each representative was thanked for the excellent cooperation and support provided to the IAC planning staff.

(4) Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee:

(a) Regional Recreation Data Program Committee was established in 1975 as a technical advisory committee to the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission. Purpose: To supply recreation demand related information for three states (Washington, Oregon and Idaho) to state and federal agencies in the Northwest. Demand projects are also used as an element of SCORP of all three states.

(b) By Executive Order, 10-1-81, the River Basins Commission was terminated and the Regional Recreation Data Program was placed in limbo.

(c) The need to continue this program was discussed by federal and state agencies involved. At a November 13, 1981 meeting, a resolution was prepared and adopted to establish the Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee.

(d) The IAC is named as the agency responsible for committee coordination; Oregon as the agency for coordination of data files and actions related thereto.

(e) Any expenses incurred in relation to the program are to be borne by the agency incurring them.

(f) The establishment of the PNRRC continues the needed data program as an integral part of regional recreation planning programs (including SCORP).

Mr. Pelton clarified that the Executive Order was a federal order and that the River Basins Commission had been eliminated. Mr. Wilder pointed out that the inventory of recreational facilities had indicated closing out of some federal and local areas; now, a cooperative planning partnership between state and federal agencies had been eliminated. Each of these has had a major impact on outdoor recreation participation and with federal areas closed, there will be more persons recreating in state and local park areas. The data program is needed since it is an attempt to forecast demand & need and is of value in the planning processes for not only the State of Washington but the states of Oregon and Idaho as well.

Mr. Pelton noted that the resolution establishing the Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee primarily states its purpose is to maintain a regional planning coordination base and to pursue the continuation of the regional data program. However, there may be other actions which this committee could handle and for which there would be a need on the part of state or federal agencies. The committee therefore has allowed for additional participants and additional subjects to be discussed in the future.

(5) Administrative ORV Project Changes: Mr. Greg Lovelady, ORV Coordinator for the IAC, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1982, concerning administrative off-road vehicles' project changes. He noted the following statistics:

- a. Six of the changes were time extensions;

- b. One project was terminated;
- c. Two represented project scope increases;
- d. One was a combination increase in cost and decrease to another project;
- e. Total number of ORV projects funded is 78;
- f. These projects represent \$4.7 million worth of ORV grants since the start of the program;
- g. Of the 78 projects, twenty-seven have been closed and there are currently 51 ORV projects now in progress; 18 federal; 31 local; and two state agencies' projects.

Administrative actions included the following:

1. Kittitas County ORV Educ. and Enforce. Program 80-55P Extended one month
2. Kittitas County Coordination Proj. 80-62P Extended to 12-31-82
3. Yakima County Suntargets Access Rd. Redevel. 80-57D Extended to 6-30-82
4. Yakima County Suntargets 81-82 Oper. & Maint. Prog. 80-63M Extended to 12-31-83
5. Thurston County, Sports Pk. Devl. II 80-58D Scope increase; no changes to total project cost
6. Thurston County, Sports Park 78-81 Mngmt. 78-2M Increased \$18,058 from 80-64M funds
7. Thurston County, Sports Pk. 82 Mngmt. 80-64M Sponsor's share increased by \$99,111; IAC project share reduced by \$18,058 placed in project 78-2M. Increased cost by \$3,910; extended time period 18 months
8. State Parks and Rec. Comm, Riverside ORV Area 78-1D Project terminated due to inability to secure permission to use property.
9. Chelan Ranger Dist., Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Devil's Backbone Trailhead 80-61P Extended to 12-31-82
10. Chelan Ranger District, Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Devil's Backbone Loop Trail 78-7D Extended 12 months; to re-survey campsite locations
11. Chelan Ranger Dist., Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Prince Creek Trail Relocation 78-8D

Following the ORV status report, Mr. Tveten reiterated Mr. Wilder's statements concerning parks and recreation programs. He felt there were three programs placing additional burden upon the state:

- (1) Drastic reduction in the LWCF - with possibility that there may be none forthcoming;
- (2) Closure of federal recreational sites, and certain local areas being closed or consolidated;
- (3) Withdrawal of the federal government from some support programs, such as the River Basins Commission, causing three states to embark upon their own program in order to maintain the regional data program so essential to them.

Further, he said, the federal parks and recreation areas are increasing their fees by almost as much as 100%. This will cause people to go to the other park and recreation areas where they will not need to pay as much. All of these, he stated,

will have considerable impact upon the State of Washington in its parks programs.

B.

III. OLD BUSINESS. Project Changes: Mr. Eugene Leach, Recreation Projects Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1982, and advised the Committee the need for withdrawal of the Town of Mabton's, Community Park Development Project. Due to unforeseen problems and the current economic climate, the Town did not believe it was the proper time to proceed on the project. The co-sponsor, Mabton School District #120, concurred.

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

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE MABTON COMMUNITY PARK PROJECT ON NOVEMBER 15, 1979, FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$75,000. (50% LWCF/25% STATE BOND/25% LOCAL), AND

WHEREAS, THE TOWN OF MABTON AND MABTON SCHOOL DISTRICT #120 HAVE REQUESTED THE PROJECT WITHDRAWN, AND

WHEREAS, THERE HAVE BEEN NO REIMBURSEMENTS OF STATE OR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND MONIES TO THE PROJECT SPONSORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY WITHDRAWS THE MABTON COMMUNITY PARK PROJECT (80-044D) AND AUTHORIZES THE DIRECTOR OF THE IAC TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III. A. LEGISLATION.

Mr. Stan Scott, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1982, on Legislation, and briefly commented on the updated status of certain House and Senate Bills. He noted particularly the status of Substitute Senate Bill 4586, Agency Reorganization, which had been in House Rules 2 and referred to Senate Rules 3 following the Regular 1982 Session. The bill has now been placed in the House Appropriations-General Government Committee as of March 24, 1982. Other bills highlighted briefly by Mr. Scott included:

- SB 3823 ORV Monies for Hiking Areas and Trails. In House Rules 3.
- SB 4460 Bicycle Laws - Governor signed.
- SB 3915 Recreation Guide - House Natl. Resources.
- Senate Joint Memorial 120 - LWCF funding - Senate Rules 3.
- HB 183 1989 Centennial Commission - Delivered to the Governor.
- HB 1012 Fees for Surveys and Maps - DNR - Delivered to the Governor.

The status of Senate Concurrent Resolution 143 which would set up a joint select committee to study the management options and potential uses of the John Wayne Trail was added to the listing by Mr. Scott, and status given as House Rules 2.

In response to Mr. Pretti's question as to why SSB 4586 had now been placed in the House Appropriations-General Government Committee, Mr. Scott replied he did not have that information at this time.

NEW BUSINESS. IV. A. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS PRESENTATIONS - 10:00 a.m.: Prior to the slide presentation of projects, the Committee reviewed letters from the Office of Financial Management and the House of Representatives pertaining to the funding session: OFM, Jim Sainsbury, "Local Agencies' Funding Session" dated March 19, 1982 to IAC; OFM, Jim Sainsbury, "Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation - Local Agencies' Funding Session", March 19, 1982 to House Ways & Means, State Legislature; and Rod Chandler, House Ways and Means Chairman, to Jim Sainsbury, OFM, dated March 24, 1982, "Local Agencies' Funding Session". It had been determined that the 25 percent local share would still stand for the March 25th funding session.

Staff Funding Recommendations memorandum and accompanying listing of projects was distributed to the IAC members. [SEE PAGES 9 AND 10 FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS]

At 10:00 a.m. the Chairman called upon the Project Services personnel for presentation of Local Agencies' Projects. Mr. Glenn Moore and his staff presented slides of the forty-five eligible projects. There were no comments from the Committee during the slide presentation at request of the Chairman. (Ended at 10:53 a.m.)

Following the slide review, the Chairman called the Committee's attention to the packet of letters received from various individuals and organizations (either pro or con) on certain of the projects and asked that they review these during the ten minute break. She reminded those desiring to address the Committee to complete a Participant Registration Card and hand it in to her.

The Committee reconvened at 11:00 a.m. with the following Quorum:

AVERY, MAGRUDER, SIMMONS, PRETTI, TVETEN, SCHMITTEN AND BOYLE

Mr. Wilder gave an overview of the funding recommendations and how these had been determined through staff analysis and evaluation team process adhering to the IAC's Participation Manual - Evaluation System. Mr. Wilder highlighted the following:

- (1) The IAC grant-in-aid program was dealt a severe cutback due to the Congressional moratorium on federal Land and Water Conservation Funds. State Bond and Initiative 215 funds intended to match LWCF now must be extended further than anticipated.
- (2) Severe economic situation faces the state. There is need to look at those projects which are labor-intensive and can provide employment for citizens of the state.
- (3) Attached funding table: Ranking of the projects was determined through the Evaluation System. Staff looked at providing state funds for as many projects as possible and for the most essential components of a project while maintaining the general project scope. Also the need for additional employment as rapidly as possible; plus providing state funds at the least percentage of the total to enable more projects to be funded.

Mr. Wilder noted that the final decision rests with the Committee; that it has the authority to make its own recommendations having reviewed that of staff. A letter had been sent to local agencies' sponsors asking that they try to adjust their project to allow less funding from IAC sources, thus aiding in funding other projects down the line. Cooperation was excellent and many sponsors assisted the IAC in this type of action.

TABLE II STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

RAEK AGENCY	PROJECT	SCORE	AG	PRIO	PER	RES	TOTAL	IAC	INIT.	LUCF	STATE	LOCAL
		BY	RITY	RECK	ION		SHARE	215		BOND		
1		0		0%		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
2	WENTON CEDAR RIVER TRAIL	121	A	50%	4	149500.	74750.	0.	0.	0.	74750.	74750.
3	WENT EAST HILL PARK	117	A	47%	4	686000.	322420.	0.	0.	0.	322420.	363580.
4	TRADINA SWIMMING POOL	116	D	43%	4	691000.	297130.	0.	0.	0.	297130.	393870.
5	WAGSALS SWIMMING POOL REHB	107	D	37%	12	267900.	98790.	0.	0.	0.	98790.	168210.
6	WYLLFOST EAST BAY MARINA	103	D	64%	5	750000.	480000.	480000.	0.	0.	0.	270000.
7	WYDISH PICNIC POINT	102	D	32%	4	590000.	160000.	0.	0.	0.	160000.	340000.
8	WYRIGHLND YAKIMA RIVER PARK	100	A	65%	10	230000.	169500.	20000.	0.	0.	129500.	80500.
9	YSCAUBN COMMUNITY PARK	99	D	50%	4	400000.	200000.	0.	0.	0.	200000.	200000.
10	YSLMENN 2-N. RYNT OF BAY	99	A	0%	3	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
11	YASOUVER LEVERICH PARK	99	D	60%	6	251000.	150600.	0.	0.	0.	150600.	100400.
12	YAN PARKER CITY BEACH	98	D	50%	3	255000.	127500.	26500.	0.	0.	101000.	127500.
13	YERANE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	95	A	0%	12	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
14	YERBUICK KENNEDY PARK	93	D	50%	10	200000.	100000.	0.	0.	0.	100000.	100000.
15	YRANKLN CO NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	93	A	0%	10	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
16	YRINKLN PETER WICK PARK	93	D	50%	4	400000.	200000.	0.	0.	0.	200000.	200000.
17	YRIBNO HOLY RIVERFRONT PARK	92	D	66%	3	112470.	74230.	0.	0.	0.	74230.	38240.
18	YRIBENTALE ENORE PARK	92	D	65%	6	115900.	74750.	0.	0.	0.	74750.	40250.
19	YRICKRINT SALESFPORT PH. 2	92	D	75%	6	76000.	57000.	0.	0.	38000.	19000.	19000.
20	YRIVALE FERRISDALE SCHOOL	91	D	0%	3	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
21	YRITALE GAS WORKS PARK	90	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
22	YRITNER SHEWAN SIRSET	90	D	75%	3	60000.	45000.	45000.	0.	0.	0.	15000.
23	YRLEWBE SPIRITRIDE	89	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
24	YRNG BEACH CULBERIGCH PARK	89	D	0%	2	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
25	YRURLAKE BALLINGER PARK	88	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
26	YRUSOUVER WALESFRONT PARK	89	D	0%	6	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
27	YRUBANISH DOCK RANGD.	88	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
28	YRURIE PARK	88	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
29	YRRENTER BLUEBERRY PARK	88	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
30	YRREBE SWIMMING POOL REHB	87	D	0%	8	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
31	YRREBIAL LK WATERFRONT PARK	87	D	0%	12	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
32	YRREB CO. SUBDEVEN PH. 2	86	D	0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
33	YRREB PARK	85	D	0%	5	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
34	YRREB SWIMMING POOL REHB	85	D	0%	12	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.

AS  
Reviewed  
at  
Meeting  
3/25/82

RANK	AGENCY	PROJECT	SCORE	AD	PRID	PER	REG	TOTAL	IAC	INIT.	LUCF	STATE	LOF		
				BY	RITY	RECH	ION	SHARE	215	BOND					
35	COLV TSB.	PARK-PLAYGROUND	83	D		0%	7	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
36	S. KITSAP	JACKSON-LUND PARK	82	A		0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
37	N.W. DIST	COMMUNITY CENTER	82	A		0%	3	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
38	WILDER SCH	EMERSON PARK	81	D		0%	9	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
39	MARY HAKER	PARK	80	D		0%	11	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
40	DAVENPORT	TENNIS COURTS	79	D		0%	9	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
41	KING CO.	HAZLE VALLEY	77	A		0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
42	COGNOLIS	MILL CREEK PH. 3	76	D		0%	2	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
43	SUMNER SCH	LAKERIDGE	72	D		0%	4	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
44	ELLERSBURG	RECREATION FIELDS	71	D		0%	8	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
45	CUMAS/FORT	HERITAGE PARK	59	D		0%	6	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.		
TOTAL FUND										2526255.	625000.	36000.	1863235.		
TOTAL USED										5142970.	2611670.	571500.	38000.	2002170.	2531300.
DIFFERENCE										-85415.	53500.	0.	-138945.		

SUMMARY BY PLANNING DISTRICTS

PLAN	DIST	TOTAL	IAC	215	LUCF	STATE	LOCAL
1		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
2		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
3		427470.	246730.	71500.	0.	175230.	180740.
4		2626500.	1254300.	0.	0.	1254300.	1572200.
5		750000.	480000.	460000.	0.	0.	270000.
6		442000.	282350.	0.	38000.	244350.	159650.
7		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
8		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
9		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
10		430900.	249500.	20000.	0.	229500.	180500.
11		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
12		267000.	98790.	0.	0.	98790.	168210.
13		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
TOTAL		5142970.	2611670.	571500.	38000.	2002170.	2531300.

TABLE I PROJECT APPLICATIONS AND COSTS

*See sent w/ kits*

RANK	AGENCY	PROJECT	SCORE	ACQ. DEV.	PER REQ	REGION	TOTAL COST	IAC SHARE	INIT. 215	LWCF	STATE BOND	LOCAL
1			0		0%		0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
2	✓ RENTON	CEDAR RIVER TRAIL	121	A	75%	4	149500.	112125.	0.	0.	112125.	37375.
3	✓ KENT	EAST HILL PARK	117	A	60%	4	686000.	411600.	0.	0.	411600.	274400.
4	✓ TACOMA	SWIMMING POOL	116	D	43%	4	691000.	297130.	0.	0.	297130.	393870.
5	✓ OAKSDALE	SWIMMING POOL REHB	109	D	37%	12	267000.	98790.	0.	0.	98790.	168210.
6	✓ CLY., PORT	EAST BAY MARINA	103	D	64%	5	750000.	480000.	480000.	0.	0.	270000.
7	✓ SHOHOMISH	PICNIC POINT	102	D	49%	4	798000.	391020.	0.	0.	391020.	406980.
8	✓ RICHLAND	YAKIMA RIVER PARK	100	A	74%	10	230000.	170200.	20000.	0.	150200.	59800.
9	✓ ISSAQUAH	COMMUNITY PARK	99	D	75%	4	800000.	600000.	0.	0.	600000.	200000.
10	✓ BELLINGHAM	B.N. RIGHT OF WAY	99	A	75%	3	500000.	375000.	0.	0.	375000.	125000.
11	✓ VANCOUVER	LEVERICH PARK	98	D	75%	6	302000.	226500.	0.	0.	226500.	75500.
12	✓ OAK HARBOR	CITY BEACH	98	D	75%	3	510000.	382500.	26500.	0.	356000.	127500.
13	✓ SPOKANE	NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	95	A	75%	12	70000.	52500.	0.	0.	52500.	17500.
14	✓ KENNEBICK	KENNEBICK PARK	93	D	75%	10	222000.	167250.	0.	0.	167250.	55750.
15	✓ FRANKLIN CO	NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	93	A	63%	10	75000.	49770.	0.	0.	49770.	29230.
16	✓ KIRKLAND	PETER KIRK PARK	93	D	75%	4	602000.	451500.	0.	0.	451500.	150500.
17	✓ SEASIDE WOLY	RIVERSIDE PARK	92	D	75%	3	150000.	112500.	0.	0.	112500.	37500.
18	✓ GOLDFORDALE	SHORE PARK	92	D	75%	6	159000.	119250.	0.	0.	119250.	39750.
19	✓ KLICKITAT	MALLISPORT PH. 2	92	D	75%	6	81000.	60750.	0.	0.	60750.	20250.
20	✓ FERNDALE	FERNDALE SCHOOL	91	D	75%	3	308000.	231000.	0.	0.	231000.	77000.
21	✓ SEATTLE	GAS WORKS PARK	90	D	75%	4	600000.	450000.	0.	0.	450000.	150000.
22	✓ LACONNER	SHERMAN STREET	90	D	75%	3	60000.	45000.	45000.	0.	0.	15000.
23	✓ BELLEVUE	SPIRITRIDGE	89	D	50%	4	200000.	100000.	0.	0.	100000.	100000.
24	✓ LONGS BEACH	CULBERTSON PARK	89	D	75%	2	233000.	174750.	0.	0.	174750.	58250.
25	✓ HOURLLAKE	BALLINGER PARK	88	D	75%	4	280000.	210000.	0.	0.	210000.	70000.
26	✓ VANCOUVER	WATERFRONT PARK	88	D	75%	6	92000.	69000.	0.	0.	69000.	23000.
27	✓ SUZANISH	DOCK RANAS.	88	D	75%	4	38000.	28500.	0.	0.	28500.	9500.
28	✓ FRAIRIE	PARK	88	D	75%	4	300000.	225000.	0.	0.	225000.	75000.
29	✓ BREMERTON	BLUESBERRY PARK	88	D	75%	4	237000.	177750.	0.	0.	177750.	59250.
30	✓ MIXEE	SWIMMING POOL REHB	87	D	75%	8	213000.	159750.	0.	0.	159750.	53250.
31	✓ MEDICAL LK	WATERFRONT PARK	87	D	75%	12	200000.	150000.	0.	0.	150000.	50000.
32	✓ KING CO.	SHOREVIEW PH. 2	86	D	75%	4	440000.	330000.	0.	0.	330000.	110000.
33	✓ RAINIER	PARK	86	D	75%	5	41000.	30750.	0.	0.	30750.	10250.
34	✓ PULLMAN	SWIMMING POOL REHB	85	D	75%	12	280000.	210000.	0.	0.	210000.	70000.

*AS Sent with KITS 3/17/82*

TABLE I PROJECT APPLICATIONS AND COSTS

RANK	AGENCY	PROJECT	SCORE	ACC. DEV.	PER REQ	REGION	TOTAL COST	IAC SHARE	INIT. 215	LWCF	STATE BOND	LOCAL	
35	COLV TRB.	PARK-PLAYGROUND	83	D	75%	7	151000.	113250.	0.	0.	113250.	37750.	
36	S. KITSAP	JACKSON-LUND PARK	82	A	50%	4	881700.	440850.	0.	0.	440850.	440850.	
37	N.W. DIST	COMMUNITY CENTER	82	A	75%	3	73000.	54750.	0.	0.	54750.	18250.	
38	WILBR SCH	EMERSON PARK	81	B	75%	9	180000.	135000.	0.	0.	135000.	45000.	
39	MARY WALKR	PARK	80	D	75%	11	200000.	150000.	0.	0.	150000.	50000.	
40	DAVENPORT	TENNIS COURTS	79	D	75%	9	85000.	63750.	0.	0.	63750.	21250.	
41	KING CO.	HAZLE VALLEY	77	A	75%	4	57200.	42900.	0.	0.	42900.	14300.	
42	COSKOPPLIS	MILL CREEK PH. 3	76	D	75%	2	92000.	69000.	0.	0.	69000.	23000.	
43	SUNNER SCH	LAKERIDGE	72	D	75%	4	236000.	177000.	0.	0.	177000.	59000.	
44	ELLENSBURG	RECREATION FIELDS	71	B	25%	8	390000.	97500.	0.	0.	97500.	292500.	
45	CORAS, PORT	HERITAGE PARK	59	D	75%	6	53000.	39750.	0.	0.	39750.	13250.	
							TOTAL	12968400.	8533635.	571500.	0.	7962135.	4434765.

SUMMARY BY PLANNING DISTRICTS

PLAN DIST	TOTAL	IAC	215	LWCF	STATE	LOCAL
1	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
2	325000.	243750.	0.	0.	243750.	81250.
3	1601000.	1200750.	715000.	0.	1129250.	400250.
4	6996400.	4445375.	0.	0.	4445375.	2551025.
5	791000.	510750.	480000.	0.	30750.	280250.
6	687000.	515250.	0.	0.	515250.	171750.
7	151000.	113250.	0.	0.	113250.	37750.
8	603000.	257250.	0.	0.	257250.	345750.
9	265000.	198750.	0.	0.	198750.	66250.
10	532000.	367220.	200000.	0.	367220.	144780.
11	200000.	150000.	0.	0.	150000.	50000.
12	817000.	511290.	0.	0.	511290.	305710.
13	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
TOTAL	12968400.	8533635.	571500.	0.	7962135.	4434765.

10-B

The funding totals provided by staff were as follows:

<u>Projects</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>IAC Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>
3 Acquisition	\$ 1,065,500	\$ 546,670 (21%)	\$ 518,830
13 Developments	4,077,470	2,065,000 (79%)	2,012,470
16 Projects	\$ 5,142,970	\$ 2,611,670 (100%)	\$ 2,531,300

Seventy-nine percent of the state funds are directed towards development projects; overall state/local match is 51-49.

The Chairman asked for comments from the audience and asked that they be limited to two minutes. Those speaking on the same project were asked not to repeat information already given to the Committee.

COMMENTS FROM LOCAL AGENCIES REPRESENTATIVES:

John Webley, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Renton - Cedar River Trail:  
Speaking for the City of Renton's Cedar River Trail project, #1 on the funding recommendation list. Appreciated staff assistance and support their recommendation. Understood that cuts had to be made in the project and would abide by them.

Barney Wilson, Parks and Recreation Director, City of Kent - East Hill Park: 1. Introduced Helen Adams, coordinator for the East Hill Park project, who had worked with Mr. Ron Taylor, Recreation Projects Manager of the IAC on the project.  
2. Felt the scores indicated the quality of the project and the value of it as an outdoor recreation park;  
3. Appreciated the IAC motto "Partners in Progress" and felt this park was an indication of that spirit;  
4. Project is aligned with a successful bond issue, and will be used in relationship with the high school campus nearby.  
5. Since it is an acquisition project, it will create jobs.  
6. Had originally asked percentage 40/60 -- this was cut to 47/53. Felt staff had done an excellent job with the money available for funding.  
7. Construction plans available to verify the jobs created if any member interested in reviewing these.  
8. Reserved option to clarify the project later on if need arose.  
9. Desired to retain IAC in a position to assist communities as it has in the past with parks and recreation areas and facilities.

Barbara Bichsel, Councilwoman, City of Tacoma - Tacoma Swimming Pool:  
Expressed her gratitude to the members of the Committee and staff for funding recommendation at this point in time. This is a local school-park swimming pool facility on the Gault Jr. High Campus and will serve many persons in lower income households.

2. Introduced Neil Ostrom, Director of the Metropolitan Park District, and Keith Palmquist, Director of Community Development, City of Tacoma. [Several Tacoma residents were in attendance to support the project. They stood and were acknowledged as a group.]

Kay Shahan, Chairperson, Oakesdale Parks and Rec. District - Oakesdale Swimming Pool Project:

(see pg. 12)

1. Thanked the committee and staff for their interest in the project; especially Larry Fairleigh, Projects Manager, for his assistance.
2. Invited the Committee to the grand opening of the Swimming Pool Project when it is completed.

Michael Corcoran, City Planner, City of West Richland - Yakima River Park:

1. Spoke on behalf of the people of West Richland.
2. Appreciated staff's assistance.
3. Have been working actively with the Trust for Public Lands and the Elks Club group to get this project for the people of West Richland.
4. Is an acquisition project and will therefore create jobs.

Mr. Schmitt asked if there would be boating activities in the project for use of the Initiative 215 monies and was informed a boat launch is planned. He stated he was pleased to see an east side of the state community park in the top ranking for funding.

Byron Elmendorf, Parks and Recreation Director, City of Bellingham - Burlington-Northern Right-of-Way Acq. Project:

1. Even though were ninth highest project, were passed over.
2. Has written a letter of his concerns to Mr. Wilder, the Director, IAC.
3. Have had a good relationship with IAC in the past. Some of the problems have been looked at, and were understood; however, since other acquisition projects are being recommended for funding, unable to understand why Bellingham's project was passed over.
4. Have worked on the project for one year with rules being followed; now suddenly there are new rules, i.e., labor-intensive being stressed.
5. Explained the project - trails acquisition for future pedestrian/bicycle trail. Would be labor-intensive and create jobs.
6. Reduced project by 20%; increased Bellingham's commitment for local match to 60/40.
7. Have worked with Burlington Northern over the past three years on this concept for a trail.
8. Other project sponsors staff has passed over are saying the same things said here.
9. There are some funds Committee is not tapping into at this time, but which are available. Real concern and questions on this -- if the money is there, consider using it. Might want to use some of this "extra" money to fund Bellingham's project and others.

Mr. Tveten asked for clarification of the project and was informed it encompassed an acquisition of an abandoned Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way. He asked if there was a time limit in negotiations with Burlington Northern. Mr. Elmendorf said a firm date had not yet been set with them.

Frank McCoy, Director Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane - Neighborhood Park:

1. Emphasized that the Spokane project was in #13 scoring position, yet were passed over to reach other projects.
2. Were pleased to have the high scoring and expected funding in order to provide this park for the people in Spokane.
3. This project is acquisition of land in a developing neighborhood; if don't acquire that land, it will never come back as it will go into development for other uses. Additional homes will be put in that area.
4. Reduced the project - held off putting in the roads. Now, there needs to be a labor-intensive feature having already taken it out.

5. Reduction was from \$135,000 to \$70,000.
6. Subdividers have been waiting since 1969
7. If there is reserve money, would like to have some designated for the Spokane project.
8. Suggested committee overturn staff's recommendation and fund the project.

Robert Boothe, Franklin County Planning Department - Neighborhood Park:

1. Project is an acquisition of land in an urban area - need is there.
2. Is only parcel left in this urban area for park purposes.
3. Have a willing seller and a willing buyer; willing to sell for less than appreciated values for the property.
4. With new interstate highway, there will be increased demand for more residential development.
5. Landowner's agreement/offer expires April 30, 1982.
6. First application with the IAC; pleased with the assistance given by Larry Fairleigh, Projects Manager.
7. First, appeared that project would be funded; was in upper third of scoring range. With new regulation that only development projects would be considered, this affected the acquisition proposal.
8. Recommended that project evaluation be in competition basis with other projects in the state and not have new change of policies at the last minute.
9. Felt Franklin County followed all procedures and requirements; now project appears to be killed because of new procedure.
10. Mentioned legislation which may give citizens to take legal action if project is not funded. Purpose of this legislation is to prevent arbitrary decisions in regard to rules of agencies, etc.
11. Recommended the Committee move to approve the Franklin County Planning Department's project.

Commissioner Boyle asked for explanation of statement (10) above. Mr. Boothe referred to House Bill #1006 (now a Sub House Bill) being considered by the State Legislature which would revise the law on compensation for taking property by governments; create a cause of action for property owners against a public entity which has placed added restrictions on a property use permit, etc. Mr. Boyle felt this did not apply to the circumstances of the Franklin County's project not being funded. Whereupon Mr. Boothe stated he was making an analogy on adopting rules and regulations and changing policies at the last minute. He felt this should not be done.

In light of the fact that three sponsors had testified to the Committee about their acquisition projects not being funded, Mr. Boyle asked for staff clarification on decision which led up to the funding recommendations.

Mr. Wilder offered the following:

1. A letter had been received from OFM spelling out some of the guidelines to be used at the funding session in allocation of bond funds. The emphasis was upon labor-intensive type projects being considered for funding. Those that would create jobs.
2. A day later, the Legislature advised the IAC about the same criteria.
3. IAC met with OFM and others to get a modification and interpretation of their advisory messages.
4. Shared the matter with all local agencies' sponsors having projects coming before the Committee which involved acquisition that their

projects could be impacted and asked that they respond and provide additional information.

5. Criteria for funding included:
  - (a) Relative ranking through the evaluation process. The Committee only uses this as one tool in the overall funding of projects.
  - (b) Final decision is based upon the merits of each project; not necessarily that they would satisfy staff's recommendation.
  - (c) Staff then went through the relative ranking.
6. Received a modification on the directive from OFM and the Legislature.
7. In looking at LWCF funding, needed to get back to a 50/50 match for state and local agencies; usually it has been 50-25-25 (50% federal monies).
8. Tried to work with the sponsors and provide state funds for the most essential components. Tried to match as many projects as possible.
9. Did consider provision of additional employment, but it was not an over-riding factor.
10. Staff then worked on the percentages; there are no changes in those. IAC has strived to maximize state money.
11. Are pleased to bring these projects to the Committee as ranked and as recommended for funding.

Commissioner Boyle complimented Mr. Wilder and the IAC staff for dealing with a funding session at a most difficult time and under these circumstances. The State Legislature has very difficult problems and needs answers to those problems. He stated the IAC was merely a part of the overall scheme in this financial situation, and though it was a disappointment to many local sponsors, the IAC staff has had to come up with a funding recommendation for the Committee. It has been sympathetic to sponsors.

Mr. Tveten said he would explore some options later following the local agencies' comments.

The Chairman called upon Steven Ladd, City of Sedro Wooley (Planner) - Riverfront Park:  
Mr. Ladd stated:

1. Sedro Woolley adopted its Park and Recreation Plan in 1980, with need for additional park facilities established.
2. Overriding priority was the access to the Skagit River, which is presently not available.
3. Have an intensive site plan program; has community support.
4. Received acquisition grant last year from IAC; now ready to develop.
5. Have coordinated with Dept. of Game and the U. S. Forest Service.
6. Skagit County currently has 19.2% unemployment; this project would create jobs.
7. Facility is badly needed; represents a very important recreational opportunity for people in the area.
8. Thanked staff for their recommendation to fund and urged Committee to support that recommendation.

Allen Lock, City Manager, City of Kirkland - Peter Kirk Park:

1. Appreciated staff's recommendation to fund the project; are ready to move on it.
2. Reduced from \$600,000 to \$400,000 with 50/50 match. Adjustments are good.
3. Project has excellent community support, and need is there.

Agnes Miller-Webert, Chairman, Klickitat County Park Board - Dallesport Pk. Phase 2:

1. Thanked the Committee for consideration of funding this park.
2. Is located in small community, but density rate is growing fast; park is badly needed. This is a phase 2 project.
3. Felt the cut imposed can be absorbed and still have worthwhile park.
4. Urged the Committee to accept staff's recommendation for funding.

Nancy Welch, Aide to Senator Al Williams - Seattle's Gas Works Park:

1. Read a letter from Senator Williams to the Committee: (dated March 25, 1982)
  - (a) Acknowledged limited funding, but felt Seattle had cut back from its original request and had increased its own share of the proposal which was commendable.
  - (b) Seven elements of the project were prioritized by the Dept. of Parks and Recreation, Seattle, maintaining a worthwhile project.
  - (c) Development will increase the available park land without additional land expenditure.
  - (d) The park serves thousands of Seattle citizens every season.
  - (e) Felt parks' use would increase in urban areas due to economic climate; more costly forms of recreation will be outside the scope of many pocketbooks.
  - (f) Urged the Committee to at least give partial funding to this project.

Harry Laben, Seattle Parks and Recreation Department, Seattle - Gas Works Park:

1. Can understand the problems in funding Committee is facing.
2. Gas Works Park is in dense urban area of about 150,000 people (surrounding area). Is receiving heavy use.
3. Project is labor-intensive; elements within the project will increase recreational opportunity.
4. Uniqueness of the park should be noted; a unique recreational opportunity not in any other park area.
5. Have increased local funds, reducing the cost to IAC; have prioritized elements within the project to be completed. Have great flexibility in funding certain elements.
6. Would accept partial funding.
7. Felt Committee should establish a priority listing of projects not funded, so that in the event there is surplus money those projects down the line can receive funding.
8. Reminded the Committee of the high value of the project locally and regionally.

Stephen Ladd, Planner, Town of LaConner - Sherman St. Boat Ramp:

1. Explained is City Planner not only for Sedro Woolley, but for Town of LaConner.
2. Is the only boat launch in this particular area; becoming run down; a lot of problems need solving. Town doesn't have the resources to repair it.
3. Construction plans/specifications - ready to go.
4. Appreciate staff's recommendation to fund the project and ask support of the Committee.

William Winn, Director of Services, Town of Long Beach - Culbertson Park:

1. First application submitted by the Town of Long Beach.
2. Prepared formal application without any assistance; done by volunteers.
3. Clarified location of Long Beach (on Long Beach peninsula) and fact that it receives extensive tourist trade.

4. Park will serve approximately 8,000 permanent population; participation increase on weekends.
5. Presently have 16 teams using three softball fields (one is at the Long Beach Grade School; one in a park; and one at Ilwaco). Don't have room for all teams (men's and women's teams) to play.
6. Long Beach is in vicinity of Fort Canby State Park and Fort Columbia, which receive heavy participation.
7. Have only one picnic table in a city park; the only picnic facilities for forty-seven miles.
8. Though Long Beach itself has only 1,300 population itself, it supports an average of about 12,000 persons in regard to recreation.

Pegie Ahvakana, Suquamish Tribal Council Treasurer - Dock Rehabilitation Project:

1. Dock has become unsafe and is in need of repair.
2. Noted that rehabilitation of this dock is by far the lowest funding request before the Committee; thus, would be the most cost-effective.
3. Preparation of application was accomplished with high degree of non-Indians and the Suquamish Tribal people.
  - (a) Diane Hodges represented the community group;
  - (b) Mike Bonhoff has been coordinator of the project.
4. Dock has been a community facility. A recent survey noted that rebuilding of the dock was the #1 priority of the entire community.
5. Supporting bulkhead is in danger of completely falling over.
6. Fear costs will increase if not repaired soon.
7. Further deterioration of this dock presents a hazard to navigation.
8. Dock serves as excellent recreation facility for the public; no fishing pier available otherwise. Urged funds for its repair.

Mr. Schmitten complimented the Tribe on its cooperative project, and was impressed with the Tribe and local people getting together and working toward this project. He also noted it was the least expensive project - \$38,000. Further, he pointed out that the local share of 25% had been donated, and he didn't think any other project had demonstrated this fact.

Michael Briggs, Town Coordinator, City of Moxee - Swimming Pool Rehabilitation:

1. Mayor Mel Tanasse unable to be present; sent his appreciation for Committee's consideration of the project.
2. Moxee has worked hard through volunteer efforts to get assistance for this project and other recreation areas.
3. Outdoor swimming pool is in dilapidated state; requires extensive repairs.
4. Built in 1950's, does not now meet state standards.
5. Pool closed by Dept. of Social and Health Services; will not allow its opening until deficiencies have been corrected.
6. Felt a facility closed by the state should be given a high priority in helping to alleviate the problems.
7. Rest of facilities are in good shape.
8. On receipt of Director's letter, reviewed the project and dropped it to \$57,000 -- or 52% of the total cost of the project.
9. Understand the limited funding situation, but ask review of the project and funding by the Committee.
10. Advised Mr. Schmitten that local funds placed in this project have all been entirely donated; \$13,000 cash and approximately \$40,000 in donated materials, etc.

Frank Andrews, Jr., Planner, Colville Tribe - Recreation Park/Playground:

1. Clarified location of the project - 6 miles Colville. Situated near low income housing project. 700 persons live in that area.

2. There is a 12% unemployed rate; the Reservation has a 14% unemployment rate. Due to deteriorating timber market.
3. Presently there are no recreation facilities on or near the site. Felt majority of projects presented asked for additions, whereas this project would provide the very basic amenities to a deprived community.
4. No other funds are available for this project; it is located on a HUD site of low income.
5. Felt application was consistent with the needs; a variety of activities will be presented in one park.
6. Noted that majority of top ones in the ranking of projects are located on west side of the state; understanding was that a certain number of dollars are allocated to the western side and certain number to eastern side. This is only project in District #7 of the state.

Jack Wilson, City Supervisor, City of Oak Harbor - City Beach Park:

1. Pleased to be recommended for funding, but disappointed in level of funds.
2. Basically funding was cut in half; but can still maintain a viable project with dollars given to it. Will need to reduce scope considerably.
3. Realize that Oak Harbor is fortunate to be recommended for funding, and understand the staff's task in recommending projects as well as the Committee's task to fund them.
4. This project is second application. Will provide excellent facilities -- approximately 30 acres with 2,200 feet of waterfront.

Richard O. Malin, Port Engineer, Port of Olympia - East Bay Marina/Park:

1. Thanked staff for recommendation to fund the project.
2. Exciting project - taking some industrial waterway and converting it into a marina/park facility to meet recreation needs.
3. Area presents a unique opportunity for this type of facility.
4. This funding will enable a first phase of the project to begin.

Commissioner Boyle asked for explanation as to the extent of the public access. Mr. Malin explained there would be a 12 foot wide esplanade down through the park area; boat launching ramp is included; and moorages. A new access road will be created across Olympia Avenue south which will connect with the boat launch ramp area.

Kelly L. Puntney, Parks Project Manager, Vancouver - Leverich Park and Waterfront park:

1. Appreciated funding of the Leverich Park project.
2. Is a redevelopment project; local share through a bond issue passed by the voters.
3. Disappointed that the Waterfront Park project could not be funded, but recognized funding situation at this meeting.
4. City provided funding for acquisition of the land for Leverich Park.

Following comments from local agencies' sponsors, the Committee discussed with staff TABLE II - STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS.

In response to questions from Mr. Tveten, Mr. Moore clarified the Total Used funding column with amount available for funding. The Total figure is the target

level based upon one-half of the appropriated funds for the entire biennium. The overexpenditure figures will balance out. Limiting the funding to one-half of the total amount of money enables the Committee to fund projects at a future meeting. Mr. Tveten said he was going to suggest that the IAC increase the Initiative 215 monies to projects that had boating aspects within them, but he now understood his suggestion would not work. However, he asked why could not the surplus in the 215 account, in the cash available, be used for funding projects at this meeting? Mr. Moore replied that fifty percent of 215 is automatically appropriated to state agencies, and that is where the surplus rested.

At this point, Commissioner Boyle asked why this fact did not appear in the Fiscal Fund Summary reviewed earlier. Mr. Scott explained that the Fund Summary indicates the amount of funding to state and local agencies, but does not show under the amount of Init. 215 any revenue coming into that fund month-by-month. Mr. Wilder stated the state side of Initiative 215 is controlled by appropriations to the state agencies. If the state agencies have projects that are not included in the Capitol Budget as approved by the State Legislature, they will not receive monies for those projects.

The Chairman called for a motion regarding staff project funding recommendations.

Mr. Pretti felt the recommendations reflected the best consideration and evaluation under IAC procedures, through a technical group highly qualified to review and analyze them; that, further, they reflected considerable staff effort and review and appeared to be an appropriate funding recommendation.

MR. PRETTI MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. SIMMONS, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 21 OF THESE MINUTES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON NOVEMBER 15, 1979, AND

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

NOW, THEREFORE, THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS (AS LISTED ON PAGE 21 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Boyle made the following points:

1. It is a difficult time to argue with recommendations of staff, realizing the efforts which have been made through negotiations with local sponsors.
2. The recommendations indicate the best efforts of staff in putting together their review, evaluations and ultimate findings.
3. It is becoming more and more difficult to get funding for these projects; there is no assurance that LWCF will be forthcoming. He disagreed that there is any short term hope of having LWCF come to the state again.
4. Noted that the total of project funding for eastern Washington is \$380,000

- if Goldendale was included as being in central Washington.
5. Applicants who don't have expertise in staffing - and money -- are unable to respond to IAC guidelines and are at a disadvantage to the IAC process. Persons coming in with fewer resources are at a great disadvantage in the application process.
  6. At the same time, fewer funds are available; and communities with the most disadvantage have the least opportunity to obtain funding.
  7. Noted that a local sponsor had suggested setting up a series of priorities to fund other projects if some that are funded happen to drop out.
  8. Felt the IAC was losing sight of the particular aspect of the disadvantaged; this goes beyond whether a person lives in an urban community or rural -- disadvantage applies also to recreation opportunities.
  9. The point scoring appears to indicate that those with the least number of points are disadvantaged by the point system itself.
  10. IAC has legislative mandate to consider urban projects, and will adhere to that, but it could review the evaluation process and perhaps aid smaller communities in other areas of the state.
  11. Felt the IAC should set some priorities now on the projects from the funding listing today which could come up to the top should some of those funded drop out.
  12. Felt IAC should look again at the scoring system - evaluation of projects -- and see if this system is still the correct one to use.

Mr. Schmitt stated he was concerned about the possible practice of embarking upon a program of exceeding revenues -- in this instance, \$85,000. He did not feel it was a prudent practice and suggested holding back the last two projects until there was sufficient money on hand to fund them - and thus keep a solvent program. Mr. Moore interjected this would not be required because in exceeding the target figure by \$85,000 it is an encumbrance and not an expenditure under the manner in which the IAC funding program is handled. Mr. Scott reviewed briefly the appropriation system of the IAC. The appropriation is for the biennium and is divided into two fiscal year allotments. In local agencies' funding, the IAC encumbers the funds at the 1st of July. An account is set up to indicate this amount of money is encumbered for use in local agencies' projects. The IAC splits the funding into two fiscal year segments - one-half this session and one-half at a future IAC session. State agencies manage their funds month-by-month; IAC is July of first year and July of second year. Commitments are made for the monies and it is not considered an overexpenditure because of the lag time in this type of funding program. Expenditures do not take place immediately but over a period of time as reimbursements are made.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON MR. PRETTI'S MOTION. IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Commissioner Boyle asked that the Committee direct the Director of the agency and his staff to analyze and review the local agencies' PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM, prepare a summary report to the Committee members for review at the June 1982 meeting, and give an opportunity to the Committee members for review of the material approximately one month in advance. The Committee members concurred with this suggestion.

The Chairman then entertained a motion from Commissioner Boyle.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE, SECONDED BY MR. SCHMITTEN, THAT IF THERE ARE ANY SAVINGS IN THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS ALLOCATIONS AS AUTHORIZED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DUE TO FAILURE OF SOME LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS TO USE THE FUNDS COMMITTED TO THEM, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DIRECTOR PROCEED TO FUND THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS INSOFAR AS IS POSSIBLE IN THE PRIORITIES GIVEN BELOW:

PRIORITY 1	SUQUAMISH TRIBE PROJECT--DOCK REHABILITATION \$38,000 TOTAL COST (GRANT SHARE TO BE DETERMINED)
PRIORITY 2	CITY OF SPOKANE--NEIGHBORHOOD PARK \$70,000 TOTAL COST (GRANT SHARE TO BE DETERMINED)
PRIORITY 3	FRANKLIN COUNTY PROJECT--LAND ACQUISITION \$79,000 TOTAL COST (GRANT SHARE TO BE DETERMINED)

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MEETINGS OF THE IAC: Mr. Wilder called the attention of the Committee to a change in funding meetings, suggesting the following schedule:

Move the Regular Funding meeting from November 1982 to March 1983  
Include the November 1982 meeting for Off-Road Vehicles' Projects Funding  
Retain the June 1982 Regular Meeting

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PRETTI, SECONDED BY MR. MAGRUDER, THAT THE DIRECTOR'S SUGGESTIONS BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IV. B. Governor's Recreation Conference - "Recreation Issues - 1982":

Mr. Wilder briefly commented on the forthcoming Governor's Conference on Recreation and the Economy (September 1982), and read the list of members of the Policy Committee:

Jean Ameluxen, Planning and Community Affairs  
Micaela Brostrom, former IAC member and former IAC Chairman  
Russ Cahill, Department of Natural Resources  
Thomas Hynes, Dept. of Commerce and Economic Development  
Archie U. Mills, State Game Commission Chairman  
Ronald Pretti, Member, IAC  
Thomas Ryan, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission  
Rolland Schmittten, Director, Department of Fisheries  
David Stevens, Asst. Energy and Natural Resources, Office of the Governor  
David Towne, Jones and Jones, Seattle  
By Haley, Coordinator  
Robert L. Wilder, ex-officio

The Policy Committee will meet March 30, 1982, and the Interagency Committee will be kept advised of plans as they are formulated. Mr. Wilder referred to the memorandum in the kit material and commented on the timetable, page 4.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS: Mr. Tveten called attention to the fact that instead of \$7.2 million available for funding local agencies' projects, there was only \$2.4 million. He said it would behoove all of the Committee members and local agencies' sponsors to write letters to the Washington Congressional Delegation supporting the Land and Water Conservation Fund and its continuance.

Mr. Wilder noted that the next meeting of the Committee would take place June 24-25, 1982 in Olympia, that staff would attempt to keep it to a one day meeting, but would reserve the 25th should the meeting need to continue. Committee members having agenda items were asked to contact Mr. Wilder so that they could be included for discussion.

Mr. Wilder thanked the staff for their efforts and for the local agencies' sponsors who had worked on their projects. He expressed his appreciation to the Committee members for their deliberations, and stated funding restraints would perhaps lessen in the near future. The funding considerations for all of the projects had been most difficult, but a good job had been done in a most difficult financial situation. He reiterated Mr. Tveten's comments -- if the IAC is to obtain additional funding, all locals, state agencies, and others must work together toward that goal. He thanked Mr. Tveten for his support of the LWCF program.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. MAGRUDER, THAT THE IAC MEETING OF MARCH 25, 1982, ADJOURN (12:37 p.m.).

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

*6/24/82 SAC Mtg.*  
*Virgil E. Magruder*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN  
VIRGIL E. MAGRUDER