

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: March 25, 1988
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

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

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

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

Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation Commission
Raymond Ryan, Designee for Joseph R. Blum, Director,
Department of Fisheries
George Volker, Designee for Jerry Neal, Acting Director,
Department of Wildlife
Stan Biles, Designee for The Honorable Brian Boyle,
State Land Commissioner, Department of Natural
Resources

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Jeanie Lorenz

APPENDICES:

A = 1988 Legislative Report
B = Participation Manual #6 - Modification
C = G-I-A Review Criteria Report

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: Ms. Anne Cox, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., with a quorum present: COX, SCULL, TVETEN, RYAN, VOLKER, MACKEY, JONES, BILES.

The Chair welcomed the attendees and asked each for an introduction. Mr. Stan Biles was recognized as the new designee for The Honorable Brian Boyle, State Land Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5-6, 1987: IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN THAT THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4-5, 1987 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

AGENDA - APPROVAL FOR THE MARCH 25, 1988 IAC MEETING: There were no additions or deletions to the agenda. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE MARCH 25, 1988 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS/CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION: Mr. Robert L. Wilder, Director, IAC, referred to two prepared resolutions and Certificates of Appreciation for former member Jack S. Wayland and former designee for the Department of Natural Resources, Cleve Pinnix. Mr. Tveten asked to address the resolution pertaining to Mr. Wayland and expressed his appreciation for his services not only to the Interagency Committee as a member but throughout his career in the former Department of Game. Mr. Wayland had served on the Technical Advisory Committee of the IAC for many years at the same time when Mr. Tveten had represented the State Parks and Recreation Commission. It was also noted that Cleve Pinnix is presently Deputy Director with the State Parks and Recreation Commission. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. JONES THAT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS BE PASSED BY THE COMMITTEE AND APPROPRIATE CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION SENT TO EACH PERSON:

WHEREAS, JACK S. WAYLAND HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THE PAST TWO YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, AND HAS SERVED IN THE PAST ON THE IAC'S TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THUS ASSISTING THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, 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, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO JACK S. WAYLAND,

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 JACK S. WAYLAND.

(RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED)

WHEREAS, CLEVE PINNIX HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AS DESIGNEE FOR THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, 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, THE COMMITTEE DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO CLEVE PINNIX,

AND, RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE HONORABLE BRIAN BOYLE, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO CLEVE PINNIX.

(RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED)

INTRODUCTIONS: The following introductions were made by Gregory Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services and Robert L. Wilder:

JEFF FROST, Recreation Resource Planner, IAC, involved in the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) process, and working in the planning data programs.

CHARLES BUTLER, Recreation Resource Planner, assigned to the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program, specifically working with nonhighway road projects.

JEFF LANE, Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder referred to the Director's Report dated March 25, 1988, and stated since the Committee had already had an opportunity to read it, he would merely stress certain critical points.

1. Executive Study: The Governor's Office will be studying the IAC to determine whether the agency should be located within an Executive department or retained as a separate agency. The report will be presented to the Legislature January 1, 1989. Unless extended, the IAC is scheduled for termination by June 30, 1989. Mr. Wilder asked the cooperation and assistance of the Committee and those benefiting from the IAC programs in the forthcoming study. There will need to be close coordination in working with the person appointed to do the study. At this point in time it is not known who will be assigned this project.
2. Funding: There will be no state bond or federal traditional funds for the November 1988 funding session. Initiative 215 funds and Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds will be available. The Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund receipts had been \$320,503 and had been authorized for expenditure by the Committee in November at the 1987 Funding Session.

LWCF: The Federal situation was outlined. An Executive Request Bill is to be introduced which will change the LWCF fund considerably. It recognizes the states and gives them \$20 million per year; Federal agencies would receive up to \$80 million.

Congressional Level: The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO) Report has been reviewed and in response the following items are pertinent:

- a. Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (HR 3545, P.L. 100-203) includes some funding for states and reauthorized the LWCF for twenty-five years at a \$900 million level.
- b. S 735 - proposes distribution of revenues from oil & gas leasing within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.
- c. S 1338 "Outdoor American Conservation Fund Act" proposed.
- d. HR 3736 - Companion to S 1338.
- e. HR 4127 (S 2199) - proposes an American Heritage Trust.

State Level: The Washington Recreation and Park Association (WRPA) is developing a legislative program for the 1989 Legislative Session. Four task forces have been developed (coalition) to advise and guide appropriate legislative efforts: Task Force on Funding; 2. Task Force on Liability; 3. Task Force on the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation; and 4. Task Force on Land Acquisition Alternatives (Ralph Mackey as Chairman).

Mr. Wilder stated though the study of the IAC is of grave concern, the IAC has been studied before and has had the support of many legislators and citizens, groups and organizations. He noted the opportunities available to the IAC from such a study. Mr. Mackey asked if there had been any "feedback" from the meetings held previously with the Governor's Office. Mr. Wilder replied there had not

been any feedback as to the matters which had been discussed, but there had been many instances recently in which the IAC has been closely working with the Governor's Office, i.e., Columbia River Gorge, Wetlands Program, U. S. Forest Service Plans Reviews, etc. Mr. Mackey suggested there be a "battle plan" prepared for the 1989 Legislature. The Committee needs to react to the proposed study and obtain help from those it serves, with WRPA being of assistance at the same time. Mr. Wilder pointed out there could be other groups involved such as the backcountry horsemen, counties, cities, port districts, trails groups, and others.

II. STATUS REPORTS B. MANAGEMENT SERVICES: 1. Fund Summary, Grant-in-Aid Projects (State/Local Agencies) -- Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, referred to Fund Summary dated March 14, 1988, indicating the figures presented were "normal" for this time of the year. He noted that Initiative 215 receipts were coming in at a rate which would offset the funding estimates made in November 1987 at the Funding Session. Thus, deficits as indicated in the Fund Summary would be erased by June 30, 1988. Further, Mr. Baker commented on the Federal LWCF monies stating the shortfall in Federal funds has left a deficit in those areas which had counted on having funding available. Since March 14th (date of the Fund Summary) several contracts from the National Park Service have come in and thus the amount indicated as pending contracts will be lowered considerably for both locals and State Parks. To assure that federal monies are expended to meet the target issued by NPS, the Projects Services Division and the Fiscal Office are working to get the remainder of the cash obligated.

Mr. Baker referred to tabulation "Projects Still Shown as Pending" (pink), a first-time inclusion, and one which will be for Committee review at each Committee meeting from now on.

2. Fund Summary, Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Program: Mr. Baker noted the current fund status as \$1,590,945.31. All balances are "reasonable" and fall within the "caps" as set by law.

II. STATUS REPORTS. C. PROJECT SERVICES: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Project Services Status Report", noting the following:

a. Currently staff is working with 66 local agency projects and 20 local agency aquatic land projects, in various stages of completion.

b. IAC Workshops: Six, one-half day spring workshops will be held in Mt. Vernon, Olympia, Vancouver, Walla Walla, Cheney, and Chelan.

April 5 - 9:00 to Noon - Skagit Co. Administration Bldg., Hearing Room A
Mt. Vernon

9:00 to Noon - Pioneer Pk. Garden Center, E. Alder St.,
Walla Walla

April 6 - 1:00 to 4:00 - Capital Mall Community Room, Capital Shopping
Center, Olympia

9:00 to Noon - Cheney City Hall, 609 Second St., Cheney

April 7 - 9:00 to Noon - City Hall, 210 E. 13th Street, Vancouver

9:00 to Noon - Chelan Golf Course, Mason Highway, SR 150, Chelan

- c. Application Workshops: Application workshops have been scheduled for May 10, Kirkland and May 12, Richland.
- d. 1988 Funding Cycle: Letters of Intent due May 1; project applications due July 1. Technical Advisory Committee to meet September 6-7 in the Seattle Area and September 13 and 14 in Yakima, if it is necessary to review eastside projects.
Project Evaluation Session is scheduled for the week of October 17 thru 21 (location to be cited later).
- e. LWCF Shortfall for 1987 Projects: Reviewed by the Committee. Shortfall available will be allocated to Everett and Kent projects approved in November 1987. In approving funding for Everett and Kent, staff assumed any future LWCF dollars would be first applied to those projects.
- f. Administrative Actions:
- (1) City of Oak Harbor, Marina Expansion, 87-076D, \$33,258 cost increase approved to substantially improve guest moorage facilities by adding 18 forty foot finger piers (total new spaces--72).
 - (2) Department of Ecology - Padilla Bay, 87-01AL \$75,000 ALEA Project Construct beach access and viewing platform at interpretive center.
 - (3) Parks and Recreation Commission - River Float Access, 88-505D \$211,000 Develop put-in/take-out points on Little Spokane River east of Riverside State Park.
 - (4) Department of Wildlife:
Fan Lake, 85-33AL \$54,000 ALEA Project Construct boating access on Fan Lake, Pend Oreille, County
Calawah Access, 87-02AL, \$59,500 ALEA Project *as corrected*
Acquire five acres of property on Calawah River, near Town of Forks
Lower Rocky Ford, 87-03AL \$323,050 with \$27,800 ALEA monies
Acquire 646.1 acres of wetlands and uplands on Lower Rocky Ford Creek east of Ephrata. (Other funds: State Bldg. & Construction Account \$210,000, Migratory Waterfowl Acct, \$22,350, and local funds of \$62,900.)

In response to Dr. Scull's questions, Mr. Wilder stated the LWCF markup at last report was \$50 million as opposed to the \$20 million finally approved for this Fiscal Year. Due to the fact that the IAC will not have any traditional bond funding for November 1988, staff will be working with individual sponsors to obtain their needs, determine cost estimates, locations of proposed projects, etc. This will then be made a part of the Capital Budgeting process to indicate the needs. Mr. Baker explained the IAC did not have direct control over the State Building Construction Account 057 as it does over the Outdoor Recreation Account 070. Mr. Ogden pointed out the 057 Account, State Building Construction, consists of a number of capital projects involving colleges, schools, parks, wildlife, etc. Mr. Mackey asked what the "Waterfowl Account" in the Department of Wildlife was. Mr. George Volker, Designee, Department of Wildlife, replied this was actually a part of the Wildlife Fund which is used for wetlands. (A dedicated portion of the account which comes from sale of duck stamps.)

Mr. Wilder clarified the 057 and 070 discussion, stating that the Legislature had opted to place approximately \$3.2 million of IAC requested funds into the State Building Construction Account.

At this point Mr. Tveten called attention to the list of "Projects as Shown as Still Pending", specifically citing State Parks' project, Water Supplies-State, totaling \$3,000. He suggested in the next budget consideration be given to avoiding small amounts in LWCF such as this project due to the tremendous amount of paperwork necessary. Mr. Wilder agreed, and Mr. Peter Antolin, Office of Financial Management, said there would be flexibility in the coming budget to accommodate this type of request.

Mr. Jones asked if there would be options for the City of Kent and the City of Everett if the LWCF funds were not forthcoming. Mr. Fairleigh replied the City of Everett could proceed, but the City of Kent at this point, unless additional LWCF funds became available, or bond monies, it would not be able to proceed.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Ms. Wendy Brand, National Park Service, stated the State of Washington is meeting its target as set by NPS. Other states have not been able to meet their targets. About 15% is allocated to those states who do.

II. STATUS REPORTS D. PLANNING SERVICES:

1. Planning Services Report: Mr. Lovelady referred to the Planning Services Report dated March 25, 1988, citing the following:

- a. New Planning Services Staff-Chuck Butler and Jeff Frost, now working in various planning areas of the IAC.
- b. Local Agencies, Technical Assistance: A total of 118 agencies are eligible for funding assistance (76 cities, 12 counties, 16 port districts, 7 special districts [park and recreation and public utility districts], 6 school districts, and 1 Indian tribe.) Currently working with 89 local agencies in various stages of plan development.
- c. Tri-State Demand Study: Federal agencies involved in the Tri-State Demand Study are ready to contribute \$65,000 toward the analysis of the data collected. Analysis of data concerning recreational demand is scheduled for December 1988.
- d. Washington River Recreation Data Base: A computerized Washington River Recreation Data Base is being developed. In March, 1987, an advisory group met, with IAC participating. Final report of this group recommended that the data base should reside with the State Parks and Recreation Commission. The data base contains both streamside (ex. fishing) and river recreation data, or preferences by users for recreational opportunities on white water and flatwater streams. State Parks and IAC would compile data from new surveys and provide this to the Washington State Energy Office (WSEO) and the general public. To date, there has been no action on the recommendations.
- e. Forest Management Plan Review Process: The seven National Forests in Washington State are required to prepare plans and conduct public review processes for agencies' and citizens' input. A team effort is

underway through twelve state agencies. To date, the team has provided state responses for the Wenatchee, Olympic, and Okanogan National Forests. Colville, Gifford Pinchot, Umatillas, and the Mount Baker/Snoqualmie National Forests are yet to be reviewed. In response to Governor Booth Gardner's request, the team will conduct an aggregate impact analysis for all Washington Forest Service Plans. IAC staff works closely with the review team to ensure that recreational interests are well represented. Proposed management plans have a significant impact upon the state as forests set land allocations. These allocations will, in turn, impact future timber harvests, mineral development, hydropower siting, wild and scenic river designation, recreational uses, tourism, and community stability.

- f. Washington State Trails Directory: IAC received approval to proceed with the production and distribution of a Washington State Trails Directory. It will be available to the public through the trail management agencies and information centers by late summer 1988.
- g. An updated IAC 1988 Grants Program Brochure (included in the kit material) was noted. Information on the Aquatic Land Enhancement Account (ALEA) has been temporarily deleted in this edition since availability of funding from this program was uncertain. The Nonhighway Road Program has been highlighted.

2. Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Report: Mr. Lovelady referred to staff memorandum dated March 25, 1988, NOVA Report. The following Administrative Actions were reported:

a. Time Period Extensions:

ORV-86-36D, Thurston County Parks ORV Park Development 7.: Due to unexpected delays in the project, time was extended to December, 1988 (12 months).

ORV-85-12P, Colville National Forest, Forest Wide ORV Study: To allow for completion of forest planning process, time was extended to December, 1989 (24 months).

b. Scope adjustment:

ORV-86-02D, Wenatchee National Forest, Cle Elum Ranger District, Icewater Creek Motorcycle Camp Development: Project scope was increased to allow for stream bank stabilization.

Project Status: A total of 255 projects have been approved and funded since NOVA grants were first made in 1978. IAC has funded 147 local agencies projects, 91 Forest Service projects, and 17 state agencies projects.

Mr. Biles, DNR Designee, asked for names of the Federal agencies involved in the Tri-State Demand Study. Mr. Lovelady cited: Several Forest Service agencies, Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bureau of Land Management. In response to further questions of Mr. Biles, Mr. Lovelady noted that the states do contribute money and assistance in the collection of the data. It was also pointed out that the survey is unique to this area.

Mr. Wilder then referred to the Washington River Recreation Data Base, pointing out that the basic jurisdiction would reside with the State Parks and Recreation Commission. He complimented that agency on its leadership and taking responsibility for the study. Mr. Wilder also referred to the 1988 Grants Program Brochure, stating information had been cut back on LWCF but reference to the traditional grants-in-aid program retained. The Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Program information had been expanded.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROJECT CHANGES:

1. City of Olympia, Woodruff Park, IAC #73-063D, Conversion: A replacement memorandum was distributed by the Projects Services staff for the Woodruff Park conversion (dated March 25, 1988 - Blue). Mr. Ron Taylor referred to this memorandum & overhead transparencies indicating the site plans for the Woodruff Park and land areas involved in the conversion. His explanation included:
 - a. Historical explanation of the Woodruff Park development. In addition to these facilities, Garfield School provided covered play area and playfields, making the combined City and School District recreation area total about 11 acres.
 - b. City has requested approval to convert an approximate 2.7 acre portion of Woodruff Park to allow needed expansion of the Garfield School by the Olympia School District. The area of conversion would eliminate play equipment, picnic shelter, lighting, irrigation, and portions of a path system. The tennis courts would remain for public use, together with school playfields/play equipment.
 - c. Replacement area: Acquisition of about 4 acres of private property plus dedication of about .30 acres of non-recreation City-owned land for a neighborhood park in West Olympia. Construction would take place within a period of about 24 months.
 - d. Values: Converted Woodruff Park property = \$130,000.
Westside Neighborhood Park replacement property = \$119,000
(Appraisal reviewed - not yet complete)
 - e. Appraisal Issue: The City must begin construction of the Garfield School expansion this Spring and cannot wait until the next meeting of the IAC for approval of the appraisal. City, therefore, will include 6.39 acres of surplus school property at 9th and Decatur to be deeded to the City as partial exchange for the Woodruff Park property. This site value: \$70,000. In addition to Westside Neighborhood Park site would meet the equal value requirement for conversion.
- F. IAC reviewed proposal based on its conversion criteria and recommended approval of the conversion contingent on completion of IAC approved appraisals as to land values.

Dr. Scull asked if the Decatur site would remain undeveloped. Mr. Taylor replied there were as yet no plans for development. Mr. Mackey felt the IAC would be losing some dollars in the development of the property, and asked if this was

being taken into consideration. Mr. Taylor assured him dollars were not being lost in the conversion. The City will be receiving a part of its money from the conversion of the land in addition to the Decatur site. Ms. Jane Boubel, Director, City of Olympia Parks and Recreation Department, was asked to comment and to reply to Ms. Cox's questions concerning population density at the Neighborhood Park site. Ms. Boubel stated there were 700 apartment units within a quarter of a mile of the site - children and adults occupied these units. She said there was a need for the park and the City would focus on developing it. Ms. Cox said she did not want to take away recreational opportunities from disadvantaged persons. Ms. Boubel said this would not happen. At present the site is an open area. The City plans a small soccer field and ball field; there will be a natural area left with paths and passive recreational areas. The site contains an elevation and at the top there is a view of Mount Rainier, the Olympics, and the Black Hills. The City will work with the neighborhood clientele in planning the park elements. Ms. Cox was pleased to know the residents of the area would be consulted as to their desires for recreational facilities.

Mr. Tveten was assured the IAC had \$61,329 in the Woodruff Park Project at the present time (\$20,443 State/\$40,886 LWCF). No monies had been granted by the IAC for acquisition. Mr. Tveten asked how much of the \$61,329 grant was actually spent in that part of the Woodruff Park which will be converted. Mr. Taylor said he did not have that information, but did cite dollar figures for elements in the project at the time it was funded by the IAC. All of the elements will be relocated on the site established by the School District at a later time. The only element which can't be is the picnic shelter. Ms. Boubel stated the play equipment in place now would be replaced since it is old equipment and not reusable. In response to Mr. Biles' question, she noted that the play equipment, security lighting, passive play area would be replaced on the school grounds. Mr. Jones was informed the elevation of the hilltop of the Neighborhood Park replacement site was approximately 30 feet.

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

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF OLYMPIA HAS RECEIVED IAC FUNDING ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOP NEIGHBORHOOD PARK FACILITIES ADJACENT TO AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH GARFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN WEST OLYMPIA KNOWN AS WOODRUFF PARK (IAC #73-063D), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT AN APPROXIMATE 2.7 ACRE PORTION OF WOODRUFF PARK TO ALLOW EXPANSION OF GARFIELD SCHOOL BY THE OLYMPIA SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF THE CONVERTED PARK PROPERTY WITH LAND OF AT LEAST EQUAL VALUE AND RECREATION UTILITY DEVELOPMENT TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN ABOUT 24 MONTHS, DOES MEET CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19B DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CONVERTED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF RECEIVING IAC APPRAISAL REVIEW CONCURRENCE FOR THE APPRAISAL:

1. WESTSIDE PARK, THE PRIMARY REPLACEMENT SITE, HAS AN UNAPPROVED APPRAISED VALUE OF \$119,000;
A BACK-UP REPLACEMENT SITE AT 9TH AND DECATUR HAS AN APPROVED APPRAISED VALUE OF \$70,000;
WOODRUFF PARK PROPERTY TO BE CONVERTED HAS AN APPROVED APPRAISED VALUE OF \$130,000.

2. THE REPLACEMENT PARCEL WILL WHEN DEVELOPED HAVE RECREATION UTILITY AT LEAST EQUAL TO THE PARK AREA LOST, WITH SOME FACILITIES LOST THROUGH THE CONVERSION TO BE REPLACED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT.
3. REPLACEMENT LAND AND FACILITIES ARE NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FOR RECREATIONAL USE.
4. REPLACEMENT FACILITIES ARE ELIGIBLE UNDER IAC/NPS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CRITERIA.
5. AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT IS ON FILE.

AND, WHEREAS, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES NOTED HEREIN IT IS THE INTENT OF THE IAC TO COOPERATE TO THE FULLEST EXTENT POSSIBLE TO PROCESS THIS REQUEST IN ORDER THAT THE OLYMPIA SCHOOL DISTRICT MAY PROCEED WITH SCHOOL BUILDING CONSTRUCTION ON SCHEDULE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST AS PROPOSED BY THE CITY OF OLYMPIA REGARDING WOODRUFF PARK (IAC #73-063D) IS APPROVED **CONTINGENT UPON THE COMPLETION OF IAC APPROVED APPRAISALS WHICH ESTABLISH THE REPLACEMENT LAND VALUES OF AT LEAST EQUAL VALUE TO THE CONVERTED PARCEL,** AT WHICH TIME THE DIRECTOR WILL BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT ONCE THE APPRAISAL IS FINALIZED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Department of Wildlife, L. T. Murray Wildlife Recreational Area, #69-609A, Property Conversion: Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Department of Wildlife, L. T. Murray WRA-#69-609A, Property Conversion", noting the following:

- a. Project consisted of an acquisition of 26,000 acres of land in the L. T. Murray Wildlife Recreation Area, north of Yakima, in 1969.
- b. Included in acquisition was a six acre parcel along Gibson Road eight miles north of Yakima. The parcel is 100 feet wide by 2,640 feet long, and was intended to be an access road area into L. T. Murray WRA.
- c. Parcel was never used, but was replaced by fully developed access two and one-half miles to the northwest. Gibson parcel now has residential development adjoining it; the land poses noxious weed and insect problems, and has become fire hazard in the area.
- d. The Department of Wildlife proposed to use proceeds from sale of the Gibson parcel toward acquisition of a 20 acre parcel twelve miles west of Yakima - known as the West Valley Elk Feeding station.
- e. Appraisals: West Valley Elk Feeding Site - \$18,000
Gibson Parcel - \$9,300.
- f. IAC staff recommended approval of the conversion.

Mr. Ryan, referring to the overhead transparency, asked where the Wildlife Department's land was that was supposed to be contiguous. Mr. Volker, Wildlife

Department, stated the Wildlife Department had an agreement with the Department of Natural Resources for use of the land which was contiguous, as well as with the private landowners. The statement which had been made about the land belonging to Wildlife was not to mislead. Wildlife management takes place on all of the land indicated by staff on the transparency. The land is DNR land, but the elk herd use it and it has become an elk feeding station. Mr. Mackey asked if recreationists could drive to that specific site and watch the elk feed. Mr. Volker replied this would be a major attraction of the site.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT THE CONVERSION BE APPROVED.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions, and Mr. Biles commented on the differences between the two conversions (Woodruff Park and the Wildlife Department lands). The Olympia project had come for review prior to any action on the part of the City; the Wildlife Department project appears to involve a sale and conversion, the sale having taken place. He asked why this had occurred. Mr. Taylor explained that normally the IAC does review any proposed sale of land and conversion, then brings the matter to the Committee for review and approval. However, this had been an instance where the Department of Wildlife had inadvertently taken steps for sale of the land thinking it did not involve IAC funds. When it was discovered IAC funds were involved, the Department had asked to present it to the IAC for approval as the correct step to take. Mr. Wilder assured Mr. Biles there was a policy and procedure which the IAC follows, but this had been an "honest mistake" and the Department had asked for it to be corrected.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION, AND IT WAS PASSED AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE ACQUIRED 26,000 ACRES OF WILDLIFE HABITAT IN YAKIMA COUNTY KNOWN AS L. T. MURRAY WRA WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #69-609A), AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT AN APPROXIMATE SIX ACRE PARCEL OF THE L. T. MURRAY WRA FOR AN APPROXIMATE TWENTY ACRE SITE NEARBY ADJOINING DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE PROPERTY AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE HAS DETERMINED THAT THE CONVERSION IS IN THE BEST PUBLIC INTEREST, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND DOES MEET CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED:

1. FAIR MARKET VALUE OF ALL PARCELS OF LAND HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCEL CONVERTED.
2. THE SUBSTITUTION PARCEL IS OF AT LEAST EQUAL RECREATION UTILITY TO THAT OF THE CONVERTED PARCEL.
3. LANDS ACQUIRED WITH FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (LWCF) ASSISTANCE HAVE RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:
 - a. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OBTAINED.
 - b. CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW - INITIATED.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE REGARDING THE L. T. MURRAY WRA (IAC #69-609A) PROJECT IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. Tveten asked if IAC staff would be making reference sometime during the meeting to the State Parks and Recreation Commission's projects changes made by the State Legislature during the last Legislative Session, i.e., certain lands in the San Juan Islands for acquisition had been deleted, and other projects added. Mr. Fairleigh and Mr. Wilder stated this had not been addressed in the material before the Committee but could be reported on at the next IAC meeting. Staff had, however, reviewed the Capital Budget and was aware of the changes which had been made.

III. OLD BUSINESS 2. NONHIGHWAY ROAD EVALUATION MANUAL: Mr. Charles Butler, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Nonhighway Road (NHR) Projects Manual". His report included the following:

a. The manual is one in a series: Introduction, Off-Road Vehicle, Nonhighway Road, Application Procedures, Reimbursement Billing Procedures. Other manuals will be added as needed.

b. Purpose is to provide prospective sponsors with the necessary information for submission of an NOVA application.

c. Project Evaluation Criteria: Has been revised on pages (8) and (9). Criteria was first adopted in November of 1986; again presented in July 1987. The new manual combines and clarifies the two previous sets, and assigns a point value to each question.

d. Use: By sponsors to encourage submission of projects.
By NOVA Advisory Committee and IAC - to determine how an NHR project might rank in funding priorities.

e. Chart: A chart was attached showing how previously funded projects scored in July 1987 would have scored under the new system.

f. Draft was reviewed by NOVA Advisory Committee, IAC staff, and representatives of Legislature, PNW Four-Wheel Drive Assn., Washington State Horsemen, DNR, State Parks, Mountaineers, Alpine Lakes Protection Society, Backcountry Horsemen, and the Washington State Trails Association. Their comments were incorporated into the manual; redraft portions of the report were then cleared by telephone.

g. Staff recommended adoption of the manual by the Interagency Committee.

Discussion followed. Dr. Scull asked what types of contributions are made by sponsors. Mr. Butler stated IAC encourages any project sponsor to contribute equipment or in-kind services in order to stretch NOVA funds.

Mr. Mike Dodd, staff member Pierce County Parks and Recreation Department, was recognized by the Chair. He asked if there had been any comments received or input made to the manual which would direct that NOVA funds should be placed in trails systems which are accessed through tax paid roadways.

Mr. Butler replied there had been no comments received for that specific purpose since the manual was directed only to evaluation questions. Ms. Cox asked if anyone present who had reviewed the draft would like to comment. Mr. Jim Eychaner, Washington State Trails Association, said he had been involved in the process and had especially appreciated the references made toward resolving user conflicts. However, he objected to references concerning user mix on trails and facilities, which he said would be an invitation to conflicts. Mr. Butler pointed out that this portion of the manual had been amended and he offered to give Mr. Eychaner a copy. John Edwards, TAC Committee, DNR Representative, said he was satisfied with the final version of the manual.

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

WHEREAS, THE MARCH, 1988 NONHIGHWAY ROAD MANUAL HAS BEEN PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH RCW 46.09, AND

WHEREAS, THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED THE PROPOSED MANUAL AND HAS FOUND IT TO BE OF GREAT BENEFIT TO PROSPECTIVE PROJECT SPONSORS,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY ADOPT THE NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS MANUAL AS ONE IN THE SERIES OF NOVA PROGRAM MANUALS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Committee recessed at 10:25 and reconvened for further business at 10:35 a.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. LEGISLATION: Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Legislation - 1988", citing the following:

1. **House Bill #1290 and Senate Bill #6106 - Recreation Guide:** Though both bills had progressed through each house, the bills failed to pass due to high priority of other bills being processed through the Legislature. **HB #1290** progressed to Second Reading in the Senate, but died after the extended cut-off date on March 6, 1988, at 5:00 p.m.

2. **CONFIRMATION OF IAC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS:** The Senate confirmed the appointments of Dr. Eliot W. Scull, Ralph E. Mackey, Joe C. Jones, and Jeanie Lorenz during January, February and March 1988.

3. **Certain House Bills and Senate Bills** cited in the memorandum to the Committee were reviewed. **(SEE APPENDIX A TO THESE MINUTES)**

During presentation of these bills, Ms. Cox asked if there was any other information the Committee should have other than that already outlined in the memorandum. Mr. Ogden commented on **SSB #6763, Capital Budget**, pointing out the projects of State Parks:

Green River Gorge acq reapprop. increased from \$39,000 to \$100,000;
Yakima Greenway acquisition \$94,000 reappropriation.
Fort Worden acquisition - \$750,000 State Bldg. Construction Acct. "
Clayton Beach acquisition \$1,600,000 " " "
Fort Casey acquisition of Keystone Spit properties " " "
Belfair, acquisition of adjacent property, \$50,000 SBCA

He also referenced the DNR project - Acquisition of 51 miles of the Milwaukee Railroad right-of-way (Jefferson/Clallam counties) - deleted monies and left \$15,000 from State Building Construction Account.

Ms. Cox asked if **SB 5147 - Public Utility and Transportation Corridors**, was a step backwards from an IAC viewpoint. Mr. Ogden replied the courts had already ruled that public agencies and utilities cannot acquire reversionary interests in corridors without payment or just compensation. This act merely brings it into law and is not a backward step.

Dr. Scull questioned **SHB #1862 - Beaches/Land Use Plans**, - was driving now not allowed on certain portions of beaches? Mr. Tveten clarified the bill stating it included restriction on the use of motor vehicles along forty percent of the ocean beach during a summer season. The State Parks and Recreation Commission now has authority to make permanent closures also. However, the local communities will be involved in these decisions. The Commission may request that within the 40% figure beaches in front of State parks would be closed for driving. In the past the Commission has had authority only to denote temporary closures. This law gives it authority to make decisions on closures - temporary and permanent. Mr. Tveten noted that local communities had supported the bill, and the Long Beach community had been instrumental in its writing. During testimony on the bill there had not been a single opposing word.

GOVERNOR'S NATURAL RESOURCE LEGISLATION: Mr. Ogden reported that the Governor's Wetlands Legislation - **Senate Bill #6384** - had progressed to Rules 2, but had died on the cut-off date, March 6, 1988. Mr. Mackey advised that the timber industry had been instrumental in opposing that bill.

In response to Ms. Cox's question, Mr. Ogden reported the IAC had established good rapport with the State Legislature during the 1988 Session; the Director testified before certain committees on specific bills; and the IAC had had the opportunity to work with the Governor's Office on its proposed legislation. Ms. Cox felt the IAC should attempt to find out who opposed the Wetlands bill and why. The opposition to this bill should be "defused".

Mr. Tveten enlarged upon State Parks' projects which had been placed in the Capital Budget. These had not been at State Parks' urging, but had evolved from the Legislature itself. The need to preserve the properties involved at Clayton and the Keystone area was recognized. Local residents felt it was not possible to wait longer and took action to see that the Legislature was advised. Mr. Tveten felt this was a unique approach and the Commission members were pleased at the local residents' actions.

Mr. Mackey asked about **House Bill #1616 - State Trust Land Purchases**. Mr. Tveten stated this bill would allow for the transfer from DNR of fifteen Trust Land sites into the State Parks and Recreation Commission's system - about 7,000 acres. One-half of the land would be new purchase; the other half would come through Trust Land transfer. Property is located adjacent to existing state parks. State Parks will enter into an agreement with DNR for the transfers of Trust Lands. There is also a potential through cooperative agreements with cities and counties to maximize use of the properties. Mr. Tveten appreciated the Committee's attention to this bill and the type of transfer of lands it involves. He felt there was opportunity to make adjustments and maximize use of resources which are already in state ownership. He expressed his appreciation for DNR's work on the projects.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. B. FUTURE FUNDING SOURCES: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Future Funding Sources". He realized the Committee had already had opportunity to review the memorandum, and referred to page (3), the American Heritage Trust bill of Representative Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) (HR 4127; S 2199 [Chaffee]). This bill is of utmost importance to the IAC. It proposes to tap a greater share of (OCS) revenues for investment by the U. S. Treasury, creating a "dedicated trust" for parks and recreation. Earned interest would be automatically available for state and federal agencies. Authorized but unappropriated Land and Water Conservation Fund balance, in excess of \$5.2 billion, would also be interest-earning account. (Explanation HR 4127-pg. 13/memo)

Page (11)--S 735 - Land Acquisition Account - This bill would create a special account with LWCF to aid land acquisition for BLM, NPS, FWS and Forest Service. Revenue sources include 25% of future receipts from oil and gas leasing activity in the National Wildlife Refuge System (principally the Arctic NWR), and \$160 million annually from the authorized but unappropriated LWCF account. (This account presently exceeds \$5 billion.)

Mr. Wilder stated he had sent letters to the Congressional Delegation of Washington State on several occasions and recently suggested the Representatives consider being joint sponsors of HR 4127. Ms. Cox asked what the statement in S 735, "Ten percent to miscellaneous receipts in the U. S. Treasury" meant. Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, assigned to the IAC, replied the funds could be used for other things but not for recreational purposes. Ms. Cox then asked concerning the statement, "Twenty percent to Land and Water Conservation Fund and 'credited to a special account within the fund.'" Mr. Wilder suggested this would be a sub-account with certain amounts to be available to the states in LWCF. Ms. Cox felt the money might be placed in this "special account" and then frozen, and it was up to the IAC in dealing with decision makers that they be reminded the money does not move if placed in an account with too many provisos. The funds should be readily available and usable.

Mr. Tveten referred to Page (13) of the memo (HR 4127 - American Heritage Trust Bill) paragraph 3:

"3. Earned interest would annually be available for obligation and expenditure without further appropriation, with fiscal year obligation limits as follows: 1989, \$500 m; 1990, \$600 m; 1991, \$700 m; 1992, \$800 m; 1993, \$900 m; annually thereafter \$1 billion."

He noted that after 1993 there would be \$1. billion available annually from the earned interest. Mr. Wilder explained that the \$900 million for 1993 would be state and federal monies. Ms. Wendy Brand, National Park Service, said the funding would remain as it is split at present - 30/30, plus 10% for the Urban Parks Act. There would not be a 50-50 split, but the states under the new program would receive more monies than heretofore.

Mr. Wilder mentioned he did not say anybody was endorsing any of this legislation, but he had a strong feeling for the Udall bill and had received this feeling of support from others. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) has not supported S. 735 to any degree. He recommended that the IAC spend time and effort on promotion of the American Heritage Trust Bill.

Honorable Ray Isaacson, Benton County Commissioner, asked to comment.

1. Stated Benton County is in critical financial condition and is unable to maintain parks and recreation areas for the people.
2. Situation is such that the parks programs will be the first to be eliminated from the budget. Economy in the county is very poor.
3. Limitations on tax levies preclude formation of park and recreation service areas, and programs must be terminated in some cases. Suggested park and recreation service area levies should be in addition to all other levies.
4. Suggested legislation along these lines would be beneficial.

Mr. Mackey stressed the tourism effect if parks are closed. Communities rely on tourism for economy purposes. Dr. Scull mentioned that other counties were in the same situation and had been working with legislators to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Bill Koss, House Natural Resources Committee, Staff Member, stated this had been discussed by the House Natural Resources Committee last December. Representative Karla Wilson is pursuing this matter. Mr. Koss felt Representative Wilson and other members of the Committee would want to be in touch with IAC and with WRPA through the Task Force on Funding which had been set up by that group. The object is to find funding for park and recreation purposes.

Mr. Mike Dodd asked if the IAC had ever contacted the Department of Transportation (DOT) to see if it would be possible to use its trails funds (authorized under RCW 47.30.050). Mr. Wilder was not aware of additional revenues which might be available from that source. Mr. Dodd said in most instances the funds had been spent on roadways, not trails. He felt it should be IAC's function to be able to program those monies and administer the trails. He asked that this be pursued by the IAC. Both Mr. Wilder and Ms. Cox said the matter would be looked into. Mr. Dodd gave examples of places where the funds had been used in a manner he thought had been inappropriate.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. 1989-91 IAC STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff "1989-91 Capital Budget Instructions", dated March 25, 1988, noting the following:

1. The IAC 1989-91 Capital Budget Instructions are a supplement to OFM's Instructions which are yet to be received.
2. Draft was sent to all IAC participating state agencies on January 27, 1988. As a result of comments, B-1 Summary Form was redesigned to assist state agencies in reducing the amount of paperwork required in the budget submittal process.

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten asked if the preliminary estimates for 1989-91 as indicated on page (2) of the draft had been discussed with OFM. Had there been any direction from OFM as to this figure? On learning there had not been any communication through OFM, he felt it was appropriate to increase that amount. He stressed the needs of the agencies which far-exceeded \$5,000,000, and suggested the request should more fairly reflect these needs. The state agencies present projects to IAC staff and it is difficult to prioritize these

with such limited funding. He did not feel the Committee should continue to stifle itself with the \$5 million figure. Mr. Mackey concurred with Mr. Tveten stating it was going to be necessary to be realistic and present a budget which would cover the critical needs. Mr. Volker stated his agency (Department of Wildlife) had been in the process of setting up its Capital Budget projects and had an excess of \$23 million worth at the present time. Mr. Mackey felt the IAC should also coordinate with WRPA to be sure that everyone is working with the same figures. Ms. Cox and Mr. Wilder agreed with thrust of the discussion. Mr. Wilder commented on past legislative actions, stating he had no problem with a higher figure with adequate justification. Mr. Jones asked Mr. Volker about the Department of Wildlife's total -- were these projects to be line-itemmed in the budget and could they all be shown as needed for public recreational purposes? Mr. Volker verified that all were needed and, in fact, those inventoried up to the present time were very desirable projects and actually there were many more which had not yet been tapped.

Mr. Tveten noted there would be approximately \$20 to \$25 million worth of needed projects which would be presented to the State Parks and Recreation Commission. He opted to indicate to the Legislature that pressures have increased on supplying recreational outlets for the people of Washington, and the only way in which to do that would be by indicating from each state agency their actual critical needs. Rather than a \$10,000,000 Capital Budget, the IAC should have a \$20,000,000 budget with \$15,000,000 of that amount allocated to the State Bonds. This would leave the \$3,000,000 for Initiative 215 and the \$2,000,000 in Federal funds.

Mr. Peter Antolin, Office of Financial Management Representative, said he did not see any problem with the IAC State Agencies' Capital Budget dealing with the entire needs in parks and recreation for the state agencies participating. However, he pointed out that the problem is there are many other demands for state funds and the competition is there during the Legislative Session. It would be appropriate to ask for the \$20,000,000 but it might not be met through OFM.

Mr. Wilder stated there were many local agencies requiring funding also, and that he could produce a listing of projects from that source, as well as the state agencies. Mr. Mackey noted the many times IAC has had to "turn down" local agencies simply because there were not enough funds to assist them. Mr. Tveten then suggested the request be increased to \$20,000,000, with \$15,000,000 of that amount being placed in State Bonds, which would be a more realistic figure.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE IAC 1989-91 CAPITAL BUDGET BE INCREASED TO \$15,000,000 FROM STATE BOND MONIES (PAGE 2, DRAFT OF CAPITAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS).

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IT WAS THEN MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE IAC SUPPLEMENT TO 1989-91 CAPITAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT REQUESTS DOCUMENT AS PRESENTED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE IAC BE APPROVED AS AMENDED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS AS FOLLOWS:

Preliminary Estimates for 1989-91:

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Initiative 215 | \$ 3,000,000 |
| State Bonds | 15,000,000 |
| Federal | 2,000,000 |
| TOTAL | <u>\$ 20,000,000</u> |

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Dr. Scull asked if Committee members could write to the legislators individually and stress the need for parks and recreation funding. Mr. Mackey approved of the idea. Ms. Cox reminded the members of the decision some time ago to work through the appropriate Legislative committee. Whereupon Mr. Mackey said it was often a good idea to contact legislators directly as well. Individual contact indicates an interest and many times points out critical issues of which they might not be aware.

Mr. Wilder was given the authority to seek a like amount (\$15,000,000) for funding local government projects.

IV. NEW BUSINESS D. THURSTON COUNTY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROPOSAL ORV #88-1P: Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to memorandum of staff, "Thurston County Development, ORV-88-01P - Funding Recommendation", dated March 25, 1988. A revised memorandum was distributed to the Committee (green). Mr. Dovel advised as follows: (Slides were shown of the project)

1. Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department has made application to the IAC for NOVA funds in the amount of \$168,450 to conduct extensive renovation of the competition track at the Park.
2. Staff has inspected the track and has noted the poor condition brought on by demand and use pressures placed upon the track.
3. The track is important to the site; has received heavy use; is in need of renovation (which would include new layout and design); however, the amount of \$168,450 represents a large investment of ORV dollars without a well developed engineering, soils, safety, and standards plan.
4. Staff recommended the \$168,450 not be granted, but that a grant of \$10,000 be made with which to complete an extensive evaluation, engineering, and planning project.
5. NOVA Advisory Committee agrees with IAC's recommendation, and the sponsor has indicated willingness to proceed with this action.
6. The sponsor will, upon completion of the planning/engineering project, make application to the IAC for development funding (November 1988 funding session).

Mr. Jones asked if there had been any correlation of the track's condition and accidents at the park during the last ten years. Mr. Dovel replied in the last year there have been a small number of accidents caused by flying rocks inflicting minor body injuries. The park has had a good safety record. Dr. Scull asked status of the three-wheeled ATV's using that track. Mr. Dovel replied they were still allowed to use the facility. Later on in the meeting, he said, there would be an agenda item leading to discussion of three-wheeled ATV's. Dr. Scull asked if the IAC or Thurston County had any liability responsibility for that park.

Mike Welter, Acting Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation Director, was asked by Mr. Wilder to respond.

Mr. Welter said the County was responsible, but there had been very few injuries at the park. Use of the park has increased considerably over time. The County did not have any problem with the Staff's recommendation and was willing to go along with the need for the planning/engineering project. The County realizes it has a maintenance problem, but at the same time knows of the safety responsibility. Mr. Jones asked how the project had become an "emergency situation" and why did it need "priority attention". Mr. Welter replied that the past five years have seen user groups and the County attempting to take care of the problem, but this is not proving to be enough action. Usage has now increased to such an extent it is no longer possible to keep the problem under control. Therefore, the County looked at various options and has been reluctant to come to the IAC for the necessary funds, but it is now considered a critical matter. Users are complaining, the usage has increased, and petitions have come in to the Park Department to do something about the track. Four-wheel drive users especially have asked that the track be renovated. The track was originally designed for motorcyclists but the four-wheel drive recreationists have also been using it.

In response to Mr. Wilder's question, Mr. Welter said the County would be able to complete the planning/engineering project and be able to go into the renovation of the track as soon as funds were approved for it in November. The renovation project would end approximately by March 1989, in time for users to use the facilities. Usage of the park is less at the time there would be renovation of it. He stated that this would be the earliest they could rework the track.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT THE THURSTON COUNTY TRACK PLANNING/ENGINEERING PROJECT BE APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000.

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten was informed that the gate receipts and proceeds at the park are being used to retire the debt which Thurston County had accrued some years ago. There are no other funds in the park other than off-road vehicle monies at this time. Mr. Tveten also asked what, if any, changes would occur in the use of the facilities if the renovation were to take place. Mr. Dovel replied there would not be any changes in the nature of the use of the park as it is at the present time. The track would be developed for heavier use and be able to be used by all those persons who recreate there. Mr. Tveten asked if there had been any public participation to maintain the park. Mr. Dovel stated in some instances the people who use the facilities have worked on the track to improve it. Mr. Tveten then asked if the neighbors to the park had given any input to the maintenance and operation of the park.

Mr. Bill Willis, President, ORV Impact Association, and a neighbor of the park, stated he and the Association had no objections to the renovation of the park. The neighbors recognize the needs, the park is there in use, and it should be given adequate attention regarding safety features.

Mr. Biles said he did not have the history of the project since he was a new designee on the Committee. He understood the technical problem with the track and the need to make it workable for the users. However, he was concerned with the fact that the project appeared to be one of County maintenance, and apparently there may have been a lack of planning the facility appropriately for its intended use. He felt it was a long-term maintenance problem, that there may have been other ways to obtain funding to repair the track. The last resource should be to come back to the Committee for assistance. He was concerned with the long-term planning in the project, and could not be assured that in two to five years the Committee would be faced with the same type of decision - to renovate

the facility. Though he did not have any objection to the \$10,000 planning/engineering project as proposed by staff, at the same time he did not want other local sponsors to interpret his support for the \$10,000 as support for the long-range commitment of the \$168,450. He felt maintenance projects should be the responsibility of the sponsor.

Mr. Dovel, in response to Mr. Tveten, stated that ultimate renovation would probably consist of Geo-Webb material which is used on boat ramps and has been found useful and effective for ORV tracks. Mr. Jones was assured the \$10,000 would be sufficient to cover the planning/engineering project. Mr. Tveten felt Thurston County should have initiated its own study and not request funds from the IAC for this type of project.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE FOLLOWING MOTION:

WHEREAS, THE THURSTON COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT HAS MADE APPLICATION TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR ORV FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$168,450 FOR AN EXTENSIVE RENOVATION OF THE COMPETITION TRACK AT THE COUNTY'S ORV PARK; AND

WHEREAS, AN INSPECTION OF THE TRACK WAS MADE BY THE IAC AND DETERMINATION WAS MADE THAT PRUDENT ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES MIGHT HAVE PRECLUDED THE NEED FOR EXTENSIVE RENOVATION; AND

WHEREAS THE IAC ACKNOWLEDGES THAT RENOVATION OF THE PARK SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED FOLLOWING AN EXTENSIVE EVALUATION, ENGINEERING AND PLANNING STUDY PRIOR TO THE COUNTY'S TARGET DATE FOR CONSTRUCTION TO ASSURE THAT THERE IS AN EXAMINATION OF ALL ELEMENTS OF THE TRACK, INCLUDING FUTURE DESIGN, DEMAND AND USE OF THE FACILITY; AND

WHEREAS, THE EVALUATION, ENGINEERING, AND PLANNING STUDY CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000, AND

WHEREAS, THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES ADVISORY (NOVA) COMMITTEE CONCURS WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION, AND THE SPONSOR HAS INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO PROCEED WITH THE \$10,000 SO THAT THEY WOULD REMAIN ON THEIR DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE THURSTON COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT ORV PARK PROJECT (ORV-88-1P) BE APPROVED FOR FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000 FOR AN EXTENSIVE EVALUATION, ENGINEERING, AND PLANNING STUDY; AND THE DIRECTOR AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THURSTON COUNTY AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THURSTON COUNTY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MR. VOLKER AND MR. TVETEN VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Volker was informed the operation of the park is through ORV funds. Mr. Tveten clarified his negative vote, stating it was not an indication he felt the study should not be made. He stressed the fact that Thurston County needs to show more initiative and more participation in solving their own problems with the park rather than coming to the IAC for funding. Mr. Volker stated this was his position also.

The Committee recessed at 12:15 and reconvened at 1:32 p.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. E. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6 - MODIFICATIONS: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Participation Manual #6 Modification", citing the following:

1. The modification was to clarify a question in the prescored section (Section D) of the Manual. A separate question will deal with the population issue (now Item C in question D-1).
2. Justification for changing the manual: With comprehensive plans some agencies identified a service or planning area larger than the confines of their jurisdiction, and thus achieve higher points.
3. Question D-1: Correction made in the maximum points -- should read Maximum 20 points, rather than 30.
C. of D-1 was deleted in entirety (concerning population of cities/districts and counties.)
4. Question D-2--newly created: (To be pre-scored by Planning Division)
"THE PROJECT IS LOCATED WITHIN A PUBLIC BODY FOR WHICH THE POPULATION IS (Maximum 10 points)....(followed by listing of cities/districts and counties/and county-wide districts columns.)
5. Modifications were reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and met with their approval.
6. One negative comment was from the City of Vancouver. They felt the new question would give an unfair advantage to counties. Their letter was available for Committee's review if necessary.
7. The point was made in the letter from Vancouver that given similar but unequal population densities that a County and City might be treated the same under the system as proposed by staff. Staff responses included: (a) A new interpretation of the question is not being proposed; rather the proposal is to better show how staff has interpreted the question; (b) the City suggested that a project service area should be considered in the Evaluation process. Staff feels this has been done in Question A-1 of the Evaluation System (up to 25 points is indicated), which has a greater value than the question proposed in the modification; and (c) the IAC has still not created the perfect Evaluation System: one that successfully handles all projects. This is a continuing task and over time the system has been improved and has evolved into an adequate system. Many unique projects have been able to receive funding.
8. The IAC is committed by law (RCW 43.51.380) to "place a higher priority on the acquisition, development, redevelopment, and renovation of parks located in or near urban areas and to be particularly accessible to and used by the populations of those areas."

Dr. Scull appreciated the thoroughness with which the IAC projects are evaluated, and he felt the system was "fantastic" and was impressed by the criteria staff uses. Mr. Wilder mentioned there were several advisory groups of the IAC who over the years had assisted in forming criteria.

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

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6, PROJECT EVALUATION PROCEDURES MANUAL, REQUIRES MODIFICATIONS IN ORDER TO CLARIFY QUESTION D-1, AND

WHEREAS, THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AND ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 286, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THAT THE MODIFICATIONS TO IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6, PROJECT EVALUATION PROCEDURES MANUAL, BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND THE REVISED MANUAL MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL THOSE REQUESTING ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE IAC'S GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAM. (SEE APPENDIX B FOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE MANUAL.)

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. F. REVIEW CRITERIA - PROJECTS SELECTION: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "Traditional Grant Program Evaluation System". This was in response to a request by the Interagency Committee members for a discussion of the evaluation system, its evolution and present status, as used for the traditional grant program. (APPENDIX C TO THESE MINUTES) Mr. Fairleigh reviewed the memorandum thoroughly and called for questions from the Committee following his report.

Mr. Mackey commented on the progress staff has made over the years toward an excellent evaluation system, which even now is being changed to meet new issues. He recalled when there was no such system and the Committee had opted to fund some projects out of ranking order and which really did not compete well with others submitted.

Mr. Tveten asked if there would be any reference to wetlands at some time in the evaluation system. Mr. Fairleigh replied this could be done in the future should the Committee desire to add the category. There might also be other types of land which should be addressed later on. The system is subject to change and modification with the needs. Mr. Tveten felt the Committee should address this issue and possibly put some emphasis on wetlands. Mr. Fairleigh said wetlands had already qualified and been funded in some instances under the present evaluation system. Question C-2 calls for up to 8 points for wetlands projects. Mr. Volker felt it was appropriate for wetlands to be in the evaluation system for consideration. He pointed out the recreational benefits of wetlands to the public, as well as for preservation of wildlife.

The fact that recreational projects are an economic factor for communities was mentioned by Mr. Tveten. Legislators in the last session had recognized this fact and the local citizenry had been responsible for the awareness. Mr. Volker agreed recreational projects were an economic value, but stated the Legislature should be looking at this aspect not the IAC. Mr. Tveten pointed out that the Legislature in its review of the budgets does take into account the economic value of parks and recreation areas and facilities. He noted specifically the 1987 Legislature when State Parks had received funding for certain projects placed there by the Legislature because these were considered to be an economic enhancement for the communities. Ms. Cox said she would rather deal with this question at a later time. Mr. Mackey stated the IAC is going to have to sell its product and use economic development with the State Legislature. Mr. Tveten agreed.

IV. NOVA MANUALS IV. G. H. & I NEW BUSINESS: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, "NOVA Program Policy and Procedures Manuals", dated March 25, 1988, which referred to three manuals proposed for adoption: (1) AN INTRODUCTION; (2) APPLICATIONS; (3) REIMBURSEMENT BILL PROCEDURE.

(1) NOVA PROGRAM PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES - AN INTRODUCTION - MANUAL: This manual has been used for several years and has gained widespread acceptance among users and all levels of government. It contains information regarding funding, what are ORVs and nonhighway roads, the eligibility of sponsors and projects, and the role of the IAC.

(2) NOVA PROGRAM PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES - APPLICATIONS MANUAL: This manual deals with the process leading to a grant award. There are five attachments (application and project information forms). Seven questions were added to the manual designed to interpret the "nonhighway road" projects (page 4-section E-of Attachment A).

(3) NOVA PROGRAM PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES - REIMBURSEMENT BILL PROCEDURES MANUAL: This manual covers reimbursement procedures. A new section NOVA Noncapital Projects was added (Section 5).

Staff recommended adoption of the three manuals which are largely a housekeeping and updating effort of guidelines already being followed.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT THE THREE DRAFTED NOVA PROGRAM POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUALS: (1) AN INTRODUCTION; (2) APPLICATIONS; AND (3) REIMBURSEMENT PROCEDURE BE ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR USE IN THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM.

Discussion followed. Dr. Scull was informed the distribution of the manuals is made in response to inquiries; manuals are taken to various workshops and meetings for distribution upon request. In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Lovelady said the manuals were virtually the same information as has been used and distributed to interested persons over the years and it was not necessary to review these with the full NOVA Advisory Committee.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION, AND IT WAS CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE POLICY: Mr. Dovel referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, "All-Terrain Vehicle Policy", noting the following:

1. The use of small three and four-wheeled all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) for recreation has grown rapidly. During the last five years, the U. S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) has been investigating the safety characteristics of these vehicles. This was largely due to the significant number of injuries and deaths among children operating these vehicles. Washington state has no restrictions on the age of operators of the vehicles operating off of public roadways.

2. CPSC determined that the design of the three-wheeled ATVs was unsafe. They have agreed with manufacturers of these vehicles that:

- a. New three-wheeled ATVs will no longer be sold in the United States.
- b. Current inventories of three-wheeled ATVs will be returned to the manufacturers.
- c. Manufacturers will provide safety training for owners of three-wheeled ATVs.

d. Warnings will be posted regarding hazards of ATV operation.

3. The agreement did not ban the use of ATVs (three or four-wheeled); nor establish minimum age or operator training/certification requirements. It did not address the resale of used three-wheeled ATVs.

4. As a result of the actions of CPSC, it is believed the problems have been resolved. When these vehicles pass their operational life-span they will no longer be a factor in ORV recreation.

5. Staff recommended adoption of an ORV policy (which includes ATVs) through a resolution. A revised copy of the proposed resolution was distributed to each IAC member.

In comparing the previous resolution which had been distributed to the Committee members with the kit material, Ms. Cox noted there were changes in the language of the new proposed resolution. She asked why this language had been deleted. The previous language had stated the IAC recognized the operation of any type of ORV vehicle is a physical and mental challenge requiring skill, that the IAC supported only safe and responsible operation of them, and remained committed to the planning, development, and operation of safe ORV facilities. It mentioned specifically the ATV three-wheeled vehicles. Mr. Jeff Lane, Assistant Attorney General, responded stating that public agencies are now more vulnerable to liability; the courts are seeing more and more of these types of problems. Agencies are being held responsible for actions which might not actually be of their doing. Since the IAC does not actually build the ORV facilities but merely funds them, it should not be held responsible for ORV accidents occurring in the ORV parks and ORV areas. Agencies which assume or undertake commitments such as written into the first proposed resolution, often find their policy being used against them in court, though this was not their intention. He advised the IAC staff to delete the proposed wording.

Dr. Scull approved of the new proposed resolution, and asked if three-wheeled vehicles had been banned in Thurston County's ORV Sports Park. Mr. Dovel replied as far as he knew they had not been. Mr. Lane stated it was his personal opinion that the County would be liable in that at this time it does charge fees to the public for use of the site. However, the IAC would have no connection with negligence in the park's use. It merely funds the park and makes it available to the public through another agency for recreational purposes.

Mr. Mackey asked if the IAC should recommend to Thurston County that it ban three-wheeled vehicle use in the park. Mr. Lane reiterated his contention that the IAC should not make these types of decisions. If it does, it would then become responsible. It is better to leave this responsibility to the local agency.

Mr. Biles asked what would happen to the policy resolution if adopted. Mr. Wilder replied it would be a part of the press release of the March meeting which receives wide distribution. Also, it would be available primarily as a position expressed by the Committee. Mr. Lane stated the language in the new proposed resolution had been reviewed by others and it was determined the language was good since the Committee was not taking any overt action. It is more of a cautionary resolution.

Mr. Tveten noted that his agency also had to be cautious in adopting administrative policies, that this was true of all state agencies. He asked about paragraph three of the proposed resolution,

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE IAC CAUTIONS PARENTS OF CHILDREN OPERATING ANY TYPE OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLE TO PROVIDE CLOSE SUPERVISION OF THOSE MINOR OPERATORS..."

How would the IAC go about "cautioning parents of children?" Mr. Lovelady replied this would be handled through the safety and education programs concerning ORVs which are set up in certain counties. Further, the agency has the responsibility for a Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Guide, and safety and education items can be written into that document. Mr. Tveten wondered whether the IAC shouldn't place more money into the safety/education program. Mr. Lovelady reminded him of the percentages which are to be allocated to the various aspects of the NOVA program as set up by law. The IAC has been adhering to those percentages.

Mr. Loren McGovern, Backcountry Horsemen's Association, asked the Committee if it made this same type of resolution for all of the other recreational activities, i.e., swimming, horse-back riding, skiing, etc. He felt every one of the recreational pursuits assumed some danger, and that if the Committee did not pass the same type of resolution for these other activities, it was wrong to do it for the three-wheeled recreational activity.

Mr. Cox advised Mr. McGovern that the Committee had wanted to give some leadership to the very apparent dangerous use of the three-wheeled vehicles and the legal ramifications emanating from their use. Therefore, staff had been asked to look into this matter and advise the Committee on what they could do about it. She said if she had felt that horseback-riding was an outrageously handled recreational activity, she would also like to do something about that. This had been an area of deep concern on learning of the many people being killed through use of the three-wheeled vehicle. She hoped that the IAC was not so hamstrung that it could not at least make a statement in regard to such use.

Mr. Tveten noted it was important to remember that the person or agency operating and maintaining the ORV facility is rightfully on the front line as to liability. Mr. Lane agreed and called attention to each paragraph of the resolution and its intent.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL THAT THE COMMITTEE HAVING RECEIVED GOOD ADVICE FROM THE STAFF OF THE IAC AS TO THREE-WHEELED VEHICLES AND THEIR USE, ADOPT THE POLICY STATEMENT AS PRESENTED IN THE MOTION.

THE MOTION DIED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.

Discussion continued. Mr. Tveten asked who posted the warnings regarding hazards of ATV operation as indicated in item 4 of staff's memorandum. Mr. Dovel stated there would be posters exhibited where all ATVs are sold. It will state that the three-wheeled vehicles are dangerous if operated out of the skill or ability level of the user.

Commissioner Ray Isaacson was of the opinion that the IAC by acknowledging the dangerous use of the vehicles, would be liable to any accidents unless it banned such use in the park areas it funds for this type of recreation. The fact that IAC has considered the matter, and may adopt a policy, makes the agency liable.

Mr. Lane replied the motion before the Committee as changed from the original policy motion would not affect the IAC in that manner. Ms. Cox felt the Committee would not be doing any good at all if it voted the motion down. It should take a positive stand. Mr. Lane reiterated his advice that the policy would not be of any harm to the IAC. Mr. Wilder pointed out the IAC does not tell local agencies, nor state agencies, how to "run their business" once projects are funded. The IAC is a funding agency; the local government authority assumes all responsibility following the funding process. Dr. Scull noted the liability factor in his profession, yet he felt the motion should be adopted; a position by the IAC should be taken. He felt if adopted it would not make the IAC any more vulnerable than it already is in regard to funded projects.

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING MONETARY AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ORV RECREATIONISTS THROUGH SAFETY, EDUCATION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE IAC ENCOURAGES ALL OFF-ROAD VEHICLE RECREATIONISTS (ORV), INCLUDING THOSE WHO RECREATE WITH ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES (ATV), TO OPERATE THEIR VEHICLES IN A RESPONSIBLE MANNER, AND TO SEEK OUT AND PARTICIPATE IN AVAILABLE TRAINING PROGRAMS, AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE IAC CAUTIONS PARENTS OF CHILDREN OPERATING ANY TYPE OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLE TO PROVIDE CLOSE SUPERVISION OF THOSE MINOR OPERATORS AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE IAC ENCOURAGES THE STATE TO DEVELOP MINIMUM AGE REQUIREMENTS AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR OPERATORS OF ALL TYPES OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLES OPERATED ON PUBLIC LANDS.

RESOLUTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED.

Ms. Cox mentioned Liability problems in Spokane County. Dr. Scull said this was throughout all counties.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. K. JULY 1988 IAC MEETING: Ms. Cox referred to memorandum of staff dated March 25, 1988, which called for consideration of a July meeting of the IAC. The Committee opted for a June meeting so that a majority of members would be able to attend.

JUNE 27-28 9:00 a.m. LONG BEACH, WASHINGTON
June 27 - Tour of projects
June 28 - IAC Regular Meeting

Stating this would affect preparation of the Capital Budget and its prior review, Mr. Wilder concurred in the meeting dates and site.

MR. MACKEY MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT, SECONDED, AND CARRIED. (2:45 p.m.)

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE *as amended*

DATE

6-28-88
Anne B. Cox
IAC CHAIR

During the Legislative Session, the IAC monitored twenty-seven House bills and fifty-one Senate bills relating to parks and recreation and natural resources issues. Of the twenty-seven House Bills, six passed the Legislature. Of the fifty-one Senate bills monitored, four passed the Legislature. A brief summary of these bills is as follows:

HOUSE BILLS

Engrossed Sub-House Bill #46: This bill provides for the distribution of local watercraft excise tax to cities and towns providing marine patrol services. Requires inclusion of all cities and towns providing marine patrol services in the interlocal agreement. Sets procedure for implementation determining compensation and the use of arbitration if necessary.

House Bill #1531 - Sunset Review Criteria: This bill terminates the Washington Sunset Act established under RCW 41.131 on June 30, 2000 instead of on June 30, 1990.

House Bill #1616 - State Trust Land Purchases: This bill adds to the list of properties to be acquired by the State Parks and Recreation Commission from the Department of Natural Resources. Specific properties to be acquired are included in the bill. Directs the State Parks and DNR to prepare a report by December 15, 1988, outlining proposed funding mechanisms to accelerate reimbursement of the related trusts.

House Bill #1710 - Public Works Board Projects: Approving projects approved by the Public Works Board. This bill approves certain listed city, town, and county projects for loans with funds previously appropriated from the Public Works Assistance Account.

E2Sub-House Bill #1835 - Tri-Cities Economic Diversification: This bill requires the Department of Trade and Economic Development to begin the implementation of certain goals established in a certain study of the region and to consider which of these goals are most likely to lead to economic diversification. Appropriates funds to the Department of Trade and Economic Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Employment Security Department, the Washington State University and the Washington Institute of Public Policy. The Act terminates on June 30, 1989. The state agencies will be involved in technology transfer, economic studies, training and job search assistance, and the promotion of industrial development.

Sub-House Bill #1862 - Beaches/Land Use Plans: This bill creates a cooperative program to provide recreation management plans for area beaches. Requires certain provisions, i.e., including restriction on the use of motor vehicles along forty percent of the beach during a summer season. Requires submission of plans by September 1, 1989, for approval by State Parks and requires State Parks to adopt a plan for sites where plans are not submitted. Declares that beaches are a public highway which remain forever open to the use of the public.

MODIFICATIONS TO PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6 - MARCH 25, 1988

APPENDIX B

SECTION D - Pre-Scored

Question D-1: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROJECT MEET OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS AS IDENTIFIED IN LOCAL AND STATE COMPREHENSIVE PLANS? (Maximum 30 Points) This question will be scored in advance by the Planning Services Division.

- A. The sponsoring agency's Comprehensive Park & Recreation Plan. (0-15)
- B. The Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). (0-5)

Population

| <u>CITIES AND DISTRICTS</u> | <u>COUNTIES</u> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 100,000 and above // // 10 // | AA and A // // // // // |
| 30,000 to 100,000 // // 8 // | 1st and 2nd // // // // |
| 10,000 to 30,000 // // 6 // | 3rd and 4th // // // // |
| 10,000 and below // // 4 // | 5th and below // // // // |

Question D-2: THE PROJECT IS LOCATED WITHIN A PUBLIC BODY FOR WHICH THE POPULATION IS: (Maximum 10 points).

| <u>Cities and Districts</u> | <u>Counties and County-wide Districts</u> |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 100,000 and above - 10 | AA and A - 10 |
| 30,000 to 100,000 - 8 | 1st and 2nd - 8 |
| 10,000 to 30,000 - 6 | 3rd and 4th - 6 |
| 10,000 and below - 4 | 5th and below - 4 |

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

Question D-3: IS THE PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN THE CONFINES OF A LOW INCOME SECTION OF THE COUNTY OR THE COMMUNITY? (Median income below 80% of median income of County) This question will be scored in advance by the Project Services Division.

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| <u>Percent of population low income</u> | 80% and above - 8 |
| | 70% to 79% - 7 |
| | 60% to 69% - 6 |
| | 50% to 59% - 5 |
| | 40% to 49% - 4 |
| | 30% to 39% - 3 |

G.I.A.

REVIEW CRITERIA REPORT 1988

PROJECT EVALUATIONS PROCEDURE MANUAL

History: A System in Evolution

The first IAC project evaluation sessions were closed meetings with projects evaluated internally by IAC staff. Staff selected one project from those submitted that was considered to be ideal, and then ranked the remaining projects in comparison to it.

In the late 1960's criteria was developed against which each project was evaluated. Evaluation sessions remained closed meetings, with no local agency sponsors or public in attendance. The July 1967 Procedural Guidelines manual listed fifteen evaluation criteria, with "need" being recognized as a top priority. The projects were rated against nine questions, two of which were bonus questions.

In 1973, IAC staff determined that a more consistent method for rating projects should be established. A Project Evaluation System was developed and adopted in January 1974 that was similar to the system in use today. The evaluation team consisted of one IAC member, the chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee, the IAC assistant administrator, one IAC planning division staff, and all IAC project officers. Projects were presented to the evaluation team by a project officer who did not vote on that project. The Inter-agency Committee passed several motions at the September 1976 meeting dealing with the basic concepts and issues surrounding the evaluation system. Local agency projects would hence be evaluated on the basis of need identified in the local agency comprehensive plan and capital improvement program and on the basis of the need exhibited in the service area not being met by existing recreation facilities. This change in emphasis led to a revision of the system in December 1976.

A thorough analysis of the system was conducted by IAC staff in 1977 and 1978 when it was determined that the emphasis of the system was still project quality rather than the relative need for the facility or opportunity to be

Following tabulation of scores, staff makes a presentation of projects and a funding recommendation to the Interagency Committee for your review of projects and final decision on funding. This process has been recognized and presented by request at both the regional and national level to both state and federal officials as a model system for project review and selection.

Current Issues and Challenges:

The current project evaluation process is well established and almost universally supported by the people it serves. However, specific project evaluation system questions are constantly being reviewed by staff in an effort to make them as responsive as possible to the needs of our project sponsors while complying with legislative intent and IAC policy directions.

As an example consider the question of boating access and access to water in the evaluation questionnaire.

In the 1974 evaluation questionnaire boating access, boating destination, and access to water (tidelands only) were three separate questions as follows:

(E-1): PROVIDES OR WILL PROVIDE BOATING ACCESS FACILITIES 0 - 12

Boating access facilities are defined as facilities which allow for the physical transference of boats from land to water. Traditionally, this would include launching ramps and other launching devices, and supporting facilities such as docks, parking areas, and restrooms. Points should be awarded according to the scope of the project and the significance of the body of water.

(E-2): PROVIDES OR WILL PROVIDE BOATING DESTINATION FACILITIES 0 - 12

A destination site is one that boaters purposely go to and stay at for a fair amount of time because of the type of facilities or recreation opportunities offered. In addition to providing the traditional moorage, picnicking, playgrounds, restrooms, and perhaps camping facilities, the site may provide access to near-by shopping, sight-seeing, and recreational activities. A site which attracts boaters for only a short stop-over, similar to a highway rest area, does not fit this definition.

Question C-2: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE BOATING ACCESS AND/OR BOATING DESTINATION FACILITIES?

0 - 10 POINTS

In the 1984 evaluation questionnaire the boating question remained the same but an access to water question was added. In this question any natural body of water including rivers was considered for an award of points. The questions were as follows:

Question C-1: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE BOATING ACCESS AND/OR BOATING DESTINATION FACILITIES?

0 - 10 POINTS

Question C-2: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE PUBLIC ACCESS TO WATER OTHER THAN RELATED TO BOATING?

0 - 10 POINTS

This approach was immediately unpopular with project sponsors who had projects not relating to either boating or water access. Due to the available points in these two questions it became virtually impossible for a non-boating/water access project to compete. In November 1984 the highest ranking non-boating/water access project was ranked 18th (Pomeroy Pool) and 21 of the top 25 projects were boating or water access related.

In response to this obvious problem a new question was written for the 1985 evaluation questionnaire that greatly reduced the impact of a boating/water access project. The question was (and still is) as follows:

Question C-1: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE BOATING ACCESS, BOATING DESTINATION FACILITIES AND/OR PUBLIC ACCESS TO WATER OTHER THAN RELATED TO BOATING?

0 - 10 POINTS

This question has been well received and project sponsors now feel that balance has returned to the system.

A similar evolution has occurred with most other questions now used in the evaluation questionnaire. Staff is now very comfortable with the existing questions. We have received very few complaints from our project sponsors regarding the questions with two exceptions. They are:

- (1) Population - The population question (D-1) has always been an issue. Small communities feel that the current practice of awarding more points to urban areas should be reversed. The Legislature has mandated that urban areas receive some preference. In 1985 the following question was added to the evaluation questionnaire:

At this point, given the lack of traditional grant funding, the entire issue is moot for 1988. However, in the future, it may be something to consider as we attempt to respond to changes in emphasis and need at the local level.

- (2) Wetlands - As you are aware IAC staff has been involved with the efforts of the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Authority related to wetlands. One task has been the development of criteria for site selection of wetlands and a listing of wetlands for preservation. Additionally, the National Park Service has required a wetlands element be added to SCORP. The impact of this new emphasis on wetlands on the project evaluation questionnaire is uncertain at this point. At present, the wetlands issue is addressed by the following question, which to this point has proven adequate:

Question C-2: DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE PUBLIC USE, ENJOYMENT AND PRESERVATION OF A NATURAL AREA OR BIOLOGICAL TYPE AS IDENTIFIED IN THE STATE NATURAL HERITAGE PLAN AND/OR PROVIDE PUBLIC USE, ENJOYMENT AND PRESERVATION OF WETLANDS?

In summary, the Interagency Committee project evaluation process and the specific questions in the process have been the subject of constant change and review to reach the current process and questionnaire. At present, staff feels the process is working well and has confidence in the current system and questionnaire. However, as always, we stand ready to discuss and implement any changes that will better meet the needs of our project sponsors. In reality the problems we find now stem more from the lack of adequate funding. Until that can be resolved, the focus of time and energy should continue to be directed toward finding a continuous and adequate funding source(s).