

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
- REGULAR MEETING

DATE: March 26, 1987
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Coho Annex, Tyee Motor Inn
Tumwater, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair
Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver
Joe C. Jones, Seattle
Dr. Eliot Scull, Wenatchee
Ralph Mackey, Everett

Raymond Ryan, Designee for Joseph Blum, Director, Department of Fisheries
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Cleve Pinnix, Designee for Honorable Brian Boyle, Commissioner of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources
Rick Lawrence, Designee for Jack Wayland, Director, Department of Game
George Volker, Alternate Designee for Jack Wayland, Department of Game

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, LORENZ, JONES, SCULL, MACKEY, RYAN, TVETEN, PINNIX AND LAWRENCE). All attendees were welcomed by the Chair and asked to introduce themselves. The Chair then asked that anyone desiring to address the Committee on any agenda item complete a Participation Card for her use.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6-7, 1986: Mr. Tveten amended the minutes of November 6-7, 1986 as follows:

Page 24, 3rd paragraph, last sentence:

"If the Senate fails to take action to confirm appointments, the Committee members ~~are-considered-automatically-confirmed~~ continue to serve."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6-7, 1986 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Ms. Lorenz mentioned that the minutes prepared for the IAC meetings are well documented and commended staff on their work. She had located three typos which had already been corrected by staff.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA, MARCH 26, 1987: There were no additions or deletions to the agenda for the March 26, 1987 IAC meeting. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED BY THE DIRECTOR BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS/CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION: In recognition of William R. Wilkerson's tenure on the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX. THAT

APPENDIX "A" = Alternatives - Hikers/
Off-Road Vehicle
Recreationists

APPENDIX "C" - PARTICIPATION MANUALS
MODIFICATIONS AS APPROVED BY
THE COMMITTEE.

APPENDIX "B" = Washington Administrative Code
Hearing

WHEREAS, WILLIAM R. WILKERSON HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PAST THREE YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES THROUGH PROVISION OF AN AUTHORIZED DESIGNEE TO THE COMMITTEE, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HIS SUPPORT AND SERVICES RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE DURING HIS TENURE, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE ENDEAVORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE THROUGH HIS AUTHORIZED DESIGNEE, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO WILLIAM R. WILKERSON.

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

RESOLUTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Gerald W. Pelton: In recognition of Gerald W. Pelton's services to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation the past sixteen years as Chief of Planning Services, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT

WHEREAS, GERALD W. PELTON HAS SERVED ON THE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PAST SIXTEEN YEARS, AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE PLANNING, ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES THROUGH HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS CHIEF OF PLANNING SERVICES, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATION AND OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COMMITTEE, THE STATE, AND THOSE WHOM WE SERVE DURING HIS CAREER, AND TO WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE ENDEAVORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND HIS DEDICATION AND EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS, APPRECIATION, AND CONGRATULATIONS TO GERALD W. PELTON,

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO GERALD W. PELTON WITH A LETTER EXPRESSING THE COMMITTEE'S DEEP APPRECIATION AND BEST WISHES ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM STATE SERVICE.

RESOLUTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Ms. Cox presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Mr. Pelton on behalf of the Committee members, and expressed her appreciation for the work he had done for the IAC these past years. Mr. Pelton thanked the Committee. Mr. Wilder announced there would be a Retirement Dinner in Mr. Pelton's honor at the Sherwood Inn, Tacoma, 7:30 p.m., Friday, March 27, 1987.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum "Director's Report, IAC Meeting March 26, 1987", noting the following:

- (1) **RESCISSION:** The State of Washington had been notified of its apportionment from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) (Dept. of the Interior) for FY 87 in the amount of \$632,000+. The President had asked Congress to rescind the LWCF funds. After 72 days of rescission, funds were released, and the IAC is in process of committing the monies to various approved grant-in-aid projects.
- (2) **PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON AMERICANS OUTDOORS (PCAO):** A Summary Report of the PCAO was given to each Committee member, with a letter of transmittal from Lamar Alexander, Chairman of PCAO, to the President (dated January 1, 1987). The actual report itself has been printed by the Island Press at no expense to the taxpayer and is available.

Though there had been legal action to prohibit distribution of the report, the "Freedom of Information Act" prevailed and it was released for publication. A summary of Commission Recommendations was included with the Director's Report. This had been compiled by the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA). It was noted that principal recommendations include: a dedicated trust fund producing a billion dollars yearly for recreation and conservation, land acquisition, development, and rehabilitation; a national network of greenways connecting major recreation resources; creation of a network of scenic byway roads; formation of a national leadership coalition and a river protection initiative.

Mr. James Webster, Chief, Projects Services, attended a meeting in Washington, D.C., of the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) concerning the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors report.

Certain key words which will be heard throughout the nation pertaining to this report are: "wetlands", trust fund, network of greenways, etc. There will be an emphasis on local government assistance.

- (3) **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (LWCF):** A talking point bill (S 84) has been sponsored by Senator J. Bennett Johnston, Chairman of the Senate Energy Committee and a PCAO member, which would authorize LWCF at \$1 billion per year. Legislation was introduced February 26th (HR 1320) to extend the LWCF for twenty-five years. The bill would reauthorize LWCF at \$900 million per year. PCAO recommends a dedicated trust of \$1 billion per year to replace LWCF.
- (4) **IAC - 1987-89 OPERATING BUDGET:** \$500,000 recommendation for Local Government (Grants to Local Agencies) still stands. Little success with obtaining an additional Off-Road Vehicle staff person. An appeal has been made with the Office of Financial Management (OFM). Legislation passed in 1986 speaks to the fact that an additional position is necessary (Chapter 126, Laws of 1986).
- (5) **LEGISLATION:** ESB 5035 (companion HB 43) has been amended; passed the Senate 45-0; amended by the House State Government Committee:
 - (a) Change termination date to June 30, 1988 (the Senate had set it at 1993).
 - (b) Review of the agency with recommendation to the Legislature

whether the agency should be merged or remain independent. Nonparticipating state agencies are reported to be logical candidates to receive the Committee and its programs.

Mr. Wilder stressed this amendment was of great concern, particularly the amending of the date from June 30, 1993 to June 30, 1988.

- (6) A QUIET CRISIS: The crisis facing parks, recreation, and conservation is real. Noted the lack of financial commitments, maintenance items being deferred and closures of parks and recreation facilities. Lack of liability insurance and concern for the health, safety, and welfare of users forces closure of parks and pools. Noted that the IAC funding of projects has aided many agencies in the renovation, rehabilitation, and recycling of critically needed projects.
- (7) JULY IAC MEETING - JULY 16-17: A proposed agenda for the July 16-17, 1987, meeting of the IAC was distributed to the Committee. Mr. James Webster, Chief, Projects Services, stated that the park and recreation officials in the area of Mt. Vernon were ready to host a salmon bake if that would be what the Committee would like to do. There would be a tour of various marinas, boat ramps, and other water facilities depending upon the schedule. On Friday, July 17th, the regular IAC meeting would be held. The Chair asked that the Committee meet for lunch and discuss this item to ensure that the members agree on what it is they would like to do on Thursday, July 16th.

There followed discussion on the amendment to ESB 5035, with further discussion being deferred to the agenda item III. A. LEGISLATION.

Ms. Cox invited all those attending the meeting as well as the Committee members to attend the Washington Recreation and Park Association and the National Recreation and Park Association Regional Conference in Spokane, Washington, April 22-24, 1987, at the Inn at the Park.

Mr. Mackey referred to Mr. Wilder's report on the IAC's 1987-89 Operating Budget, and asked if there was any way the off-road vehicle position(s) could be reinstated since they were essential to the new program. Mr. Wilder replied he had met with OFM, had stressed the needs, but because all new positions were being "struck from the budget" statewide, nothing to date had been done to restore IAC's additional position. OFM had been advised the IAC would need "1.5 positions", and had noted the funds would be from a dedicated source not from the General Fund. However, this had no effect. Mr. Pinnix felt it was important to emphasize that the position(s) was not to be funded through General Fund monies but through the dedicated Off-Road Vehicle Funding source. Ms. Cox wondered how it is possible to have the funding and the legislation requesting the position(s) and yet not be able to get these passed through the budgetary process. Mr. Pinnix stated that the Ways and Means Committee is dealing with a \$10 billion State Budget and it affects all the state agencies, and their instructions are to cut that budget wherever possible and yet meet the needs. They have opted to cut back on all new positions affecting the General Fund therefore they cut all agencies. The IAC needs to let the legislators know the IAC's

predicament. Ms. Cox asked that the Committee be given a listing of the members of the Ways and Means Committee of each house of the Legislature. She suggested Committee members call or write to those legislators they know and express their concern about the IAC's Operating Budget. (Later on in the meeting, a listing of the two committees - (Senate and House members) was given to the Committee members.)

PCAO: Mr. Pinnix referred to the report on the PCAO and the fact that Mr. Webster had attended the meeting in Washington, D.C. of the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) dealing with the President's Commission's report. He thanked Mr. Wilder for the report received with the Director's Report which was a summary of the Commission Recommendations. He had not seen the outcome of the Commission's deliberations and felt this supplied answers that he and the Committee members needed. He encouraged the Director to obtain further information. He emphasized the need for Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF). The extension of this fund will not happen unless people are aware of the recommendations and take steps to see that they are put into action.

Mr. Wilder thanked Mr. Pinnix for his comments, and asked that the Committee not lose sight of the fact that there is now a 1988 date in the proposed legislation -- that this, too, must be addressed with the legislators at the same time as the need for additional off-road vehicle staff.

II. STATUS REPORTS:

B. Management Services: Fund Summary - Grant-in-Aid Traditional Projects: Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, called on Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, for the report on funding balances. Mr. Baker referred to Fund Summary dated March 17, 1987. He reported on the negative balances explaining that the budgets for state agencies are made up several years in advance based on estimates. Additional receipts from sources have been less than the amounts projected at that time. The amount of the pending contracts are greater than the deficit in the balances shown. None of the contracts are signed unless funds are available. During the rescission the contracts remained pending and when LWCF monies are released these will be signed and forwarded to the sponsors.

Mr. Baker also noted the deficit in Initiative 215 for Local Agencies. This is a normal occurrence at this point in time. Last November 1986, the Committee approved the projects through income generated to June 30, 1987. The figure on the Fund Summary represented monies received through January. Additional monies (\$100,000+) have been received for February 1987.

At the conclusion of Mr. Baker's report, Mr. Wilder referred to the footnote at the bottom of the second page and asked that the Committee delete it, substituting "Includes 1987 Federal Fiscal Year Apportionment of \$632,043".

Fund Summary - Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities: Mr. Baker noted that the balance of \$1,598,712.05 was larger than usual due to the postponement of the funding of nonhighway projects at the November 1986 IAC meeting. The Department of Natural Resources transfer indicates \$0. The new procedure requires some time to put into effect. When those monies

are received they will be added to the receipts portion of the report. Noted that the report was through the month of January only; that additional receipts are due in February and not indicated.

II. STATUS REPORTS - C. PROJECTS SERVICES: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "Project Services Division Report" and noted the following:

- (1) Currently working on 62 local agencies' projects; and 19 local agencies' aquatic land enhancement projects.
- (2) Spring Workshops:
Westside - April 6, Skagit County Admin. Bldg., Mt. Vernon;
April 7, Tacoma Metropolitan Pk. Dist., Tacoma;
April 8, Old City Hall, Kelso.
Eastside - April 6, Richland Library, Richland;
April 7, Cheney City Hall, Cheney;
April 8, Chelan Golf Course Clubhouse, Chelan.
- (3) Application Workshop:
 May 12 in Lynnwood
 May 14 in Moses Lake
- (4) Letters of Intent - due May 1, 1987 in the IAC Office.
Project Applications - due July 1, 1987.
- (5) Technical Advisory Committee:
 September 10-11 - Kent, Washington
 September 15-16 - Eastside city (to be determined)
- (6) Project Evaluation Scoring Meeting:
 October 19 to 23rd - probably Olympia.
- (7) State Agencies' Administrative Actions:

Agency	Project	IAC No.	TOTAL	STATE	LWCF
Parks	Flaming/Geyser - Kummer	87-511D	\$183,000	\$ 183,000	- 0-
	Procure, deliver, install, and related engineering -- King County owned steel truss vehicular bridge over Green River/gain access to Kummer property in Green River Conservation Area.				
Game	Vancouver Lake Develop	86-605D	\$166,000	\$ 109,000	- 0 -
					\$ 57,000 DJ Funds
	Develop existing access road and parking lots for Vancouver Lake boat launch in Clark County. (\$57,000 from Dingle-Johnson Funds, federal funds for boating related projects.)				

STATE AGENCY COST INCREASE:

Parks & Rec. Commission Clallam Spit Development #81-507D \$ 13,000
 To cover unforeseen costs incurred during development now underway.
 Funds available from unspent balance of completed Fort Worden
 Bathhouse project (IAC #82-515D)

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Webster advised that the state agencies have improved in closure of their projects and getting final billings in to the IAC. Since there is a target date for use of the LWCF funds, he stated it would be necessary for state agencies to complete their billings on all those projects having Federal monies in them. He commended the Department of Game on recent "catch-up" billings. Mr. Tveten asked that when letters on billings are sent to the state agencies that a copy be sent to the Director of the agency as well as the agency representative.

II. STATUS REPORTS - D. PLANNING SERVICES:

1. Local Agencies, Technical Assistance: Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Project Services, referred to staff memorandum concerning technical assistance to local agencies, citing that there are a total of 94 eligible agencies on file with the IAC (57 cities, 14 counties, 13 port districts, 5 special districts (park and recreation, public utility districts), 3 school districts, and 2 Indian tribes.

a. Ten local agencies have prepared plans and will be granted eligibility soon. Several other local agencies are working with agency staff on their local plans.

b. Mr. Pelton cited the four items necessary for an agency to establish planning eligibility:

- (1) A current comprehensive park and recreation plan or a park and recreation element in a comprehensive plan;
- (2) Evidence of adoption of the plan by resolution, motion at a meeting, or an official action;
- (3) A capital improvement program (CIP).
- (4) Public Lands Inventory forms.

c. Local Agency Standards: A new publication made possible through services of an intern last fall was mentioned. The Local Agency Standards document was compiled from the comprehensive plans on file with the IAC and are assembled by population. A worksheet allows the local agency to determine its park and recreation needs using the National Recreation and Park Association's (NRPA) standards and comparing these to other local agencies around the state with similar population. (A copy of this document was given to each IAC member later during the meeting.)

2. Nonhighway & Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report: Mr. Greg Lovelady, NOVA Coordinator, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report", citing the following:

a. NOVA Advisory Committee met on February 20th to consider the two nonhighway road project proposals: Yakima Greenway Project (N-86-43D) and Game Department/Similkameen Primitive Trail Project (N-87-1A).

b. Publications through support of the NOVA program were cited and distributed:

- (1) "ORV Sports Park: Washington's Family Off-Road Recreation Experience" (Thurston County Parks & Recreation Dept.)
- (2) "Off-Road Vehicles in Pierce County" (Pierce County Sheriff)
- (3) "1986 Off-Road Vehicle Survey, Executive Summary", IAC Planning Services. (A summary of

the State of Washington Off-Road Vehicle Study,
Gilmore Research and Matrix Management Groups.

- (4) "Off-Road Vehicles in Mason County" (Mason County Sheriff)
- (5) "Off-Road Vehicles in Grant County" (Grant County Sheriff)
- (6) "Washington State ORV Use Permit" (Mason County Sheriff)
- (7) "ORV" - City of Richland (rules/activities).

3. Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee", noting the following:

a. Washington is nearing completion of the final, four-month survey period of the demand survey; Idaho has completed its collection and coding for summer data and is in mid-cycle for collection of winter months' data. Oregon's last monthly survey will cover the month of May with phone calling to be done in June. Analysis of all data is scheduled to begin this summer.

b. Results of the survey efforts will provide basis for development of regional recreation demand projections, useful to management agencies and research institutions in meeting recreational needs and resolving recreation issues.

c. The end product will provide recreational demand data base for the next update of the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. That update is scheduled for completion in 1989 to continue eligibility to receive Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds, National Park Service.

4. Forest Plan Review Process: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "Forest Plan Review Process", and outlined for the Committee the review process the IAC has in operation for review of environmental impact statements as well as agency management plans of various entities. The U. S. Forest Service Plans are also reviewed under this program.

a. Procedures for review have been established in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The IAC, and other agencies, prepare comments and send them to the state coordinator in the Department of Ecology. DOE then provides the state position to the Forest Service.

b. The IAC has assisted in the review of the Okanogan National Forest, the Wenatchee National Forest, and the Olympic National Forest. Appeals pending in court have stalled further comments and reviews. Draft plans for the remaining forests in the state and region will probably not be out for another two to three months. (Remaining for review are: Umatilla, Gifford Pinchot, Colville, and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests.)

c. Most of IAC comments have been in support of the planning alternative which appears to provide the greatest recreational opportunities for the future.

Discussion followed. Dr. Scull asked if the IAC staff in commenting on Forest Service Plans attempted to influence the outcome of any particular aspects of it, or was the input purely informational? Mr. Pelton replied the IAC tries to influence the plan towards the recreational opportunities, either to strengthen those aspects or to advise of ways in which recreation could be enhanced in the plan. All input is given only to the Department of Ecology and it is their responsibility to incorporate all state replies and suggestions and forward these to the Forest Service.

Both Dr. Scull and Mr. Mackey questioned the statement in the memorandum concerning appeals pending in court, asking if this action would have any effect on the IAC releasing its funds to the Wenatchee National Forest on the off-road vehicle projects. Mr. Pelton and Mr. Lovelady replied such action would not affect ORV funding. Plans and programs exist now in the National Forest for off-road vehicle planning and projects, and those plans and programs have already been addressed through the usual process. IAC staff was not aware of any litigations concerning ORVs.

Ms. Cox questioned the supporting of various alternatives on the statements of only perhaps one or two persons. In deciding the "highest and best use" she hoped that the IAC was not specifically citing any particular activity as the "highest and best use" for specific areas. She felt there should be checks and balances in review of the plans. Mr. Pelton assured her this was very closely reviewed. Mr. Tveten pointed out the need to follow the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) -- that this document served the purpose in this respect. Mr. Pelton agreed and pointed out that there is a management plan in the SCORP document but that the IAC staff through the director does not support any one activity over another. SCORP does point out, however, the activities related to each area and the highest uses, etc. Mr. Pinnix felt the entire process of review was more of an assistance program to the Forest Service. The state may have information on certain areas which the Forest Services does not have and supply that to them for their deliberation. Later all of the information should be made available to the state for further review. Mr. Wilder stated most of the comments and suggestions made to the Forest Service in response to its plans has been related to the SCORP document which has been previously adopted by the Committee and the Governor.

5. 1986 Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Survey: Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "1986 Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Survey". He noted that the State of Washington's ORV Plan is updated every six years, and it is necessary to conduct an ORV survey prior to the updating. He referred to the Executive Summary included with the kit material and its relationship to the larger publication - the 1986 Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Plan. The plan, itself, is used to determine future funding, program direction, and priorities for the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program of the IAC.

a. For the survey, telephone interviews involved 3,460 persons. The numbers were developed through random digit dialing. Counties within each of the IAC's official planning districts were sampled proportionate to each district's population. For accurate analysis, the sample was weighted to reflect actual statewide population characteristics.

b. The mail survey provided an in-depth look at the needs and activities of 526 ORV users and owners. It was designed specifically for those who use their vehicles off paved roads.

c. There were personal field interviews from 311 users also.

Mr. Dovel pointed out the most important objectives of the survey and called for questions.

Mr. Tveten asked if there was any discussion in the survey document pertaining to the issue of hikers-hunters-and off-road vehicle users. Mr. Dovel replied there is a section in the document asking how the general population feels about ORV's and their recreational use. Also there is reference to this in the overall Statewide ORV Plan. Mr. Tveten asked if there would be a public review process of the document once it is in draft form. Mr. Dovel replied the report is being circulated chapter-by-chapter to the NOVA Committee in an attempt to ensure a thorough review. Mr. Tveten suggested there be a public review also, with notices in the paper as to how the public can have input. Staff agreed this was a good suggestion and would follow up on it.

6. New Publications: Mr. Pelton reported on memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "New Publications", and distributed a packet of same as follows:

a. Recreation Resources - A Heritage for the Future - This document provides an historical background on park facilities, recreation programs, and park and recreation related legislation accomplished in Washington over the past one hundred and thirty-three years.

b. Safety in Parks and Recreation - A Bibliography) - This publication was prepared as a reference source for information on safety programs and practices throughout the nation.

c. The Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan Development Workbook - This document is an updated reprint of an existing IAC publication used by agencies preparing their comprehensive plans.

d. 1986 Off-Road Vehicle Survey: Conducted by Matrix Management and Gilmore Research Groups as part of the Off-Road Vehicle Plan update program as mentioned previously.

e. Local Agency Standards - explained by staff previously (1. Local Agencies Technical Assistance, page 7, of these minutes).

Ms. Lorenz suggested the last page of the Local Agency Standards should be enlarged as it is difficult to read.

The Chair suggested the Committee recess and take up agenda Item III B. Project Changes on reconvening.

..... Recessed 10:20 a.m. - reconvened 10:30 a.m.

III B. PROJECT CHANGES:

1. King County, Sammamish River, IAC #66-025A & #70-008A, Property Conversion: Mr. Don Clark, Recreation Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, concerning this project citing the following:

a. The County requests IAC approval to convert approximately 1,102.75 square feet of land located adjacent to and south of NE 85th Street at the Redmond Bridge to solve an encroachment by an adjacent property owner onto Sammamish River Park.

b. The land will be deeded to Maingate Investors (the property owner), and in turn that agency will deed to King County a strip of property of approximately 1,589 square feet located adjacent to the existing park.

c. Both parcels of land were appraised and reviews were complete. The park land to be converted is valued at \$8,550; the replacement parcel at \$10,750.

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

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY ACQUIRED PROPERTY ALONG THE SAMMAMISH RIVER FOR TRAIL PURPOSES (IAC #70-008A), AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY (KING COUNTY LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 17, 1987) HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE AN APPROXIMATE 1,102.75 SQUARE FEET OF THE SITE, FOR ABOUT 1,589 SQUARE FEET OF (RETAIL/COMMERCIAL/OFFICE ZONE) PROPERTY, 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 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 THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY KING COUNTY FOR CONVERSION OF 1,102.75 SQUARE FEET OF LAND (IAC #70-008A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. City of Spokane/Riverfront Park Land Exchange, IAC #77-053D: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Recreation Projects Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, in reference to this project and noted the following:

a. Burlington Northern Railroad Company (BNRRC) had suggested an exchange of land which would benefit the City of Spokane by its receipt of additional land along the Spokane River to continue its trail easement.

b. BNRRC would in exchange receive land on the south side of the river. Slides were shown indicating the specific land exchange.

c. Both parcels of land have been determined to be at least equal in value, and the parcel acquired will be more conducive to recreation.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PINNIX, SECONDED BY MR. JONES THAT THE EXCHANGE OF LANDS BE APPROVED.

Mr. Tveten asked if the City had submitted all the required documentation for the land value, and was assured by staff this was now a part of the file. With that understanding, the following motion was voted upon:

WHEREAS, IN 1977 THE CITY OF SPOKANE WITH IAC/LWCF FUNDING ASSISTANCE HAD PLACED UNDER IAC CONTRACT, RIGHTS TO PROPERTY ALONG THE SPOKANE RIVER NEAR DIVISION STREET (IAC #77-053D), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF SPOKANE AND THE BURLINGTON NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY FIND IT MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL TO EXCHANGE PARCELS EACH CONTAINING .18 ACRES OF EQUAL VALUE, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THIS EXCHANGE MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE EXCHANGE IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE REQUIRED CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. Port of Bremerton, Port Orchard Marina Boat Moorage, IAC #85-058D, Cost Increase Request: Mr. Ron Taylor, Recreation Projects Manager, distributed a brochure of the Port of Bremerton's Port Orchard Marina Project, and referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987 concerning the project.

a. The Port of Bremerton requested a cost increase in the amount of \$164,454 to cover higher costs of construction incurred when the original design proposal was changed to ensure there would be proper construction which could withstand seasonal storms in that area.

b. Staff reviewed the request and felt only the maximum IAC funding assistance could have been approved when the project first came to the Committee (\$150,000) - therefore since the project had been funded by IAC at \$133,715 (from Initiative 215 funds) only \$16,285 IAC share could be allocated to the project...a 12% increase. The total cost increase was \$32,570.

Mr. Mackey was informed the consulting firm was not the same as the one providing assistance to the Langley project. The Port does have the balance of funding available. Mr. Jones brought out the statement he had made at the last IAC meeting concerning A&E costs within each project, and had been informed ten percent was the usual set aside for these costs, yet this exceeded that amount. Mr. Darryl Piercy, Harbormaster for the Port of Bremerton, replied the original A&E costs were set at 10%, but the current cost now is 12%. Mr. Taylor explained that the IAC is not paying any additional costs on the engineering aspect; this is being taken up by the Port of Bremerton. Mr. Jones said he was concerned about the fact that the Port had not, in reviewing the project, determined it would require more than 10% and had proceeded with the project through the IAC process. Apparently they did not have the foresight to project these costs to protect and allow for additional needs. Mr. Ken Attebery,

Assistant Manager, Port of Bremerton, replied that as originally conceived the Port had given the IAC proper information on the A&E costs. Subsequent to that, there was a growing concern that the original site selected for the project was a poor one due to the fact that it was probable it could not withstand seasonal storms in the area. The project was re-reviewed to locate the moorage at a better site. He understood Mr. Jones' point, but in this particular case it was necessary to move the project site thus involving additional costs. Ms. Lorenz stated cost increases bothered her, that the IAC approved each project based on the various costs within it at the time staff brings it to the Committee for review. Ms. Cox asked the Committee's decision since there had been two points raised by members which apparently clouded the issue.

Mr. Tveten stated he was struggling with the numbers and asked for clarification. Mr. Jim Webster explained that the original application was in the amount of \$267,430, of which the IAC had funded \$133,715 from Initiative 215 funds. The Port spent considerably more than the amount allocated, and had asked for a 61% cost increase. Staff felt it could not recommend this amount, and based its 12% on the fact that had the project come in for \$150,000 IAC funding, it would have been considered for that amount and perhaps been so funded. Therefore, only a 12% increase was recommended.

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

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE PORT OF BREMERTON, PORT ORCHARD MARINA BOAT MOORAGE PROJECT (IAC #85-085D) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$267,430 (50% INITIATIVE 215), AND

WHEREAS, THE PORT OF BREMERTON HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$164,454 (61%), TO COVER ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED AS A RESULT OF REVISING THE ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME AT THE ADVICE OF THEIR ENGINEERING CONSULTANT, SUBSEQUENT TO IAC APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT, AND

WHEREAS, THE PORT IS COMMENDED FOR PROCEEDING WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MORE SERVICEABLE YET HIGHER COST PROJECT THAN ORIGINALLY PROPOSED TO FULFILL ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE IAC PROJECT CONTRACT; IT IS, HOWEVER, RECOGNIZED UNDER IAC POLICY, THAT HAD THE REVISED PLAN BEEN SUBMITTED IN PLACE OF THE ORIGINAL PLAN, THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF IAC ASSISTANCE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN RECEIVED IS \$150,000,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$32,570 (12% - \$16,285 IAC SHARE, INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS) IS APPROVED FOR THE PORT OF BREMERTON, PORT ORCHARD BOAT MOORAGE PROJECT (IAC #85-085D). THE IAC DIRECTOR IS HEREIN AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE APPROPRIATE PROJECT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. Chelan County ORV Education/Enforcement Project, ORV #85-04E, Contract Extension: Mr. Dovel referred to memorandum of staff concerning the Chelan County E/E Project #85-04E, and distributed a revised memorandum (blue paper) for review of the Committee. Mr. Dovel asked the Committee's approval of a contract extension for this project to allow deliberation concerning a \$2,400 (3%) cost increase as a result of unanticipated program expenses. Additional monies were needed for personnel and equipment.

Ms. Lorenz asked the original amount of the project - (\$8,000) - and were there funds to pay for the increase of \$2,400 if approved? Mr. Dovel replied in the affirmative. Dr. Scull brought out the fact that the Chelan County Sheriff's Department was in an "upheaval" at the present time -- one of the deputy's had been reassigned and had previously been responsible for the ORV duties. He asked if this would hamper the E&E project proceeding on schedule. Mr. Dovel replied he was not aware of any "upheaval", but that the staff tries to monitor closely each E&E project in terms of assignment of duties. He stated Chelan County had done an outstanding job in their ORV responsibilities and was very cooperative. Dr. Scull felt the County might fall behind in their tasks and staff ought to monitor their program closely. Mr. Pinnix asked if the Nonhighway and Off-Road Advisory Committee had reviewed this request, and was informed it had not. He also pointed out that the Committee had a guideline to fund \$40,000 for deputy positions in Counties requesting same, since there were limited dollars for the E&E ORV funding category.

Mr. Dovel stated this was a guideline set by staff and approved by the Committee. It had also been approved through the NOVA Committee. However, the guideline is flexible. Mr. Wilder stated if the County has a justifiable reason, staff can review it and come to a decision. Mr. Tveten asked if there wasn't a 10% Director's cost increase approval in the ORV program as well as the traditional grant-in-aid program..why had this matter come before the Committee?

It was explained by staff and Mr. Wilder that this particular project had inadvertently been overlooked at the time a request had been made for the cost increase. Now time has run out on the contract and it is necessary to come back to the Committee for approval of a contract extension to allow sufficient time for the Director to address and resolve the issue. Mr. Tveten asked when the expenditure had taken place and Mr. Lovelady replied it was within the contract period. Mr. Jeff Lane in response to Mr. Tveten stated there were no problems in staff's decision to request Committee action.

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

WHEREAS, CHELAN COUNTY'S ORV EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECT (ORV 85-04E) CONTRACT EXPIRED ON DECEMBER 31, 1986; AND

WHEREAS, CERTAIN COST ADJUSTMENT ISSUES, WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROJECT, HAVE ARISEN, REQUIRING ADDITIONAL TIME FOR RESOLUTION:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THIS ORV PROJECT BE EXTENDED FOR A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED SIX MONTHS TO ALLOW SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THE DIRECTOR TO ADDRESS AND RESOLVE THESE ISSUES.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III. C. FOREST SERVICE REPORT:

1. User Groups Conflict Resolution (Blue Creek and Mad River Projects):

Ms. Cox referred to page (51) of the minutes, November 6-7, 1986,

(Dr. Scull)

"....He asked that it be on the record that it is the Committee's wish that conflict between user groups be resolved through these groups getting together, and that a report of their meeting be made a part of the March 1987 agenda."

She also noted that Ms. Ruth Ittner had commented on her work with a mediation group which had helped in other instances of conflict concerning wilderness recreation.

Mr. Lovelady noted the Committee had received a report on conflict resolution dated March 10, 1987 from Donald H. Smith, Forest Supervisor. He distributed to each Committee member a second letter from Mr. Smith, dated March 17, 1987 which contained minutes of the March 14, 1987 meeting with users of forest trails. Mr. Lovelady noted there was a "Summary of Contents" provided for the Committee's review. As requested by the Committee two meetings had been held in an effort to find a compromise between motorized and nonmotorized recreationists regarding the Mad River and Blue Creek projects. No consensus, however, was reached. The Forest Service will continue its pursuit of IAC funding for these two projects at this IAC meeting. The involved parties support the following approaches:

1. Development of parallel trail systems;
 2. Identification of new hiker-only trails.
 3. Increase of monitoring to determine extent of conflict.
- In addition, some adjustments in seasonal restrictions on use may be employed.

Mr. Lovelady noted that at the second meeting, the group was presented with 14 alternatives, each directed at limiting user conflict. Alternatives ranged from various forms of zoning to increasing monitoring activities. These were ranked on a scale of one through ten. The pros and cons of each were discussed. The three most popular alternatives were the three mentioned above. Mr. Lovelady also mentioned a letter from Phillip Glass, Recreation Staff Officer, Wenatchee National Forest, to David Dworkin, Legislative Assistant to Congressman Rod Chandler, which was included in the material given to the Committee for review. Congressman Chandler has had several concerns regarding the Mad River-Blue Creek area.

Ms. Lorenz asked how many persons had attended the March 14th meeting. Mr. Glass responded there were five from each group - hikers/off-road vehicle recreationists/and the Forest Service.

Ms. Cox called upon Mr. Phil Glass for the Forest Service Report. Highlights of Mr. Glass's report were as follows:

- (1) Meetings did not really resolve the conflicts but provided opportunity for group discussion and developing of the alternatives.
- (2) Felt the Forest Service has complied with all rules and regulations and the legal process. This was discussed at the two meetings.
- (3) Request for funding in the area is simply a follow-up in their improvement for all users.

- (4) Forest Service request is still valid and the use on the trails will continue to be motorized unless the supervisor of the Wenatchee Forest Service makes a decision to change it. Therefore, these trails will be improved one way or the other whether IAC approves the funds or not.
- (5) Two meetings were held -- one February 21; the other March 14th. The Forest Service did not select the participants; representatives were selected by the hikers and the off-road vehicle users themselves.
- (6) First meeting: Discussed the area and what the plans were for that area. The Ranger discussed his expectations to better understand the needs and concerns of the trail user and provide opportunities for them to use the trails in the Wenatchee Forest. Asked for the trail users views in an attempt to establish alternatives to help resolve conflicts. Discussed what is unique about the Mad River Area to cause hikers' resistance to the bikers and why they wanted to exclude them from use of certain trails.
- (7) Trail users (hikers) feel it is a very unique area, too heavily used by bikers when they have other places to recreate. Hikers want the area designated as a "hiker only" area.
- (8) The hikers brought up Executive Order 11644, and the Forest Service feels it has complied with the Executive Order in all respects.
- (9) Noted that the hikers feel there is conflict, but the bikers don't seem to feel there is and get along well on the trails with the hiking recreationist.
- (10) Forest Service in the past has felt biker use in the area was moderate and had therefore allowed off-road vehicle use to continue.
- (11) Forest service asked what was important to the hikers and bikers respectively. There were several suggestions-- (1) a study should be conducted to find out the problems before reconstruction of other trails in the Chiwawa/Mad River Area; (2) IAC should continue funding programs, etc.
- (12) Problems were identified at the first meeting. Mentioned was trail design and the Forest Service feels it can do a better job in this area. Exhaust fumes were mentioned as a trail drawback, and speed of the vehicles, etc.
- (13) MARCH 14 meeting: Management Alternatives were discussed as noted on page 3 of the minutes of that meeting. The three approaches mentioned by Mr. Lovelady (page 15 of these minutes) were the main ones, but there are others as noted in the March 14 minutes. (Read some of the alternatives.) (APPENDIX "A")
- (14) There was essentially no agreement only discussion; but the alternatives were discussed and are presented to the Committee.

Ms. Cox referred to page (3) of the Trail User Meeting, 2-21-87, "Food For Thought - Conflict - Pedestrian users see the conflict, not ORV users." She felt there was conflict that the report of the meetings was a reiteration of what the IAC has already discussed. She asked what was the criteria used at the meeting and what was the process. The Committee did not want to hear the same problems over and over; the aim was to have conflict resolution. Mr. Glass stated there has not been any criteria developed by the Forest Service except in the ORV monitoring plan for the forest. He said there was criteria established which described conflict as either high, medium, or low. This is derived from on-the-ground complaints, some telephone calls, the number of accidents, etc. This criteria is used by the Forest Service.

Ms. Lorenz asked if after the deliberations did anyone come up with solutions or a compromise. This is what the Committee desired to hear.

Ms. Cox referred to page (7), item 8 under "Hikers" - "Build parallel trails away from conflict areas (Hy-Yu Trail - Entiat Ridge)." She felt this was an identifiable option coming from the hikers, but did not see this type of option coming from the bikers. Mr. Glass said the ORV users had come up with options and these had then been identified in the second meeting minutes as "Alternatives". Ms. Lorenz felt each side wanted "their own way", and she could not detect any compromise.

Mr. Glass referred to the second meeting minutes (March 14th) and noted that the Trail Plan for the Mad River had had an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) approved through public input. The alternative at that time was to allow motorized trail development use in that area (1982). This, he stated, was a legal document and in order to change the decision of the Forest Service, it would be necessary to produce another EIS or an amendment to the existing one if it were decided to limit ORV use. Ms. Cox pointed out the Committee had heard reference to "past documents" and now would like to hear about negotiation and compromise for the present time. Mr. Glass stated the Forest Service was attempting to do this, but it is also tied by the legal processes involved.

Mr. Glass again referred to the March 14th meeting wherein it is stated that the Forest Service will continue to explore various methods of management which hopefully will reduce conflict between the user groups throughout the Forest. He cited the alternatives one through 14 as presented in the minutes of the meeting. He felt there was some agreement on some of the options, but the two groups (hikers/bikers) still remain somewhat polarized. He specifically noted Alternative "F" - "Develop the ORV system to include a currently funded and/or completed trail system pending completion of the Wenatchee Forest Plan" which had the support of the bikers, but was overwhelmingly opposed by the hikers. Mr. Tveten asked what the alternative meant by "pending completion". Mr. Glass said this meant to keep the ORV system in that area and at the same time recognize there are other trails which have not yet been funded by IAC but which could be at some future time.

Mr. Glass then referred to Alternative K, "Test the parallel trail idea on the Cottonwood/Myrtle Lake route." This appeared to be somewhat in favor by both hikers and bikers.

Ms. Cox noted Alternative C, "Some trails closed and some open to hikers." She felt this was a strange alternative as well as the Alternative B, "Some trails closed and some open to ORVs." She asked who had written the alternatives and Mr. Glass replied the Forest Service had ranked the results of the workgroups findings and recommendations and had given them an 1 thru 10 rating (alternatives A thru N).

Ms. Lorenz felt the hikers and bikers were not looking at the problems as a group of people concerned about the area, that they are still very much separated in their thinking. She said she would like to see a survey done by a select group of five hikers and five bikers.

At this point Dr. Scull suggested questions be held until Mr. Glass had completed his report to the Committee. The Chair agreed.

Forest Service continued report: Mr. Glass stated the method used by the Forest Service as indicated in the minutes was a good one, and that most people have felt the process used (ranking by alternative, etc.) was well done and meaningful. He agreed there might have been some misunderstanding between the two groups regarding the Ranger, but the Ranger did ask everyone to talk to him about the various alternatives. Mr. Glass also cited the following:

(1) The discussion involved an item which kept coming up -- how do you only discuss the Mad River and Blue Creek trails when there is a much larger area to cover? It was felt by many that the Chiwawa-Mad River Plan tied in with the Mad River and Blue Creek trails and when discussing these you need to consider the Chiwawa-Mad River trail as well.

(2) The Forest Service felt its research through the two meetings had complied with the desires of the IAC Committee and, in fact, went beyond it. The information obtained from the meetings will be very valuable and useful in completion of the Forest Service Plan.

(3) The fourteen alternatives as noted in the March 14th minutes were, to his knowledge, the main objectives discussed between the two groups. (Mr. Glass read many of the alternatives at this point.)

(4) Mr. Glass felt the two groups were very much polarized, and the Forest Service has planned the trail areas for hikers, bikers, and horsemen with \$1.5 ORV monies having been spent there over the past ten years.

(5) Conflicts between users on National Forest trails is a continual problem. The Forest Service policy has been since establishment of the trails to provide the "greatest good to the greatest number" of recreationists. It is difficult to do.

Mr. Ryan asked if any funding needs had been changed by the Forest Service due to the meetings held. Mr. Glass replied in the negative because the Forest Service believes it has a viable plan and will provide off-road vehicle use in the National Forest. He noted ORV use is recognized throughout the nation as a legitimate use of public lands.

Mr. Ryan asked if the multiple-use of the trails had evolved over the years. Mr. Glass replied years ago the Forest Service had foot trails and recently ORV recreationists began to use the trails for their recreating. Trails had been used for horses also. The Forest Service did not manage the trails until the Executive Order of 1982. At that time the agency recognized that off-road vehicle usage was a legitimate use of the National Forests. The Order also states the Forest Service must also minimize conflicts between the various users. This it attempts to do. There are conflicts not only between hikers and bikers, but the various recreationists using the rivers, streams, snow areas, and other motor vehicles and trucks.

(6) Mr. Glass stressed the need to share the forests which were after all for everyone.

In response to Mr. Pinnex's questions as to how the Forest Service applies the Executive Order, Mr. Glass stated the Order directs public land agencies to manage ORV use, and manage it in such a way that the resources are protected for the future. Also the Forest Service is asked to minimize conflicts.

(7) During 1979 an ORV Environmental Impact Statement was instigated. There was tremendous public input. The Forest Service felt it had complied with the Executive Order and through development of trails it provided a system of loop trails. There appears to be very little off trail impact. The Forest Service feels its trail system provides opportunities for all users.

(Ms. Cox noted for the record that Mr. Rick Lawrence had left the Committee meeting and had appointed George Volker as designee for the Department of Game.)

As a member of the Committee Ms. Lorenz stated she wanted to review a project, know that it had the agency's approval, and fund it with the understanding that the trail use sites could be used by recreationists without being disappointed due to problems and conflicts. She asked if the Forest Service had had this kind of feeling from those who had met to discuss conflicts. Mr. Glass said this was a general feeling, that both sides had a deep respect for the natural resources and he felt that eventually they would learn to live with the situation and cooperate. Ms. Lorenz stated the other alternative would be that none of the trails could be improved or developed. Mr. Glass stated the Forest Service would not follow this course at all but would continue to work with their trails program. The purpose is not to separate uses 100% but to work out multi-use trails wherever possible.

The Chair called for a show of hands to recess for lunch. It was the consensus that the Committee break for lunch and return at 1:00 or 1:15 p.m. for the Washington Administrative Code Hearing with further discussion concerning the conflict question to continue following that hearing.

Recessed 11:50 a.m. - Reconvened 1:04 p.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE HEARING 1:00 P.M.:

Ms. Cox called the Washington Administrative Code Open Hearing to order at 1:04 p.m.. Mr. Wilder asked Mr. Webster for an explanation of the WAC change (WAC 286-16-035). Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "WAC 286-16-035 Applications Deadlines - Traditional Local Agencies' Grant-in-Aid Projects." He stated the WAC would allow an application submittal date for Local Agencies' projects to July 1 giving them additional time to do the work necessary prior to submittal and also allow the IAC staff sufficient time to assist local agencies with their project plans through the project process. To change this submittal date, it was necessary to change the Washington Administrative Code.

Mr. Wilder read the amendment to WAC 286-16-035 to the Committee members:

"AMENDATORY SECTION - WAC 286-16-035 - APPLICATIONS--DEADLINES.

(1) ~~((Acquisition-project-applications-from-local-agencies-must-be-submitted-to-the-interagency-committee-at-least-five-months-prior-to-a-scheduled-funding-meeting-to-be-considered-at-that-meeting.--Development))~~ All project applications from local agencies must be submitted at least ~~((six))~~ four months prior to a scheduled funding meeting to be considered at that meeting. Project applications from local agencies that are not completed in the manner required by these rules and the participation manuals will not be considered by the interagency committee unless all of the required material is on file with the interagency committee at least 30 days preceding a funding meeting at which the projects are to be considered for funding.

(2) These deadlines must be complied with unless an agency requests and is granted a waiver by the director." (APPENDIX B)

Mr. Ogden was asked if there had been any comments received regarding the WAC amendment. He replied in the negative.

At this point, Mr. Lane (Assistant Attorney General) asked that the Director note for the record the number of the Notice of Intention to Adopt, Amend, or Repeal Rules, Form CR-1, which had been filed with the Code Reviser and authorized the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation to hold the Washington Administrative Code Hearing. Mr. Wilder so noted the following:

WSR 87-05-026, Code Reviser's Office, Filed 2-17-1987 (APPENDIX B)

Mr. Tveten asked if the agency had had occasion to use the authority given in paragraph (2) of the amended WAC - "These deadlines must be complied with unless an agency requests and is granted a waiver by the director". Mr. Wilder stated this authority had been used many times in cases where one or two items may have been missing from the application but would be received prior to a project funding session.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT

WHEREAS, IT IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT PREPARATION TIME FOR LOCAL AGENCIES TO SUBMIT THEIR PROPOSED PROJECT APPLICATIONS.

FOR ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, REDEVELOPMENT, OR RENOVATION TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW AND ACTION, AND

WHEREAS, A REDUCTION IN SUBMITTAL TIME TO FOUR MONTHS BEFORE A SCHEDULED FUNDING SESSION WOULD PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PREPARATION AND PLANNING TIME FOR LOCAL AGENCIES, WITH BOTH ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS DUE IN THE IAC OFFICES ON THE SAME DATE, AND

WHEREAS, THIS SAME REGULATION WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PARTICIPATION MANUAL NO. 1, GENERAL SUMMARY MANUAL, AND SPECIFICALLY ITEM 01.03B PROJECT APPLICATIONS GENERAL, PARAGRAPH TWO,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THAT WAC 286-16-035 BE AMENDED TO INDICATE A FOUR MONTHS SUBMITTAL TIME FOR SAID APPLICATIONS AS INDICATED IN WSR 87-05-026, CODE REVISER FILING OF FEBRUARY 17, 1987, AND AS INDICATED ON PAGE 20, PARAGRAPH 2 OF THESE MINUTES.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

(APPENDIX B) & (APPENDIX C)

At 1:10 p.m, the Chair asked Mr. Glass to continue his report. Mr. Glass said he was finished and was open to questions from the Committee.

Discussion re Forest Service Report of Mr. Glass:

Mr. Mackey asked if the Forest Service had had a legal opinion on the procedure it had followed in relation to the Executive Order with which it is complying. Mr. Glass replied that the procedure had not been questioned and it is assumed the Forest Service is abiding by the regulations very well. There have, however, been three cases presented by one of the hiker community. Two of these concerned Bureau of Land Management problems and the other a national park problem. Copies of these cases were sent to everybody concerned and to the General Counsel, Forest Service in Portland as well, for their review and comment.

Dr. Scull mentioned that earlier in the report Mr. Glass had stated even if IAC-ORV funding was not forthcoming the Forest Service would proceed with the improvement of the trails anyway. He asked for an explanation. Mr. Glass replied the use on the trail is motorized use for certain seasons of the year and others use the trail when it is open. It is necessary therefore to ensure it is in condition for use. The environmental aspects of the necessary work need to be looked into also in relation to the use of the trail. Therefore, the Forest Service will need to proceed with improvement of the trails whether or not it receives IAC funding. The necessary funding would come from the Forest Service and might be "down the road" a few years, but the work would have to be done.

Dr. Scull asked Mr. Glass to elaborate on the alternative which seemed to receive some consensus -- the possible seasonal closure of certain trails to ORV use which were in the Mad River area. Mr. Glass discussed the soil conditions of trails during certain times of the year, and stated the Forest Service did close trails to ORVs when the soil was wet and soggy. However, Fall closures had not as yet been considered and he felt perhaps it might be time to consider that option also.

He mentioned that the Department of Game had also recommended early Spring closure on some of the trail areas during calving season for deer and elk.

Mr. Tveten referred to a March 18, 1987 letter to the IAC Committee members from Louise Marshall, President, Washington Trails Association, PART II, "Executive Order 11644 as amended by Executive Order 11898",

"...At the request of the Washington Trails Association, Wenatchee National Forest has asked its legal counsel to investigate the matter. However, according to a Wenatchee spokesman, the Forest Service (sic) feels confident the legal department will uphold their ORV Plan."

He asked if the Forest Service had requested a legal opinion concerning the ORV Plan. Mr. Glass replied the agency had requested an opinion through a review of the three cases he had mentioned earlier. The General Counsel of the Forest Service will determine whether the Forest Service is in compliance in its ORV Plan with the Executive Orders. This opinion should be rendered within a month.

Mr. Mackey asked if the three alternatives noted in the "Summary of Contents" of the March 14th meeting would be within the Forest Service Plan. Mr. Glass replied in the affirmative and noted that the Forest Service feels some of the suggestions and alternatives are good ones, especially those relating to seasonal use, parallel trail systems, etc. Adding these to the Plan, however, would entail an amendment to the EIS and the new alternatives adopted through additional public involvement and the official process. Mr. Mackey asked if the Forest Service would actually go forward with amendments to the EIS and the Plan. Mr. Glass replied this would be up to users themselves. The present Plan is a legal document but it can be "opened up" by request for addenda to it.

Mr. Ryan said he was now hearing that the Forest Service would listen to possibilities for amendment to its Plan, but during the morning's report he had thought he had heard that the Forest Service would proceed regardless on trail improvement. Mr. Glass explained that the Forest Service would proceed with the funding for the trail improvement of the Mad River and Blue Creek areas. No firm commitments have been made by the Forest Service on any of the alternatives but they would be considered as it is the Forest Service's responsibility to listen to suggestions from the users. However, he said, the Forest Service would like to try out some of the ideas proposed prior to future funding requests. Mr. Glass felt he knew the position of the Committee and it is therefore incumbent upon the Forest Service to consider these alternatives.

In reply to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Glass stated that the Forest Service would not be qualifying the current projects in regard to the alternatives -- only future projects. For instance, he said it will not be possible to use the current funding to fund parallel trails but this could be done in the future. Entirely new applications would have to be made. None of the three alternatives mentioned in the "Summary of Contents" of the March 14th meeting would be applicable to those projects

to be considered for funding at the March 26th IAC meeting. Ms. Lorenz asked if number (3) - "Increase monitoring to determine extent of conflict. In addition, some adjustments in seasonal restrictions on use may be employed" - would not be applicable right away. Mr. Glass replied the Forest Service would be increasing its monitoring in the Mad River and Blue Creek areas with its own funds because of the conflict there at the present time. There have been very few complaints in the past and present records do not indicate much conflict. There will be seasonal closures because of the soil conditions.

The other two alternatives -(1) "Development of parallel trail systems", and "Identification of new hiker-only trails" will not be applicable today. Projects submitted for review and consideration of the Committee today involve improvement of existing trails.

Mr. Tveten referred to the Forest Service's Plan and asked if an EIS had been made at that time. Mr. Glass said this had been prepared in 1979 - and an Environmental Assessment (EA) in 1981. Mr. Tveten asked if the Mad River and Blue Creek projects being considered by the Committee had had an independent EIS or were they under the 1981 EA. Mr. Glass replied they were under the 1981 EA. Mr. Tveten asked the Assistant Attorney General, Jeff Lane, if the action before the Committee to fund the projects later today would be legal without requiring a new EIS. Mr. Lane replied to his knowledge it would be correct, that the Forest Service has complied with the requirements through its EA and a state level EIS would not be needed.

Mr. Tveten referred to a letter from the Washington Native Plant Society, Len Gardner, Conservation Co-Chair, Seattle, dated March 19, 1987, to all IAC members; and specifically paragraph 2, page 2:

"Although the EA in question was adopted by the Forest Service and approved by the IAC staff, the Committee has an oversight responsibility."

He pointed out that this statement was incorrect -- the IAC has not adopted the EA document prepared by the Forest Service and does not have to so adopt it. Mr. Lovelady pointed out that staff must ensure that the requirements have been met on all the projects prior to bringing them to the Committee. However, staff does not pass on the quality of the EA; that is the Forest Service's prerogative.

Dr. Scull referred to paragraph 4 of the Summary of Contents:

"The Forest Service will continue to monitor activities in the area of these projects and work to develop approaches which will limit user conflict in the future."

He asked if the Forest Service could assure the IAC that it would continue its monitoring regarding conflicts and guarantee the Committee this service. Mr. Glass replied it was the Forest Service's responsibility to monitor for conflicts. However, in this area (Mad River-Blue Creek)

the Service needs to determine first if there is conflict. Ms. Lorenz asked if the three alternatives being discussed were in priority order; and Mr. Glass replied they were not, that the third one is actually first priority and one that the Forest Service can do immediately.

Mr. Volker asked if there would be any time differential of any significance if the IAC did not fund the projects and the Forest Service funded them instead. Mr. Glass said the Forest Service with its own funds could only temporarily "fix-up" the rough areas on the trails to reduce the environmental impact. The Forest Service trails maintenance budget has increased just recently and it would be possible to do more work on the trails. Because the trails have to compete with other trail projects for maintenance work, it might be that the Mad River and Blue Creek areas would need to await further action following the temporary work. Ms. Lorenz asked if the Forest Service was looking several "years down the road" for the maintenance funding. Mr. Glass called on Mr. Joe Higgins, Forest Service Regional Office, Portland, for response. Mr. Higgins commented on the Forest Service's Trails Capital Program - a five year program. Normally a new project would come in at the end of the five-year program. Unless a very high priority (safety problems, etc.), it takes from three to five years to get a project going.

In response to Mr. Volker, Mr. Glass stated addenda to the Forest Service Plan may come about through public input and a procedure is followed to process these. He clarified for the Committee the process used in setting up the alternatives in the second meeting (March 14th). Discussion had been had on these at the first user meeting (February 21) from user input and thus he felt they were in actuality user alternatives. Mr. Volker was informed that the same people who had attended the second meeting had also attended the first.

Mr. Pinnix noted that the guidelines adopted by the Committee at the November meeting relating to "Recreational Nonhighway Road Project Policy Eligibility" provided for use of some of the funds to reduce conflicts. He felt the Forest Service as it works toward resolving the conflicts should also keep the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Activities (NOVA) Committee advised. He understood that there was increased cost involved in parallel trails but it would be one mechanism to use to resolve conflicts, and it should be considered.

Mr. Mackey suggested the Forest Service and NOVA get together, and that the Interagency Committee send a letter to the Forest Service giving it an official statement from the IAC. He felt the IAC should be on record with the Forest Service through the established guidelines that it is attempting to avoid conflicts, to provide facilities for the various trail users, etc.

Ms. Cox commented on the higher elevation trails, that these did not seem to be mentioned anywhere in the discussions. She felt that alternative number 1 (Development of parallel trail systems) was too broad and should be defined further. Mr. Glass stated these would be new projects in an entirely new system and a site specific analysis would have to be done to address each site. The analysis would be to determine the effects of such parallel trail on the resource.

Ms. Cox reiterated her concern that there was no mention of high altitude areas and that this should be taken into consideration by the Forest Service.

Mr. Glass brought out the fact that the standards for ORV trails adopted by the Forest Service do seem to encourage speed. He said it might be well to review those standards in relation to multiple use trails. Also, he said that all trails in the forest do not have to serve ORVs. Ms. Cox commented on the liability message which is prevalent now. It is necessary to construct and/or build in such a way that there will be some protection from law suits. Mr. Glass said the Forest Service was not too concerned about this unless it had built into the trail a definite hazard. Trails are designated at different levels of difficulty in the Trails Inventory System.

Dr. Scull expressed his concern on the impact of ORVs in high country terrain. That impact is often an adverse one but it could be minimized by properly built trails with protection of the resources. He proposed that the IAC if it approved the two projects (Mad River/Blue Creek) make it binding upon the Forest Service to pursue the conflict issue according to the alternatives which were under discussion. He said the IAC should make it a process that would continue in a very definite manner -- a plan that would proceed into the next year. Also, any additional projects for funding would then need to take these matters into account and address them specifically. Mr. Glass suggested that the IAC should use the term "investigate the possibility of" in reference to alternative number 1 (development of parallel trail systems) since this would require much research and is more costly. Ms. Cox asked if these three alternatives were what the groups had come up with or how were they picked out? Mr. Glass stated there had been 14 alternatives. He did not want to say only three were the most important, only that the three were supported by both the hikers and the motorcyclists present.

Mr. Pinnix suggested that the IAC recommend that the Forest Service continue to pursue constructive solutions with all of the user groups using the alternatives listing, and perhaps they could come up with others. He felt the approach to resolution of conflicts was going well at this point. Dr. Scull agreed and proposed that the IAC express a willingness to fund planning projects of this type if that funding is necessary to encourage fruition.

Mr. Ryan discussed parallel trails, noting that he realized it was expensive to construct these but he did not want them excluded from consideration for that reason alone. It might be the most appropriate solution not only for the trail users but for the environment.

In response to Mr. Jones' question, Mr. Glass stated the Forest Service in conjunction with users and engineering personnel set the standards for trails.

Mr. Tveten expressed his support of Dr. Scull's proposal. He felt a planning document would be worthwhile, working with the Forest Service, the hikers, the ORV recreationists, etc. It should be possible to build on the alternatives that have been presented and see if there isn't a solution that can be developed which would provide for everyone. At the same time, it could be learned to what extent they will compromise. IAC ought to be a part of this task also.

No motion was made by the Committee. Mr. Tveten suggested the public be asked for input; the Chair and members agreed. Mr. Glass remarked that if the Committee did make a recommendation it ensure that the Forest Service is not tied to just the three alternatives. He wanted it understood that the Service is going to do what it can to resolve conflicts.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Mr. Jim Eychaner, Executive Director, Washington Trails Association:

(1) The Washington Trails Association is very concerned with the Forest Service following Executive Order 11644, and is pursuing administrative avenues to ensure compliance.

(2) Interested in working with the Forest Service and the ORV recreationists to resolve conflicts, but are getting different opinions on what the Executive Order means and how it should be interpreted.

(3) Some of the alternatives were generated by WTA -- the proposed IAC funded hiker/biker study was one.

(4) WTA feels it is exhausting its channels and may go to court to question the Forest Service's compliance with the Executive Order.

Mr. Ira Spring, citizen:

(1) Did not feel it was right for the IAC to fund projects where there is conflict.

(2) Further, the "quarrel" is between the Forest Service and the hikers - thus, IAC should not be the agency to make the decision on what should be done to resolve conflict.

(3) Referred to cover letter of Gary Heath (for Donald H. Smith, Forest Supervisor, Wenatchee National Forest) dated March 17, 1987, paragraph three,

"We do not believe there are severe user conflicts in the Mad River area, but will increase our monitoring activities to ensure that is the case. We have calculated use of the area in 1986 to be 67 percent trailbikes, 21 percent hikers, and 12 percent horse users."

"Most of the hiking use presently occurs prior to July 15 when seasonal restrictions are lifted to allow trailbike use."

(4) Stated hikers are willing to use these areas and that they have been using the trails longer than the bikers. Motorcycles are now "chasing them away".

(5) Unless the Forest Service is willing to work out compromise and work toward a solution, the matter will go to court.

(6) Hikers are willing to go through the proper channels to see changes made, and when the Forest Plan is completed, it will then be challenged. Action may go through to the Federal Courts before it is resolved.

Mr. Glass felt the WTA brochures on trails evidenced a "hiker only" concept. Mr. Spring replied the brochures specify "hiker-horse" trails and that it is the off-road vehicles they wish to be free from.

Michael Sacha, Northwest Motorcycle Association (Steilacoom):

(1) A meeting set for November 19th between the two groups had been cancelled. It was felt the Forest Service should call a meeting and document it, that the Nov. 19th meeting would have been bias toward the ORV interest.

(2) Felt the meetings of February 21 and March 14 had been beneficial.

(3) Noted that the IAC is the only agency off-road vehicle recreationists can go to for funding assistance; the Forest Service has not spent much money on ORV trails.

(4) If funds are cut-off from the IAC, the Forest Service will then have to fill that void and expend some of its own funds for off-road vehicle trails.

Mr. Jones asked for explanation of the percentages cited in the Forest Service letter of March 17th. Mr. Glass stated for the Mad River area this was the amount of use that took place in 1986. Dr. Scull asked if bikers would be willing to have a shortened season. Mr. Sacha replied it was difficult for him to discuss only the Mad River in response to this question. In actuality there are over 9,000 miles of trails in the forests, and of that ORV recreationists have use of 1,700. He stated, however, that his Association was opposed to a shortened season in the Mad River area. It should not be necessary to reduce trail mileage of ORV recreationists. Sometimes only eight weeks is allowed for bikers to use that area.

Mr. Pinnix referred to the listing of alternatives, specifically

"K. Test the parallel trail idea on the Cottonwood Myrtle Lake route."

He asked why bikers had not supported this alternative. Mr. Sacha replied there was a problem of whether that was an appropriate test area. It is used by horsemen and hikers, and conflict was in that area. Further, it would be focusing on a very small part of the state. Mr. Sacha felt there are people who do not want ORV recreationists in the woods and that parallel trails would not help that situation.

Ms. Cox said if there is concern that ORV recreationists don't have enough time to bike in the high countries, they do have opportunities in the lower lands.

Mr. Glass commented on the impact on resources in the Fall. The impact on wet lands is severe from horse users and hikers. In the Spring horses are restricted, but not in the Fall. The Mad River trails are only open in the Spring for hikers. If the restriction went to the Fall season, then the Forest Service would be restricting use by youngsters who use their horses in that area.

At the conclusion of testimony, Mr. Glass was asked by the Chair for agenda item report III. C. 2, Forest Service Plan Comments.

III. C. 2. FOREST SERVICE COMMENTS: Mr. Glass noted the following:

(1) There are 2,550 miles of trail system in the Wenatchee National Forest. Washington's use of this area ranks very high in the National Forest System throughout the United States.

(2) Forest Service is continually trying to coordinate its resource activities. Obtain public input. Recently had around 4,700 responses concerning the Forest Plan...or, 40,000 specific comments.

(3) Tracking system for these responses is available for use if it is necessary to pull out any one comment or suggestion.

(4) Of the 4,700 comments there were 1,387 comments concerning trail use and management. Main comment was "do not reduce trail mileage".

(5) Because of timber roads, Forest Service may lose 52 miles of trail; however, Forest Service may replace those elsewhere.

(6) A significant number of comments related to horse and ORV use. Also biking through clear cut areas.

(7) There were 2,929 comments concerning the ORV issue. It therefore received the most comments of any issue and the majority were against ORVs in the forest areas.

(8) Many were opposed to ORV use of trails which lead into the wilderness areas. Service has noted its requirements through Executive Order and it recognizes that the issue of ORVs and trail use is a very emotional one.

(9) Hiking areas were another subject matter. Horses are allowed in certain of these areas. 301 comments were received concerning hiking only; and additional 135 comments supported specific areas. There were 26 against hiking areas.

(10) The comments and response indicates keen interest in the forests for recreation and Forest Service management of the trails.

(11) Now have the Washington Trails Association "campaign" and recognize their needs as well as the other recreationists.

(12) The Forest Service held over sixty (60) meetings with the general public, and interest in the Plan was generated.

(13) Glass Staff Paper:

a. The public is deeply divided on the roadless areas and their use. Felt that most of the trail users would like to see the roadless areas remain roadless, or if they are roaded, that these roads be closed after the timber is harvested.

b. The Forest Service must decide how much motorized trail use it should provide, where it may occur, and where it may be needed in the future.

c. Approaches selected may set a precedent on any other National Forest because the Wenatchee National Forest provides more ORV use trails than any other national forest in the system.

d. 2,550 miles of trail; one-half of these are informally

designated as wilderness and are closed to any motorized use. The other 1,239 miles are outside of the wilderness areas and only 793 miles are open to motorized use.

e. Maintenance budget for this large system of trails is very substantial. Look to the IAC to assist in funding and provide better opportunities for ORVs. ORV recreationists are very complimentary of the Forest Service program and funding from the IAC.

f. During passage of the 1984 Wilderness Act, wilderness boundaries were adjusted on the Naches and Chelan Forests to accommodate trails where ORV use had been permitted in the past. Gives an indication of how Congress feels about ORV recreation.

g. Hikers favor reduction of ORV use of the trails. They are concerned about their personal safety, noise, and effect on the environment.

At the conclusion of Mr. Glass's remarks, Mr. Tveten asked if the Executive Orders had the force of law. Mr. Higgins replied it does have in that these are incorporated into the regulations of the Forest Service and those regulations must be followed since they become a "force of law". Mr. Tveten stated there didn't seem to be any real definition of what constitutes minor conflict, what is moderate conflict, and what is considered major conflict. He asked if the Forest Service had made these definitions otherwise he felt the Service might have this taken out of their hands and the courts would be doing it for them. Mr. Glass replied these are defined in the Forest Service Plan as "high, medium, or low" conflict -- but this is only in the Wenatchee Forest Service area. He agreed perhaps a national definition of conflict might be required.

Mr. Mackey gleaned from Mr. Glass's report that if the IAC did not fund the Mad River and Blue Creek projects, the Forest Service would be able to do so in about three to five years. He asked if the Forest Service in the interim would bar ORV use in the area. Mr. Glass stated the Service would only stop ORV use if there were to be an unacceptable resource impact. However, in that case it would be necessary to ban use of the trail by all users. Whether hikers would be restricted would depend upon environmental impact. He also noted that the Forest Service could restrict use if conflict cannot be resolved between the users. He hoped, however, that the controversy would not become that serious.

In reply to Ms. Cox's inquiry, Mr. Glass stated he had not yet had opportunity to discuss with the Colorado Forest Service the mediation team they had used. However, a mediation group was hired to talk to the management group of the Wenatchee National Forest together with private citizens involved in the Sandy Butte area. It was decided it was the Forest Service's responsibility to mediate the problems, and that the institute approach would have been expensive.

Dr. Scull asked what would happen if the IAC funded the projects and then a court litigation proceeded to stop the ORV useage of the trails. Mr. Lane (Asst. Atty. General) replied that the IAC process is contractual and there are some conditions imposed in the contract on the recipient of the funds. He cited two provisions in the current contract:

- (1) Time frame - a project can be terminated if it does not follow completion time frame.

- (2) Obvious impediments....If it appears that the project will not be completed on time then it can be terminated.

Mr. Lane surmised the court would probably issue a preliminary injunction temporarily restricting the Forest Service and directing them not to proceed with projects pending the outcome of the litigation. This would then affect termination of the project cited in the appropriate project clause. The IAC contract agreement with the Forest Service could be worded to protect the funding. He felt this was "new ground" and something the agency through the A.G. would need to look at.

Mr. Spring stated that Senator Dan Evans was concerned about the contract between the Forest Service and the IAC and had asked his Washington, D.C. office to look into it. Senator Evans was informed the contract was really a "memorandum of agreement" and there would be no obligation for return of monies to the IAC if a trail was not proposed for IAC use. Mr. Lane asked that the Committee forget the terms that he had previously mentioned. He pointed out that the IAC contract with the Forest Service is a contract for reimbursement - therefore, if the Forest Service did not expend the funds, there would not be an outlet to recover any funds. If the Forest Service did not go ahead with the project, at some point in time the IAC could execute a termination. He also pointed out there was no contract in place for either of the projects being discussed.

There followed discussion on the IAC-ORV-Forest Service contracts. Mr. Lane felt there should be a clause in the contract for return of the monies to the IAC if the project did not evolve. Mr. Tveten remarked this would give a lot of power to an official of the state. Mr. Webster pointed out there is a clause in the traditional grant-in-aid funding projects which states if a project is stopped or no longer viable, there must be lands provided of equal or better recreation opportunity in place thereof.

In response to Mr. Mackey, Mr. Lovelady reviewed the Mad River Trail project funded in 1979 (ORV 79-34P), which had provided planning monies; in 1983, Proj. ORV 83-5P, followed through on the planning phase providing information regarding site engineering, etc. He stated the same situation applied to the Blue Creek project. Both have completed the first two phases and now are going into redevelopment.

Mike Sacha stated when the Washington Trails Association (WTA) published its brochures, his Association felt they were forcing conflict because they did not mention ORV areas as well as hiking areas. He said he had personally stopped on the trail to talk to hikers and ask them about ORV-hiker use of the trails. It was his feeling most of the conflict originated from the WTA publication and the omission of ORV trails information. In reply, Mr. Ira Spring stated he felt the WTA brochure did talk about ORV conflicts. Mr. Spring also responded to Mr. Glass's report as follows:

- (1) Congressman Chandler has stated publicly that during the entire time the Wilderness Bill of 1984 was being considered not once did it come up that because an area wasn't in the wilderness meant that there could be

- multiple use outside of it.
- (2) In speaking of trails which would be "lost" as pointed out by Mr. Glass, felt it should be recognized that hikers feel trails are "lost" when a road cuts through the trail -- there is partial loss of that trail.
 - (3) Felt there were 900 miles of Wenatchee Forest trails which are in jeopardy from being cut by roads.
 - (4) The 792 miles of motorized trail would leave 500 miles of non-motorized trail outside of the wilderness area.
 - (5) When trails were opened for motorized use it was invariably those trails which are used by average or beginner hikers and their families.
 - (6) Except for a few nature trails, the trails that are not available to motorized recreationists are such difficult trails they are hardly available to hikers.

At this point, the Chair called for presentation of the projects.

III. D. NOVA OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS: Mr. Lane advised the Committee he had checked on the EA and EIS questions raised by members. The Committee can require the sponsor of a project receiving funds to comply with SEPA as a condition of the grant.

Projects considered:

ORV 86-09D, USFS Wenatchee, Entiat, Blue Creek Trail Redevelop. \$53,907
ORV 86-10D, USFS Wenatchee, Entiat, Mad River Trail Redevelop. \$63,612

Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, dated March 26, 1987, concerning the above cited projects pointing out the following:

(1) Deferral of the projects by the IAC was made in consideration of concerns expressed by representatives of the hiking community during the November 6, 1987 IAC meeting. Committee had suggested a meeting of those concerned with the trails (hikers, ORV recreationists, and Forest Service). These were held Feb. 21 and March 14.

(2) Projects are located in a motorized recreation area. Three separate Forest Service plans support a continuation of the current management direction.

(3) Funding is sought to halt environmental damage and bring the multipurpose paths up to current specifications.

Ms. Cox referred to the third paragraph of the staff memo in which three Forest Service plans were mentioned (Wenatchee National Forest Plan, Wenatchee National Forest Trail Plan, and the Mad River-Chiwawa Area Plan). She asked when these plans had been completed. Mr. Lovelady replied the first plan (Wenatchee National Forest Plan) even though not concluded each alternative would continue the use of the area under its current system. Mr. Spring felt there had been a plan which turned the area into a non-motorized area. At this point Mr. Glass explained there had been an EIS in 1977, and the first Trail Plan had been developed in 1980. The third plan, Mad River-Chiwawa had been completed in 1982. Ms. Cox stated she was not comfortable using for determination a plan approved in 1977. This was ten years ago and prior to the heavy use of ORV's. She stated this was one reason she could not support the funding

recommendation. She asked the date that the NOVA Committee had discussed these projects. Mr. Lovelady replied this was in October of 1986 when the projects were considered for presentation at the November 1986 meeting. Since then they expressed no desire to reconsider the projects having already reviewed and approved them. Ms. Cox stated the timing of the plans and the timing of the NOVA review were fairly significant to her.

Mr. Volker brought out that the Department of Game in 1981 reviewed the Mad River Trail Plan and at that time a substantial report had been presented to the Forest Service. The recommendation by the Department of Game was to oppose the plan at that time because in several instances the environmental impact (particularly on wildlife) had not been adequately addressed. He read a portion of the letter relating to the Department of Game's opposition. He advised that the Department of Game has re-reviewed the projects and the trail plan and the position is the same as in 1981. When a vote is taken on the two projects being considered, the Department of Game will oppose funding them.

Mr. Tveten asked for clarification. It was his understanding that the Department of Game is opposed to ORV use in the entire forest area, and specifically is addressing the Mad River and Blue Creek areas at this time. However, in 1981 the Forest Service Plan referenced where ORV use was taking place. Even if the Committee were to fund the projects through the alternatives and conflict resolution, was the Game Department going on record as against ORV use there? Mr. Volker replied there are many problems on impact to wildlife in the two particular projects under discussion. He was not discussing the entire Wenatchee Forest area.

Mr. Pinnix noted there were within the projects funds for the Department of Game to do studies. He asked for an explanation. Mr. Volker stated that when the projects were initially presented prior to October, at that time the Regional III staff who reviewed them had no other alternative but to look into the impact on wildlife. Subsequent to that time the IAC approved funding of a statewide review of wildlife impact. This is now underway and will be in place for the next two years. If this review had been completed the Department of Game would not have to oppose the projects.

Mr. Lovelady was dismayed to hear opposition from the Department of Game. He said he had copies of documents from the Department of Game on these two projects recommending approval contingent upon funding of the wildlife assessment. Mr. Volker said he was aware of this and it was so stated in each application; however, this was prior to the funding of the overall statewide study which will give the basis on which the Game Department regions can react to the projects. Now that the study is underway, the Game Department has no other alternative than to oppose the projects at this juncture.

Mr. Wilder stated it was difficult to relate to the time frame which had just been discussed. He felt staff recommendations were responsible ones based upon information accumulated for some time. There had been various meetings: NOVA review, an IAC meeting "review", and meetings concerning conflicts which had led to the reports heard today. He stressed this was the best information staff has and that the sponsor has met every requirement necessary for funding. He stated he could not recommend against

the projects.

Mr. Ryan felt there had been significant efforts made to reduce conflicts. The Committee now has three alternatives which could move it in the direction of taking care of those conflicts. However, he felt the projects do not move in that direction and he would be uncomfortable in funding them until they could fit into the concepts the Committee has discussed.

Mr. Mackey assumed that both of the projects included Game Department studies and that those studies were completed and in favor of each project. Mr. Lovelady stated this was not the case. If the projects are approved money will be made available to the Department of Game so that they can work with the Forest Service in a study. Ms. Lorenz stated it was her understanding that Game Department did not need these funds because of the statewide study it is now under obligation to make. Mr. Lovelady said it was staff's understanding the Department of Game would reconsider the projects and that IAC would cooperate with them in their studies. Mr. Mackey asked if Mr. Volker agreed with this statement. Mr. Volker replied it was the understanding in July of 1986 that the projects could be studied after they were funded. However, now that the Department of Game is funding an overall statewide study it is not possible for the agency to approve the projects. The Department feels it would rather "back off" its approval until the overall study is completed.

Mr. Tveten asked if the overall statewide study would be completed by November 1987 when projects would be before the Committee for consideration of funding. Mr. Volker replied the study would not be completed until sometime in 1988. Ms. Lorenz and Mr. Tveten questioned whether projects that have already been funded could still proceed. Mr. Volker replied in the affirmative, that only new projects would be affected by the Game Department's overall statewide study.

Mr. Pinnix referred to Page 38-E of the IAC Minutes of November 6-7, 1987, which alluded to the Game Department's Assessment Process. He read a portion of the items in the Assessment listing. Mr. Wilder asked if everyone was aware of the process of project applications through the Department of Game. (Item d. Reasonable funding for each assessment to allow specific project proposals to be completely evaluated by the Department of Game as part of the approved contract.) The Department of Game is reviewing its current assessment process and meanwhile the current process is to be kept in place until it is changed.

Ms. Lorenz felt that the Department of Game should have notified the IAC prior to its meeting that they would be opposing the two projects. Mr. Volker said this had just arisen in the last few days and there had not been time to do so.

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

THE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE TWO PROJECTS AS PER THE MOTION IN THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION:

WHEREAS, PROJECT 86-09D (BLUE CREEK TRAIL) AND 86-10D (MAD RIVER TRAIL) HAVE UNDERGONE APPROPRIATE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS REVIEW, AND

WHEREAS, CURRENT WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST PLANS CALL FOR THE AREA OF THESE PROJECTS TO REMAIN AVAILABLE FOR MOTORIZED RECREATIONAL USES, AND

WHEREAS, BOTH OF THE TRAILS EMBODIED IN THESE PROJECT PROPOSALS ARE IN NEED OF REHABILITATION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THESE PROJECTS BE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING AS FOLLOWS:

BLUE CREEK TRAIL REDEVELOPMENT	86-09D	\$ 53,907
MAD RIVER TRAIL REDEVELOPMENT	86-10D	63,612

Mr. Pinnix suggested that the Committee also consider a motion along the lines of Dr. Scull's discussion earlier in the meeting. The Forest Service and user groups have been working to resolve conflicts and the approval of the projects by the Committee should not be considered as a signal for this type of activity to cease. They should be encouraged to keep on with resolution of conflicts through meetings with the Forest Service and through the Forest Service process. Mr. Tveten assumed that since there were funds of \$2,770 and \$1,822 in the projects respectively for Game Department studies, these studies would be carried on. Mr. Volker replied in the affirmative.

Dr. Scull stated he was in favor of the projects for resource protection. They will improve the trails and minimize damage. He was concerned that the two projects did not deal with the conflict resolution in any effective way. Also, the Department of Game's assessment and statewide study were now "problems". Further, he noted the possibility of litigation proceedings. He therefore suggested that he would like an amendment to the motion which would encourage all groups to continue their efforts to seek solutions to the user conflicts, taking into account the alternatives discussed and brought out at the two meetings - particularly parallel trails.

MR. SCULL AMENDED THE MOTION TO CONDITIONALLY GRANT THAT THE FOREST SERVICE PROCEED WITH MITIGATION OF USER CONFLICTS ACCORDING TO THE FOREST SERVICE PLANS AND ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED IN THE MEETING.

MS. LORENZ SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

Mr. Lane said it was highly questionable that such a condition would be upheld because it was not in the Committee's authority to make it. He said the Committee could encourage the Service to do this, but not make it a condition. The Committee has been presented with an eligible project (or projects) and is attempting to decide how it compares among other eligible projects. Nowhere in the statute does it give the Committee authority to establish that kind of condition on a grant. The Committee could say it encourages the Forest Service to continue with its conflict resolution techniques.

Mr. Glass stated the Forest Service has an agreement now with the IAC and is directed to resolve conflict when and where possible. The conditions do not, he said, need to be in the motion. He appreciated the advice of the legal counsel and agreed with his concept. He pointed out that the trail will be continued for ORV use whether or not it is approved by the IAC. Conflicts will also be looked into though it is a deeply emotional issue. It is the responsibility of the Forest Service not the IAC to resolve these issues. If the IAC does not fund the project, he reiterated, the Forest Service would fund it eventually.

AT THIS POINT, MR. PINNIX AMENDED THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE FOREST SERVICE CONTINUE ITS EFFORTS TO SEEK SOLUTIONS TO USER CONFLICTS IN THE MAD RIVER AND BLUE CREEK AREAS WHICH WOULD PROVIDE FOR THE LEGITIMATE NEEDS OF BOTH NONMOTORIZED AND MOTORIZED RECREATIONAL USERS.

(No question having been called on the amendment to the motion by Dr. Scull (page 34), it was considered dead.)

The Chair called for comments from the audience:

Jim Eychaner, Washington Trails Association, thanked Mr. Glass for advising WTA that there could be amendments to the Forest Plan. He was not aware of this procedure.

Louise Marshall, President, WTA: Approved of the amendment.

Ira Spring: Took exception to some of the Forest Service report dealing with moderate and high conflict. How do you determine this? The Mad River is listed as moderate, yet he felt it was critical.

The Chair suggested he meet with the Forest Service for discussion.

QUESTION ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Pinnix stated he would be looking for a continuation of good faith efforts on the part of the Forest Service and the user groups. He would also be observing whether the Forest Service is attempting to do its job as a responsible landowner and the user groups as responsible recreationists. He, as a member of the Committee, wanted to see a demonstration of what had been accomplished in resolving conflicts on any future projects. Mr. Ryan endorsed Mr. Pinnix's comments.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO FUND THE MAD RIVER AND BLUE CREEK PROJECTS (PAGE-33-34). THE MAJORITY VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION; MR. GEORGE VOLKER, DEPARTMENT OF GAME, VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE.

At 3:20 p.m., the Committee recessed and reconvened at 3:35 p.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS A. NOVA NONHIGHWAY ROAD VEHICLE'S PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. Lovelady distributed a revised resume for the Department of Game's Similkameen Primitive Trail Project, \$87,000 nonhighway funding requested. Previous project cost had been \$200,000 prior to changes. Attachment 1 to the memorandum was corrected for that project and resume color noted. Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "1987 Nonhighway Road Project Considerations" and the attached listing by order of presentation (PAGE 37-A, THESE MINUTES). Slides were shown of each project.

#N-86-2D

Dr. Scull commented on the Icewater Creek project stating it was an excellent idea and in the correct spirit of easing user conflicts. Campgrounds would be used for all users and there would be no segregation according to Mr. Lovelady. Mr. Pinnix asked what happened to the money taken in from fees to use this site. Mr. Glass replied that the Forest Service returns these funds to the unit which collects them through its bookkeeping procedure.

Yakima County Parks Dept., Greenway Lakes Trail Development Project, #N-86-43D: Mr. Tveten asked what combination made this particular project eligible for the new nonhighway funding program. Mr. Dovel replied it qualified under the new program due mainly by its use for fishing access. In response to Mr. Tveten's other questions, Mr. Dovel said an explanation would be coming later from staff as to funding qualifications and eligibility.

Department of Game, Similkameen Primitive Trail, N-87-01A: Mr. Jones asked why the project had been reduced from \$200,000 to \$87,000. He was informed that the PUD would be able to purchase the first part of the trail, and that the Department of Game would only need to purchase the other portion at \$87,000. Later the Department of Game feels it can work out with the PUD an arrangement to use their portion of the trail for recreation by easement.

Nonhighway Projects Program Explanation: Mr. Lovelady referred to a flip-chart demonstration to explain the challenges in the new nonhighway projects program. Legislation is extremely complicated and requires three types of eligibilities:

1. Sponsor eligible.
2. Access eligible.
3. Project eligible.

Sponsors are: Counties, Municipalities, Tribes,
Federal agencies, and State agencies

Nonhighway:

Access - public agency/owner
No Motor Vehicle SS in it
City/co owner?

Supporting role - the recreational facility should support the nonhighway road.

(continued next page)

1987 NOVA PROJECTS
(PROPOSED)

NONHIGHWAY ROAD/OFF-ROAD VEHICLE COMBINED FUNDING

<u>Proj. No.</u>	<u>Sponsor Name</u>	<u>Proj. Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
86-2D	Wenatchee National Forest Cle Elum R.D.	Icewater (Taneum)	\$ 107,023
86-5D	Wenatchee National Forest Supervisor's Office	Goose Creek Campground	291,698

NONHIGHWAY ROAD FUNDING

N-86-43D	Yakima County Parks	Greenway Trail Develop.	143,873
N-86-01A	Department of Game	Similkameen Trail Right-of-Way Acq.	87,000

TOTAL \$ 629,594

Project - Day-use
Campground
Trail - Trailhead
Horse Camp

Following Mr. Lovelady's presentation, Mr. Tveten asked how the projects before the Committee fit into the guidelines. Mr. Lovelady said they were 100% in line. He gave for an example the Yakima County Parks project: It has access by a nonhighway road; no motor vehicle funds are in it; and the owner is the Yakima Greenway Foundation. That foundation will give control and maintenance of that road over to the Department of Game. There had to be a determination if the access road would support the facility or whether the facility would support the access road. It was determined that the facility would support the access road - that is, the road will continue to exist and the public will continue to use it to get to the river for fishing or general walking along the dike in the area.

Mr. Pinnix asked for a site plan to be shown. Mr. Dovel reran the slides indicating the locations questioned.

The Chair recognized Mark Smiley, Yakima Greenway Foundation's Executive Director. Mr. Smiley corrected Mr. Dovel stating the slide had indicated picnic sites and not picnic shelters. Mr. Pinnix felt the project was in a fairly high highway-accessible area and he questioned whether it could be considered a "nonhighway project". Mr. Dovel replied it was not possible to get off that highway into the area shown. The highway is a freeway and does not have any access to the site. Mr. Pinnix supported the Yakima Greenway Foundation and its project, but he wanted to ensure that the Committee would be funding the right kind of project for nonhighway funds. He asked if the NOVA Committee had reviewed the project. Mr. Dovel stated NOVA had reviewed it and come to a consensus that the project did fit into the proper category of "nonhighway". It is in a remote setting. Even though located close to a city, the NOVA Committee felt it was an "exception to the rule". Mr. Pinnix said he needed to know the development plan and secondly, he still felt it would be accessible from the highways nearby.

Mr. Smiley asked to re-review slides with the Committee, pointing out that the road parallel to it was an interstate freeway and does not allow any access to the site. There is an underpass which allows access to the nonhighway road leading into the site. Therefore, access comes only by traveling over a nonhighway road. Mr. Smiley said the specifics of the project such as parking and restrooms were not shown and it was unfortunate that he did not have them for the Committee to view in a slide. Ms. Lorenz asked about flooding and was informed there is a 100 Year Flood Plan in existence; designed to protect major elements in the project will be the dike which is in existence. Mr. Tveten stated it was possible to access the 88 acres described by Mr. Smiley from highway accesses at the north and south. Mr. Smiley described how the site could be reached in response to Mr. Tveten's questions.

Mr. Pinnix asked how many nonhighway projects had been reviewed and evaluated by staff. Mr. Lovelady and Mr. Dovel replied there had been two

others, but they were determined to be ineligible.

Mr. Wilder referred to Mr. Lovelady's demonstration and explanation of the new program, pointing out that the staff did need Committee input; that the program required criteria such as what is a nonhighway road, how far does it need to go to a site to be considered, etc. Mr. Lovelady said people would continue to use the road whether or not it is funded and it did seem therefore that the facility would support the road.

Mr. Pinnix was perplexed that the project would be considered as "non-highway". His problem he said was in regard to the law and the guidelines the Committee had recently approved. It seemed to him there were different categories with which to work and that the program was literally very different from those the Committee had dealt with in the past. He referred to the Department of Natural Resources' (DNR) access roads. It has always been said that these are not eligible for nonhighway funds and this particular project is being considered as eligible by staff of the IAC. He felt it was a "terrific strain" on the approved guidelines. Though the project was a good one, he did not wish to set a pattern for the future, and the project did not appear to him to be in the spirit of the approved guidelines.

Mr. Lovelady said if the Committee did not feel the project met the approved guidelines, then staff should be so advised. Mr. Wilder agreed and also pointed out that the road is a primitive road, yet used by recreationists to get to a valid site.

Mr. Pinnix referred to the minutes of November 6-7, 1986 page 35, paragraph five, Project Eligibility - 1.

"Mr. Pinnix suggested deleting "or by a public highway".....
Mr. Pinnix explained to Mr. Wayland why it was being deleted:
The definition of the Attorney General states that a nonhighway road facility must somehow be associated with a nonhighway road. An earlier A.G. opinion directed that many of these projects need to have as a common element that they are related to a nonhighway road. Therefore, it is necessary to strike "or by a public highway". Mr. Ryan asked that a consensus be reached at the end of each item discussion."

His idea at the time, he said, was to remove the assumption that these areas would be accessible by a public highway. It seemed to him that the project being considered was accessible by a public highway and therefore not within the guidelines.

Mr. Smiley felt the Committee was working with two errors: 1. There is no existing recreational facility on the site; and 2. there is no existing trail on the site. It is a nonhighway road and is the only road to the site. He did not feel it was fair to say there was other access available because there is not. The purpose of the project is to open up the area for recreation. Trails, restroom, etc., do not now exist.

John Svendsen, NOVA Committee Member, stated that the NOVA Committee as well as staff of the IAC need guidelines from the Committee as to length of roads leading into these areas, as well as other criteria as discussed. He asked how do you arrive at eligibility for nonhighway road projects? Louise Marshall, Washington Trails Association, mentioned the Skookum Flats Trail area and others which eventually lead into highways. These are not eligible for nonhighway funds yet they do go into the backcountry areas. Mr. Wilder said the staff had looked at this project carefully and cautiously, and it was felt the road was in existence for the user and not just for the facility. Staff has, however, never considered the length of a road in establishing eligibility. Mr. Ryan stated there should be some sort of screening of the projects to meet the eligibility. He felt that a campground facility ten miles into the forest and on a nonhighway road should have a chance for nonhighway road funding.

Mr. Ira Spring noted that in the projects being considered and discussed, there is a high priority for use; the trails are needed; in one a railroad right-of-way may be lost if the Committee doesn't act. He mentioned the need for funds for trailheads and the importance of a funding program. He was not sure whether nonhighway funds should be used in some of these projects, but commented on the need for them.

Mr. John Edwards, Department of Natural Resources, asked if the Department of Game were to manage a project, would it be necessary for recreationists to have a Department of Game "sticker" for use of the facility and nonhighway road? Mr. Volker replied this was no longer the case and the general public could use the Game areas without a Game "sticker". He felt in the instance of the project under discussion, such would not be necessary. Mr. Ryan asked if Mr. Pinnix would have a problem with the funding of projects by the Committee if they were funded as marginally eligible, and then proceed with funding for future projects mandating that these meet the standards (guidelines) set by the Committee. Mr. Pinnix replied he would not; that it was necessary to get the projects done. He felt the Committee would soon be faced with possible funding for larger projects of this nature, and it will need to decide how to differentiate eligibility in each case. He felt the Committee could, therefore, fund the project, but wanted to ensure that the staff would develop criteria for the Committee in reviewing nonhighway projects. He noted the fund was unique and intended for a different purpose than projects the Committee had heretofore reviewed for funding. He said he was prepared to vote for the project.

Mr. Larry Yount, Grant County Sheriff's Office - and Member of NOVA, asked the legal definition of a nonhighway road. Mr. Lovelady did not feel this was germane at the moment; however, Jeff Lane responded stating a nonhighway road can be a public road and a license would be required. But, some nonhighway roads will require a license and some will not. Mr. Tveten asked if one could turn into a local drag strip used for motorcycles, and Mr. Lane replied this would not legally be termed a nonhighway road. It would still be a public highway, but each case would be different and require staff's review. Mr. Lovelady stated the administering agency would have the prerogative of determining the type of vehicles which would be allowed on the nonhighway road.

Mr. Lane suggested in setting criteria that staff consider the types of vehicles that will be allowed on the nonhighway roads in specific projects. Mr. Tveten spoke in favor of the Yakima County Project stating it would benefit the public in that area. He questioned the Game Department's Similkameen Project. Mr. Lovelady said this project's nonhighway road intersected an abandoned railroad right-of-way. Mr. Volker referred to the resume stating the trail is on railroad land and the proposal is to extend the trail, with operation and maintenance to be funded from other Game Department sources. The Department of Game has three existing river access sites that are not maintained by motor vehicle funds. The main purpose is stream bank fishing.

Mr. Walter H. Olsen, Tenino, Washington: Mr. Olsen was recognized by the Chair, noting the following:

(1) Represent the Washington State Rails to Trails Conservancy and 87,500 members of the various outdoor user groups and 6,000 members of the Washington State Horsemen.

(2) Is Region 6 Coordinator of the National Association of Competitive Mounted Orienting with 1,584 members in the State of Washington.

(3) Referred to the railroad system. In 1920 U.S. had almost 260,000 miles of track in rail service. Now an average of 3,000 to 4,000 is being abandoned per year. By year 2000 it is expected to reach 100,000 miles.

(4) Corridors are rapidly disappearing. Could be used for trails (conservation, recreation, cultural interpretation and historical preservation) as well as access to rivers and public lands for camping, hunting and fishing.

(5) Referred to the President's Commission Report and the statements that there are thousands of miles of abandoned rail lines which could be used for trails.

(6) Felt trails drew tourists to areas and thus increased economy.

(7) Groups represented by Mr. Olsen were in favor of the Department of Game's plans to acquire this abandoned railroad line.

Ruth Ittner, Pedestrian Member of NOVA, stated she had visited the Yakima project and had met with those involved in it. She actually walked the trail and was impressed with the site. Funding will enable removal of fencing and provide access for recreationists. Felt it was wise to turn this back into an "urban wilderness" for the people.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING OF THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS AS FOLLOWS:

86-2D Wenatchee Natl. Forest Cle Elum R.D.	Icewater (Taneum)	\$ 107,203
86-5D Wenatchee Natl. Forest Supervisor's Office	Goose Creek Campground	291,698
N-86-43D Yakima County Parks	Greenway Trail Devel.	143,873
N-87-01A Game Department	Similkameen Trail (Right-of-Way Acq.)	87,000
TOTAL		\$ 629,594

AND THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE SPONSOR AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. THE MAJORITY VOTED IN FAVOR; MR. VOLKER ABSTAINED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Mackey suggested that the staff fine line the criteria for nonhighway and off-road vehicle projects. The Chair asked staff and the NOVA Committee members to review the criteria and come up with specific guidelines for these projects which the Committee can use in considering them for funding.

IV. C. PARTICIPATION GRANT-IN-AID MANUALS MODIFICATIONS: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "IAC Participation Manual Modifications", which proposed various changes to Manuals Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7. He explained that the proposed changes fell into three basic categories -- editorial, minor procedural changes, and additional procedure concerning concessions/leasing requirements on approved projects. Ms. Cox stated since the Committee had had time to review this material prior to the meeting, it would not be necessary to listen to a complete report. She asked if any member of the Committee had questions on any specific item. Hearing none IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT THE IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL MODIFICATIONS AS INCLUDED IN APPENDIX A TO THESE MINUTES BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

III. OLD BUSINESS - LEGISLATION: Mr. Gary Ogden was asked for a report on 1987 proposed legislation.

Mr. Ogden referred to memorandum of staff dated March 26, 1987, "Legislative Status", and to the Sponsor/Monitor listing included with it. The legislation included:

HB #527	1987-89 Operating Budget
HB #327	1987-89 Capital Budget
HB #43	Extend IAC - repeal RCW 43.99.115
HB #551	Aquatic Lands/Sales
SHB #758	Establish Dept. of Wildlife
HB #1037	Increase motor vehicle tax

(Legislation - Continued)

1 Sub HJR 4207	Reorganize Executive Branch
SB #5027	Create Dept. State Resources
ESB #5035	Extend IAC - to June 30, 1993
SB #5251	Game to Dept. of Wildlife
SB #5273	Lottery for Urban Parks
SSB #5306	Marinas - Pumpouts
SSB #5322	Natural Resource Conservation Areas
SSB #5421	State Bicycle Program
SB #5664	Redesignate Game as Dept. Wildlife
SSB #5730	Milwaukee Road Corridor
SSB #5911	Dept. Natural Resources Acquisitions
SSB #5984	Wetlands Protection
SB #5985	Reuse of Abandoned Rail Corridors

Mr. Ogden referred to the amendment by the House Committee on State Government which changed the date the IAC would cease to exist from June 30, 1993 to June 30, 1988, and added the following paragraph:

"By January 1, 1988, the Governor's Office shall recommend to the Legislature whether the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation should be located within an executive department or retained as a separate agency. It is the intent of the Legislature to maintain the Committee's general structure and independence from those agencies to which it may distribute funds."

A copy of the amendment was given to each Committee member. During discussion the Chair asked for a listing of the Ways and Means Committee members of both houses so that Committee members would be able to contact them. Mr. Wilder stated the Committee members could contact the Legislators from this list either through the HOT LINE or by calling the legislators' office direct. The Committee discussed the IAC's 1987-89 Operating Budget and the need to ensure there would be sufficient staffing for the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program. At present, Mr. Wilder reported, no action has been taken by OFM to restore staffing for this program which is in critical need. He explained the IAC's request for staffing and the resulting cuts that had been made. These two items of legislation dealing with the IAC were discussed further. The Chair asked that Committee members contact the legislators as quickly as possible and confirm the need for positions in the nonhighway and off-road vehicle program as well as the need to continue the IAC.

IV. D. DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES, RECREATION SITE RE-EVALUATION PROGRAM:

Mr. Pinnix reported to the Committee that the Department of Natural Resources has been involved in a comprehensive statewide review of its recreation sites and was prepared to present a slide program. Mr. John Edwards stated DNR was looking at the potential relocation of fifteen sites. The proposed

course of action would be to expand selected recreation sites, add a few new ones which have been judged to be more conducive to public recreation, and eliminate certain previously selected outdoor recreation sites. Ms. Cox was informed if the program were to be given it would entail forty minutes. Mr. Edwards said it would be possible to delay the program if that was the desire of the Committee and present it at the July meeting with a specific request to move on the first phase of sites. A packet has been prepared for the Committee with a write-up of the proposal and what it will attempt to accomplish. It is necessary for the Committee to review the sites since some of them are developed with IAC monies. Mr. Webster agreed it would be necessary to work with DNR on the sites and ensure there is no loss of recreation opportunity. Mr. Ryan suggested that the Committee note its intention to cooperate with the project and encourage staff to work with DNR. The Committee could review the entire program at the July meeting. It was the consensus of the Committee that DNR's presentation on the sites be delayed until July.

JULY 16-17, 1987 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE:

Ms. Cox referred to the proposed July IAC meeting schedule which had been discussed by the Committee members during the lunch break. It was suggested that there be a picnic lunch during the tour at a picnic area location rather than each member "on their own" for lunch. This would save time and probably allow the Committee to visit additional sites. The schedule as presented by staff was otherwise acceptable. The following day (July 17) will be a Regular Meeting of the IAC. Ms. Cox asked that the staff in presenting the Evaluation Procedures to the Committee start from the beginning, i.e., Letter of Intent, application submittal, review, etc.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX THAT THE MEETING ADJOURN
- 5:35 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

7-17-1987
DATE
Anne B. Cox
CHAIR