

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: March 28, 1986
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Coho Annex, Tye Motor Inn
500 Tye Drive
Tumwater, Washington 98502

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS OR DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair
Jeanie Marsden, Vancouver
Ralph Mackey, Everett

Cleve Pinnix, Designee, Honorable Brian Boyle, Natl. Resources
George Volker, Designee, Jack Wayland, Director, Dept. Game
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gary Alexander, Designee, Bill Wilkerson, Director, Fisheries
(afternoon session)

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Anne Cox, Chair, with a quorum present. (COX, MARSDEN, MACKEY, PINNIX, VOLKER, TVETEN.)

The attendees were welcomed by the Chair and asked to introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - NOVEMBER 7, 1985: Corrections to the minutes of November 7, 1985 were called for. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, TO AMEND PAGE 1, PARAGRAPH 6, ITEM (3) 1-90, Wildlife Referendum, as follows:

"(3) 1-90, Wildlife Referendum: Increase state sales tax by 1/8 of 1% (25¢ on a \$200 purchase), generating approximately \$38 million per year. Two-thirds deposited in State Game Fund; ~~1/2~~ 1/3 in the wildlife account to be administered by IAC to fund wildlife recreation projects and programs (state and local projects)."

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. MARSDEN, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, TO AMEND PAGE (19), COLUMN 2 OF THE TABULATION, SPONSOR #14, AS FOLLOWS:

Sponsor name changed from "~~Bremerton, City of~~" to "Bremerton, Port of" to indicate that the Port of Bremerton, First Street Dock Enhancement Project, was funded \$74,177 Init. 215 and \$74,177 Port of Bremerton.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 7, 1985, AS AMENDED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA, MARCH 28, 1986: Mr. Robert L. Wilder, Director, IAC, added the following to the agenda:

NEW BUSINESS - Item "B" - ADOPTION OF EMERGENCY RULE, WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, WAC 286-16-080, GRANT-IN-AID POLICY - 11:00 a.m.

MS. MARSDEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 28, 1986, IAC MEETING AGENDA. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Appendices are NOT attached to these minutes. If you wish a copy, please contact IAC - 753-7140.

APPENDIX A - INFORMATION RE KING COUNTY-SAMMAMISH RIVER PROJECT - #66-025A
APPENDIX B - EMERGENCY ORDER - WAC 286-16-080
APPENDIX C - ORV LETTERS RE ORV PROJECTS
APPENDIX D - IAC CAPITAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS 1987-89

Mr. Wilder reminded those planning to testify at the meeting to complete a Participation Registration Card for use of the Chair.

II. STATUS REPORTS.

A. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum dated March 28, 1986, "Director's Report - March 28, 1986", stating it was necessary for clarity to discuss Item III D. Legislation in connection with the Director's Report, and that Mr. Stanley Scott, Chief, Management Services, would be covering the 1986 Legislative Session report also at this point on the agenda.

1. A Quiet Crisis: Mr. Wilder mentioned an article published in the Washington Recreation and Park Association's SYLLABUS newsletter entitled "Have You Heard The Voices?". The article, written by Mr. Wilder, reported on happenings in parks, recreation, and conservation in the State of Washington that could be defined as a "quiet crisis"limited funding, closure of parks and recreation facilities, etc. Also, though the Governor's Recreation Resource Advisory Committee had made its recommendations, nothing has as yet been done in regard to the recommendations. He mentioned Initiative 90 and the filing on January 3, 1986 of 210,000 signatures in support of this "Wildlife-Recreation Initiative". He felt the "voices" of concerned and dedicated citizens of Washington State would be heard in November when the Initiative 90 is on the ballot.

At this point, Mr. Scott reported to the Committee on House Bill #1382 and other 1986 legislation, referring to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "Legislation 1986":

III D. LEGISLATION

HB 1382 - ORV Legislation: This legislation is a result of extensive negotiation and compromise by and between numerous user groups, state agencies and legislative staff. It amends the language in RCW 46.09 (ORV statutes) to provide for a wide range of changes. Examples: ORV use permit revenues are no longer certified to the State Treasurer; provisions for issuing temporary ORV permits is set forth; redistribution of the existing 1% motor vehicle fuel tax including an increase to the IAC is included; all ORV education programs to be administered by IAC; a specific percentage is given to the Parks and Recreation Commission; includes establishment of expenditure "caps" by program; expands application of public review provisions, and calls for review by the Legislative Budget Committee. It also calls for the formation of an advisory committee of nonhighway road recreationists. HB 1382 is effective on June 30, 1986.

SB 4490 - River Running: Regulates those who conduct whitewater boating experiences carrying passengers for hire on certain rivers in the state. A sub-section directs in regard to designation of rivers or portions thereof:

"Any other section of a river designated a whitewater river section by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. Such river sections shall be class two or greater difficulty as defined by the American Canoe Association."

Other legislation which did not pass was reported on by Mr. Scott:

HB 771 - Bicycle Safety Coordinator
HB 1484 - Metropolitan Park Districts
HB 1634/SB 4715 - Aquatic Lands

(continued next page)

SB 4493 - Reorganization
SB 4516 - Urban Parks
SB 3704/SB 4568/SB 4955 - Alternatives to I-90
SB 4606/SB 4609 Railroad Abandonments
SB 4773 Marina Pumpouts
SB 4955 Serial Property Tax Levy

Ms. Cox asked why SB 4516, Urban Parks, did not pass. Mr. Scott stated that the Governor's Office was not amenable to the idea of having revenues from the existing lottery used for a dedicated purpose. Mr. Wilder explained the reasons for the bill and noted his expectations that it would no doubt be returned to the Legislature for re-consideration. In response to Ms. Cox's question whether the funds would be used for playfields and sports complexes, Mr. Scott stated the legislation would enable eligible agencies to apply for these types of recreational facilities as well as others now being funded through the IAC grant-in-aid program.

There followed some discussion on Initiative 90 and the alternatives (SB 3704 - SB 4568 - SB 4955). Mr. Scott explained the differences in the sales tax percentages within each proposed bill, and called attention to the fact that SB 4955 was originally a proposal by the Washington Recreation and Park Association (WRPA) as a serial property tax levy at the state level, with the monies to be administered by the IAC. The bill was then conceived as a potential alternative to Initiative 90, increasing the sales tax by 1/10 of one percent with all funds administered by the IAC. This proposal, however, did not make it beyond the drafting stage.

Initiative 90: Mr. Scott and Mr. Wilder both pointed out that Initiative 90 is a very significant proposal for the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. If ratified in November it will become effective on January 1, 1987. The sales tax increase of 1/8 of one percent will generate approximately \$42 million each year, one-third of which will be administered by the IAC (approximately \$13 million). Areas of concentration in the IAC's portion of the program will be wildlife habitat, public access, and public facilities. Ms. Marsden asked if the \$13 million program would be accumulative. Mr. Scott answered affirmatively, explaining that there would be a new account created in the State Treasury with specific uses -- it cannot be dedicated for other purposes.

Legislative Summary: Mr. Scott reported the Legislative Session had been a good one in the 59 days length. There was a feeling of accomplishment both in terms of what succeeded and what did not. He noted that the next session will be different in that certain representatives and senators may be elected in November to replace those who were in the 1986 Session. Mr. Wilder felt it had been a positive session, that many participating agencies had assisted in supporting the IAC programs, and an ORV bill had been passed which could now augment the IAC's ORV program. He particularly noted that nothing negative had come up in the Legislative Session about the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation -- there had been support from many agencies and individuals.

Mr. Greg Lovelady, Coordinator, Off-Road Vehicle Program, was then asked to give a more thorough interpretation of House Bill #1382:

1. Governor's signature is anticipated; law would take effect June 30, 1986.
2. An ORV trail will be a multiple-use corridor; more than one type of

use will be allowed.

3. User permit fees will be directly certified to the IAC. In the past this was "split" among three agencies. 18% to DOL.
 4. The one percent motor vehicle fuel tax distribution was changed as follows:
 - a. 40 percent to DNR for planning, maintenance, management of ORV recreation facilities, nonhighway roads, nonhighway recreation facilities to be distributed as follows: (Formerly received 45%)
 - (1) up to 5% for information programs;
 - (2) 10 to 50% for ORV recreation facilities;
 - (3) up to 25% for nonhighway road maintenance;
 - (4) up to 50% for nonhighway road recreation facilities;
 - (5) 10% to be transferred to the IAC for law enforcement grants in counties where DNR maintains ORV facilities.
 - b. 3.5% to Game Dept. - nonhighway road/recreation facility management.
 - c. 2 percent to Parks & Recreation Commission - ORV use area and facility maintenance and management.
 5. 54.5 percent to IAC for planning, acquisition, development, maintenance, and management of ORV facilities, nonhighway road recreation facilities, user education, information, and law enforcement. (Formerly received 51.5%) Fund distributed as follows:
 6. . up to 60% for ORV recreation facilities;
 7. . up to 20% for nonhighway road recreation facilities;*
 7. . up to 20% for ORV education, information, and law enforcement programs; (formerly 50%)
 - . all of DNR's 10% transfer for Education and Enforcement;
 - . all of permit fees for ORV recreation facilities.
- * The new funding "nonhighway road recreation facilities" category has not been defined, and meetings will be conducted (user groups, ORV groups, etc.) to interpret this portion of the new law.
8. Further, general administration is limited to 10 percent for all agencies except the Dept. of Licensing.
 9. Indian tribes are now eligible to receive IAC-ORV monies.
 10. The public hearing procedures were broadened.
 11. The Legislative Budget Committee will review allocations and limitations of allocations of monies made in this act. Submit to the Legislature by January 1, 1988.
 12. Directs the IAC to establish an advisory committee of nonhighway road recreationists...repeals the current Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee.

Mr. Pinnix complimented all of those various user groups and individuals who had worked diligently to ensure passage of House Bill 1382 (ORV). He mentioned Tommy Tompson, ORVAC members, John Edwards, Ruth Ittner, Michael Sacha, representatives of the Washington Horsemen's Association, and many others. Some had worked on the bill to put together acceptable legislation. He felt the bill would not have passed if the various groups and individuals had not worked together and coordinated their efforts. The legislation itself is a good step forward. Mr. Wilder concurred and thanked Mr. Pinnix for his efforts also. The willingness to work together and compromise where necessary - to have a good "give and take" - was excellent.

Introduction: Mr. Wilder introduced Don Clark, Project Manager, formerly with the City of Olympia, as Park and Recreation Director.

Returned to DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to page 2 of the Director's Report, dated March 28, 1986, noting the following:

Initiative 215: Reported that the percentage had dropped over the years from .93 percent to .80 percent, and preliminarily was reported to be approximately .779 percent at the last survey period. However, with the hearing process and assistance of knowledgeable individuals -- plus good staff work -- deficiencies were pointed out in the data and reversed the above-mentioned trend. As a result, the preliminary percentage has now been modified to one percent. This will amount to approximately a twenty percent increase in Initiative 215 funds for boater related projects.

Mr. Wilder expressed his special appreciation to: Ralph Mackey, State Representative Joe Williams, Jim Sheler, Dave Schilperoot, Robin Torner, Pat McDonald, Donna Stringer, George Ides and Stan Scott.

Accomplishments - IAC - 1985: Mentioned the brief report prepared by IAC of accomplishments for the year 1985. Available for distribution to others expressing an interest.

Safety-Liability: Reported attendance at the Western Regional Safety School, Berkeley, California, in January 1986. Washington State may soon feel the impact of liability suits as is happening in the State of California. Some communities in California have had to close their park and recreation areas. Insurance rates in some areas have become so prohibitive that adequate liability insurance coverage cannot be obtained. Whether the IAC should become involved in this type of activity (to assist local government in regard to their projects, etc.) has not yet been determined. An inquiry has been made of the Assistant Attorney General to the IAC.

President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO): Commented on the meeting of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO) in Seattle, June 5-6, 1986. June 5th will involve public testimony. Jim Webster, Chief, Projects Services, IAC, will be coordinating the IAC's involvement for the hearing and tours. Ms. Wendy Brand, National Park Service, will be assisting with plans for tours of park and recreation facilities in the vicinity (Seattle-King County). A Planning Workshop is being coordinated through Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, IAC, to be held June 4, 1986, the day before the PCAO meeting.

Mr. Pinnix asked questions concerning the Safety-Liability report. How

would the IAC be involved. Mr. Wilder stated if an A.G. opinion would give IAC authority to become involved in this area, then staff could assist communities through the normal process -- Evaluation Session, Technical Advisory Committee, Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee, etc. Staff could review areas and ensure safety features as well as discuss the process to ensure they would be functional. Mr. Pinnix agreed this could be a very important step for the future.

Mr. Mackey asked concerning liability of the Interagency Committee members. Since staff was unable to respond to the question, Mr. Wilder said he would have this researched and obtain the information for the Committee members.

Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF): Reported on the current status of receipt of LWCF apportionment. The Administration requested a rescission of \$36 million of the \$48 million Land and Water Conservation Funds in the Federal Budget. The rescission exists through about the middle of April 1986. Ms. Brand (National Park Service) reported to the Committee that NPS was apportioning \$195,052 for immediate use to the State of Washington, and that this included a certain additional amount of money in recognition of the fact that the State of Washington had excellent performance in using the LWCF monies allotted to it. (The total amount for distribution amounted to \$10,091,900 for the states; \$195,052 to the State of Washington.) The additional funding (approximately \$693,000) will be available once the rescission has been lifted.

II. B - MANAGEMENT SERVICES - FUND SUMMARIES REPORTS:

Mr. Scott called upon Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, for the fund summaries reports:

1. Fund Summary - Grant-in-Aid Projects, State/Local Agencies: Mr. Baker referred to the Fund Summary for local/state grant-in-aid projects, dated March 18, 1986, correcting the Land and Water Conservation Fund total for the Department of Game from \$4,702,592 to \$4,792,592. The balance of \$ -287,350 should be \$ -197,350. Mr. Baker also explained that the state and local agencies' Land and Water Conservation Fund negative figures were due to the fact that the 1986 LWCF apportionment has not yet been received, and the state agencies' negative figures also show the effect of including in the report the entire biennial Master List, but the inclusion of only one year of "state" money. This occurs in the first year of every biennium and is not unusual. When monies are received, the balances will appear in the fund summary accordingly.

Mr. Mackey inquired about the balance of \$329,234 in Initiative 215 for local agencies. This included figures only through January 31, 1986. New reports from the Department of Licensing will add \$100,000 each to the state and local balances. Mr. Baker further pointed out the March receipts for Initiative 215, when received, will be sufficient to "erase" the negative balances for the state agencies. Mr. Mackey asked whether the General Obligation Bond monies officially approved by the courts would be included in the summary also. Mr. Baker pointed out that formerly the sixth column had been titled "HJR 52", but now includes all General Obligation Bonds and thus the title was changed to "G.O. Bonds". Both HJR 52 and the "new" bond monies will be shown in this column from now on. No bonds are as yet sold; selling of the bonds is monitored by Stan Scott through the State Finance Committee.

In response to Ms. Marsden's question, Mr. Scott explained the statute concerning Initiative 215 provided for a marine fuel tax survey to be made by the Department of Licensing at least every four years. Ms. Marsden felt some type of record should be kept by the people using the marine fuel and this be monitored by the state so that there would be a better tracking record which in the long run might increase the percentage coming to the IAC. Mr. Scott stated there were no plans for this type of record-keeping that he was aware of, whereupon Ms. Marsden said it should be taken under consideration if something could be worked out that would be satisfactory to all.

2. Off-Road Vehicle Fund Summary - February 25, 1986: Mr. Baker referred to the Off-Road Vehicle Fund Status Report - dated February 25, 1986, but reporting receipts and commitments as of January 31, 1986. A total of \$1,133,623.60 was the balance at that time. This has since increased. Mr. Mackey asked the status of funding given to those sponsors at the last meeting who had said that if they did not receive the full amount they had asked for they would disband their programs. Mr. Wilder said none of the sponsors had "backed out" of their commitment and had accepted the adjustments which had been made. The three projects which had not received funding and which the Committee had asked to re-review were on the agenda (Items III B., (1), (2) and (3)). Mr. Tommy Thomson, Off-Road Vehicle Committee member, clarified for Mr. Mackey that Mason County had been the sponsor in question, and the County had accepted the grant and proceeded with its project.

Mr. Baker pointed out that as soon as the funding program as stipulated by House Bill 1382 takes effect, the IAC will then have two fund summaries for the off-road vehicle program, closing out the present report as these funds are exhausted. Adjustments will be made in this regard. Mr. Mackey questioned the term "recovered ATV funds"...(\$1,002,381.79)...as reported on the ORV fund summary. Mr. Baker stated these were monies returned by the counties which had not used their full grants within a specified period of time. The ATV (all-terrain vehicle) program was phased out in 1976.

Ms. Cox commented on the fact that the Off-Road Vehicle Program of the IAC funds itself, and it would be most desirable to have other programs of this type -- "tax ourselves" -- and use those funds within the program being taxed to further the service being given to the recreating public. She emphasized that the other funding programs of the IAC were limited and were suffering due to lack of funding sources because there were no user taxes being applied. Mr. Wilder stated "pay-as-you-go" programs were being discussed nationwide. PACO is looking at innovative ways to improve funding sources. Initiative 215 is actually a "pay-as-you-go" program. The Land and Water Fund protects our natural resources, adds to the recreation facilities throughout the nation, yet does not come up with all of the answers. The primary source of funding for LWCF is revenue from oil leases.

Mr. Pinnix gave an historical report of the Land and Water Conservation Fund since its inception in 1964. The decrease in monies being placed in this fund was emphasized. The President's Commission (PCAO) will be confronted with this issue. Ms. Cox felt as many as possible of those interested persons and organizations should try and be placed on the PCAO agenda to voice their concerns and interest in the funding of recreational areas and facilities.

She felt the LWCF program was a legacy that is being allowed to "slip by the wayside" unless interested persons take action to ensure its continuance. Mr. Mackey commended the off-road recreationists and the users of the off-road vehicle program. Because of their keen interest in obtaining areas and facilities for their recreating, they had been able to put forth a piece of legislation which had at that time been looked upon favorably by the State Legislature and others interested in providing for the off-road vehicle recreationists. He felt they had worked as a team and recommended that the users of recreation areas and facilities cooperate and coordinate their efforts.

11. C. PROJECT SERVICES - ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS - PROJECT STATUS REPORT:

Mr. Jim Webster, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "Project Services Division Report", and reported on the following items:

1. Local agencies outdoor recreation projects - currently working on 67.
2. Local agencies aquatic lands projects - nine currently being monitored.
3. Spring workshops:
 - April 4, Westside Workshop
Public Utilities District (PUD) Auditorium Bldg.
Shelton, Washington
 - April 8, Eastside Workshop
Corbin Art Center
Spokane, Washington
4. November funding cycle: Letters of intent - due May 1, 1986
Development project applications - due June 1, 1986
Acquisition project applications - due July 1, 1986
ALEA applications - due July 1, 1986
5. Technical Advisory Committee Review:
 - Westside - September 4-5, Mount Vernon
 - Eastside - September 11-12, Pullman
6. Evaluation Scoring Meeting:
 - October 20-24, Ellensburg
7. State Agencies' Administrative Action - 71 state outdoor recreation projects in various stages of completion.
10 aquatic land projects in various stages of completion.

IAC STATE AGENCIES MASTER LIST APPROVALS:

Agency	Project	IAC No.	Total Cost	State Funds	LWCF
Parks	Ft. Worden-Bank Protect. Provide bank and shoreline protection to eroded areas along the north beach at Ft. Worden State Park.	85-501D	\$ 114,000	\$ 114,000(52)	

(continued next page)

(State Agencies' Master List Project Approvals - continued)

Agency	Project	IAC No.	TOTAL COST	STATE FUNDS	LWCF
Parks	<u>Boating Repair-Statewide</u> Provide repairs and/or replacement to boat launches, piers, floats, mooring buoys in various State Parks marine facilities statewide.	85-502D	\$ 202,000	\$ 202,000 (215)	
Parks	<u>Boating Improvement</u> Renew boat facilities/repair boat launches, boat launch accesses, floats, piling, dolphins at marine facilities statewide.	85-503D	325,000	325,000 (215)	
Parks	<u>Kopachuck-Shoreline</u> Provide shoreline protection and repair/replace existing bulkhead along Carr Inlet at Kopachuck State Park, Pierce County.	85-504D	52,000	52,000 (HJR 52)	
Parks	<u>Sacajawea</u> Redevelop existing boat launch and day-use facilities at Sacajawea State Park in Franklin County.	85-505D	91,000	91,000 (215)	
Parks	<u>Auburn Game Farm</u> Renovate existing buildings on site to establish State Parks Region V Headquarters and remove other buildings and prepare a portion of the site for future recreation development	86-508D	18,000	18,000 (HJR 52)	
Parks	<u>Statewide Water Supply</u> <u>Install Vacuum Breakers</u> Provide vacuum breakers for all hose bibb connections statewide.	86-509D	24,000	24,000 (HJR 52)	
Game	<u>Amber Lake</u> Redevelop existing boat launch and parking area at Amber Lake located in Spokane County, ten miles south of Cheney.	85-612D	84,000	42,000 (HJR 52)	\$ 42,000
Game	<u>Diamond Lake</u> Redevelop existing boat launch/parking area at Diamond Lake, located in Pend Orielle County.	85-613D	53,400	26,700 (215)	26,700

The Committee recessed at 10:15 and resumed business at 10:25.

III. OLD BUSINESS - A. Project Changes: The Chair moved to agenda items under A. Project Changes, referring to Item 3. City of Lacey, Lake Lois Project, IAC 72-035A, Conversion. Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "City of Lacey, Lake Lois Park, IAC #72-035A, Partial Conversion of Use" reporting as follows:

1. The City of Lacey submitted a request for approval to convert a 45 footwide strip of land (about .7 acre) along the eastern property line of the park to allow the widening of Carpenter Road.

2. In exchange, the City proposes to acquire a parcel of land about 100 feet in width (approx. 1.2 acres) along the west boundary of the park.

3. Both parcels of land have been appraised and appraisal reviews are complete. The park land to be converted is valued at \$6,600 and the replacement parcel valued at no less than \$15,500.

4. Criteria in IAC Procedural Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted was reviewed by staff and it was determined the proposal meets all necessary requirements.

Mr. Mackey asked for clarification of whether there were residences located along the road leading to the park. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Jim Sheler, Director, City of Lacey's Park and Recreation Department, stated the residences are approximately 500 yards down the road and on the lake side of the road north of the park area. Ms Marsden asked if the road widening would destroy much of the park, and was informed by Mr. Taylor that there would have to be some fill to accommodate the widening of the park. In response to Mr. Tveten's question, Mr. Taylor noted there would be some fill dirt in the lake, but not much and it would not negatively affect the water level. Mr. Sheler stated the lake receives outflow from three other lakes as its source of water.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF LACEY ACQUIRED THE APPROXIMATE 6 ACRE LAKE LOIS PARK SITE IN 1972 WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #72-035A), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT A 45 FOOT WIDE STRIP ALONG THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE PARK FOR THE PURPOSE OF WIDENING CARPENTER ROAD, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION PROCESS AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL MEET THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PROCEDURAL MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.17A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED, IN THAT

1. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF BOTH PARCELS OF LAND HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCEL TO BE CONVERTED;
2. THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF AT LEAST EQUAL RECREATION UTILITY TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Chair then called for Item A. Project Changes, 5. City of Bonney Lake, Lake Tapps Park, IAC 72-015A, Partial Conversion. Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff, "City of Bonney Lake, Lake Tapps Park, IAC #72-015A, Request for Partial Conversion", reporting as follows:

1. The City requested IAC approval to adjust common boundaries between the City Hall property and a portion of the park property in order to accommodate

greater recreation utility of the park and to allow needed expansion of public works maintenance/storage facilities located on the City Hall site. Conversion of approximately 35,000 square feet of park property in exchange for about 42,300 square feet of City Hall land was involved.

2. Staff reviewed the proposal based on criteria in IAC Procedural Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted, and determined the project met the requirements except in one instance. The land proposed for substitution does not meet the IAC land acquisition policy in that there are no legal restrictions prohibiting the City from transferring use from general City Hall functions to park purposes without receiving just compensation. However, IAC staff felt in this instance the proposed action constitutes only a shift of common boundaries between public lands under management of one agency to improve recreation opportunities and to mutually benefit public services.

In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Taylor explained the access areas to the park and that there were no deed restrictions involved. He referred to the map (EXHIBIT B) to answer Ms. Marsden's and Mr. Tveten's questions as to access to the park across the land being taken by the City. Mr. Terry Ward, Director, Public Works Department, City of Bonney Lake, clarified the use of the park property in certain areas, i.e., parking area, boat launch site, future development, etc. Ms. Marsden felt that as a condition of approval, the Committee ought to add a requirement that the City provide perpetual public pedestrian access across the City Hall complex property from McGhee Drive to the park property. With that understanding, MS. MARSDEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE HAS RECEIVED IAC FUND ASSISTANCE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF LAKE TAPPS PARK (IAC #72-015A) AND,

WHEREAS, THE CITY HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT APPROXIMATELY 35,000 SQUARE FEET OF PARK PROPERTY IN ORDER TO SHIFT COMMON BOUNDARY LINES BETWEEN CITY HALL PROPERTY AND THE PARK PROPERTY TO GAIN GREATER UTILITY OF USE FOR PUBLIC SERVICES INCLUDING RECREATION NEEDS AND THAT THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE WILL MAINTAIN PUBLIC PEDESTRIAN ACCESS IN PERPETUITY TO THE PARK FROM MCGHEE DRIVE, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED, HAVE BEEN MET (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC LAND ELIGIBILITY OF PUBLIC LAND REQUIREMENT (SECTION 07.19A(4)) WHICH HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO NOT APPLY IN THIS CASE), AS FOLLOWS:

1. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF BOTH PARCELS OF LAND HAS BEEN DETERMINED BY APPROPRIATE APPRAISAL PROCEDURES. THE CITY HALL PROPERTY IS GREATER IN VALUE (\$21,150) THAN THE PARK PROPERTY (\$17,500) DUE TO ITS LARGER SIZE;
2. THE REPLACEMENT PARCEL HAS GREATER RECREATION UTILITY THAN THE CONVERTED PARCEL IN THAT IT ADDS TO THE MOST USEABLE PORTION OF THE PARK.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Chair then called for Item A. Project Changes, 4. King County, Sammamish

River, IAC #66-025A, Conversion. She noted there were eleven persons desiring to testify on this conversion - some in favor of the proposal and some opposed. She directed that the first person speaking either in favor or in opposition of the proposal would be given a longer period of time than others in the interests of time. She asked those speaking not to be repetitious if someone has already covered some of the points they also had in mind to cover. Ms. Cox also pointed out that the IAC was not a "public hearing board", and that those speaking should keep their speeches to an absolute minimum, knowing that the Committee does want to hear from each individual.

Mr. Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "King County, Sammamish River Park - IAC #66-025A - Property Conversion", citing the following:

1. King County submitted a request for IAC approval to convert approximately 22.5 acres surplus to the needs of the lineal park along the west bank of the Sammamish River north of N.E. 116th Street. A 100-foot wide trail right-of-way (1,258 lin. ft.) of the 25 acre parcel along the west bank of the river would be retained in County ownership.

2. The converted 22 acres will be sold to the King County Agriculture Program in fee-simple, who, in turn, will retain the development rights and sell the agricultural rights to the adjoining dairy farmer at the appraised value.

3. Sales revenue will be used by the King County Parks Division to purchase three parcels of land about 50 feet in width and 1,978 feet in length along the west bank of the Sammamish River beginning at N.E. 145th Street and extending in a northerly direction. This exchange will result in an additional .38 miles of trail added to the west bank of the Sammamish Trail System.

4. Support for the conversion in order to complete both sides of the river trail system is evident in a County survey completed by the Parks Division in 1985.

5. Twelve new soccer fields have been constructed by the Lake Washington Soccer Association (in cooperation with King County) on County park land immediately across the river from the parcel that will be sold.

6. Appraisal: All four parcels of land have been appraised and appraisal reviews are complete. The park land (22.5 acres) to be converted is valued at \$263,400; the replacement three parcels total (2.27 acres) values are \$301,587.

7. IAC staff reviewed this proposal based on criteria set forth in IAC Participation Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted, and concluded the proposal meets those requirements.

Mr. Bob Jacobs, Chief, Capital Improvement Section, King County Parks Department, was asked to explain present use of the site. He stated that in the original plan for the Sammamish River area, the intent was to acquire property on both sides of the river, but no development plan was submitted at that time. The Parks Department anticipated it would need trail right-of-way areas on both sides. In acquiring waterfront property, it is difficult to obtain 150 foot strips. There is reluctance from owners to sell in that manner. Therefore, the Parks Department had to acquire more property than it had originally anticipated. Presently there is no development on the area under discussion, the recreational use is limited -- such as toy rocket use by those individuals interested in this sort of recreation, some golfing practice, etc.

The Chair called upon the following persons to testify on the Sammamish River Project:

Donald Baker, President, Lake Washington Youth Soccer Association (also representing District 11, Washington State Youth Soccer Association; Washington State Youth Soccer Association as a whole; and the Washington State Soccer Association):

1. Washington State Soccer Association is very interested in the park area being sold; wants it to be retained for use by soccer teams -- or be developed for recreational purposes.
2. Were not aware the proposal to sell the property until January when an ordinance was passed to work out the plan.
3. There has not been adequate community input on this proposal.
4. Soccer Association is interested in having this property tie-in with their fields located on the other side of the river.
5. Soccer Association has a ten-year lease with King County for acreages directly across from the property being considered for conversion.
6. Approximately \$75,000 a year is spent on use of this property by the Association.
7. There is a need for additional soccer fields in King County, and do not like to see this property sold.
8. Felt Sammamish Trail improvement proposal would be done at the expense of the recreating public.
9. Felt the County may well have other land resources which could be sold to help the trail.
10. Property being considered is too valuable and too critically situated to be sold and returned to agricultural use.
11. Asked that the Committee not approve the conversion proposal.
(Copy of Lake Washington Youth Soccer Association's letters of March 22 and March 24, see EXHIBIT A of these minutes.)

Mr. Tveten asked for clarification of those areas now being used by the soccer team, referring to the maps included with the memorandum in the kit material. Mr. Baker also commented that the Washington Soccer Association will be hosting the Western Regional Soccer Teams, with fourteen Western States being included. This points out the need for soccer team fields. He also commented that using the property for farm land was not viable; most farms are not of this size and don't require as much space as is involved in the property.

At this point the Chair announced it was necessary to cease discussion on the Sammamish River Project in order to call a special hearing for an emergency Washington Administrative Code action of the Committee, stipulated to be held at 11:00 a.m., March 28, 1986. Sammamish River discussion would continue following the hearing.

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE - EMERGENCY RULE CHANGE - WAC 286-16-080, GRANT-IN-AID POLICY:

11:00 A.M. - Mr. Stanley Scott, Chief, Administrative Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "Emergency Rule Change - WAC 286-16-080, Grant-in-Aid Policy". He introduced Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation for assistance in the Emergency Rule Change procedures. Mr. Scott itemized the following:

1. Chapter 34.04 RCW (Administrative Procedures Act) sets forth both requirements and procedures to be used in proposing, amending or repealing the Washington Administrative Code. RCW 34.04.030 provides

for the immediate adoption or amendment of a rule upon a finding by an agency that a rule is necessary for the preservation of the public health, safety, or general welfare. Such rule when approved through the Committee may be filed with the Code Reviser and may not remain in effect for longer than ninety days.

2. Amendment to WAC 286-16-080 Grant-in-Aid Policy Sub-section (2): Presently prohibits IAC eligibility for incurred development costs. Staff believes changing circumstances justify reconsideration of this prohibition in allowing a waiver of retroactivity for development.

3. Noted emergencies which arise in development projects, often beyond control of either the project sponsor or the IAC. Even though appropriation authority exists for projects, the IAC cannot execute project contracts based on uncertain funding... (State bonds authorized by the Legislature were for a time unavailable; Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) are still uncertain and the amount questionable.)

4. Pointed out situations which might cause missing a construction season or cost increases incident to continued delays, etc.

5. The development projects are already approved by both the Legislature and the IAC -- executed contract is lacking due to money situation.

6. Staff recommended resolution of the dilemma by amending WAC 286-16-080 to authorize the director to issue a waiver of retroactivity for development projects. Sponsor would need to define and justify that an emergency exists. Such a waiver of retroactivity may not apply to federal funding.

7. Specific WAC change is as follows: (SEE EXHIBIT B, of these minutes.)

"(2) Retroactive costs. Development: Retroactive costs on a development project are defined as those site improvement and construction costs incurred prior to execution of the project contract. ~~((Retroactive-development costs-as-defined-herein-are-not-eligible-for-reimbursement-))~~" If, after project approval by the interagency committee, but prior to execution of a contract, an applicant determines that conditions exist which jeopardize a project, and that action must be taken by the applicant to prevent loss of the project, loss of a construction season, unreasonable cost escalation, or other emergency, application may be made in writing to the director for a waiver of the prohibition against interagency committee grant assistance for costs incurred after project approval but prior to contract execution. Such application shall state the nature of the emergency or other condition(s) and the necessity to take action or expend funds prior to contract execution. A waiver, if approved by the director, shall permit otherwise allowable costs to be included as reimbursable costs in the event funds are available and a contract is executed. In the event funds are not available, or a contract is not executed, no expenditures made by an applicant under the provisions of such waiver shall be reimbursable. A waiver, if granted shall not be construed as final approval of an otherwise approved project. No such waiver shall be applicable to any grant-in-aid support from federal funds unless also approved by the federal agency.

In response to Ms. Marsden's question - why was not this provision provided in the WAC earlier, Mr. Scott stated development projects do not have the type of "emergencies" that acquisition projects have, i.e., acquisition projects usually have options or some other contractual instrument which precedes the acquisition -- if they are not completed and in order, you may lose the land. In development projects these actions are not required. However, now the agency is faced with considerable delays causing problems for sponsors to develop their projects (LWCF funds not available; bond issue monies delayed, etc.). A

construction season is approaching and project sponsors are faced with the need to begin construction. They require IAC assistance now. Mr. Wilder stated retroactivity for development projects had been discussed, but there had not been this type of emergency situation heretofore. Staff now feels there is an emergency and the rules need changing to allow sponsors to take care of their urgent problems. Staff may recommend this be a permanent rule later on. Presently, if approved by the Committee and filed with the Code Reviser, the rule would be effective for only ninety days.

Mr. Pinnix inquired whether there would be any chance that the Federal Government would change its ruling and allow this type of assistance for development projects also. Ms. Brand (National Park Service) pointed out that the Land and Water Funds were not intended to fund everything, and it had been determined that development projects were not subject to waivers of this type. She noted that there is strong Congressional committee language which speaks to waivers for development costs. She doubted if that language would ever be changed. However, there is an advance proviso and on donation lands the NPS will pay certain costs.

Mr. Pinnix asked if IAC staff was satisfied that it has enough ability to restrict the kinds of charges which are included in a development project. Mr. Wilder clarified that this is taken care of in provisos in each project contract. There is no guarantee even with the waiver on development that the sponsor will receive funding.

Two questions were asked by Mr. Tveten: (1) If a state or local agency were to apply for funds with LWCF monies in it for a development project, and it became necessary for a waiver to be granted by the IAC which was approved -- then later if LWCF monies do not become available, does this mean the agency now has to come back for a reduction in project scope, and is it then automatically assumed that the reduction in project scope will be granted by the IAC and the state or local agency must then come up with the balance? Mr. Wilder stated this was the risk that is taken with any waiver of retroactivity.

(2) Does the Assistant Attorney General feel satisfied that this meets the requirement of an emergency rule -- that it is necessary for the "public health, safety, and welfare"?

Mr. Lane (Asst. Attorney General) stated this type of rule is not likely to be challenged since it affects only those persons interested in coming before the committee concerning an emergency situation. He felt he could not answer as to the "public health, safety, and welfare" -- merely that the courts would refer to this type of rule as affecting emergencies only.

Mr. Tveten asked if there were agencies awaiting approval of this rule change. Mr. Scott stated there were 3 in addition to the Department of Fisheries' Langley Fishing Platform project which might utilize the changed rule. Mr. Tveten questioned the inclusion of the Langley project on the agenda today, stating he would find it difficult to vote on the rule change and then apply it to the Fisheries' project prior to official filing of the rule change if adopted by the Committee. There followed discussion concerning the Fisheries' Langley Fishing Platform project and the critical need for waiver of the IAC's Participation rules in connection with WAC 286-16-080. Mr. Scott noted this was another agenda item (III C.) and would be discussed at that time. Mr. Lane pointed out there is nothing in the statutes which would prohibit the Committee from acting on the project prior to filing of the Emergency Code change to WAC 286-16-080. This merely amends the Code allowing the Committee to

make a decision on development projects for a ninety-day period. The three other projects may also apply for waivers of retroactivity on an emergency basis through this rule change since the projects have already been approved by the IAC at its November 1985 meeting.

Mr. Pinnix felt the sponsor or applicant should make an advance application to the director for a waiver while the contract was still pending, thus ensuring the proper authorization to proceed with the emergency construction or whatever was required. Mr. Scott said this would be the proper way to proceed. If the waiver is granted, it would authorize the applicant to proceed and in effect the IAC with the proposed rule-change would be stating this would not give the applicant final approval or that the project would be finally approved. It would give the authority to go ahead, but with the understanding that they would be taking a risk. If the project is approved the applicant would not have to forfeit those costs it had incurred up to that time. Mr. Lane pointed out that the rule as drafted does not require the applicant to make application prior to the time they expend the funds. It only requires them to make application prior to the time a contract is executed. Mr. Pinnix asked why the Committee could not approve the Fisheries' (Langley Fishing Platform) project regardless of the WAC rule-change proposal. Mr. Lane said the Committee could do this, but it would be ignoring its own "rule" and its own Washington Administrative Code rule which prohibits such action. As now in the Code and the procedural guidelines of the IAC, the Committee cannot approve a waiver of retroactivity for development, thus the amendment to the Washington Administrative Code is required.

Mr. Pinnix said there should be some understanding if the staff is going to consider amending the language prior to the July 1986 IAC meeting that there be better wording concerning advance application to the director of the IAC. With this understanding, MR. PINNIX MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY THAT THE MOTION AS PREPARED BY STAFF BE APPROVED. (SEE PAGE 16-A FOR ADMIN. CODE MOTION)

At this point Mr. Lane stated because the emergency rule is effective for only ninety days and there is a thirty-day waiting period; there will be a couple of months when there will be no similar rule in effect. The timing of any request for a permanent rule should be geared to that time frame. The emergency rule could be extended, but Mr. Lane advised it would be better to have the rule established permanently as quickly as possible. Mr. Tveten pointed out that presently the IAC is consistent with LWCF regulations on acquisition projects, but if it takes this action it will be inconsistent with LWCF regulations on development projects.

MR. MACKEY CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

The discussion on the Department of Fisheries' Langley Fishing Platform project was deferred until a later time during the meeting.

CONTINUATION ON DISCUSSION & DECISION REGARDING ITEM 111 4. KING COUNTY, SAMMAMISH RIVER, IAC #66-025A, CONVERSION: The Chair returned to agenda item 4. King County Sammamish River, IAC #66-025A, Conversion. Mr. Tveten asked to question Mr. Don Baker as to his comments (see Page 13, of these minutes). He noted the interest of the Soccer Association in the County's retention of the 22.5 acres to be used for recreation purposes. He asked if the Association had had an opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the King County officials. Mr. Baker replied though he had had a meeting with one of the

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE MOTION - 3-28-86

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS BEEN UNABLE TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS WITH SEVERAL APPLICANT AGENCIES FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS BECAUSE OF FUNDING UNCERTAINTIES, EVEN THOUGH ALL APPROPRIATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS ARE IN PLACE, AND

WHEREAS, SEVERAL APPLICANTS MUST PROCEED AT ONCE OR RISK LOSS OF PROJECT ASSISTANCE, SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED COSTS, AND/OR LOSS OF CONSTRUCTION SEASON, AND

WHEREAS, IN DOING SO UNDER PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE RULES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WOULD MAKE THEM INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE; AND

WHEREAS, ACTION MUST BE TAKEN ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS TO ALLOW CERTAIN APPLICANTS TO PROCEED, AND

WHEREAS, RCW 34.04.030 AUTHORIZES SUCH AN EMERGENCY RULE CHANGE AND PROVIDES FOR IMMEDIATE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT, AND

WHEREAS, ANY AMENDMENT PASSED AS AN EMERGENCY RULE CHANGE IS EFFECTIVE UPON FILING WITH THE CODE REVISER AND MAY NOT REMAIN IN EFFECT FOR LONGER THAN NINETY (90) DAYS AFTER FILING, AND

WHEREAS, THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO WAC 286-16-989, GRANT-IN-AID POLICY, OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, WOULD PROVIDE THE AUTHORITY FOR CONSIDERATION OF A WAIVER OF RETROACTIVITY FOR CERTAIN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE PROPOSED CHANGE TO WAC 286-16-080, GRANT-IN-AID POLICY OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE IN THE FORM OF AN EMERGENCY RULE CHANGE AS PROVIDED FOR IN RCW 34.04.030, AND BE FORWARDED TO THE CODE REVISER FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION.

King County Councilmen in June of 1985, he was unaware of the proposal to sell the property until mid-January of 1986. At that time, he said, a letter had been forwarded to two County Councilmen expressing concern. On the 17th of March a meeting was held with the Parks Department. Mr. Tveten asked for comments from King County.

Mr. Jacobs stated he could not speak for the County Council, but the Ordinance was approved in January 1986. The Soccer Association did have an opportunity to review the ordinance, and there was time for public input. He stated he had discussed the project with Mr. Baker, and had pointed out the proposal for conversion was to meet the total responsibility for a balanced recreational program in King County. A request to retain the property for soccer fields/recreation would have been turned down regardless because of the County's higher priority to provide a continuous trail system on both sides of the Sammamish River. Ms. Marsden asked if property owners in the area had been notified of the County's proposal. Mr. Jacobs replied in the negative because there are no property owners as such, and public agency actions are published in local newspapers for the benefit of the general public. Ms. Marsden was informed that King County Parks and Recreation owns the property being leased by the Soccer Association at the present time. Mr. Don Baker said the lease with King County is a good one, enabling soccer teams to use the area and keep it in good condition. The loss will be felt if the property across the river, usable for soccer activities in the possible future, is given up by the Parks Department. He felt it was good recreation land and was needed for recreational purposes.

At this point, Ms. Cox stated though the points made were valid, she did not want to have the Committee considered as a "Hearing Board", nor did she feel the Committee should get into this type of debate. It should consider only the request of King County for conversion. Mr. Tveten stated the issue before the Committee was King County's request and not the use of the property. He suggested that King County consider the request for additional soccer fields through meetings with the Soccer Association and come to an understanding. If these areas aren't provided for in the County now, they will no doubt be needed later, but this is an issue for King County to resolve and not the IAC Committee. To accomplish the goals and objectives and to meet trails recreational activities, the County has asked the Committee to consider this conversion of lands. The need for both trails and soccer fields is known by the County.

Ms. Marsden asked if there was an emergency to acquire the property by the King County Agriculture Dept. Mr. Keith Artz, King County Project Manager, Agriculture Office, replied his department had only a short period of time to complete the transaction and acquire the property rights. The 22.5 acres will be a part of the King County Farm Land Preservation Program in the Sammamish River Valley. Funding is available only through June of this year to acquire about 13,000 acres of land. The proceeds from this purchase will be used by King County for acquisition of land for trails elsewhere. In the acquisition of this land King County would still own the development rights on 65 acres of the dairy farm area (to the north) and 32 acres of this site would make up the dairy farm area. The farmers would own the agricultural rights and be able to use the land for agriculture. Mr. Artz stated the trail area, as he understood it, had been established because of the pastoral setting and the open space in the valley. However, the valley area has been turned away from any development, and the King County officials feel that at

least 80 acres should be in open space for the farm land. The trail area will be there for the public's use, plus there will be an increase in the amount of trail use because of the link to be provided with the other trail area. Mr. Artz felt the entire transaction/proposal would enhance the recreational use.

At this point, Ms. Cox expressed her confusion in that there were three or perhaps more actions involved in the land under discussion: (1) negotiations to provide farm land; (2) need for continuation of the Sammamish River Trail; (3) recreational use of the proposed land, i.e., soccer fields, playfields, etc. However, the purpose of the Committee in reviewing the IAC proposal for King County only involved the conversion process. The other actions cannot be dealt with by the Committee, and if further recreational areas are to be provided for playfields, she pointed out this was the purview of King County - to bring new projects to the Committee.

Mr. Mackey then stated the Committee was not a "Hearing Board". It is not the prerogative of the IAC Committee to interfere with internal affairs of governmental agencies such as King County. As long as the sponsor comes to the IAC Committee with a legitimate request, that is the request with which the Committee must deal. Further, the IAC Committee must determine whether or not the request being made meets the criteria of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation's rules and guidelines. Mr. Pinnix agreed with Mr. Mackey, stating the members should look at what the IAC originally had funded in its grant request for this area, relate it to the request at hand, and make its decision.

Mr. Bob Muller, Farmer, Redmond Area: Mr. Muller made the following points:

1. Has been a dairy farmer for 60 years; operates the only dairy farm in the area being discussed;
 2. The King County Park property has been a part of the farm lands for about twenty-five years;
 3. Farmers lost the land across the river (where soccer fields are) when it became available for sale.
 4. Would not like to lose this land which is critical to dairy farming.
- In favor of the conversion of the land through action of the Committee.

Maxine Keesling, Citizen, Woodinville, Washington: Ms. Keesling read her statement to the Committee in opposition of the conversion proposal. Her main point was that the land would be given to the dairy farmers and for agricultural purposes - thus lost to any sort of recreation. She felt the IAC Committee should not be a party to giving up this land.

2. Also noted that newspaper articles continually point out the need for park and recreation lands and facilities. If this land is placed in agricultural use under the present negotiations, it will be lost forever for any recreational use.

Ms. Cox reiterated this would be up to King County, not the Committee. Mr. Volker stated no matter what his personal feelings might be about the side issues being presented, it would be up to him as a Committee member to restrict his analysis to two points as given in Participation Manual #7, Section 07.19A, Acquisition Projects Converted: (1) The fair market values of the parcels of land have been established by proper appraisal, and the substitution parcel is of greater value than the parcel to be converted; and

- (2) The substitution parcels are of at least equal recreation utility

to that of the converted parcel in terms of trail use.

Ms. Keesling then pointed out that there was property immediately north of 145th Street which would involve donated land, a part of which could be for trail purposes. Mr. Clark, Project Manager, could not address this issue and stated the Committee was considering only the King County request for conversion and the compliance with IAC guidelines.

Mr. David Mozer, Cascade Bicycle Club, Bellevue: Pointed out that the original intent of King County in purchasing lands in that area was for trail purposes. The unique nature of the valley contributed to this type of recreational project. Mr. Mozer spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Peter Lagerwey, City of Seattle Bicycle Program: Gave his support for the conversion and the proposed area for trail purposes. Stated that bicycling is the second most popular sport in the United States, and there is a great need for trails to support the recreation.

Ms. Winifred Carlson, Citizen, Bellevue: Stated her support for the conversion and proposed trail use.

Ms. Amy Carlson, Bicycle USA Organization: Also supported the conversion.

Mr. Brian Puncochan, Citizen, Seattle: Stated he used bike trails as a means of transportation all year-round and was in favor of the conversion.

Mr. Tom Ekston, Project Administrator, King County Parks and Recreation Dept.: Felt King County's position had been made clear and that there was no need for his comments. Open to questions if any were asked.

In the ensuing discussion, it was brought out by Mr. Clark that the land had been purchased as a part of a future trail development; the Committee had approved projects for trails along the Sammamish River over time; the conversion would provide trail development along the riverbank; there are no developed playfields on the land being discussed at the present time.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY ACQUIRED THE APPROXIMATE 25 ACRE PARCEL IN 1966 WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #66-025A), AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY THROUGH KING COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 7423 HAS NOW REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE AN APPROXIMATE 22.5 ACRE PORTION OF THE SITE FOR ABOUT 2.27 ACRES OF PROPERTY (MANUFACTURING PARK ZONE) IN ORDER TO EXTEND PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF THE WEST BANK SAMMAMISH RIVER TRAIL BY AN ADDITIONAL APPROXIMATE 1,978 LINEAL FEET, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION IS IN THE BEST PUBLIC INTEREST, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED - AS FOLLOWS.

1. THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE MORE PRACTICAL TO REQUEST.

2. THE LAND PROPOSED FOR REPLACEMENT IS OF GREATER RECREATION UTILITY THAN THE LAND CONVERTED
3. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE LAND TO BE CONVERTED AND THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE LAND TO BE SUBSTITUTED IS AT LEAST EQUAL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY KING COUNTY FOR CONVERSION OF A 22.5 ACRE SITE (IAC #66-025A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Ms. Cox expressed her sympathies to those who were in opposition to the project, and suggested that they continue to work with King County for play-fields of the type they desired. Such projects could then be considered by the Committee and perhaps ultimately funded.

III. A. 1. Yakima County ORV Program, Suntargets ORV Park, ORV #85-30C, Conversion: The Chair referred to agenda item III. A. 1 and called upon Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, for the presentation. Mr. Dovel referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, concerning this project, noting the following:

1. In November 1985, the IAC denied funding for the continued operation and maintenance of the Yakima County ORV Sports Park due to light use of the park over the years. The park is currently closed; secured against vandalism and trespass.

2. Authorities now feel the best option is to sell the property and return the proceeds to the IAC. However, approximately \$3,500 will be needed to cover land appraisal expenses.

3. Staff recommended approval of the \$3,500 to Yakima County to accomplish its request.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. VOLKER, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT

WHEREAS, YAKIMA COUNTY AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AGREE THAT THE COUNTY'S ORV SPORTS PARK (ORV 85-30C) HAS RECEIVED LITTLE SUPPORT FROM ORV RECREATIONISTS, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN SHOWN THAT DUE TO THIS LACK OF ORV USER ACCEPTANCE AND AN UNCERTAIN ECONOMIC SITUATION IN YAKIMA COUNTY, THAT THE FACILITY CANNOT BE OPERATED AND MAINTAINED AS A SUCCESSFUL RECREATIONAL PARK, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY HAS REQUESTED PERMISSION TO SELL THE ORV PARK AND RETURN THE PROCEEDS FROM SUCH A SALE TO THE IAC, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY HAS FURTHER REQUESTED A COST INCREASE OF \$3,500 FOR PROJECT ORV 85-30C (.13 PERCENT, TO \$29,810) FOR ACCOMPLISHING A LAND APPRAISAL IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SALE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE REQUEST TO CONVERT THIS RECREATIONAL FACILITY BY SELLING IT IS APPROVED, AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT A COST INCREASE OF UP TO \$3,500 TO PERFORM A

LAND APPRAISAL TO ASSIST THIS SALE IS ALSO APPROVED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III. A. 2. Thurston County ORV Sports Park, ORV 84-19D, Reinstate Contract:
Mr. Lovelady, ORV Coordinator, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, concerning the Thurston County ORV Sports Park Project, and reported as follows:

1. Thurston County requested in letter of February 24, 1986 to the IAC that its ORV Contract 84-19D be extended to enable completion of construction of a gazebo at the Thurston County ORV Sports Park.
2. The gazebo functions as a command post - used for scoring/managing four-wheel drive activities. Presently it is unsafe for use.
3. Background information on the Sports Park was given. Reimbursement of \$20,168 has been made to the IAC by the County concerning its previous debt situation of which the Committee has been aware.
4. The park operation has improved considerably in the past year -- attendance and revenues are up, a firm direction and goals have been charted by the Park Board Commissioners, etc.,.
5. The County is working towards improvement of its educational program (project to be presented later on to the Committee at this meeting).
6. The present gazebo is unsafe and must be removed.
7. Staff had originally denied this request for contract reinstatement. However, due to information submitted as above, staff recommended approval of the contract for one year, (expiration December 31, 1986).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MS. MARSDEN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ORIGINALLY APPROVED THURSTON COUNTY'S 1984 ORV SPORTS PARK DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL (ORV 84-19D) FOR IMPLEMENTATION DURING THE 12-MONTH PERIOD OF 1985, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY WAS UNABLE TO COMPLETE ALL ELEMENTS OF THIS PROPOSAL WITHIN THIS TIME PERIOD, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY HAS REQUESTED THAT THE IAC REINSTATE THIS PROJECT TO ALLOW COMPLETION OF THE GAZEBO ELEMENT, AND

WHEREAS, DUE TO SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS AND GOOD FAITH EFFORTS ON THE PART OF THE COUNTY, IT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF BOTH AGENCIES TO SPEED COMPLETION OF THIS ELEMENT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE IAC THAT ORV PROJECT CONTRACT (ORV 84-19D) IS HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE DURATION OF CALENDAR YEAR 1986.
MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III. B. OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS: Prior to consideration of Off-Road Vehicles' Projects, Mr. Lovelady distributed a packet of letters concerning the Mad River Trail and Pond Camp Tie Trail projects for review of the Committee. (SEE APPENDIX C, of these minutes.)

(It was noted for the record that Mr. Richard Costello, Department of Natural Resources, was representing Mr. Bill Wilkerson, Director, Department of Fisheries, in a non-vote status at this point in the meeting.)

Three projects were before the Committee at its request, having been held over from the November 1985 Funding Session. The Committee members had asked for

further review by staff as to certain conflicts regarding trail use, environmental concerns, etc., raised at the November 1985 IAC meeting.

Mr. Lovelady, ORV Coordinator, referred to memorandum of staff "Wenatchee National Forest, Lower Mad River (ORV 85-19D) and Pond Camp Tie (ORV-85-20D) Trail Projects", dated March 28, 1986, reporting as follows:

1. The Committee had requested that these projects be reconsidered at the March IAC meeting if people not represented among the motorized recreationist community could have a chance to participate in project reviews and hearings; if staff would review these projects again, giving special consideration to conflicts; and if the conflicts could be worked out.
2. Noted that an interdisciplinary review team was formed by the Forest Service to determine the impact and acceptability of these projects. The team included representatives from four areas of expertise: soil science, resource assistants, wildlife biologists, and forestry technicians.
3. National Environmental Policy Act procedures were followed. This involved creation of two separate plans: the "Wenatchee National Forest Trail Plan Environmental Impact Statement" and the "Chiwawa-Mad River Environmental Assessment". The development of these plans was widely advertised, and coordinated with thousands of individuals, agencies, and organizations (including the Sierra Club and the Mountaineers). Each plan provided two principle opportunities for public involvement, including a 45-day period during which the Forest Supervisor's decision could have been appealed.
4. Public hearings were conducted - 10-13-85 and 3-16-82, per state law. Each was well-advertised.
5. The "Washington Intergovernmental Review Process Weekly Log", July 29, 1985 edition, announced the projects.
6. The State Department of Game also reviewed these projects. A request was made by that Department for \$4,710 additional monies to accomplish several wildlife-related goals.
7. The IAC's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC) met on two occasions to review the projects. On October 1, 1985, at least two representatives of nonmotorized recreational interests were present; but no comments were made by them.
8. A summary listing of all ORV project applications is made available to all interested parties, and was sent to many motorized and nonmotorized recreationists.
9. Two meetings were called to specifically review these projects: January 15, 1986 (including Game Dept. and Forest Service representation) and February 3, 1986 (involving Forest Service and nonmotorized recreation representatives).
10. Major concerns were raised February 3rd: Nonmotorized recreationists present stated they would not accept ORV recreation on any of these public lands, including the Mad River and Pond Camp Tie areas. They felt that: (a) ORV motorcycle use is unacceptable because resource damage will occur in the area's fragile meadows; (b) hiker recreationists will stop using the area due to the ORV impacts; (c) wildlife will be unacceptably impacted.

11. The Forest Service indicated that each of these concerns had been evaluated in detail. The decision to proceed with the projects was based on years of review and testimony by experts and the lay public. The Service feels that ORV activities can be managed. Wildlife and other fragile resources will be monitored and remedial action taken.

12. Both pedestrian and motorized use of the trails are seen as legitimate.

13. There are 2,550 miles of inventoried trail in the Forest. Approximately 70 percent (1,760) are open only to pedestrian uses. The remaining 30 percent (790 miles) are classified as multipurpose, and shared among trail bike users, equestrians, and hikers.

Mr. Lovelady summed up the observations and stated that staff and the Forest Service are satisfied that the projects meet the criteria of the IAC. Staff therefore recommended they be approved for funding by the Committee.

Mr. Pinnix asked about the maintenance problem of the trail in the Mad River area where it had been stated previously flooding occurred and there was very poor soil to hold a trail. Mr. Lovelady replied that though the trail would not be able to be moved very far and unstable soils are found in a few places, it would be possible through reconstruction techniques to allay the present maintenance problem. Mr. Les Julian, Forest Service, clarified the types of use: hikers, fishermen, horsemen, and general park access use. It is an all-purpose trail with three access points. Mr. Pinnix asked Mr. Lovelady concerning the Pond Camp Tie Trail. Mr. Lovelady stated this was an alternate trail that will go around a segment of trail that traverses a fragile area. Now, it is necessary to have the alternate route around the previous trail.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (2) of the memorandum where the statement was made that the nonmotorized recreationists present at the February 3rd meeting, do not accept the use of ORV's on any public land, including the two projects being discussed. He asked if these nonmotorized recreationists had contributed to the discussions when meetings were held concerning the projects when they were first conceived. Mr. Lovelady replied he didn't believe so, but that in the early 1980's there had been meetings held and a lot of input was received on the plans that led to these two projects. He felt those not accepting of ORV's on forest trails were in the minority. Mr. Tveten asked to hear from the nonmotorized recreationists present as to their concerns.

Mr. Ira Spring, Citizen, Edmonds, Washington: Mr. Spring distributed a brochure entitled, "Washington Trails Association Proposes Six Hiking Areas -- For Hikers and Horsemen", to the Committee and staff of the IAC. He explained that this public information pamphlet referred to the Mad River Hiking area as well as five others. He stated the Trails Association is definitely opposed to ORV use in the Mad River area because it is a prime hiking area.

2. Noted that the Committee had a basic problem in that they believed there are only 2 percent of hiking users (or less) that are opposed to ORV's on trails. There is more than just a minority.

3. Quoted an Executive order, January 9, 1972, #11644, stating that ORV's are to be allowed only where there will be no conflict, i.e., recreational uses, environmental, etc.

4. In surveys taken an overwhelming majority of hikers do not approve

of ORVS on trails used by hikers. Therefore, the Committee is limiting hiker use when it funds an ORV trail such as the Mad River Trail.

5. The Washington Trails Association is promoting through its membership the safe-guarding of some of the areas that are very important to hikers. The Mad River area is one of six areas being suggested for hiking use.

6. The Forest Service has problems in reaching the hiker for input on their proposals because hikers don't belong to groups, such as the off-road vehicle recreationists do.

7. Felt that monies to be used for these trails could be better spent on trails not in conflict with the hikers.

Mr. Harvey Manning, Issaquah Alps Trails Club - President, Bellevue:

1. Supported Mr. Spring's foregoing statements.

2. Off-road vehicle recreating is "with us" and has been so for some time, and there is a need to retain areas for hikers while at the same time providing places for the ORV recreationists.

3. Funds for recreational areas are difficult to find; can understand the Committee's concerns for wildlife habitat and the need to provide at the same time park areas and lands that may be used by the public.

4. Law enforcement: Felt law enforcement for ORV's had been very lax and the situation must be remedied. Had the highest respect for the Department of Natural Resources and its abilities to provide for the public at Tiger Mountain. Are working with DNR in this respect.

Ms. Cox asked that those addressing the Committee limit their remarks to the two areas under discussion - Mad River and Pond Camp Tie. Mr. Manning on being questioned said he felt the funds to be used for these projects should be used for law enforcement in the Tiger Mountain area.

Mr. Tommy Thomson, Chairman, Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee, IAC:

Mr. Thomson distributed a map of the Mad River Trail Ride #3 area, highlighted to denote the multiple-use trails and those being discussed, as designated by the Forest Service in the Mad River area. The Mad River is a vital link to all of them. He stated the Forest Service wants to make these trails environmentally sound so that they can be used by the recreationists. He said it was not a question of whether or not these trails should be there; it is a question of how the monies should be spent to provide them for the public which is using them.

Mr. Mike Dolfay, U. S. Forest Service, Trail Coordinator: Advised the Committee it should be looking at the entire picture of trail provisions, not just these two projects. Ms. Cox stated the Committee had tentative plans to be in that area in July and would be discussing the ORV program in depth at that time. Mr. Dolfay noted the following:

1. The land has been designated for multiple use -- and not for single purpose use, i.e., logging may also occur here.

2. Felt it was difficult for the Committee to view these trails objectively until it had the opportunity to consider the entire program of Forest Service trails. The Mad River trail is only a small portion of over 2,500 miles of trails.

There followed some discussion about the Pond Camp Tie Trail in connection with the Mad River Trail. Mr. Pinnix questioned Mr. Dolfay as to the tie-in, and the "loop area", and the ORV use. Mr. Lovelady clarified that there

was off-road vehicle use in the Pond Camp Tie area but not on the particular hillside where the new trail would be located.

Ruth Ittner, Citizen, Ex-officio ORVAC: (Though no Participation Card was filed, the Chair recognized Ms. Ittner for comments.)

1. Pointed out that she had hiked the Mad River area and was very much interested in seeing that it remained a prime area for hikers;
2. Felt the Pond Camp Trail Area was now going to increase the use of the beautiful meadow area and that ORV use would be adverse;
3. The lower trail being discussed is not greatly used by hikers;
4. Unable to reach destination on a trail hike because certain stepping stones had been removed from the river area so that ORV's could pass through; asked replacement of this aid to hikers.

Mr. Michael Sacha, Northwest Motorcycle Association, Steilacoom:

1. Felt though the ORV project process had been adhered to, that it was still difficult for the Committee to establish non-conflict trails by that process;
2. In the future there will be ORV areas and non-ORV areas established and those interested recreationists must work together and come to some agreement on where they will be placed.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MS. MARSDEN, TO APPROVE THE MAD RIVER PROJECT (ORV 85-19D).

Since others had registered to address the Committee, Ms. Cox called upon those persons prior to question for the motion.

Mr. Carl Riegert, Chelan County Sheriff's Dept., Deputy Sheriff, Wenatchee:

1. Spoke in support of the project for the Mad River area;
2. Stated there are 105,000 motorcycle users in Washington State at the present time and that number is growing;
3. There is a place for ORV users in Washington's National Forests, and he felt that the forests are large enough to be shared by the various users.
4. Would like to see areas for ORV's opened and expanded where possible.

Mr. Pinnix stated the area has been planned for ORV use and developed for this motorized use. It is, therefore, an acceptable project even though there are some non-motorized people using the area. In his view, the people misusing the Tiger Mountain area are "outlaws". There are no areas for ORV use in that area, and ORV recreationists are using that area in an inappropriate manner. Ms. Cox asked that the Tiger Mountain comments be put aside since they were not germane to the Mad River area under discussion. Mr. Pinnix said he was aware of that, but DNR is going to have land areas closed to ORV use and will need to look for acceptable areas which these people can use.

Mr. Tveten appreciated staff's efforts and what they had to do in bringing the matter to the Committee's attention once again. He stated there would be more and more of these types of projects and conflicts within them. The Committee will need to review these carefully; there should be willingness on the part of hikers and ORV users, and others, to work toward acceptable areas for multiple-use and single use. He said he was disappointed by the statement that ORV users "don't belong in the forests". These are public lands and are for the use of all recreationists where appropriate. He personally does not use ORV's, but is aware ORV users have their rights and

must have places they can enter and enjoy their recreating. The Committee should develop projects which will meet hiker, ORV, horsemen, etc., use. Mr. Wilder pointed out that House Bill 1382 was an excellent example of cooperation between the various groups; ORV users, horsemen, hikers, etc. This type of cooperation must continue. Ms. Cox stated she had never been an "ORV person" but would be objective in bringing ORV projects for presentation to the Committee and not bring any prejudice to the Committee table. The Committee, she said, needs to support these projects, review them, and come up with the best possible areas for use. Ms. Marsden agreed with Ms. Cox. On viewing the slides, she had noted the destruction of some areas in the forest which had occurred due to ORV use, but she felt there was a need to provide recreational areas for these recreationists. She also said there was destruction in county and city parks as well - vandalism, etc. Areas need to be constantly maintained in all types of recreational facilities. Mr. Tveten pointed out that the Committee has the option of putting its monies into maintenance of facilities and environmental protection if it so desires. Taking care of facilities in place is needed.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. MR. VOLKER ABSTAINED FROM VOTING. TVETEN, MARSDEN, AND PINNIX VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

Mr. Volker explained his abstaining vote. The impact on wildlife on both the Mad River Project and the Pond Camp Tie project was still being investigated by the Department of Game, and thus he was unable to vote aye or nay. Funding to address ORV impacts on wildlife had been included in these projects as approved by the IAC on November 7, 1985. A complete report on that subject has not as yet been accomplished. Mr. Dolfay said the Forest Service has evaluated impacts on wildlife and expects to continue with the projects, on approval today by the Committee. Mr. Wilder noted that the impact on wildlife and environmental aspects was vital to these projects and is being taken into consideration in all future ORV projects.

THE CHAIRMAN ASKED FOR A SHOW OF HANDS ON THE MOTION TO FUND THE MAD RIVER PROJECT (ORV 85-19D). TVETEN, MARSDEN, PINNIX, MACKAY AND COX VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. MR. VOLKER ABSTAINED.

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS APPROVED FUNDING SUPPORT FOR SEVERAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN THE MAD RIVER AREA OF THE ENTIAT RANGER DISTRICT, WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST, AND

WHEREAS, THOROUGH REVIEWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED ON THE LOWER MAD RIVER TRAIL RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT (ORV 85-19D), AND

WHEREAS THESE INVESTIGATIONS HAVE LED TO A DECISION TO PROCEED WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS PROJECT BY THE LAND MANAGING AUTHORITY, AND

WHEREAS, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WILL SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE RESOURCE PROTECTION, RECREATIONAL OFF-ROAD VEHICLE SAFETY AND MULTIPLE-USE OPPORTUNITIES ON THE FOREST,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE IAC THAT FUNDING UP TO THE AMOUNT OF \$93,360 (ORV 85-19D) BE APPROVED TO CARRY OUT THE RECORDED GOALS OF THIS PROJECT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED BY FIVE AFFIRMATIVE VOTES.

111. B. 2. USFS Wenatchee, Pond Camp Tie Trail, ORV 85-20D: Mr. Lovelady, ORV Coordinator, referred to the second project in the memorandum dated March 28, 1985 alluding to the two projects (Mad River Trail ORV 85-19D, and Pond Camp Tie Trail ORV 85-20D). He stated the same thorough investigation and review had been made on the Pond Camp Tie Trail as had been done for the Mad River Trail. Ms. Cox asked for clarification on where the project was located in reference to the map distributed by Mr. Thomson. Mr. Lovelady pointed out the location on the map (9.5 miles up the Mad River Trail to a junction with the Chickamin Trail - a loop trail as indicated in green outline). The project will provide approximately four miles of trail designed to disburse use away from the heavily used Chiwawa area while discouraging dangerous ORV-log truck conflicts on area roadways. Mr. Tveten asked if the expanded trail would be restricted and was informed there would be signs indicating the new trail segment and the Forest Service might well restrict its use but he knew of no plans in this regard. In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Ira Spring said he was not in favor of this looped trail area since it would bring more "destruction" to the area from ORV use. Ms. Cox asked why the trail was being relocated. Mr. Dolfay replied there was a need to relocate it because of the expanded use and the wet condition of the trail and the maintenance factor. The existing trail is in a fragile area and can no longer withstand motorized use, but it could be available for hiking. The Forest Service will post that area as closed to ORV use because of these adverse conditions. Mr. Mackey was informed that if the trail was not relocated the use would continue on the existing trail to the detriment of the land - and this would cause a definite maintenance problem.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT THE COMMITTEE FUND THE POND CAMP TIE TRAIL (ORV. 85-20D). MR. TVETEN, MR. PINNIX AND MS. MARSDEN VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. MR. VOLKER ABSTAINED.

Mr. Sacha asked why two Committee members were voting down the project. Mr. Volker reiterated the Game Department's need to complete its evaluation of the impact on wildlife. Mr. Sacha asked if this would be a requirement on every ORV project, and was informed it would be. Ms. Marsden said the information had not been available and the Committee had not been able to make a decision at the November 1985 IAC meeting. Mr. Sacha inquired whether the Committee would need more information. Mr. Mackey stated he felt the IAC should not be funding Federal agencies, but this was in the statute. His concern was that if the project was funded, would the Forest Service be able to take care of it and keep it in condition for use. He said he had problems with local agencies also not being able to meet their obligations following funding of projects by the IAC. Further, he was concerned about the impact on the Game Department areas and thus was unable to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Sacha stated the Forest Service had brought the project to the IAC; it had been through the process; the Forest Service has the land available and goes "out of its way" to provide this land; the IAC Committee now needs to decide whether the monies are available and whether to fund the project. He said he did not understand the problem members were having in coming to an affirmative vote.

Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, was asked his opinion whether a vote of three with five members voting would constitute passage of the

motion. Mr. Lane was able to review the agency's rules & regulations to ascertain there were no restrictions to a majority vote, and stated the motion had passed with the three members voting in the affirmative, one in the negative, and one abstaining. Ms. Cox said she would vote as Chair in the affirmative if it were necessary. She felt if it had been possible to have held the workshop perhaps the Committee would not have felt the need to question staff and the Forest Service concerning these two projects. She said the workshop will probably be held in July in Wenatchee, and at that time there would be two new members of the IAC in attendance. Mr. Dolfay pointed out that the Forest Service had a meeting of its regional staff the week of July 19th if the Committee could arrange to tie in with it. Mr. Sacha also noted the support the Forest Service had given to the passage of House Bill 1382 which would now provide additional monies coming to the IAC for ORV projects.

THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS PASSED:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS APPROVED FUNDING SUPPORT FOR SEVERAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN THE ENTIAT RANGER DISTRICT, WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST, AND SPECIFICALLY THE POND CAMP TIE TRAIL AREA, AND

WHEREAS, THOROUGH REVIEWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED CONCERNING THE POND CAMP TIE TRAIL (ORV 85-20D), AND

WHEREAS THESE INVESTIGATIONS HAVE LED TO A DECISION TO PROCEED WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS PROJECT BY THE LAND MANAGING AUTHORITY, AND

WHEREAS, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WILL SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE RESOURCE PROTECTION, RECREATIONAL OFF-ROAD VEHICLE SAFETY AND MULTIPLE-USE OPPORTUNITIES ON THE FOREST,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT FUNDING UP TO THE AMOUNT OF \$39,645 (ORV 85-20D) BE APPROVED TO CARRY OUT THE RECORDED GOALS OF THIS PROJECT.

The Committee recessed at 1:40 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION - MARCH 28, 1986

On reconvening at 2:42 p.m., the following quorum was recognized: COX, MARSDEN, MACKEY, PINNIX, VOLKER, and GARY ALEXANDER, DESIGNEE, REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES.

III. B. 3. Thurston County Parks and Recreation, ORV Safety/Education, ORV 85-8E:
Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to memorandum of staff "ORV 85-8E, Thurston County Parks Department, ORV Safety/Education Project, Resubmittal", dated March 28, 1986, noting the following:

1. At the November 1985 meeting the Committee had opted to have the project "reworked" and returned for consideration of the Committee at the March 1986 IAC meeting.
2. The reworked proposal differs markedly from the previous ORV safety-education project. The main differences were:

a. A greater emphasis will be placed on providing direct services to ORV recreationists. (Published articles, clinics, school programs, etc.) Less time and money will be dedicated to efforts that involve nonusers (mall shows, general publication articles, etc.).

b. A change in emphasis from a single employee conducting all activities (school programs, safety seminars, etc.), to one where a part-time employee acts as a coordinator, bringing in others to handle the bulk of the instruction work.

c. Cost of project lowered from \$35,000 to \$18,770.

d. Reduction in full-time employee involvement, from 1 FTE to 0.18 FTE.

Staff recommended the project since it retains all essential elements of previous proposals and institutes important cost-cutting measures.

Mr. Pinnix brought to the Committee's attention a recent publication of the Safety-Education Instructor, Thurston County ORV Program, entitled "Off-Roaders Guide", January 1986. The publication was reviewed by each Committee member. Mr. Pinnix pointed out the derogatory cover depicting ORV use crossing a river area with little regard for the environment, and an article within the publication which, in his opinion, advised the ORV users to "take any kind of use on these trails", that they were built specifically for dirt-bikes, etc. He emphasized that using trails in the Capitol Forest in this manner was very poor judgment and that the trails had been specifically standardized for certain management activities. It is difficult to maintain these trails when ORV users go over them constantly and are not authorized to do so. Sixty-five citations were issued in one day on these trails because they were being used in the wrong way. This is a problem to DNR and it is hurting the DNR trails program.

He asked that the Committee carefully evaluate what this money (\$18,770) would be used for -- that the product issued recently is not up to standards and those who read it are being advised inappropriately.

Mr. Earl Williams, Director, Parks and Recreation, Thurston County:

1. Felt Mr. Pinnix's comments were a little more critical than was appropriate. Thurston County Parks and Recreation became aware of DNR's concern in the last couple of weeks.

2. Stated there was a more positive thrust in the publication than Mr. Pinnix pointed out. Other advice is given to ORV users.

3. Have made a number of modifications to the publications -- and safety-education program of Thurston County to meet IAC staff and Committee requirements.

4. The publication in question focused on safety and regrettably did miss the environmental aspect.

5. Did not feel the publication was sufficient documentation to undermine the current safety/education ORV program in Thurston County.

6. If the Committee had the benefit of all the safety/education publications issued over the years by Thurston County, it would be satisfied that the County is meeting its obligations in this respect.

Mr. Pinnix stated he did not intend to convey the impression he was commenting on the entire safety/education program, but was merely pointing out that this issue of the ORV Guide was detrimental to DNR's ORV program in the Capitol Forest. He objected to the advice to ORV users to go out into the forest and use the power line trails, gas line trails, etc. -- because they are not in the DNR program. He asked the IAC Committee to understand DNR's management program of the trails system.

Ms. Marsden asked if there were some way to have other agencies review the ORV Guide publications before they are issued. Mr. Mike Welter, Assistant Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation, stated there were some problems with the publications emanating thru the County, and it had been suggested that future issues be monitored. This had been done and publications improved. There had also been a communication problem, and this had been rectified. The County plans to have the actual services accomplished by professionals from established ORV groups and organizations, and will be reviewing publications prior to their completion. Ms. Cox asked if this particular ORV Guide issue had been reviewed by Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams stated he did not think it had come across his desk and did not believe he had read it.

Mr. Wilder stated there had been problems with ORV publications through Thurston County's program, but the IAC staff had felt it was not necessary to bring these out at a public meeting feeling it was an internal matter to be taken care of by the County. He said he had not reviewed the publication until today. Mr. Tveten referred to the project memorandum --"....0.18 FTE"--and asked who would be actually writing the safety-education documents; where would the material be coming from? Mr. Welter replied the County would be bringing the services of two persons into one -- giving the County better coordination with the park itself. The intent is to use the existing staff personnel, but also contract services out. The park itself will do a publication on the ORV activities there. Persons knowledgeable about ORV matters will be writing articles. Mr. Tveten suggested these articles could possibly be used by other ORV agencies and other areas of the State of Washington. Mr. Pinnix asked if there had been a review process built into the new program. It was his feeling that the person writing an article might be an advocate of ORV use and not recognize other recreational needs or needs involving management of the trails and environmental concerns. Mr. Welter stated Thurston County intends to use the ORV Sports Park as a training center and would be distributing this material from there. Ms. Cox said when ORV material is printed and distributed to the public it is conveying the points of view of the administrators of the park, and should be carefully reviewed. Ms. Marsden felt the danger was there was no reviewing process. The publication has a good deal of important information for the ORV users, but someone should coordinate the review of that information before it is dispensed.

Mr. Williams was concerned with the entire matter under discussion, and said he had thought all the necessary steps had been taken to ensure a good publication. He said the revised program would now include experts in the ORV field and the result should be sound information going to the users. He assured the Committee the County would work with DNR on these matters. Mr. Tveten suggested someone on IAC staff should provide consultation also. Mr. Volker pointed out this type of mistake (issuing of a publication detrimental to one or another ORV principle) could happen to any governmental office, and that the IAC Committee should allow Thurston County to "try again". He acknowledged it was an embarrassing situation, but the publication cannot be recalled. MR. VOLKER MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT THE THURSTON COUNTY SAFETY/EDUCATION ORV PROGRAM, ORV 85-8E, BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE SINCE IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON'S ORV USERS.

Ms Marsden asked who would receive the material to be published, and was informed there are about 1,000 persons on the current mailing list who are

involved in ORV recreation. There followed discussion concerning the educational information part of the project, and the fact that there would be school visitations, safety seminars, etc., all beneficial to ORV users. Mr. Dovel noted this would provide a balance for the publications and educational aspects of the overall program. Mr. Alexander mentioned the ORVAC group and the fact that he looked to that group as providing the guidelines and interpretations for ORV material. The publication itself, he felt, had not been helpful to the program -- consideration of the environment had not been stressed and use of ORV's in certain areas not clearly outlined. However, these matters can now be discussed with ORVAC, DNR, and Thurston County. He felt Thurston County has complied with the Committee's request in its re-working of the project. Mr. Mackey also expressed his support of the project and was satisfied that the safety aspects would now be a direct responsibility of the Sports Park. Ms. Marsden was satisfied with the dollar figure for the project (\$18,770).

At this point Mr. Wilder stated the IAC felt it had needed a handle on the ORV program in regard to safety and education. These were two important items coming under the program. There needs to be good management of areas and consideration for the environment. Also there needs to be an understanding which trails are for hikers; which for motorized (ORV) use. He felt the reworked program for Thurston County's ORV Education/Safety program would be workable. QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION BY MR. MACKEY.

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS REQUESTED THAT ORV 85-8E, THURSTON COUNTY'S ORV SAFETY-EDUCATION PROJECT, BE RETURNED FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MARCH 1986 MEETING, AND

WHEREAS CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS IN THIS PROJECT HAVE BEEN MADE SINCE IT WAS LAST REVIEWED BY THE IAC (NOVEMBER 1985), AND

WHEREAS, THESE MODIFICATIONS, INCLUDING CHANGES IN EMPHASIS AND COST, HAVE MADE THIS PROJECT MORE ACCEPTABLE AND COMPATIBLE WITH THE GOALS OF THE IAC'S OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROGRAM,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE IAC, THAT FUNDING FOR ORV 85-8E BE APPROVED UP TO THE AMOUNT OF \$18,770.

Ms. Cox mentioned the pay-back system used in Spokane for services rendered to other agencies. Perhaps this would work for the IAC. She felt there should be an administrative fee included in the motion to fund the project. Mr. Wilder stated if somebody were to set up an editorial review board they could readily pay for a review of any publication. Ms. Cox explained she meant there is sufficient ORV monies to pay administrative fees if such were required. Mr. Wilder stated there will be a provision for an additional ORV Coordinator in the IAC's proposed 1987-89 budget. This new position if authorized could take on the publication reviews along with other duties. Ms. Cox stated this person could coordinate and help with ORV projects; but she felt for other assistance from the outside an administrative fee would be helpful. Mr. Pinnix agreed, and stated he did not think the Dept. of Natural Resources would want to review every publication, but would be willing to lend its assistance to this project. He wanted to be assured that the Thurston County Safety-Education Project would be able to clear publications and not have a slip-up in the type issued January 1986.

QUESTION HAVING BEEN CALLED FOR BY MR. MACKEY, THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Ms. Cox asked if Mr. Wilder would be able to put this item in the budget. Mr. Wilder agreed there would be a request for an additional position in the 1987-89 IAC Operating Budget in the ORV Program.

Ms. Marsden asked that she (and other Committee members, possibly) be on the mailing list to receive the ORV publications. Mr. Volker felt the discussion had been beneficial to the IAC Committee, and he expressed his hopes that the safety-education program would be well organized. Mr. Welter offered the assistance of Thurston County in assisting with ORV publications on the state level as well as County.

III. C. Department of Fisheries, Langley Fishing Pier, Waiver of Procedural Guidelines: Mr. Stan Scott, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "Department of Fisheries/Langley Fishing Platform - Procedural Guidelines Waiver", and began his report. Ms. Cox noted that the Committee had already read the memorandum to which he referred and asked if the presentation could be shortened. Mr. Scott explained he felt it was necessary to point out the main facts on the waiver to ensure the Committee's understanding of the situation prior to their taking a vote. His comments were as follows:

1. The Department of Fisheries is requesting approval for a development project in which construction costs have already been incurred. IAC Participation Manual #4, Section 04.12, Retroactive Costs Eligibility, and WAC 286-16-080(2) both state:

"Retroactive costs on a development project are defined as those site improvements and construction costs incurred prior to execution of the project contract. Retroactive development costs are not eligible for reimbursement."

2. The Committee had taken action earlier in the meeting (Item: Emergency WAC Hearing, page 13-16) to amend WAC 286-16-080(2) to allow retroactive costs for certain specified development projects (emergency status as determined by the director of the IAC, etc.).

3. It was necessary to also waive Section 04.12 of IAC Participation Manual #4 once the emergency rule under WAC 286-16-080(2) has been authorized through action of the Code Reviser and is in effect.

4. Explained that the waiver of retroactivity for the project would allow reimbursement of costs to the Department of Fisheries.

5. The 90-day element in WAC 286-16-080(2) was explained.

In the following discussion, Mr. Tveten pointed out that the proposed motion in the memorandum he had before him did not cover the issue as discussed by the Committee when it had reviewed the WAC process. Others on the Committee felt the motion only involved the Langley Project and a different motion should be considered to cover other projects. Mr. Scott pointed out he had reference to a REVISED MEMORANDUM, dated March 28, 1986, on the Fisheries/Langley Fishing Platform Project which had been distributed to the Committee during the WAC discussion. On referring to this memorandum and the motion proposed within it, the Committee opted to move to approve the waiver of retroactivity. Suggestion was made that the ninety-day factor be inserted in the revised motion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES HAS RECEIVED AN APPROPRIATION OF \$70,000 FOR USE BY THE CITY OF LANGLEY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A FISHING PLATFORM, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE PROJECT ON JULY 25, 1985, AS PART OF THE APPROVED STATE AGENCIES' MASTER LIST, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF LANGLEY PROCEEDED WITH CONSTRUCTION ON THE PROJECT IN A MANNER THE CITY FELT WOULD BE MOST TIMELY AND COST EFFICIENT, AND

WHEREAS, RELEASE OF STATE BOND MONEY WAS DELAYED THROUGH NO FAULT OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, OR THE CITY OF LANGLEY, AND

WHEREAS, DUE TO THE DELAY OF NOTIFICATION OF THE STATE APPORTIONMENT FROM THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, CERTAIN LOCAL AGENCIES PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON NOVEMBER 7, 1985, MAY BE IN JEOPARDY UNLESS ALLOWED TO GO TO BID IN APRIL OF 1986, TO ENSURE CONSTRUCTION DURING THE 1986 SUMMER CONSTRUCTION PERIOD, AND

WHEREAS, THE IAC STAFF CONCURS THAT SIGNIFICANT COST SAVINGS WERE REALIZED IN NOT DELAYING CONSTRUCTION ON THE LANGLEY PROJECT AND SIGNIFICANT COST SAVINGS AND TIME SAVINGS WILL BE REALIZED IN NOT DELAYING CONSTRUCTION ON CERTAIN LOCAL PROJECTS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR TO TAKE ACTION UNDER EMERGENCY CONDITIONS AND WITH SUFFICIENT JUSTIFICATION, ON REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS PROVIDED SUCH WAIVERS ARE AUTHORIZED UNDER WAC 286-16-080 AS AMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE TODAY, AND FURTHER, IF SUCH WAIVERS ARE APPROVED TO ALSO WAIVE THE PROVISIONS OF IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #4, SECTION 02.14, RETROACTIVE COST ELIGIBILITY, IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT WAC 286-16-080 WHEN FILED WOULD AUTHORIZE THIS TYPE OF ACTION FOR ONLY NINETY (90) DAYS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

There was discussion whether or not the Committee would permanently adopt this rule at a subsequent meeting. It was consensus that if this is done staff will follow the usual permanent rule-making process, bringing the rule to the Committee at a subsequent IAC meeting for consideration and action.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. A. 1987-89 Capital Budget Instructions - State Agencies:
Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "1987-89 Capitol Budget Instructions", and the accompanying draft IAC Supplement to the instructions to be used for Outdoor Recreation Account requests by the State Agencies. Because the Committee had had time to review the instructions on receipt of the kit material, Mr. Pelton briefly reviewed the development of the document, its purpose, and the suggested changes received from the state agencies and staff, which had been incorporated into the final draft form. The new draft also included proposed revisions to the evaluation questions. Mr. Pelton reviewed these:

Question #3 - Recommended adding a "repair" criteria to accommodate an NPS audit suggestion for more precise determination of renovation related projects;

Question #5 - Deleted Coordination/Cooperation.

NEW Question #5 was formerly Question #6;

NEW Question #6 was formerly Question #7 - and in that question it was suggested to increase scoring from 0-5 to 0-9. This places greater emphasis on individual agencies to more precisely justify their projects at the time of oral presentation and gives more flexibility to evaluation team in giving recognition to "special" projects and considerations not covered in the other five questions.

Staff did receive comments on deletion of Coordination/Cooperation (the old #5); however, it was felt that with increased points given to the "bonus" questions, a worthy project could technically receive more points than it could have under the previous system. Further, a sentence has been included in Question #6 to make all agencies aware of this potential scoring opportunity for outstanding coordination/cooperation efforts.

In reference to the Instruction document itself Mr. Pelton pointed out it will be necessary to add the ORV program later and this will be worked out as soon as procedures have been finalized upon signature of House Bill 1382 by the Governor.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (2) and the preliminary estimates for 1987-89, asking if these were justifiable. Mr. Wilder noted the estimates were for the stateside only (locals will have similar estimate). Mr. Tveten pointed out that two years ago the agency was estimating receipt of approximately \$10- to \$12 million, and now funds are declining so that the state agencies will be limited in their project funding programs. Mr. Pelton stated the funding estimates could change by July when more accurate figures are available. Agencies will continue to prioritize their projects as they have in the past.

Mr. Alexander advised of a change in the C-2 procedure as to the Capital Budget process. A new form has been devised which will prove to be more helpful to OFM and to the state agencies. Also, Mr. Alexander stated that the Department of Fisheries approved of the new scoring system.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ALEXANDER, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE IAC STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS AS IN APPENDIX D OF THESE MINUTES AND THAT THE STAFF BE AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH THE 1987-89 CAPITAL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. STATUS REPORTS - continued from page 9.

D. PLANNING SERVICES -

1. Local Agencies' Technical Assistance. Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated March 28, 1986, "Local Agencies' Technical Assistance", noting the following:

a. A total of 86 eligible agencies - including 52 cities, 12 counties, 11 port districts, 5 park and recreation districts, 4 school districts and 2 Indian Tribes are now being monitored by the Planning Services Section.

b. Many local agencies are in the process of updating their local agencies' plans.

c. Currently the IAC is working with 45 local agencies in this process. All have been given technical assistance.

Mr. Pelton called upon Ms. Lorraine Flemm, Recreation Resource Planner, for information. Ms. Flemm exhibited two publications which have recently been published by the Planning Services Section: (1) The Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan Development Workbook (updated), and (2) The Community Involvement Handbook (a new publication). Ms. Flemm explained that the Workbook was revised in December 1985 to include examples of the plan components. Ms. Flemm also has instituted a circulating library of current "model" local plans to assist agencies in getting started with their plans. The Handbook will be available the first week in April for distribution at the Projects Division Workshops (April 4, Shelton; April 8, Spokane). Both publications will be in a display regarding the IAC at the Washington Recreation and Park Association's Annual Conference, Tacoma (April 23-25, 1986 - Tacoma Sheraton Hotel).

Ms. Flemm also reported that the Town of Steilacoom's park plan had been submitted to the Planning Association of Washington's Awards Program, and it would be receiving an award at its meeting in July. Steilacoom's park plan was unique in its intensive community involvement.

D.4 - Recreation Guide: Mr. Pelton referred to the memorandum of staff, dated March 28, 1986, "Recreation Guide". Since the Committee had already had opportunity to review this memorandum, he merely reported that the Guide would be available commencing April 1st in most Pay and Save Stores and Safeway Stores throughout the State of Washington.

For the record, the memorandum cited:

1. Sales are going very well (200-300 per week).
2. There are 160 plus outlets.
3. The Washington Pavilion at EXPO 86 will be carrying the Guide, with sales estimated at 150,000.
4. Staff has received letters and phone calls concerning the second edition. Printing is tentatively scheduled for the spring of 1987. Update work has begun; to be added will be some major local facilities (zoos, camping facilities, aquariums, boat launches, etc.).
5. Approximately 300 sites can be added without increasing the number of existing pages.
6. Increased printing and production costs have raised the price from \$3.00 to \$4.95. It is the intent to remain at that price for the second edition.

D. 3. Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee (PNRRC): Though Mr. Pelton did not take time to review this memorandum, the Committee having had opportunity to review it, the following information is for the official record:

1. The tri-state recreational demand survey is progressing on schedule. (Washington, Oregon, Idaho).
2. In January, a technical subcommittee from all three states met to organize the survey questionnaire and process. Coordination is being accomplished through recreation research staffs at Western Washington University, Oregon State University, and the University of Idaho. Each state is underwriting its own costs of conducting the survey in its own state.
3. The final questionnaire will be completed and pre-tested for presentation to the entire Committee (PNRRC) at its April meeting.

4. Actual demand survey work will begin no later than June 1986 in all three states.

D. 2. Off-Road Vehicle Status Report: Mr. Lovelady did not take the time to review this memorandum at request of the Chair, the Committee having had opportunity to read it prior to the meeting. He did report on the reappointments of Carol Jensen and Tom Jesmer to new three-year terms on the IAC's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee. The following information is for the official record:

1. ORV Plan: Since the last IAC meeting, staff and a sub-committee have selected a consultant to conduct a statewide survey of ORV use... Matrix Management and Gilmore Research.

(The Committee received a copy of the proposed survey questionnaire with the memorandum dealing with the Off-Road Vehicle Status Report.)

2. Safety-Education-Enforcement (E&E) Project Review: Staff is currently conducting an examination of all education and enforcement projects. From this, an attempt will be made to assess relative strengths and weaknesses.

3. ORV Funds Returned: Thurston County returned \$20,160 to the IAC (State Outdoor Recreation Account) as a result of a State Auditor examination and recommendation.

4. Project Changes - ORV: The following ORV project administrative actions were reported:

. Time Period Adjustments:

83-9D Wenatchee National Forest, Pyramid Peak Trail #941:
12-month extension granted (to 12/86).

83-24D Colville National Forest, Phase 1 Batey-Bould Trail:
12-month extension granted (to 12/86).

80-36D Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Evans Creek ORV Area:
24-month extension of termination date (to 12/87).

84-9P Chumstick Four-Wheel Drive Plan:
Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87.

83-7P Bear Creek Trail Survey, Design:
Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87

83-6D Four-mile Ridge: Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87

83-5P Mad River Trails Survey: Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87

82-2D Lake Creek/Angle Peak Trails: Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87.

80-60D Phase 2 Devil's Backbone, Pot Peak, Chesapeake Trails:
Extended 12-24 months to December 1986-87.

. Cost Adjustments:

84-22E City of Richland, ORV Education/Enforcement 3 - Cost increase of \$1,500 to cover ORV portion of citywide cost-of-living raises.

84-20M City of Richland, Horn Rapids ORV Park M&O 1985 - Cost increase of \$3,500 to cover ORV portion of citywide cost-of-living raises.

. Miscellaneous Adjustments:

- 84-26P Adams County Park and Recreation District, ORV Feasibility Study:
12-month extension of termination date (to 12/86).
Cost increase in the amount of \$11,500 as directed by IAC
at its November 1985 IAC meeting.
- 83-2P Wenatchee National Forest, Goose Creek Plan:
Scope increased to add plan for campground to the project element.
(Originally approved by the IAC - element was inadvertently
omitted from the project agreement.)

Following the Off-Road Vehicle Report, the Committee adjourned at 3:58 p.m.
without a motion.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

7-25-86

Date

Wm. B. Cox

CHAIRMAN