

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
REGULAR MEETING

DATE: June 28, 1988
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: The Breakers
95th and Highway 103
Long Beach, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair
Dr. Eliot Scull, Wenatchee

Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation Commission
Raymond Ryan, Designee for Joseph R. Blum, Director,
Department of Fisheries
Jenene Fenton, Designee for Curt Smitch, Director,
Department of Wildlife

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver
Ralph Mackey, Everett
Joe C. Jones, Seattle

Honorable Brian Boyle, State Land Commissioner,
Department of Natural Resources, or Designee,
Stan Biles

APPENDICIES:

IAC 1989-91 BUDGET REQUEST - SCHEDULE ONE
IAC 1989-91 BUDGET REQUEST - SCHEDULE TWO
IAC 1989-91 STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Anne Cox, at 9:03 a.m. Quorum included: COX, SCULL, TVETEN, RYAN, FENTON.

Attendees were welcomed by the Chair and asked to introduce themselves. Among those attending were: Tad H. Shimazu, Assistant Attorney General and Mr. John Edwards, Department of Natural Resources, representing that Department.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES, MARCH 25, 1988: The following correction to the minutes was brought to the Committee's attention by Dr. Scull:

3-25-88, Page 5 - f. Administrative Actions, Item (4):

"Calawah Access, 87-02AL, \$59,000 \$59,500 ALEA project. Acquire five acres of property on Calawah River, near Town of Forks."

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT THE MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 1988, BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

AGENDA - APPROVAL FOR THE JUNE 28, 1988 MEETING: There being no additions or deletions to the June 28, 1988 IAC Meeting Agenda, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. RYAN, SECONDED BY DR. SCULL, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE JUNE 28, 1988, IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Robert Wilder, Director, referred to memorandum "Director's Report", noting the following:

1. Appreciated welcome given to the IAC by community leaders in Long Beach. Tour given to IAC members was excellent and indicative of the preparations by local people. Thanked everyone on behalf of the IAC members and Committee.

2. Gave background information on the LWCF funding. Probably be at \$20 million this time, but is a positive statement that the LWCF fund should be kept "alive". House of Representatives now needs support of the Senate in LWCF funding program.
3. WRPA - making contacts with legislators concerning funding program for parks, recreation, and conservation through the IAC.
4. Contacts stressing support for IAC have been numerous. Meeting with **Mr. Fred Hellberg**, Office of Financial Management and Governor's Office liaison, went well. IAC members met with Mr. Hellberg June 27, 1988, at 10:00 a.m. Comments were asked from the IAC members:

Dr. Scull received the impression from Mr. Hellberg that he was leaning towards a recommendation for a merger into another department. Ms. Cox stated she felt the members were being asked to "get on board", that this was the proper action to be taken. Dr. Scull noted that the members had given Mr. Hellberg their feelings and impressions on this matter. There did not appear to be any criticism of the IAC or its programs, but Mr. Hellberg had stated it would be more efficient to have the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation placed in with another larger agency. Ms. Fenton asked that the Committee be able to review the report early so that comments could be made. She asked that the Director stress the need to have the report available in November as is contemplated. She did not want to have the members receive the report in December when it would actually be too late for constructive comments. Ms. Cox suggested that a letter be sent (with her signature) to Mr. Hellberg pointing out the need for the Committee members to have the report in November, thus allowing time for review and comment. The Committee members present agreed with Ms. Cox's suggestion.

Director's Report - continued:

5. Announced employment of **Ms. Marguerite Austin**, as Recreation Projects Manager, effective July 5, 1988, bringing the IAC staff to full authorized level. Ms. Austin's experience includes working with the Land and Water Conservation program in the State of Indiana.
6. Funding for November 1988 includes the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle and Initiative 215 (I-215) revenues and is looking good.
7. 1989 will be Centennial year; 75th Anniversary of the State Parks and Recreation Commission; and the 25th Anniversary of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. A special week of celebration will be held nationwide as a spin-off of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO).
8. NRPA Board of Trustees: Accepted invitation to have a Trustee meeting in Washington State in May, 1989. A good opportunity for parks/recreation personnel to have interaction with them.
9. Conversions: IAC's role in defending existing legacy of parks, recreation, and conservation areas is growing in importance as other interests strive to convert areas to other uses.
10. IAC has assisted in 2,023 park, recreation, and conservation projects to date, totaling over \$271 million. 217 individual agencies served.

11. Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account, Dept. of Natural Resources: Has proven to be a successful program. IAC assisting DNR and project clientele is an example of a fine cooperative program.
12. Two lawsuits were withdrawn, relieving the IAC of the burden of expensive time-consuming litigation.
13. Governor's Office: Relationship with Governor's Office is going well. Cooperation in: Wetlands Study and Plan, Forest Service Plans reviews, Columbia River Gorge, Federal Legislation, press releases, and trouble-shooting - all reflect Governor's Office has confidence in IAC.
14. IAC staff presently doing "more with less". Staff morale remains high. Dedication and commitment to the Committee and IAC programs is unwavering.

At the conclusion of Mr. Wilder's report, Mr. Tveten inquired into the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account of the Department of Natural Resources. Since the IAC assists in this program, he suggested the Director might want to look into a surcharge for the administrative services it is rendering. The impact on Initiative 215 funds would then be less. He said he did not intend to make a motion, but felt the Committee should be aware that Initiative 215 monies are being used in this program. Mr. Wilder replied he did not feel the IAC was incurring a great deal of costs in the program. However, if there was a need to place a surcharge on these projects, he would then come to the Committee for the necessary approval. At this point, Mr. John Edwards, Manager, Division of Land and Water Conservation, Department of Natural Resources, said he did not know how much more of the ALEA funds would be available for grants (both state and local). Approximately one-half million has been allocated to Snohomish County. There may also be some taken for the Department of Ecology's wetlands. Therefore, it is not possible to determine further funding for grants to projects with which the IAC would be involved.

II. STATUS REPORTS - B. Management Services:

1. Fund Summary -- Grant-in-Aid Projects - Traditional: Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, referred to the Fund Summary dated June 15, 1988, concerning the traditional Grant-in-Aid Projects of the IAC. He reported the statistics were "normal" for the time of year and were basically as anticipated by the agency. The minus figures in the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund column were explained. Mr. Baker also stated that the Initiative 215 funds which were in the minus category at the March IAC meeting were now on the plus side and there will be sufficient funds to cover needs for the entire biennium. He referred to the "Projects Still Shown as Pending List", which included a listing of projects for local agencies, Wildlife Department, Department of Natural Resources, State Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Department of Fisheries. The Committee was informed that the Squaxin Island Tribe's Public Boat Ramp and Dock project in the amount of \$25,000 from Initiative 215 monies, approved in November 1987, had been withdrawn. Therefore, an additional \$25,000 of Initiative 215 funds was now available.

2. Fund Summary -- Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program: Mr. Baker reviewed the NOVA Fund Summary, dated June 15, 1988, which indicated a current fund status of \$1,947,393.19. Transfers from DNR from 6-20-86 to 4-30-88 were noted at \$217,947.83.

II. STATUS REPORTS. Project Services: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "Project Services Division Report" noting the following:

1. Currently Project Services staff are working on 64 local agencies projects and 23 local agencies aquatic land projects, in various stages of completion.
2. Certain projects recently completed and observing dedication ceremonies were cited:

Port of South Whidbey - Possession Beach Park and Boat Ramp
City of Auburn - Auburn Game Farm Park
Snohomish County - Meadowdale Beach Park
City of Normandy Park - Marine View Park (Normandy Beach)
Yakima County - Yakima Greenway - Century Land and Robinson Landing
3. Squaxin Island Tribe's, Public Boat Ramp and Dock Project was withdrawn.
4. Conversions: Reported several in the offing -- East Green River Park, Shoreview Park, King County; Whatcom Lake, Lake Whatcom Park; Burke-Gilman Trail, King County. Committee will be kept advised of these pending conversions.
5. November Funding Session: Only Initiative 215 funds will be available for November 1988. Staff received 23 Letters of Intent for boating-related projects. Normally, approximately 100 Letters of Intent are received for all types of projects.
6. Staff is working with a number of communities, possible sponsors of projects in anticipation of renewed available funding.
7. Resolved Lawsuits: Reported the following lawsuits were resolved:
 - a. Lysack v. State: Diving injury, Tumwater Historical Park, Tumwater, Washington. Settled with cash payment and annuity to plaintiff.
 - b. Gunn v. State: Drowning at DNR's County Line Park. Settlement not involving state was reached.
8. State Agency Activity:
 - a. Aquatic Land project - administratively approved:

<u>Parks</u>	Fishing Access for	#86-10AL	\$33,100 ALEA funds
	the Disabled		
 - b. Cattle Point - DNR Project: San Juan Island project completed.

II. C. 2. King County, Burke-Gilman/Sammamish River, IAC #86-059A (Blythe Park):

Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "City of Bothell, 96th Avenue Widening Project, King County, Burke-Gilman to Sammamish River 'Final Link', IAC #86-059A", citing the following:

1. In 1985, the IAC assisted King County with acquisition of 1.3 acres of property which provided the "final link" between the Burke-Gilman and Sammamish River trails. Public use of 25.8 miles of trail, uninterupted, between downtown Seattle and the Marymoor Park in Redmond, were thus provided. Also access via an old railroad trestle was provided between the trail and the City of Bothell's Blythe Park.
2. The City of Bothell needs to widen 96th avenue and must acquire a narrow strip of the King County park property. IAC staff, contacted by King County, has been working to resolve this matter.
3. A conversion of use would take place under IAC procedural guidelines. The City of Bothell has identified a suitable replacement parcel contiguous to the south boundary of Blythe Park and the north right-of-way of the Tolt River Pipe Line east of the Sammamish River. Appraisals will be made. If approved the City will acquire the replacement parcel and deed it to King County for park purposes.
4. Staff anticipates no difficulty in resolving the issue. However, due to the time frame, the City of Bothell may be under construction and utilizing the King County parcel before actual acquisition of the replacement property.
5. This basic background information was provided to the Committee prior to a request for "conversion of use" at the November 3-4, 1988 meeting of the IAC.

Mr. Tveten referred to the conversion to take place within the Shoreview Park Project (King County). He noted this would involve a portion of the park being converted to a stormwater retention pond. He felt it would be necessary for him, as a member of the Interagency Committee, to know the impacts on recreational opportunities if the Committee were to consider such a conversion. He felt the conversion could quite likely be one in a series of such requests and the staff of the IAC ought to have some direction from the Committee in handling them. There were, in his opinion, many questions to resolve in considering this type of conversion: What type of pond is being planned? What effect will it have on recreation in the park? What recreational opportunities would be lost? What, if anything, would the park be gaining for recreation? Etc.

Mr. Fairleigh stated the pond would be a temporary retention pond -- water will flow into it at times and flow out. A large excavation will be required with also some landfill. The park, he felt would be losing a very nice meadow area as well as a portion of the forested area. The pond would have necessary riprap and an armor attached to it which, he stated, would not make it particularly attractive to recreation.

Mr. Tveten felt the pond should be attractive in its relationship to the recreational aspects, and it could be if constructed in the proper manner. He cited the need for a pond to hold waters at the Grayland State Park. It had been so constructed that it was an asset to the park's recreational aspect, as well as turning into a "stopover" for wildlife. Mr. Fairleigh pointed out that the City of Kent likewise had a holding pond in one of its parks and had made it fit into the recreational purposes of the park.

Mr. Tveten stated if the pond did not contribute anything to wildlife or recreation, the Committee should carefully review the conversion request. Mr. Wilder mentioned he had visited the area and could vouch for its valuable contribution to the park's recreation. He commented on the "history" of the request and stated King County through conversations with the IAC was now looking at the concept and proposed change and will be coming up with further recommendations. Mr. Tveten asked how King County could justify its contention that the request was not an actual conversion. Mr. Fairleigh replied the County intended to plant grass. However, they would not riprap the entire project and they felt children would be able to play there. Dr. Scull asked if the pond could be full of water year-round. Mr. Fairleigh replied this was possible, but at this point in planning the pond will only be a basin, and could not be used for anything else. Mr. Clark stated that King County had presented to the IAC staff what appears to be a conversion of use and they now need to replace the property use with similar property conducive to recreation, as stipulated in the IAC guidelines. He felt the County as of the present time was proceeding with that understanding.

Mr. Wilder cautioned that the Committee would need to evaluate this request carefully since the County is planning stormwater retention ponds in other areas as well in the future. In response to Mr. Tveten's question, Mr. Fairleigh stated there were four or five acres of meadowland with the balance of the property being heavily timbered. Mr. Barney Wilson, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Kent, mentioned the maintenance road in the park, which he felt could be made into a trail and thus add to the recreational attractiveness.

Mr. Fairleigh informed the Committee there would be further conversions to be reviewed by the Committee in the City of Olympia, Percival Landing Project during the November 1988 Funding Session.

II. STATUS REPORTS D. Planning Services: Mr. Greg Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "Planning Services Status Report", reporting on the following items:

1. Local Agencies Technical Assistance: A total of 119 agencies are eligible to participate in the IAC's traditional grant-in-aid program. 78 cities, 12 counties, 15 port districts, 7 special districts (park and recreation and public utility districts), 6 school districts, and 1 Indian Tribe. Currently staff is working with 104 local agencies in their plan developments.
2. Trails Directory Update: Target date for distribution of the Trails Directory is November 11, 1988, which will allow inclusion of trail events planned in honor of Washington State's Centennial Celebration.

The National Park Service (NPS) is currently involved in producing a Pacific Northwest Trails Directory. Will be working with NPS to ensure IAC Trails Directory does not duplicate their information. Since the NPS directory will include maps and will be a nationwide informative publication, it appears the IAC Directory will not overlap information given to the public. It will contain information sources where an individual may obtain maps and publications on specific trails.

3. Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area: Mr. Lovelady corrected information in the memorandum to indicate that the four-phase recreation assessment to be completed in December, 1988, will guide \$13 million of recreation development, rather than the \$3 million. This figure does not include the \$10,000,000 for an interpretive and conference center.

The Assessment Committee of the Columbia River Gorge Commission is determining, through consultants and Forest Service planners, the demand and need for recreation facilities in the Gorge. The Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) has provided vital information to the group.

4. **Wetlands:** Copies of the Washington Wetlands Priority Plan were distributed to the IAC members. This plan was approved by the members and adopted as an official addendum to the Sixth Edition of SCORP by Governor Booth Gardner on December 14, 1987. NPS approved the plan in January of 1988.

IAC staff continues its work with the departments of Ecology, Natural Resources, Fisheries, and Wildlife in the development of the wetlands preservation element for the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority Management Plan (PSWQAP). Work will continue through 1989 and 1990.

At this point, Mr. Lovelady commented on the new covers the IAC has on tap for use in its various publications. There are three designs; one to be used for major reports, one for IAC manuals, and the third for special reports and projects. These will be used from time-to-time to upgrade the IAC's image. Heretofore reports had contained only xeroxed covers.

Planning Services Report - continued:

5. Recreation Guide Update: The updated lists for the Recreation Guide were included in the Planning Services' status report. Ninety-four new sites were identified and 16 closed sites reported.

D. 2 - Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Report: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, "Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Report", dated June 28, 1988, reporting the following items:

1. NOVA Applications: 60 applications were received for NOVA grant-in-aid funding. Twenty-eight are off-road vehicle project proposals and 32 are Nonhighway Road proposals. Evaluations take place October 6, 1988, at the Capital Mall Community Room, Olympia. Committee members are invited to attend.
2. Off-Road Vehicle Manual: Preparation of an ORV Procedural Manual is underway. Draft document has been distributed to the NOVA Advisory Committee for its review and comment. Consideration for adoption by the IAC will take place at the November 1988 Funding Session.

3. 1988 NOVA Program Deadlines: Reported NOVA meetings included:
 - a. August 18 - NOVA Advisory Committee Project Review
10:00 a.m., Capital Mall Community Room, Olympia
 - b. October 6 - NOVA Advisory Committee Evaluation meeting
8:30 a.m., Capital Mall Community Room, Olympia

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Project Changes

1. Thurston County, ORV Sports Park, #80-58D, Conversion: Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "Thurston County ORV Sports Park, #ORV-80-58D". He outlined the history of the lighting system at the ORV Sports Park and the request to remove a portion of same:

a. June 2, 1980 - Thurston County applied for track lights so that events could be staged at night. The project indicated that the track had been previously lighted and this project would, therefore, be an improvement of existing, historical use. With this information, following public hearings and approval by County legislative authority, the Interagency Committee granted approval for the project (#ORV-80-58D) on April 1, 1981.

b. The lights were installed. Neighbors to the park objected on the grounds that the lights were not an improvement of existing lights, but rather were an expansion of use. This question was sent to the County Hearings Examiner and following public testimony, the Examiner ruled on July 21, 1981, that the lights were in fact an expansion of use.

c. During the past eight years the lights have remained unused. Early in 1987 the Thurston County Park Board voted to remove the lights. On March 10, 1987, the Thurston County Commissioners moved to ask the then Parks Director, Earl Williams, to take action to remove the lights.

d. 1988 the Thurston County Parks Department is ready to remove the lights. It appears that the County had no intention of misleading the IAC on this issue, and is now desirous of removing the lights as directed.

e. Only a partial conversion is under consideration - (17 poles with fixtures were installed; 7 are to be removed). The value of the conversion is \$43,121.12 (\$6,161.59 per pole with fixtures).

f. A prepared motion was distributed to the Committee members which included certain criteria to be followed: Final recipient(s) must be approved by the IAC director; all revenues desired to be returned to the IAC and credited to ORV deposits for future ORV grant purposes; and order of preference to be given to parties interested in the lights.

Dr. Scull asked if the motion were approved by the Committee and the seven lights were removed, would that resolve the conflict between the neighbors of the park and the Thurston County Parks Department. Ms. Jeanette Willis, ORV Impact Association, stated her understanding was different than that broached by IAC staff. She had thought there would be some poles left topped only with security

lights, but that all outdoor lights for night-time use would be removed. Mr. Dovel explained staff was recommending the removal of all lights around the track area itself. However, those lights which would not affect the track would remain standing with security lights on those poles in use. This action would take away the ability of the park personnel to host any night-time events. In reply to Dr. Scull's further questions, Mr. Dovel stated this proposal had been decided upon as being the least expensive and the most efficient to accomplish the decision to remove lights so that the track could not have competition during night hours. The remaining lights would not be used, but remain atop the poles with the security lights in use only.

Ms. Willis asked since the IAC seems to have a list of persons interested in using the lights and poles, why isn't the agency allowing that to happen? Mr. Dovel replied the IAC did not have a list of agencies at this time. Also, the lights are not night time lights used to light ballfields. They are a different kind of lighting. Once the IAC Committee has approved a motion to remove the lights, the IAC will issue a NOVA program contract in certain cases. He referred to the motion and cited the following:

- a. First preference - public agencies who will use the lights for furthering an off-road vehicle purpose. Lights to be conveyed at no or reduced cost and considered "replacement-in-kind". A standard IAC NOVA program contract will be used.
- b. Second preference - public agencies who will use the lights for furthering a nonhighway road program purpose, with same stipulations as above.
- c. Third preference - public agencies who will use the lights for furthering other park and recreation purposes with same stipulations as first preference.
- d. Last preference - public and/or private entities who will use the lights for purposes other than those listed above. Payments at \$6,161.59 per pole - total \$43,131.12.

Mr. Lovelady corroborated Mr. Dovel's remarks, adding that in talking to the lighting expert, it would be expensive to remove the top part of the lights, leaving the security lights, and in actuality would not be worth it. An interested buyer would be better off to buy brand new lights.

Dr. Scull felt that in the details being given to the Committee, the staff had not resolved the basic conflict -- that between the neighbors of the park and Thurston County. He received the impression the conflict was not being resolved through staff's proposal.

Mr. Dovel stated staff was eager to take direction from the Committee in whatever final decision is to be made. Further, he felt that Thurston County was also of the same mind. Staff was willing to go back over the matter and come up with a new recommendation if that was desired. Dr. Scull asked if staff could give an estimate of what it would cost to top the rest of the poles and remove the lights, leaving just the security lights on the poles. Mr. Dovel stated he was unable to do so, but that staff could review this further if the Committee requested this be done.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Dovel explained the number of lights in the original contract and their purpose. Mr. Tveten stated he was not familiar with the IAC contract for the ORV Sports Park per se, and felt since the IAC had already invested considerable money in this project, perhaps it would be better if the Committee would hold the County responsible for that dollar amount and allow the County to sell the lights. Mr. Wilder noted that the Committee has the authority to make decisions in conversions of this type and could hold the County responsible if it so desired. Staff would follow directions from the Committee. Mr. Tveten then suggested that the County be asked to take down all of the poles and lights which were under discussion and put up their own security poles with lights at their own cost.

Mr. Lovelady pointed out that the ten poles if they remained were not in a position to light up the track for any night time events. Dr. Scull asked if staff or Thurston County had anyone interested in the lights at this time. Mr. Dovel replied preliminary inquiries had been made and that no one has as yet determined whether they would want the lights because estimated cost of removal needs to be known. Dr. Scull suggested the taking of all 17 poles and lights to resolve the conflict with neighbors to the park, and at the same time contribute utility poles and lights to a "needy" park or recreation department/district. Ms. Willis agreed this would be the best approach. She felt that as long as the lights were in place they would continue to be a threat. She noted the fact that over the years since 1981 when the ORV Impact Association had asked for removal of the lights, there had been a change in personnel in the Thurston County Park and Recreation Department as well as at the track. Some day someone might use the lights not being aware of the conflict. She stated the ORV Impact Association wanted to (1) ensure that the proper guidelines are followed and (2) eliminate any idea of night lighting at the park through removal of the lights and poles. She noted there had been eight years of aggravation and now was the time to resolve the situation. Mr. Bill Willis, ORV Impact Association, expressed his understanding that at the last meeting of the Thurston County Park Board it had been decided all lights would be removed, and those with security lights half up the poles would be cut off at the top, taking down the night lighting fixtures for possible sale.

Mr. Tveten stated he could understand why it was necessary to keep the security lights, but it might not be in the best interests of the IAC to keep the full length poles with the night light fixtures on them. He felt that concept needed to be explored.

...A ten minute recess was called for by the Chair at 10:28 a.m. The Committee reconvened at 10:38 a.m.

Ms. Cox called upon Mr. Mike Welter, Acting Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department, asking that he advise the Committee what the concerns of the County might be about removal of all 17 light poles.

Mr. Welter stated it had been the intent of Thurston County all along to remove the night lights in the facility, therefore it had requested only the ten poles with the security lights on them be retained. However, if it was direction of the Committee to remove all 17 poles and light fixtures, this would be agreeable with the County. It would then be necessary to install security lights, which the County would do since there are recreationists who stay overnight in the park.

Mr. Wilder advised that staff had reworked the proposed motion, it had been discussed with Mr. Welter, and should resolve the conflicts. Ms. Cox felt it did not address her concerns, that she wanted to change paragraph (4). The number of poles to be removed should be 17. The rest of the motion could remain the same.

Discussion followed. Dr. Scull emphasized that the main purpose in removing the lights is to resolve the conflict with the neighbors to the park. He was in favor of removing all 17 poles and having the County reinstall new security lights.

Mr. Lovelady pointed out that in discussions with a lighting expert, it had been brought out there really might not be a lot of value left in the poles. Over time they have suffered through the general aging process and there is a chance they could be nicked or damaged in removal. Thus, it could possibly be easier for an entity needing lights and poles of this type to purchase new ones with new fixtures instead of attempting to transfer damaged poles. Ms. Cox countered Mr. Lovelady's observations citing an example in Spokane where a lighting system not actually meeting the necessary guidelines is being used nevertheless and is working out to everyone's satisfaction. She felt if at all possible the poles and lights should be recycled.

Dr. Scull asked Mr. Welter if anyone had expressed an interest in the lights. Mr. Welter replied there were six to eight different entities; however, seven of those are only interested in the lighting fixtures not the poles. Dr. Scull asked if they would take the poles down in order to procure the lights. Mr. Welter felt they might do so, but he was unsure. Mr. Tveten felt the poles had a considerable "lifeline" and those in the park should be able to last another 34 years. He suggested staff explore the alternative of having the poles and lights removed as units. This to be done by the persons or organization desiring them. Mr. Wilder stated staff had talked to several ORV people feeling the lights could be used in another ORV facility, but there had been no takers. The City of Auburn's Park Department had expressed an interest. Perhaps staff needs to make a more concerted effort to locate a purchaser.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE MOTION AS PREPARED BY STAFF WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT ALL 17 POLES WITH LIGHTS WOULD BE REMOVED RATHER THAN SEVEN; THAT STAFF WOULD EXPLORE OTHER POSSIBILITIES FOR USE OF THE POLES.

Discussion followed. Mr. Wilder asked for clarification. In dealing with Thurston County staff will ensure, following removal of the 17 poles with lights, that the County will reinstall security lights at their own cost. Steve Zimmerman, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Thurston County, also asked for clarification. It was his understanding the motion called for removal of all 17 poles and lights, and that any security lights and poles would be the sole responsibility of the County. Further, that the Director must approve final recipient of the poles and lights being removed.

Dr. Scull and Ms. Cox affirmed this was correct. Ms. Cox noted that the County could retain the security lights for installation on new poles.

With that understanding the following motion was before the Committee for action:

WHEREAS, THE THURSTON COUNTY PARK AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT REQUESTED APPROVAL TO REMOVE FROM THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK PROJECT (ORV 80-58D) A PORTION OF THE NIGHT LIGHTING SYSTEM DECLARED BY THE THURSTON COUNTY HEARINGS EXAMINER IN A RULING DATED JULY 21, 1981, AS AN EXPANSION OF USE AND THEREFORE NOT ALLOWABLE WHEN ORIGINALLY INSTALLED, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN REVIEWING THE REQUEST DEEMS IT ADVISABLE TO REMOVE ALL SEVENTEEN POLES WITH LIGHTING FIXTURES RATHER THAN A PORTION OF SAME IN ORDER TO RESOLVE CONFLICT WITH NEIGHBORS OF THE PARK AND MEET THE OBJECTIVES OF THE THURSTON COUNTY HEARINGS EXAMINER'S FINDINGS; AND

WHEREAS, THE THURSTON COUNTY PARKS BOARD HAS VOTED IN FAVOR OF REMOVAL OF THE NIGHT LIGHTS AND POLES IN ORDER TO ABIDE BY THE HEARINGS EXAMINER'S RULING, AND,

WHEREAS, THE NIGHT LIGHTS AND FIXTURES WERE DESIGNED TO ILLUMINATE THE COMPETITION TRACK IN THE PARK AS WELL AS THE SURROUNDING AREAS OF THE PARK FOR OVERNIGHT RECREATIONISTS, WITH SEVEN OF THE POLES CONTAINING SECURITY LIGHTS AS WELL AS THE NIGHT LIGHTING FIXTURES, AND,

WHEREAS, IT IS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN THE SEVEN SECURITY LIGHTS WITHIN THE PARK; AND

WHEREAS, THE THURSTON COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WOULD NOW LIKE TO NEGOTIATE THE POSSIBLE TRANSFER OR SALE OF THE SEVENTEEN POLES AND NIGHT LIGHTS INVOLVED, WHILE MAINTAINING SECURITY LIGHTS AT THE PARK;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY APPROVE REMOVAL AND TRANSFER OR SALE OF THE SEVENTEEN POLES AND NIGHT LIGHTING FIXTURES WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATIONS AND PROVISOS:

1. THURSTON COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT, FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE POLES AND NIGHT LIGHTS, WILL ASSUME FULL COST OF REINSTALLATION/REMOUNTING OF THE SEVEN SECURITY LIGHTS REQUIRED AT THE PARK.
2. IAC STAFF WILL ASSIST THURSTON COUNTY IN EXPLORING POSSIBILITIES FOR REMOVAL OF THE NIGHT LIGHTS AND POLES. FINAL RECIPIENTS OF THE NIGHT LIGHTS AND POLES MUST BE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION.
3. ANY REVENUES DERIVED WILL BE RETURNED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AND CREDITED TO OFF-ROAD VEHICLE DEPOSITS FOR FUTURE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE GRANT PURPOSES.
4. THE ORDER OF PREFERENCE TO BE GIVEN TO INTERESTED PARTIES WILL BE AS FOLLOWS:
 - a. **FIRST PREFERENCE:** PUBLIC AGENCIES WHO WILL USE THE LIGHTS FOR FURTHERING AN OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PURPOSE. THE LIGHTS TO BE CONVEYED AT NO OR REDUCED COST AND CONSIDERED A "REPLACEMENT-IN-KIND". A STANDARD IAC NOVA PROGRAM CONTRACT WILL BE EXECUTED.

- b. **SECOND PREFERENCE:** PUBLIC AGENCIES WHO WILL USE THE LIGHTS FOR FURTHERING A NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROGRAM PURPOSE. THE LIGHTS TO BE CONVEYED AT NO OR REDUCED COST AND CONSIDERED A "REPLACEMENT-IN-KIND". A STANDARD IAC NOVA PROGRAM CONTRACT WILL BE EXECUTED.
- c. **THIRD PREFERENCE:** PUBLIC AGENCIES WHO WILL USE THE LIGHTS FOR FURTHERING OTHER PARK AND RECREATION PURPOSES. THE LIGHTS TO BE CONVEYED AT NO OR REDUCED COST AND CONSIDERED A "REPLACEMENT-IN-KIND". A STANDARD IAC NOVA PROGRAM CONTRACT WILL BE EXECUTED.
- d. **LAST PREFERENCE:** PUBLIC AND/OR PRIVATE ENTITIES WHO WILL USE THE LIGHTS FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED ABOVE. PAYMENTS WILL BE BASED ON THE TOTAL COST PAID FOR LIGHTING ELEMENTS (\$104,747 FOR SEVENTEEN POLES AND LIGHTS), AT \$6,161.59 PER POLE WITH FIXTURES.

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

2. City of Zillah, Loges Park, IAC #83-041D, Reinstatement: Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, Project Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "City of Zillah, Loges Park, IAC #83-041D, Request for Retroactive Reinstatement and Extension of Ending Date", as follows:

1. Project was approved in March 1983, at a total cost of \$92,000 (50% match/HJR 52). All scope elements, except paving of the parking area, were completed by November 1985, well within the extended time period of the contract (June 30, 1986). A balance of \$9,600 remained in the project.
2. Staff advised the City to proceed with the paving since there were funds to cover. A final billing was submitted in April 1988 indicating the paving was not done until August 1986 -- two months after the project contract had expired.
3. The City requested retroactive reinstatement of the project and extension of the Project Contract to April 30, 1988, in order that the expenses for paving the parking area could be reimbursed.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT THE REQUEST OF THE CITY BE APPROVED.

Mr. Tad H. Shimazu, Assistant Attorney General, was asked if there was any legal problem involved in this action of the Committee. Since the motion included a specific date (April 30, 1988) for project contract extension, Mr. Shimazu felt there was no problem. However, he did point out that the Committee might be subject to challenge on this kind of action since a new contract had not been actually signed. Extensions to contracts should be made prior to the expiration date of the contract. Mr. Shimazu felt it was a "grey area", but the Committee could retroactively extend the contract if it saw fit to do so.

The following motion was before the Committee:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE CITY OF ZILLAH, LOGES PARK

PROJECT (IAC #83-041D), IN MARCH 1983, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY PERFORMED WORK TO COMPLETE THE PARKING AREA AFTER THE PROJECT CONTRACT EXPIRED, AND

WHEREAS, IT IS NECESSARY TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT ENDING DATE IN ORDER TO REIMBURSE THE CITY FOR THE WORK ACCOMPLISHED,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CITY OF ZILLAH, LOGES PARK PROJECT CONTRACT, IAC #83-041D, BE REINSTATED AND THE ENDING DATE EXTENDED TO APRIL 30, 1988, AND THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Ms. Cox thanked Mr. Shimazu for his comments stating the Committee would keep his advice in mind for the future.

3. City of Bremerton, Kitsap Lake Park Development, IAC #87-013D, Cost Increase:

Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "City of Bremerton, Kitsap Lake Park Development, IAC #87-013D, Cost Increase", giving the following explanation:

1. The project was approved by the IAC in November 1986, at a total cost of \$220,993 -- IAC share being \$149,269 (68%) Initiative 215 and State Bond funds.
2. Lowest bid the city received was \$248,400, not including design and engineering costs of \$25,000. The cost of accomplishing the project is \$273,400 - \$52,407 above the approved project cost.
3. The City committed an additional \$40,000 to the project, but has no other funds available to meet the additional \$12,407 needed. IAC funds are therefore being requested.

Mr. Taylor introduced **Ms. Arvila Oldhe, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Bremerton**, who was available to respond to any questions from the Committee. Dr. Scull's concern was with the possibility of setting a precedent for similar cost increase requests to come in to the Committee. Mr. Tveten stated the IAC had consistently dealt with cost increases in a responsible manner and had kept them to a minimum. He favored the request of the City of the additional \$12,407.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE CITY OF BREMERTON, KITSAP LAKE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (IAC #87-013D) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$220,993 (68% I-215/ STATE BONDS), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF BREMERTON HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,407 TO COVER CONSTRUCTION BIDS HIGHER THAN THE PROJECT ESTIMATES WHICH CANNOT BE MET WITH ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE CITY FUNDS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$52,407 (23%) BE APPROVED FOR THE PROJECT AND THE IAC SHARE BE INCREASED BY \$12,407 IN INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS TO \$161,676 (ABOUT 59%) OF THE TOTAL PROJECT COST OF THE CITY OF BREMERTON'S KITSAP LAKE PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (IAC #87-013D), AND THAT THE IAC DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE APPROPRIATE PROJECT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Wilder reminded the Committee of the Director's authority to grant cost increases up to ten percent (10%). These are carefully reviewed with the sponsors to ensure the necessity.

III. OLD BUSINESS. IAC Executive Study (Chap. 425, Laws 87, SSB #5035): Mr. Gary Ogden, Chief, Management Services, briefly reviewed the memorandum dated June 28, 1988, entitled "Executive Study of the IAC (RCW 43.19.115)". Since the Committee had met on June 27th with Fred Hellberg (Special Policy Assistant, OFM - and Governor's Office), a further report was not necessary. The study is on schedule and interviews are now being conducted by Mr. Hellberg.

Ms. Cox asks that the Director obtain a listing of those persons and organizations interviewed by Mr. Hellberg. Committee members agreed this would be helpful to them.

IV. NEW BUSINESS. A. Legislation: Mr. Ogden referred to memorandum of staff entitled "1989 Legislation", dated June 28, 1988. Enclosures included: (1) Draft bills, Revenue Generating Proposals (blue sheet), and WRPA Legislative Platform information. Mr. Ogden reported:

- (1) Since writing of the memorandum, staff had received from the Office of Financial Management the 1989 Procedures for Review of Proposed Agency Request/Advocacy Legislation. A copy was distributed to each IAC member.
- (2) Also a memorandum sent to all Agency Directors by Richard A. Davis, Director of the Office of Financial Management, dated June 22, 1988, entitled, "Budget Update", was distributed to each IAC member. This memo advised of the status of the budget regarding carry forward programs, requiring \$11,664 million, and the fact that projections did not include: salary increases, welfare grant increases or non-statutory vendor increases at the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), reserve, or any new program initiatives from the Governor or state agencies.

An enclosure outlined revenues available next biennium and the cost of carrying forward existing programs into 1989-91. Also included were policy options which the Governor will consider.

A hold-the-line on spending was advised. Departments were asked to continue to develop efficiency and cost-saving initiatives.

- (3) Staff needs to proceed to develop legislation directed at providing a stable source of revenue to the Outdoor Recreation Account (070) to match Federal resources and to fund local and state projects

which are not eligible for Federal or Initiative 215 funding.

(4) **Revenue Generating Proposals:**

- a. Draft Bond Issue legislation to produce income for Account 070 (Sample legislation was included in the legislation material.)
- b. Draft legislation which would provide a trust fund to ensure a stable source of income to Account 070.
- c. Other alternatives --
 - . Redirect camper excise tax receipts from General Fund to the Outdoor Recreation Account 070.
 - . Authorize the Lottery Commission to conduct one game per year directing proceeds to the 070 Account.
 - . Amend RCW 43.99 to authorize the IAC to operate a loan program. A legislative appropriation would be requested to provide the initial corpus for the Loan Revolving Fund.
 - . SB 5911, Chapter 472, Laws 1987, provided an additional excise tax on the sale of real property at a rate of six one-hundredths of one percent of the selling price to be deposited in the Conservation Account. This tax expires June 30, 1989, and could be extended for future years, and redirected could provide approximately \$4 million per year to the Outdoor Recreation Account.

(5) **Nonrevenue Generating Proposals:**

- a. Resubmit legislation to strike the Interagency Committee for Outdoor recreation termination clause of June 1989.
- b. Resubmit legislation to remove the cost recovery language in the statute for the Washington Recreation Guide.

- (6) **Washington Recreation and Park Association (WRPA):** The IAC Director asks approval to advocate for legislation sponsored by the WRPA or state agencies which seek to enhance recreational opportunities by soliciting funds for acquisition, development, redevelopment, and renovation of recreation facilities, provided these are in keeping with the goals and objectives of the IAC as noted in WAC 286-04-030.

- (7) All legislative drafts and requests to be an advocate for or against specific bills will be presented to the Committee before submission to OFM.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (4) of the sample proposed bond issue legislation and suggested it be changed as follows:

"NEW SECTION. Sec. 5.(1) (a) One share of ~~not more than~~ fifty percent shall be allocated to the State of Washington, or any department or agency thereof, for the planning, acquisition, development, improvement, redevelopment, and rehabilitation, ~~and preservation~~ of outdoor recreation areas and facilities and for the acquisition ~~and preservation~~ of natural and wildlife areas."

He noted that other bond bill presentations had had this same wording, and the State agencies should receive 50% of the funds and not "up to". Mr. Wilder pointed out this was a former draft bill, one of many which had been reviewed and negotiated by previous state and local interests. Unfortunately, it had not been drafted to correct the wording to which Mr. Tveten objected. Mr. Tveten asked that Mr. Wilder look at the wording closely and ensure when redrafted it correctly covers the current funding program of the IAC, which is 50% state and 50% local funding. He acknowledged the bill being reviewed by the Committee would be changed, that it was not a specific bill with specific language at this point in time. On canvassing the other state agencies' representatives present, all agreed with Mr. Tveten's request (Wildlife, Jenene Fenton; Fisheries, Ray Ryan; and DNR represented by Mr. John Edwards, Technical Advisory Committee member).

Mr. Ryan asked if there should be a different strategy employed to ensure the legislation for a bond issue would get some attention. Mr. Wilder replied each time the IAC has proposed the legislation, it has been denied because it would affect General Fund monies. Perhaps an Initiative would be the way to handle it. Mr. Ryan suggested working with legislators, obtain their support. This also has been done and the WRPA has continued the practice having contacted up to one-third of the legislators recently. Ms. Cox felt it was imperative that the Interagency Committee work with the legislators and keep them advised of our legislative program. Mr. Ryan cautioned it was not very effective to use state agencies or state paid staff to do this type of lobbying.

IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT IAC STAFF CONTINUE ITS PREPARATION OF THE PROPOSED 1989 LEGISLATION AS OUTLINED IN STAFF MEMORANDUM TO THE COMMITTEE DATED JUNE 28, 1988, AND ENSURE THAT ALL LEGISLATIVE DRAFT PROPOSALS AND REQUESTS TO BE AN ADVOCATE FOR OR AGAINST SPECIFIC BILLS BE PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS BEFORE SUBMISSION TO THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.

B. IAC 1989-91 Budget Request: Mr. Ogden referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "IAC 1989-91 Budget Request", noting the following:

1. Two component parts of the budget are:
 - a. Current Level Budget
 - b. Agency Request Level Budget

2.

1989-91 Current Level	\$ 13,211,300		Staff 18
Required Increases to Current Level	84,000		Staff 0
1989-91 Current Authorized Level	\$ 13,295,300		
New and Expanded Programs	17,714,700		Staff 1.5 FTE
TOTAL PROJECTED 1989-91	\$ 31,010,000		

3. Referred to Grants for Local Agencies - \$14,500,000 above Current Level effort of \$5,500,000 in the Grants Program: \$20,000,000

4. Concept of Project 89 was explained. This is part of a larger program designed to encourage and enhance economic development in the state in conjunction with the State Centennial in 1989.

5. Small Works Program - \$3,000,000 - is included in the IAC's Budget through an additional bond resource program.
6. Budget Preparation will take place through July, with budget submission to OFM by August 1, 1988.
7. **Schedule One:** Summary Analysis of General Revenue and Program was reviewed. New funding and proposed changes were as indicated on the Schedule (APPENDIX A TO THESE MINUTES - Green Sheet).
8. **Schedule Two:** Summary Analysis of IAC Budget by Objects of Expenditure was reviewed (APPENDIX B TO THESE MINUTES - Yellow Sheet).

Following Mr. Ogden's presentation, Ms. Cox asked for an explanation of the new position being requested. Mr. Wilder stated this was an Recreation Project Manager 2 position under the PROFIT Program - PROFIT standing for "Planning, Recreation, Opportunity For Income and Tourism. There is an opportunity to assist private enterprise in considering development, operation, maintenance, management or service requirements. The IAC through this position could extend its services to this entity, focusing on problems and programs which will benefit the private landowner, voluntary groups and the recreationist.

Ms. Cox asked if the position had been received well and supported. Mr. Wilder replied up to this time it had not, but the IAC had been able to define the need for the position. Ms. Cox felt the position might not be approved, and Mr. Wilder agreed since it was a new position and new program that may very well be the case. However, there is a need to indicate how this program could be of great assistance to the overall outdoor recreation programs of the state.

Ms. Cox then asked concerning the intern position. Mr. Wilder replied that this position would in all likelihood be conducting compliance inspections of projects which are required by federal and state guidelines. Due to workload staff has not been able to inspect sites as rapidly as they should be inspected.

Ms. Fenton asked about the Small Works Program. Larry Fairleigh explained this would assist the smaller communities in the funding of some of their small projects which in the evaluation system do not rate high on the list of need. Many smaller communities require perhaps only a piece of playground equipment for their parks, or one ballfield, etc. Although eligible for funding these do not compete with the larger communities requesting parks and recreation areas and facilities. Mr. Wilder noted there would be a comparable assistance program for the State agencies also.

Mr. Tveten referred to the Revenue Generating Proposals, Item 3 of the Legislative Memorandum, and read No. 3 in that listing, "Amend RCW 43.99 to authorize the IAC to operate a loan program. A legislative appropriation would be requested to provide the initial corpus for the Loan Revolving Fund." He asked if this was reflected in the IAC Request Budget. Mr. Wilder replied it was not. Both he and Mr. Fairleigh explained the concept of the loan program. Mr. Tveten also noted Option 3 of the WRPA Legislative Proposals: "Loan options would be provided in a manner similar to the existing scheme, whereby a local agency could obtain a low cost loan to be repaid over the next 20 years. Interest rate/repayment schedules would be programmed." WRPA suggested for parks and recreation projects that a 50/50 matching grant program for amounts up to \$150,000 be created.

Mr. Tveten stated it would be difficult for state agencies to participate in this program since they require revenue sources to pay back loans.

In response to Mr. Tveten's questions, Mr. Ogden referred to Schedule One noting the general source of funds: Initiative 215, Federal, NOVA Program and Bonds. The comparison with last year's budget was indicated on Schedule Two. Both Mr. Tveten and Mr. Ryan noted the increase was approximately ten percent (10%), and this was a fairly modest increase.

Mr. Ryan questioned the State's Bonding Authority - how much would be likely to be available? Mr. Ogden stated that Mr. Vic Moore, Office of Financial Management, had indicated to him there would be about seventy percent (70%) available over that of previously authorized - \$250 million versus \$320 million. Mr. Ryan noted this would be a 30% decrease.

The Chair called attention to the prepared motion. IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SCULL, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION STAFF HAS PREPARED A PROPOSED 1989-91 IAC BUDGET REQUEST CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING:

AN AUTHORIZED CURRENT LEVEL OF	\$ 13,211,300
AN AGENCY REQUEST OF	31,010,000

AND, WHEREAS, HAS SUBMITTED THE PROPOSED BUDGET TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE DIRECTOR OR HIS DESIGNEE IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND COMPLETION OF A FORMAL BUDGET REQUEST TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (OFM) FOR INCLUSION IN THE GOVERNOR'S 1989-91 STATE BUDGET, AND

THAT AS PART OF THE FORMAL PREPARATION OF THE FINAL BUDGET, THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO MAKE SUCH MODIFICATIONS TO THE ABOVE FIGURES AS ARE REASONABLY NECESSARY TO BRING THEM INTO COMPLIANCE WITH FINAL ADJUSTMENTS AND UPDATES OF CERTAIN ESTIMATES USED IN PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT BUDGET, AND

THAT THE FORMAL BUDGET, AS FINALIZED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, BE SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (OFM) AS PER INSTRUCTIONS IN THE 1989-91 STATE BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

C. IAC 1989-91 STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET: Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated June 28, 1988, "IAC 1989-91 State Agencies' Capital Budget", giving the background leading up to the budget recommendations by staff. A total of 183 state agencies' project requests were received. Totals included 46 acquisition, 68 development, and 69 renovation of existing facilities projects (as in Table I). A grand total of \$51,706,000 had been requested. The process of staff review, evaluation and ranking was outlined by Mr. Lovelady. Staff was recommending the review, consideration, and acceptance of Table 4a (White), which had been sent to the Committee prior to the IAC meeting.

Discussion followed. Ms. Cox asked if staff was comfortable with the projects included in Table 4a given the fact that they had had little time to prepare the budget.

Mr. Lovelady replied staff was comfortable with the results and though the time was short, evaluation and ranking had been possible. He pointed out there were omnibus projects in the Capital Budget to be funded from 057 the State Building Construction Account. This followed the directions of the Governor's Office and the Legislature. Combining smaller projects into omnibus type projects was encouraged. These occur on a statewide basis and a single IAC contract is issued. Mr. Tveten stated this was a significant cost-saving factor. A department may have several small projects but only one contract is issued and only one official project ledger is maintained for them. It also helps in the auditing process.

Mr. Lovelady commented on the evaluation process used to formulate the Capital Budget. In evaluating and ranking projects, it was obvious there were some changes needed in the system. The IAC staff will therefore be revamping the evaluation process soon and will be working with the state agencies on any proposed changes.

Mr. Lovelady stated each omnibus project was reduced twenty-five percent (25%). He referred to the Lakes Omnibus #1, Redevelopment Project of the Department of Wildlife as an example. The Department of Wildlife had requested 25% more; staff had allotted the project \$615,750, and had placed it in the 057 State Building Construction Account. Mr. Tveten pointed out that in reducing the project by 25%, staff had not taken into consideration the scope of the project. He said he was not convinced this was a good process. There should be some thought given to modification of the project when a reduction is made.

Mr. Lovelady noted 99 of the 183 state agencies' projects were being recommended, with a total of \$29,131,750. Table 4a (yellow) (dated June 23, 1988) was distributed to the Committee members. Funding sources were based on the limits as set by the Committee at the March 1988 IAC meeting.

Ms. Fenton stated the Department of Wildlife had major concerns with the proposed funding of their projects. Exception was taken to the funding source 057 State Building Construction Account in certain Wildlife projects. The chances of receiving funding from this source she felt were very slim. She noted that not only would the Department of Wildlife lose the project, it would also lose the federal match. She recommended that the Wildlife projects be funded from Initiative 215, starting with those projects receiving the highest priority which included the Lakes Omnibus #1, Redevelopment Project of the Department of Wildlife.

Mr. Wilder stated the Department of Wildlife had brought this to staff's attention, that staff in creating the omnibus projects had been following the Office of Financial Management's direction. The amount in Account 057 was not to exceed current level (or \$3.2 million). Using 057, it was felt IAC would be able to nearly double the number of projects to be funded. He stated he did not feel it would be possible to go very far with the new bond categorized projects, but he did feel there would be Land and Water Conservation funds available, possible \$1.5 to \$2 million. This, along with Initiative 215 and current level 057, would be a better funding package for the state agencies.

In response to Mr. Ryan's questions, Mr. Wilder stated the target was \$15 million as originally approved by the Committee. IAC staff felt the omnibus projects were very important and they were given special recommendations for the 057 Account.

Mr. Tveten asked what had happened to monies from past Referenda 26, 27, 28, and 30 provided certain departments sometime ago. He was informed these revenue sources were now depleted. Mr. Tveten then asked Ms. Fenton if she was inferring that the Lakes Omnibus #1, Redevelopment Project, Department of Wildlife, should be recommended for funding from Initiative 215. Ms. Fenton

reiterated the desire of the Department of Wildlife to have that particular project funded from Initiative 215 as well as all of the other higher priority ranked projects which had been placed in the 057 Account. This would assure their funding from a continuing funding source - Initiative 215.

At this point, Mr. Lovelady was asked to distribute Alternate Table 4b (buff) -- an analysis of three projects moved from 057 Account into the Initiative 215 Account. Page (7) listed \$4 million from Initiative 215; page (3), Sprague Lake Development Project, Department of Wildlife, would not be able to be fully funded from Initiative 215 since the ceiling of available Init. 215 was met at that point. Ms. Fenton assumed the State agencies would have the prerogative of reducing in scope those projects which had been reduced by 25%.

John Edwards, Department of Natural Resources, expressed his opinion that the Omnibus projects were scored lower because of their broader scope, and thus he felt they were suffering more than the other projects. To have staff reduce them 25% more, he felt, was not appropriate. Bob Dice, Department of Wildlife, agreed, as well as Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Edwards referred to Page (2) of Alternate Table 4a, DNR's Long Lake Project, which had been split in funding - Initiative 215 and State Bonds. He said this was entirely a boating project and if it received all Initiative 215 funds, it would negate the Sprague Lake project of the Department of Wildlife. Ms. Cox asked that the Department of Natural Resources have a Committee member represented at future IAC meetings. Mr. Wilder explained Mr. Edwards did have permission (an authorized letter) from his director to serve in the event there had not been a quorum. Mr. Edwards felt his close association with the Technical Advisory Committee and ranking/evaluation of projects made it inappropriate for him to sit on the Committee and participate in the budget discussion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MR. RYAN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION (IAC) IS REQUIRED BY RCW 43.99.120 TO RECOMMEND TO THE GOVERNOR FOR INCLUSION IN THE 1989-91 STATE CAPITAL BUDGET SUCH PROJECTS AS THE IAC FINDS CONSISTENT WITH AN ORDERLY PLAN FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION LANDS IN THE STATE, AND,

WHEREAS, IN ORDER TO REMAIN ELIGIBLE FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS (LWCF), THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES WHICH IMPLEMENT PUBLIC LAW #93-43 (THE LWCF ACT) REQUIRES EACH STATE TO IMPLEMENT AN OPEN PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS WHICH RATES EACH PROJECT SUBMITTED FOR FUNDING ACCORDING TO AN EQUITABLE EVALUATION SYSTEM SUPPORTED BY THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP), AND

WHEREAS, THE IAC'S 1989-91 STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET PROGRAM COMBINES A PROVEN PROCESS DEVELOPED AND SUPPORTED BY ALL CONCERNED AGENCIES TO MEET THE ABOVE REQUIREMENTS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE FOLLOWING BE ADOPTED AS THE OFFICIAL IAC STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET FOR 1989-91, AS PROPOSED BY IAC STAFF IN ALTERNATE TABLE 4b (APPENDIX C TO THESE MINUTES) AS MODIFIED BY THE IAC MEMBERS,

WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES', LONG LAKE PROJECT, BE FULLY FUNDED FROM INITIATIVE 215 (\$205,000):

AGENCY	NO. PROJECTS	ACQUISITION	DEVELOPMENT	RENOVATION	TOTAL
PARKS	52	\$ 3,253,000	\$ 5,031,000	\$ 8,317,500	\$ 16,601,500
WILDLIFE	22	3,606,000	1,000,000	1,706,250	6,312,250
FISHERIES	18	2,750,000	900,000	550,000	4,200,000
NATL. RES.	7	-0-	1,113,000	905,000	2,018,000
TOTAL	99	\$ 9,609,000	\$ 8,044,000	\$11,478,750	\$ 29,131,750

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THESE RECOMMENDATIONS BE TRANSMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED PROCEDURES AS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION'S STATE AGENCIES' 1989-91 CAPITAL BUDGET.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (SEE APPENDIX C)

D. IAC MEETING - NOVEMBER 3-4, 1988: The Committee confirmed the next meeting of the IAC November 3-4, 1988, Olympia, with meeting site to be selected by the Director. This meeting will be a project funding session.

ADJOURNED: 12:25 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE:

11-3-1988
 (DATE)
Anne B. Cox
 ANNE COX, CHAIR, IAC

06/21/1988

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
 AGENCY BUDGET SUBMITTAL - 1989-91 - SUMMARY
 SCHEDULE ONE

GENERAL REVENUE ANALYSIS

SOURCE OF FUNDS	CARRY-OVER	NEW FUNDING	TOTAL AVAILABLE
INITIATIVE 215	\$ 350,000	\$ 4,460,000	\$ 5,310,000
FEDERAL	150,000	2,000,000	2,150,000
NOVA PROGRAM	1,820,000	3,930,000	5,550,000
BONDS	0	18,000,000	18,000,000
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$ 2,320,000	\$ 18,390,000	\$ 21,010,000
	=====	=====	=====

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

OPERATIONS	CURRENT LEVEL	PROPOSED CHANGES	FINAL BUDGET
INITIATIVE 215	\$ 1,334,777	\$ 196,445	\$ 1,581,222
LWCF (PLANNING GRANT)	10,316	12,500	22,816
NOVA PROGRAM	716,800	53,500	772,400
	-----	-----	-----
SUB-TOTAL - OPERATIONS	\$ 1,721,293	\$ 254,545	\$ 1,986,438

GRANTS TO PUBLIC AGENCIES

INITIATIVE 215	\$ 1,728,778	\$ 0	\$ 1,728,778
FEDERAL	1,100,574	1,016,510	2,117,134
NOVA PROGRAM	2,781,711	2,095,889	5,177,600
BONDS	3,982,244	14,037,856	18,000,000
	-----	-----	-----
SUB-TOTAL - GRANTS	\$ 11,573,407	\$ 17,460,155	\$ 29,023,562

TOTAL IAC REQUEST	\$ 10,095,300	\$ 17,714,700	\$ 21,010,000
	=====	=====	=====

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
IAC OPERATING BUDGET
1989-91
SCHEDULE TWO

	CURRENT AUTHORIZED LEVEL	NEW & EXPANDED PROGRAMS	TOTAL 89-91 REQUEST
AA Salaries	1,098,029	108,137	1,206,166
EA Supplies	15,516	0	15,516
EB Communications	19,540	0	19,540
EC Utilities	9,682	0	9,682
ED Rentals and Leases	60,734	1,200	61,934
EE Repairs and Maintenance	12,956	0	12,956
EF Printing and Reproduction	21,070	94,700	115,770
EG Employee Prof Dev & Trng	11,626	2,000	13,626
EK Facilities and Services	1,764	0	1,764
EL Data Processing	23,938	0	23,938
EM Attorney General	11,920	0	11,920
EN Personnel Services	6,814	0	6,814
EP Insurance	196	0	196
ER Purchased Services	36,802	33,000	69,802
ES Vehicle Maint & Oper. Cost	22	0	22
ET Audit Services	17,260	0	17,260
EW Archives	3,018	0	3,018
EZ Other	1,840	0	1,840
Subtotal - Object E	254,698	130,900	385,598
GA Travel	75,362	6,800	82,162
JA Equipment	44,192	0	44,192
LA Employee Benefits	249,612	18,708	268,320
ND Grants to Public Agencies	11,573,407	17,450,155	29,023,562
----- Total -----	13,295,300	17,714,700	31,010,000
=====	=====	=====	=====
Staff Months	415.2	61.1	476.3

APPENDIX C - 1 - RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET 1989-91

BY EACH STATE AGENCY - AND FUND SOURCE

IAC 1989-91 STATE AGENCIES' CAPITAL BUDGET APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION TO OFM 6-28-88

AGENCY	NO. PROJECTS	ACQUISITION	DEVELOPMENT	RENOVATION	TOTAL
PARKS	52	\$ 3,253,000	\$ 5,031,000	\$ 8,317,500	\$ 16,601,500
WILDLIFE	22	3,606,000	1,000,000	1,706,250	6,312,250
FISHERIES	18	2,750,000	900,000	550,000	4,200,000
NATL. RES.	7	-0-	1,113,000	905,000	2,018,000
TOTAL	99	\$ 9,609,000	\$ 8,044,000	\$ 11,478,750	\$ 29,131,750