

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 8-9, 1990  
TIME: 9:00 A.M. each day

PLACE: Westwater Inn  
Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT:

Dr. Eliot Scull, Chairman, Wenatchee  
James R. Fox, Friday Harbor  
William Fearn, Spokane  
Joe C. Jones, Seattle  
Jeanie Lorenz, Vancouver  
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission  
Jenene Fenton, Designee for Curt Smitch, Director, Department of  
Wildlife  
John Edwards, Designee for Honorable Brian Boyle, Commissioner  
of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources  
Richard Costello, Designee for Joseph R. Blum, Director, Department  
of Fisheries

APPENDIX "A" - LETTERS RECVD.  
OPPOSITION/OR/SUPPORT OF  
PROJECTS.

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scull at 9:00 a.m., with seven members present. Later Ms. Fenton and Mr. Costello arrived making a quorum of nine: SCULL, FOX, FEARN, JONES, LORENZ, TVETEN, FENTON, EDWARDS, AND COSTELLO.

Attendees were welcomed to the meeting by the Chair. Introductions were made by the Committee members, staff, and audience. Shannon Smith, Assistant Attorney General, was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 28, 1990: The following corrections to the minutes of September 28th were cited:

- (1) Page 32, Fourth Paragraph, last part: "Mr. Eric Johnson, Project Manager, responded stating there are specific costly elements such as lighting not in the Yakima Valley Project. The Bellevue project is an old ~~play~~ spray field and so the County is putting a cap on it."
- (2) Page 26, First Paragraph: DELETE PARAGRAPH: "Mr. Fearn remarked that the IAC has an excellent funding system, but it would be better if it were possible to fund all of the projects that had been reviewed."
- (3) Page 29, City of Spokane, Cannon Hill Park, IAC #91-104A: Mr. Fearn clarified the acreage in the project. The site was originally a possible 12-acre park site. A portion of that has been developed for apartment purposes leaving six acres available in this acquisition for the park development.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MR. EDWARDS, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 28, 1990 MEETING BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON PAGES 26, 29, AND 32 AS NOTED ABOVE. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

**ADDITIONS, CORRECTIONS, OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER**

**8-9, 1990:** The following correction and additions to the agenda for November 8-9, 1990 were requested by Mr. Robert L. Wilder, Director, IAC:

- (1) ITEM III. A. Project Changes 2. King County. Project title changed from Lake Wilderness Trail to Lake Wilderness Park.
- (2) ADD ITEM IV. NEW BUSINESS F. NOVA OFF-ROAD VEHICLE CAPITAL AND PLANNING PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS
  1. Thurston County Sports Park Cost Increase
  2. Maintenance and Operation Set-Aside
- (3) ADD UNDER ITEM V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS: Discussion of:
  1. Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program (WWRP)
  2. Washington Administrative Code - IAC
  3. Continuity of Funding - Funding Alternatives
  4. Other Items Committee Members may wish to discuss

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. JONES, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 8-9, 1990 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

**II. A. STATUS REPORT - DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Memorandum entitled "Director's Report", dated November 8, 1990, was distributed to Committee members and referred to by Mr. Wilder. He commented on Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) and the fifteen acquisition projects which are essentially complete under that program. He asked Mr. Joe LaTourrette, Executive Director of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition to present a slide program. Mr. LaTourrette noted the following in his presentation:

**WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION COALITION PRESENTATION;**

(1) A professional photographer was hired to take pictures of various sites involved in the WWR Program. The Mountaineers volunteered to assist, taking photographs, and putting the slide program together. The presentation will be presented to the State Legislature also.

(2) A new brochure has been produced by the Coalition entitled "A Message from Dan Evans, Mike Lowry and Governor Booth Gardner". It has been mailed to 100,000 recipients. An envelope concerning contributions is attached to it for anyone's use.

(3) The following areas were pictured in the slide presentation: Swank Ranch, Fish Lake Trail, Okanogan Range, Jameson Lake, Peshastin Pinnacles, Lewis River North and East Forks, Cross-state Trail Project, Cosmopolis to Chehalis R/R Right-of-Way, Chehalis River Surge Plain, Hoko River State Park, Point Roberts Heron Rookery, Burrows Island, Snohomish-Arlington Trail, Tacoma Shoreline, and Hope Island.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Mr. Wilder continued, noting that (1) the IAC is now at that point where it will be necessary to amend its Washington Administrative Code (WACs) due to new programs requiring new rules and regulations. These will be drafted, revised, and brought to the attention of advisory groups and the Committee as the staff proceeds.

(2) Volunteers, advisors, public input, planning, management, and projects are interwoven. All are working together to bring to the Committee the best information and projects possible.

(3) Projects Services is currently assisting over 345 projects and dealing with 49 more at November's meeting.

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND;** Mr. Wilder called upon Ruth Anderson, National Park Service for a brief report on the Land and Water Conservation funding program. Ms. Anderson stated Congress recently appropriated \$30,000,000 for the LWCF as assistance to the states. Washington State will receive one-half million. Also \$20 million was appropriated for the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Mr. Wilder continued: (4) The IAC is now involved in the Firearms Range Program with funding provided through legislative action.

(5) Today the Committee will adopt a Washington State Trails Plan which has been extensively reviewed.

(6) The Maintenance and Operation Study is progressing and will be reported upon.

(7) Planning Services is becoming more involved in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) hydroelectric licensing process.

(8) Local planning assistance has led to the approval of 131 agencies' plans.

(9) Staff is working with fifty local agencies to prepare local comprehensive plans.

## **II. B. STATUS REPORTS - MANAGEMENT SERVICES - FUND SUMMARIES:**

Mr. Ray Baker, Financial Manager, was called upon to present the four fund summary reports.

- (1) Traditional Fund Summary Report - dated October 25, 1990  
Negative numbers remain for two reasons - first, the state agencies' budget on the biennial accounting period and have not yet received the second year's federal apportionment, and secondly, the apportionment has been below the estimates used by the agencies to establish the

- appropriation levels.
- (a) Federal balance  
Remaining balance of \$680,000 - two years of apportionments.
  - (b) Pending Projects  
Noted that the Sedro Wooley project is now under contract, as is DNR's Long Lake project.
- (2) Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Fund Summary - dated 9-30-90  
Explained discrepancy in amounts received from Department of Licensing. An error of approximately \$460,000 was corrected. The amounts in each of the reported categories remain within the mandated parameters for funding.

Mr. Tveten was assured the \$1,408,151.80 was the correct current funding status. However, this would not all be funded at the November meeting--some will be allocated for Education/Enforcement Projects and Maintenance and Operation Projects to be considered at the March 21-22, 1991 IAC Meeting. Licensing fees in the amount of \$119,182.83 were noted for Ms. Lorenz.

- (3) Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Fund Summary  
Noted that because of the size of some of the projects, percentage shifts are possible by closing or withdrawing a single project. In later years, a base of completed projects will curb this shifting in percentages.

Several state agencies' projects were written which covered many individual projects so that if one could not be completed another could be substituted. Estimates in funding are therefore indicated in the fund summary.

The Habitat Conservation Account will be monitored closely since at this point in time it indicates more funding than is allowed under the appropriation.

Trails Category is below the legal amount; however, there is flexibility in this WWRP Program and withdrawals, etc., will affect funding, plus new projects coming along in future years.

Mr. Tveten stated it is very difficult to acquire trail corridors and there is a lot of trouble involved in finally obtaining property rights. He noted that WWRP projects expire on December 1, 1990 and asked if the IAC could now proceed with making some shifts in project funding. Mr. Wilder said that most of the state agencies' contracts go through the biennium, and, hopefully, reappropriations could be requested.

- (4) Firearms Range Program Fund Summary - dated 10-28-90  
Noted fund status of \$270,751.39, through June 1990.

Licensing's reporting system will be altered to give to the IAC more up-to-date reports.

Actual revenues received are below what IAC had estimated. Amount available for an annual grant period will be approximate \$100,000.

**II. C. STATUS REPORTS - PROJECTS SERVICES;** Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Chief, Project Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "Project Services Division Report", citing the following:

(1) Currently assisting 345 projects.

(2) Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program (WWRP): The following projects were withdrawn from the WWR Program:

Whitman County, Kamiak Butte	Local Parks Category	\$ 300,000
Skagit County, Youngs Park	Water Access Category	50,000
Island County, Double Bluff	Water Access Category	100,000
Spokane County, Glen Rose Trl.	Trails Category	50,000
Spokane, So. Hill Wetlands	Urban Habitat Category	368,000
		<u>\$ 868,000</u>

A Cost Reduction was made for the City of Renton's May Creek Project 205,800

TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE \$1,073,800

(3) Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program:

(a) NOVA Technical Advisory Committee met August 16-17, 1990, in Leavenworth.

(b) Evaluation Meeting for NOVA ORV and NHR projects was held in Chehalis at the Lewis County Courthouse on October 18-19, 1990.

(4) Firearms Range Program:

(a) Advisory Committee has been appointed and has met to consider drafted guidelines, etc..

(b) Manuals have been drafted: Firearms Range Procedural Guidelines and Firearms Range Application Manual.

(c) First project funding consideration - March 21-22, 1990.

(5) Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP):

(a) Certain property already acquired: State Parks, Hope Island; Dept. of Wildlife, Weatherly Ranch; King County, Salmon Creek; King County, Moss Lake Wetlands; and Dept. of Natural Resources, Mount Si. Others acquired since this report was written.

(b) WWRP is going through an evolutionary process and there has been a need the past six months to rapidly react to many different demands, needs, and pressures. It is necessary now to take time to consider changes to program rules and guidelines. The

program will be reviewed by staff and drafted criteria will be brought to the Committee in March 1991 for review.

(6) Administrative Actions (Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program):

- (a) City of Olympia, Grass Lake Project: \$ 1,800,000  
(\$900,000 WWRP - \$900,000 Local)
- (b) Kitsap County, Silverdale Wetlands: \$ 1,167,300  
(\$583,650 WWRP - \$583,650 Local)

At the conclusion of Mr. Fairleigh's report, he advised Mr. Jones that the mailing list for the Firearms Range Program initial contact had been extensive. Listing from the Department of Wildlife and other IAC listings included non-profit groups, dealers, hunting education instructors, state and local government entities, law enforcement agencies, etc. There are a wide range of people providing shooting ranges and an attempt was made to contact all of those people. Mr. Fairleigh also reported in answer to questions that the legislation providing for the firearms program does not specifically rule out automatic weapons ranges. He felt the staff and the Committee members would need to educate themselves about this program as it proceeds. It is assumed that opposition will be site specific. There does not appear to be any opposition to this type of program but considerable support for it. The obstacle will be lack of funds.

Lawrence Pavish, Paine Field Sports Club, Marysville: Advised the Committee that there are many people involved in the firearms range program. In Snohomish County there are six organized clubs. Most guns used on the ranges will hold only from four to five bullets, and automatic weapons are not welcome. The ranges are well-supervised, well-organized, and controlled by the membership. A range location was lost when a large corporation purchased the area being used. He felt there was a "desperate need" to look at available sites for recreational shooting areas.

Mr. Tveten referred to page (2) of the report concerning the five WWRP projects withdrawn and asked if this was because there were no matching funds. Mr. Fairleigh replied that only one, Whitman County, Kamiak Butte, did not have the match. The others were withdrawn due to unwilling sellers or the price for the acquisitions was too high.

The Committee recessed at 10:06 a.m. and reconvened at 10:20 a.m.

IV. C. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Initiative 215 Projects":

(1) Projects being reviewed would be funded from Initiative 215 funds or boating funds provided by Chapter 393, Laws of 1989 (SSB 5372). Referred to Table I which noted the ranking of each project application as recommended by the Evaluation Team.

TABLE 1 - NOVEMBER, 1990  
Traditional 215 Projects

Score Rank	Proj. No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Request
138.20	1 91-178D	10th Street Marine Park	Everett	150,000	588,967	738,967	150,000
137.42	2 91-120D	Boat Launch	Mercer Island	150,000	979,944	1,129,944	300,000
130.67	3 91-217A	Sagan Property	Marysville	100,000	100,000	200,000	400,000
129.99	4 91-164D	City Dock Project	Port Townsend	150,000	243,100	393,100	550,000
126.40	5 91-177D	Rotary Park Phase 2	Everett	150,000	150,000	300,000	700,000
125.50	6 91-102A	Lower Point Hadlock Launch	Port Townsend, Port of	30,567	30,567	61,134	730,567
122.58	7 91-248D	Solden Gardens Boat Ramp	Seattle	150,000	842,474	992,474	880,567
120.28	8 91-1186/D	North Isianos Dock	San Juan County	98,900	98,900	197,800	979,467
119.44	9 91-165D	Coulee City Community Park	Coulee City	19,650	19,650	39,300	999,117
117.17	10 91-045D	Ediz Hook Launch Repair	Port Angeles, Port of	12,000	12,000	24,000	1,011,117
117.15	11 91-240D	Chiwana Park	Franklin County	138,500	138,500	277,000	1,149,617
113.29	12 91-263D	Odlin Park	San Juan County	43,000	43,000	86,000	1,192,617
111.40	13 91-261D	Riverfront Park Boat Launch	Prosser	62,800	62,800	125,600	1,255,417
109.34	14 91-146D	Red Wolf Marina Const & Expansion	Clarkston, Port of	79,920	79,920	159,840	1,335,337
107.47	15 91-130D	Columbia Park Boat Launch Improv.	Kennewick	150,000	156,840	306,840	1,485,337
104.00	16 91-262D	Lake Meridian Boat Launch	King County	103,094	103,094	206,188	1,588,431
		Totals		1,588,431	3,649,756	5,238,187	

(2) Project sponsors submitted applications based on the IAC guideline of 50% local participation, 50% IAC, with a maximum of \$150,000 for a project.

(3) Acknowledged assistance and expressed appreciation to members of the Evaluation Team: Rich Costello, Dept. of Fisheries; John Barker, City of Bellevue; Bob Cooper, City of Everett; Andrea Fontenot, Port of Port Townsend; and Michael Welter, Thurston County Parks.

Each project was then presented to the Committee by Project Services staff using slides and verbal summaries.

Those projects receiving comments or questions from the Committee members while being reviewed were as follows:

City of Marysville, Regan Property, IAC # 91-217A: Dr. Scull was informed there were no wetlands in the project, but it was in the flood plain. In response to Ms. Lorenz, Eric Johnson, Project Manager, stated though there were additional lands surrounding the project, only seventeen acres of it is identified for Initiative 215 funds. James Ballew, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Marysville, pointed out on the slide the parking lot facilities for boaters' use and the other land options being pursued by the City.

City of Port Townsend, City Dock Project, IAC #91-164D: Mr. Tveten was informed that at this point, the project does not have provision for a dump station.

Port of Port Townsend, Lower Port Hadlock Boat Launch, IAC #91-102A/D: Ms. Lorenz questioned the few parking spaces (12) in the project. Mr. Johnson pointed out there was not much property available for parking and the project was located at the toe of a bluff.

City of Seattle, Golden Gardens Breakwater/Fishing Pier, IAC #91-248D: In response to Mr. Fearn, Mr. Johnson explained this was an entirely separate project from the one the Committee had previously approved. This project deals with the replacement of the breakwater in Shilshole Bay. Mr. Fairleigh explained for Ms. Lorenz that the \$992,474 indicated on the resume as total project cost included the ramp, floats, etc. This is a Phase 2 of the original project and any monies left over from the Phase 1 will be included in the replacement costs of the breakwater.

Port of Clarkston, Red Wolf Construction & Expansion, IAC #91-146D: Mr. Jones asked about the "pro-rated with Marina" statement on the resume' for parking, paths, and restrooms. Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, explained that the marina provides permanent as well as transient moorage for the boating population, therefore it is pro-rated to reflect their use of the facilities.

Presentation of the Local Projects concluded at 10:42 a. m.

At conclusion of the slide presentation, Dr. Scull asked that anyone wishing to address the Committee complete a Participation Card noting on which project(s) they would be testifying.

Ms. Lorenz asked if the City of Prosser (Riverfront Park Boat Launch, #91-261D) had any other park facilities in the area giving access to the waterfront. Mr. Robert Peters, City Planner, City of Prosser, replied there were no other waterfront access areas in the city available for the public.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Robert Cooper, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Everett, (Rotary Park Phase 2, IAC #91-177D), informed Mr. Tveten that the federal government (navy expansion proposal) had not given any monies to the City for this project.

Mr. Tveten referred to the City of Mercer Island, Boat Launch Project, IAC #91-120D, and asked what the Department of Transportation was proposing in the project. Mr. Scott Chapman, Projects Manager, replied that approximately 56% was being paid by the federal government, 30% by the City and Initiative 215 funds approximately 13%.

Mr. Jones noted there were 13 development projects and only three acquisition. He asked if prioritization of need, etc., had had anything to do with development over acquisition. Mr. Fairleigh replied that historically this was a normal happening. Eligible agencies request development of their facilities often, and the evaluation process is critical to the final ranking of projects.

Mr. Tveten brought up the twelve parking spaces in the Port of Port Townsend, Lower Port Hadlock Boat Launch Project, IAC #91-102D. He assumed this project had made it through the process because there are no opportunities for recreational boat launching projects in that particular area. Mr. Johnson agreed pointing out the site was being used mostly by local persons. Ms. Lorenz reiterated her concern about the few parking spaces and asked if perhaps the local agency couldn't develop the project. Mr. Johnson replied this had not been pursued by staff, but that a user count had been made and there was a definite need for the facility even though it is a small project.

Dr. Scull commented on the San Juan County Public Works Department, North Islands Dock Project, IAC #91-118A/D, stating he was familiar with the area and knew it was adjacent to the Roche Harbor resort. He asked if the management of the resort was concerned in any way regarding the mixing of public facility users and private users. Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, replied the land in the project is owned by the resort management. Their planning calls for abandonment of the access road and the resort lodge road will then become the main entrance to the resort.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Mr. Fairleigh distributed "Table II, Staff Funding Recommendation, Boating Facilities Projects - November 1990.

TABLE 2 - STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION  
 Traditional 215 Projects - November, 1990

Score Rank	Proj. No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Request
138.20	1 91-178D	10th Street Marine Park	Everett	150,000	<del>588,967</del> 809,353	758,967	150,000
137.42	2 91-120D	Boat Launch	Mercer Island	150,000	979,944	1,129,944	300,000
130.67	3 91-217A	Regan Property	Marysville	100,000	100,000	200,000	400,000
129.99	4 91-164D	City Dock Project	Port Townsend	150,000	243,100	393,100	550,000
126.40	5 91-177D	Rotary Park Phase 2	Everett	150,000	150,000	300,000	700,000
125.50	6 91-102A	Lower Point Hadlock Launch	Port Townsend, Port of	30,567	30,567	61,134	730,567
122.58	7 91-248D	Solden Gardens Boat Ramp	Seattle	150,000	842,474	992,474	880,567
120.28	8 91-118A/D	North Islands Dock	San Juan County	98,900	98,900	197,800	979,467
119.44	9 91-165D	Coulee City Community Park	Coulee City	19,650	19,650	39,300	999,117
117.17	10 91-045D	Ediz Hook Launch Repair	Port Angeles, Port of	12,000	12,000	24,000	1,011,117
117.15	11 91-240D	Chiawana Park	Franklin County	138,500	138,500	277,000	1,149,617
113.29	12 91-263D	Odlin Park	San Juan County	43,000	43,000	86,000	1,192,617
111.40	13 91-261D	Riverfront Park Boat Launch	Prosser	62,800	62,800	125,600	1,255,417
109.34	14 91-146D	Red Wolf Marina Const & Expansion	Clarkston, Port of	79,920	79,920	159,840	1,335,337
107.47	15 91-130D	Columbia Park Boat Launch Improv.	Kennewick	150,000	156,840	306,840	1,485,337
104.00	16 91-262D	Lake Meridian Boat Launch	King County	103,094	103,094	206,188	1,588,431
		Totals		1,588,431	3,649,756	5,238,187	

Funds Available:

Initiative 215 to December 30, 1990

SSB 5372

\$1,503,600

165,000

\$1,668,600

Funds Requested

Balance

1,588,431

\$ 80,169

All projects submitted to the IAC had been recommended for funding, with \$1,588,431 IAC Initiative 215 and Boating Funds (SSB 5372, Chapter 393, Laws of 1989), \$3,649,756 Matching from local agencies, for a total of \$5,238,187. Mr. Fairleigh noted that \$1,668,600 boating funds were available for this session, thus a total of \$80,169 would be left through the funding of all projects.

In reply to Dr. Scull's questions, Mr. Wilder reported it was possible this time around to fund all of the Initiative 215 projects; however, this is not always the case. Sometimes there is a greater demand and monies are not there to cover. He noted the \$150,000 limit per project as set by the IAC which enabled the funding to go farther. Mr. Tveten stated that communities in the Lower Puget Sound Basin have actively tried to provide enough boating projects for the public but in many instances find that the monies provided do not anywhere near accomplish the job. There could be much larger projects.

In response to a question from Mr. Costello, Mr. Fairleigh explained the funding source through Chapter 393, Laws of 1989. It provided \$330,000 through the IAC for projects which would result in public access to waterways. The monies need to be expended by June 30, 1991. The carry-over of \$80,169 (Init. 215) was discussed. This could be used for cost increases, be committed to a project in need, or carried over to the next funding session. Also, the Committee has in the past obligated all the monies available and sometimes used anticipated revenues. Mr. Tveten noted the balance for local agencies in the current Traditional Fund Summary of \$1,018,392, Initiative 215, which is the balance as of October 25, 1990, thus in its funding proposal of \$1,588,431, the IAC is considering some anticipated funds as well.

Mr. Hal Schlomann, Project Manager, Northwest Marine Trade Association, reported he had been on the site of many of the projects presented to the Committee. There is inadequate access to waterways statewide, and a need for many more due to increase in population of the state. He noted the fact that many times a project receives so much opposition that it is impossible to meet the need in some of these critical areas. Speaking especially to the City of Mercer Island Project (Boat Launch - IAC #91-120D), he said it was very necessary that the project be funded..

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 13 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) [WASHINGTON OUTDOORS: ASSESSMENT AND POLICY PLAN] AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON MARCH 22, 1990, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY

COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE (13) OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

**II. D. STATUS REPORT - PLANNING SERVICES:** Mr. Greg Lovelady, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "Planning Services Status Report":

(1) Operation and Maintenance Study: This study is being prepared at direction of the 1990 Legislature. The assessment addresses deferred operation and maintenance problems as well as new stewardship responsibilities associated with the Trust Land Transfer and Washington Wildlife and Recreation Programs (WWRP). A review draft is scheduled for distribution mid-November.

(2) Publications: Recently (or soon to be) made available are:

(a) County Recreation Profiles: Format has been changed from previous years. The publication features expanded results from IAC's inventory program and describes the basic supply of recreational opportunities in our state, by county.

(b) Assessment and Policy Plan, Action Program: Distributed in mid-October. Documents are entitled "Washington Outdoors: Assessment and Policy Plan" and "Washington Outdoors: Action Program".

(c) Wetlands Action Plan: Copies of the plan are available for distribution.

(d) Off-Road Vehicle Guide: Distribution of 20,000 Guides completed. Remaining copies are available for expected demand in the spring of 1991.

(3) Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities (NOVA) Program:

(a) Due in 1993. Process of developing the plan began in April 1990. Further work postponed pending completion of the O & M Study.

(b) NOVA Projects: Staff is currently managing 12 planning related NOVA projects.

A 12-month time extension was granted to the

Colville Confederated Tribe's ORV Plan project, ORV #90-142P, to enable the Tribe to complete its reservation-wide survey.

(4) Local Agencies' Technical Assistance:

A total of 131 agencies have met planning requirements for the Traditional Grant-in-Aid Program. Fifteen agencies will be finishing and adopting plans within the next few months.

Staff is currently working with fifty local agencies preparing plans for 1991 grant applications.

(5) Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area: Described the National Scenic Area (NSA) (Clark, Klickitat and Skamania Counties) and its division into three types of Management Areas: Special Management Areas (SMAs): General Management Areas (GMAs), and Urban Areas. Draft Management Plan for the SMAs (areas to be managed by USDA, Forest Service) has been released. IAC reviews and comments on these draft plans in conjunction with the Governor's Interagency Coordination Team.

Major issue in the SMAs is that proposed and existing trails system will be multi-purpose: pedestrian, equestrian, and mountain bicyclist. There are no plans for additional trails in the SMAs. IAC asked the Forest Service to add a policy statement to encourage motorized uses on existing private road systems.

(7) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Review: In its review procedure, IAC comments on adequacy of recreation elements in FERC hydroelectric licensing process. FERC areas provide valuable recreation opportunities. Currently, IAC is monitoring the development of about twelve hydro projects.

Maintenance and Operation Study: Mr. Tveten brought up the issue of Trust Lands and transfer between DNR and State Parks. Mr. Edwards replied there were DNR lands going from trust status to either park status or natural area preserves status. When that change takes place there are no dollars for management of that land and there are still costs DNR is obligated to pay for M&O. By pooling lands into those categories, there is a deficiency in management funds for them. Requests for M&O funds have been cut from the proposed DNR budget.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Wilder stated the IAC would not have any further responsibility at this time regarding the Maintenance and Operation Study other than to complete it and submit it by December 15, 1990. Any direction received after that will be followed.

FERC: The fact that there will be a substantial amount of FERC relicensing requests was mentioned by Mr. Tveten. Many of the leases are coming up for relicensing after a fifty year authorization. The opportunities to provide recreation is now a paramount question in

the relicensing. Dr. Scull observed that the Committee had viewed some of the FERC areas on its tour in Wenatchee (July 1990).

Off-Road Vehicle Guide: Mr. Edwards asked about the supply of ORV Guides and would it be necessary to reprint it during the biennium. Mr. Lovelady replied the present supply should last through the summer of 1991. The possibility of including advertising in the Guide to offset costs was discussed.

**III. A. OLD BUSINESS - PROJECT CHANGES:**

**1. City of Renton, Cedar River Trail System, IAC #79-038A -**

**Conversion:** Mr. Johnson referred to memorandum of staff, "City of Renton, Cedar River Trail System Conversion (IAC #79-038A), Renton S-Curves", dated November 8, 1990, citing the following:

(1) The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) requested the taking of 9,202 square feet of park property to accomplish improvements to Interstate 405 through the S-Curves.

(2) The City requested this property conversion in exchange for a .32 acre tract along SR 1269 to serve as parking for the Cedar River Vista Park. The replacement site contains some 400 feet of river frontage.

(3) Appraisal: Value of the property to be converted = \$6,200. Value of the replacement property = \$20,000.

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC ASSISTED THE CITY OF RENTON IN THE ACQUISITION OF THE CEDAR RIVER TRAIL SYSTEM PROJECT (IAC #79-038A), AND

WHEREAS, THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUIRES A PORTION OF THAT PROPERTY FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO INTERSTATE 405, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF RENTON HAS REQUESTED IAC APPROVAL TO CONVERT 9,202 SQUARE FEET OF THE CEDAR RIVER TRAIL PROPERTY FOR .32 ACRES WITH 400 FEET OF RIVER FRONTAGE ON THE CEDAR RIVER, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF RENTON'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND MEETS THE CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, "ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED",

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST PROPOSED BY THE CITY OF RENTON REGARDING THE CEDAR RIVER TRAIL SYSTEM PROJECT (IAC #79-038A) IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

**2. King County, Lake Wilderness Park, IAC #80-052A - Conversion:**

Memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "King County Conversion of Tracy Owen Station (IAC #770-057A and IAC #77-004D) and Lake Wilderness Park (IAC #66-026A)" was referred to by Mr. Johnson as follows:

(1) Lake Wilderness Park: King County requested to replace two separate parcels totaling 4.0571 acres of the Lake Wilderness site which have been leased to two groups (Maple Valley Historical Society/Maple Valley Community Center) for nonoutdoor recreation purposes. 1.417 acres appraised at \$42,600; 2.6401 acres appraised at \$92,400.

(2) Tracy Owen Station: Easement for ingress, egress, and utilities over a 20 foot strip of land 481.456 feet long is sought in this project. This would encompass 9,629 square feet of the park property. Appraisal = \$11,500.

(3) Replacement Property: Two inholdings within Lake Wilderness Park - encompassing 6.12 acres. First parcel 15,090 sq. ft. = \$40,000 appraisal; Second parcel 5.77 acres = \$400,000.

(4) Total property taken: 4.27 acres - value \$146,000;  
Total replacement property: 6.12 acres - value \$440,000.

Mr. Costello asked if the County had considered acquisition of the land rather than granting an easement to it. **Mr. Gene Maxon, representing King County,** advised him that the County has tried to acquire the property, but it is not for sale. At present there is no access to this area of the lake.

Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY ACQUIRED APPROXIMATELY 108 ACRES OF LAND KNOWN AS LAKE WILDERNESS PARK (IAC #66-026A) WITH IAC ASSISTANCE, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY ACQUIRED APPROXIMATELY 17.8 ACRES OF LAND NOW KNOWN AS TRACY OWEN STATION (IAC #70-057A) WITH IAC ASSISTANCE, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY DEVELOPED APPROXIMATELY 5.3 ACRES OF TRACY OWEN STATION INTO A WATERFRONT PARK WITH IAC ASSISTANCE (IAC #77-004D), AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY HAS REQUESTED CONVERSION OF APPROXIMATELY 4.05 ACRES OF LAND AT LAKE WILDERNESS AND EASEMENT ACROSS 9,629 SQUARE FEET OF TRACY OWEN STATION, AND

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY IS PROVIDING 6.12 ACRES OF REPLACEMENT PROPERTY ADJACENT TO LAKE WILDERNESS PARK, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY'S PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT OF CONVERTED LAND MEETS THE CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

1. THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF ALL PARCELS OF LAND HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE PROPER APPRAISAL TECHNIQUES AND THE SUBSTITUTION PARCELS ARE OF GREATER VALUE THAN THE PARCELS BEING CONVERTED.
2. THE SUBSTITUTION PARCELS ARE OF GREATER RECREATION UTILITY THAN THE PARCELS BEING CONVERTED.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE CONVERSION REQUEST PROPOSED BY KING COUNTY REGARDING LAKE WILDERNESS PARK AND TRACY OWEN STATION BE APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

**3. City of Richland, Columbia Park West, (IAC #88-014D) - Cost Increase:** Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "City of Richland, Columbia Park West - Cost Increase", noting the following:

(1) The City requested a cost increase from the IAC to assist in covering construction costs which cannot be met with additional available city funds. (\$41,168 additional Initiative 215, \$41,168 local funds = \$82,336.)

(2) Benton County had transferred responsibility for development, operation and maintenance of Columbia Park to the Cities of Richland and Kennewick. IAC grant to develop the boating facilities at the Park's west end was included in this transfer.

(3) The City of Richland has agreed to accept responsibility for the maintenance of two previously funded IAC projects in their portion of Columbia Park. Some revisions in plans and cost estimates to reflect current construction standards and costs were made by the City upon reviewing the Benton County design plans.

Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVED THE COLUMBIA PARK WEST BOATING PROJECT (IAC #88-014D) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$252,400, (50% INITIATIVE 215), AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF RICHLAND HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$41,168 TO COVER CURRENT CONSTRUCTION COSTS WHICH CANNOT BE MET WITH ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE CITY FUNDS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$82,336 (32%) BE APPROVED FOR THE PROJECT AND THE IAC SHARE BE INCREASED BY \$41,168 IN INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS TO \$167,368 (50%) OF THE TOTAL PROJECT COST OF THE CITY OF RICHLAND'S COLUMBIA PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, (IAC #88-014D), AND THAT THE IAC DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE APPROPRIATE PROJECT AMENDMENT

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

**III. B. OFF-HIGHWAY GAS TAX STUDY:** Mr. Wilder referred to the status report dated November 8, 1990, "Off-Highway Gas Tax Study":

(1) In response to Committee direction, a small group of leaders was formed to discuss the Off-Highway Gas Tax Study:

Norm Winn, Conservation Chair, The Mountaineers  
Stan Biles, Department of Natural Resources  
Cleve Pinnix, State Parks and Recreation Commission  
Stan Humann, Off-Road Vehicle/Four-Wheel Drive Interest  
Ron Morgenthaler, Trail/Motorcycle Interest  
Jim Thornton, Executive Director, Rails to Trails Conservancy

(2) A first meeting was held October 15, 1990. Due to illnesses some were unable to attend. Attendees: Carol Jensen (for Stan Humann), Cleve Pinnix, Jim Thornton, Ron Morgenthaler, Bob Wilder, and Larry Fairleigh.

(3) Observations and discussion: The willingness to work together; agreement that more money for backcountry trails is needed (a dedicated source); impacting RCW 46.09 or funding a study from NOVA funds was not supported; possibility of soliciting a grant from a "foundation"; good data is needed to form policies and Trails Plan could be a start; backcountry trails maintenance/reconstruction, etc., are areas of greatest need; timing is not right to consider a gas tax increase; need to sell the economics of trails (recreation); communication needs to be open/honest if groups are to work together. Ron Morgenthaler and Jim Thornton will meet with Norm Winn to discuss issues in common.

Mr. Costello mentioned the comment concerning a gas tax increase. Mr. Wilder said the group is actually seeking a fund source to do a study. \$100,000 was considered as the budget item. Discussion on the gas tax increase question was only speculation. Mr. Fairleigh said there were two issues: (1) Would there be justification for reconsideration of the fund as it now exists, and (2) would there be justification to attempt to get some source of existing gas tax revenue diverted from DOT. No one proposed that there be additional gas tax monies. Mr. Tveten pointed out that backcountry trails are generally the concern of the National Park Service and the Forest Service. He asked if there had been any discussion whether there could be federal funds in the program. Ms. Ruth Ittner, NOVA

member, informed the Committee that the State Trails Plan addresses that issue. Also, she said she had available for Committee and staff some review material from the Trails National Symposium held in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, which concerned the economics of trails. She noted she had talked to Norm Winn and that he was planning to get together with the Nonhighway Gas Tax Study Group to discuss whether the percentage was correct.

### III. C. PARTICIPATION MANUALS

1. Testing Costs: Memorandum from staff dated November 8, 1990, entitled "Hazardous Substances", was distributed to the Committee members. Mr. Fairleigh reported as follows:

(a) As a result of guidelines relating to hazardous substances adopted by the IAC at its July, 1990 meeting, questions were raised regarding who pays for testing and clean-up costs and how much is eligible. One of the guidelines adopted states: "Any project found to contain hazardous substances becomes immediately ineligible for IAC funding assistance or reimbursement until it is clean."

(b) There is a need to modify and further refine the guidelines. OFM does not support a Testing and Mitigation Fund as discussed at the July meeting. There are some agencies reluctant to sign the IAC's hazardous substances Certification Form as written. There is a need to have a guideline on hazardous wastes, but a line must be drawn somewhere that makes certain contaminated sites ineligible.

(c) IAC staff will meet with both state and local sponsors to discuss this matter further.

Mr. Edwards pointed out that meanwhile his agency needs to do additional testing in certain areas and DNR does not have any funds to meet the cost. Mr. Fairleigh stated testing costs were made eligible at the July meeting, but the Committee did not address to what extent they were to be eligible. In response to Mr. Jones, Mr. Edwards remarked that the Department of Ecology (DOE) only has cleanup standards. Mr. Tveten suggested there be a limitation set and built into the appraisal process, then reflected in the purchase price of the property -- perhaps a 25% reduction in the fair market value of the property. Mr. Fairleigh felt this could be better handled by the state agencies themselves, that OFM has stated the seller should make the property clean before the state buys it.

Ms. Lorenz asked what type of sites were being discussed. Mr. Fairleigh stated: old mill sites, old manufacturing areas, sites that have been condemned due to previous use for petroleum products, etc. Mr. Edwards said not every project goes through a testing analysis, but there is an environmental analysis and from that sponsors ascertain the type of problems there might be with hazardous wastes. Testing the site is an altogether different subject.

2. Mitigation Costs: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Wetland Mitigation Costs":

(1) Since the July 1990 meeting, staff has been working with the Department of Ecology to ensure IAC policies and procedures remain consistent with Executive Orders #89-10 and #90-04 relating to protection of wetlands. DOE has not yet developed its Wetland Procedures to allow IAC to suggest policies or procedures regarding wetland mitigation issues.

(2) IAC staff suggested delay concerning mitigation costs and related procedural issues until DOE has completed its procedural process.

The Committee accepted this status report with the understanding that IAC staff will continue its monitoring and eventually be able to draft guidelines for the Committee's review on wetland mitigation costs.

3 Application Deadlines: Memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "Grant Program Deadlines", was referred to by Mr. Fairleigh:

(1) Meetings scheduled for the IAC in 1991 include the months of March, July, September and November for the various funding programs: Firearms Range, NOVA E&E, NOVA M&O, WWRP, Boating Facilities, NOVA ORV and NOVA NHR.

(2) Certain due dates are involved for letters of intent and applications.

Following Mr. Fairleigh's review of the memorandum and that of the Committee, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MR. JONES THAT THE FOLLOWING SCHEDULE OF IAC GRANT PROGRAM DUE DATES BE ADOPTED FOR 1991:

MARCH 1	....	WWRP Letters of Intent
MAY 1	....	WWRP Applications
		Boating Facilities Projects Letters of Intent
		NOVA Off-Road Vehicle/Nonhighway Road Letters of Intent
JULY 1	....	Boating Facilities Applications
		NOVA Off-Road Vehic/Nonhighway Rd. Applications
NOV 1	....	NOVA E&E Letters of Intent
		NOVA M&O Letters of Intent
		Firearms Range Program Letters of Intent
DEC 1	....	NOVA E&E Applications
		NOVA M&O Applications
		Firearms Range Program Applications

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Tveten suggested that staff ensure the public is informed of the new schedule since there are significant changes from the former due dates.

The Committee recessed at 12:10 a.m., and reconvened at 1:20 p.m.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS A. 1. FIREARMS RANGE PARTICIPATION MANUALS:**

Mr. Fairleigh introduced Mr. J. K. Johnson, Black Powder Sports, and Mr. William Brereton, Archery Shooting Sports, members of the State Firearms Range Advisory Committee (FRAC). He reported there are 10 members of FRAC and 5 Ex-officio members. Memorandum of November 8, 1990, "Amendments to Firearms Range Manuals" was distributed to the Committee members. Further review of the draft manuals which had been sent to the Committee earlier had led to staff's request for two amendments as cited in the memorandum.

Mr. Tveten asked who would be the applicants for the Firearms funds. Mr. Fairleigh replied Letters of Intent had been coming in indicating interest from both cities and counties as well as a number of law enforcement agencies. One proviso of the program is that the facilities must be open to the general public.

Mr. Fairleigh stated the Firearms Manuals reflected the statutory requirements and some standard procedures the Committee has adopted over time in its other grants programs. Pertinent discussion on the manuals included:

(1) **Procedural Guidelines Manual**: Paragraph 2 - The Firearms Range Program (RCW 77.12): Created the Firearms Range Committee to assess needs of law enforcement, sports groups, and the general public for archery ranges and shooting facilities. Legislative Report by this Committee was submitted to the Legislature January, 1990. Legislation was introduced and passed in the 1990 Session to establish the program to be administered by the IAC. Funding comes from a surcharge on licenses to carry a concealed weapon. A ten member committee (FRAC) was created to be advisory to, and appointed by, the Director of the IAC. Funds are available on a matching grant basis to units of government and **eligible nonprofit organizations**.

(2) Primary goal is to assist in the acquisition, development, and renovation of firearm and archery ranges and facilities. Secondary goal is to provide for increased hunter safety and law enforcement access to ranges.

(3) No "comprehensive plan" is required as in other programs of the IAC.

(4) As a part of the nonprofit organization application IAC specifies that Articles of Incorporation are required--Bylaws, certification by the Secretary of State, etc.

(5) Need to resolve if Indian Tribes are eligible to participate in the funding. The legislation does not reference tribes specifically. Ms. Shannon Smith, Assistant Attorney General, advised the Committee that a determination will need to

be made as to whether Indian Tribes are eligible. Other laws of the IAC pertaining to other grant programs do provide eligibility for Indian Tribes.

(6) Mr. Tveten questioned Page (2), paragraph 5. A: "By statute all ranges receiving Firearms Range Program funding must: ..... be open to hunter safety education classes on a regular basis without cost." He noted there are fees charged by the Department of Wildlife to sign up for shooting programs. Ms. Fenton said this would depend upon where a person would be getting shooting experience. There may or may not be a cost. Mr. Costello referred to Page (2), paragraph 5 A. ".....must be open to members of the general public", and asked if this also would be at no cost. An evaluation question referring to this was explained by Mr. Fairleigh. Points would be given for more public access.

Mr. Pavish commented on the Snohomish County groups. A fee of \$2.00 is charged at some facilities; others do not charge fees.

(7) Ms. Lorenz referred to Page (2), 3. which indicated the Letter of Intent for the program was due November 1st, a date which had already passed. Mr. Fairleigh explained sponsors had already been notified that for the first funding session the due date for receipt of the Letter of Intent had been extended to November 15th.

(8) Ms. Smith advised there was no Constitutional problem involved in funding nonprofits since the Legislature had through the Firearms legislation granted the IAC authority to fund them. Mr. Tveten thought the IAC should ensure that the facilities which are funded are going to be available for a certain number of years. Mr. Fairleigh stated the statute requires a term of ten years. If it becomes unavailable within that time period, then the sponsor must repay the grant amount to the IAC.

(9) Mr. Edwards referred to Page (4), Item 7-5. Eligible and Ineligible Costs, and asked that the hazardous waste testing issue be included in the list of eligible land acquisition costs. Mr. Fairleigh agreed this should be included as well as the wetlands mitigation issue. Mr. Jones asked if firearms equipment was included in eligible costs. Mr. Fairleigh referred to Page (4), 7-6. "Purchase of fixtures and equipment not related to the operation and maintenance of a range facility" are ineligible.

(10) Mr. Fairleigh referred to the amendments memorandum and added Item 8. to Page (5) B. Ineligible Costs

"8. All development costs and any acquisition costs not under an IAC Waiver of Retroactivity incurred prior to the execution of a Project Agreement signed by the Director of the IAC and the project sponsor."

(11) Conversion of Use: Mr. Fox suggested the applicants be required to post a bond in all or part of the full grant amount, and this should be stipulated in the manual.

(12) Fund Assistance Limits and Matching Shares: Mr. Edwards questioned Page (10) B - "The IAC contribution to any single project application is limited to \$50,000." He felt this was a very small amount. Mr. Fairleigh replied the entire Firearms grant will approximate \$400,000 for the biennium and is grossly underfunded for the demand, so it will be necessary to limit projects to that amount. Mr. Pavish advised the Committee of funds which are accumulated by the federal government pertaining to manufacturing of guns. Some of these funds were allocated to the State of Washington but went into the General Fund and did not assist the firearms program in any way. It was felt by those interested in shooting ranges that this money should have gone toward developing ranges.

(13) Hearings: Mr. Tveten suggested the term "public hearing" be used as well as "public meeting" since a public hearing requires record keeping, notice to the public, etc. Mr. Edwards and Mr. Fox agreed and suggested that this be "tightened up" in the manual.

(14) Handicapped: Mr. Fearn referred to Page 11, Question #10, "Does the project provide for access to and use of facilities by persons with disabilities?" and suggested the multiplier be increased from one to three. Mr. Fox agreed there needed to be more emphasis on facilities which the handicapped will be able to use. He also noted that it appeared from the evaluation questions that a facility "on the ground" ranks higher than a new facility. Mr. Fairleigh replied that the FRAC members had suggested priority be given to the present facilities to provide increased use of them and to preserve them from being eliminated.

(15) Liability Insurance: Mr. Tveten referred to Page (4), Item 7-8, "Liability insurance for public and nonprofit firearm and archery range and training facilities" - eligible cost. He suggested the Committee place a limitation for liability insurance. He also asked if staff had looked at this matter in relation to the Recreation Liability Act, where a public service is provided but fees are not charged. Liability is less in this respect. Ms. Smith agreed this was important, but staff has not yet discussed the considerations raised by Mr. Tveten and will need to look at them. Mr. Tveten said if the manual had to be approved today, he would add at Page (4), Item 7-8, "**Maximum amount of liability insurance to be established by the Director of the IAC**" and on Page (5) under 7. "**Court awards in excess of the liability insurance amount are ineligible**".

Mr. Pavish advised that liability insurance is a very necessary item and felt anyone providing shooting facilities should also provide the insurance. The NRA has liability insurance for its members.

Dr. Scull asked if the IAC assumed any liability for these ranges. In response, Ms. Smith replied she had not yet reviewed a contract between the IAC and a firearms sponsor. Any liability insurance which the IAC might require would relate to any interest the IAC had

in the property or facility. At this time, she said she was unable to comment on the liability question. Mr. Tveten said the difference in the Firearms Program from others the IAC funds is that liability insurance is mentioned as an eligible cost, and this concerned him. In other IAC programs liability insurance is automatically with the management of the facility and the state is "held harmless" through its contracts.

(16) Indian Tribes: J. K. Johnson, FRAC, advised the Committee it had been the intent of FRAC that tribal law enforcement agencies should be included to participate in the program. If they have a range open to the public, they should be permitted to apply for grants. He commented on the liability insurance which is available to the range management, and felt there ought to be minimums established rather than maximums. He stated that insurance rates are somewhat higher for those facilities open to the general public than those open only to specific membership. He also felt that the \$50,000 limit per project was satisfactory in view of the limited funds in the program.

Following review of the Firearms Range Procedural Guidelines Manual, the Committee moved the adoption of the following:

(1) IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FOX, SECONDED BY FEARN THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ADOPT THE FIREARMS RANGE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES MANUAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF.

(2) MR. FOX MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT ON PAGE (11), #10, "DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE FOR ACCESS TO AND USE OF FACILITIES BY PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES?" THAT THE MULTIPLIER BE INCREASED FROM 1 TO 4. AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(3) MR. COSTELLO MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. FOX, THAT ITEM 7, ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE COSTS #5 INCLUDE HAZARDOUS WASTE ASSESSMENTS AS AN ELIGIBLE COST. AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(4) MR. FOX MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. FEARN, THAT PAGE (10), ITEM 6. "TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE PROJECT SPONSOR GOING TO MAKE THE FACILITY AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL PUBLIC, HUNTER EDUCATION, OR LAW ENFORCEMENT USE?" THAT THE MULTIPLIER BE RAISED FROM 3 TO 5. AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED."

(5) MR. FOX MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. EDWARDS, THAT PAGE (5), ITEM 9. CONVERSION OF USE HAVE LANGUAGE ADDED THAT CERTAIN APPLICANTS APPROVED FOR FUNDING ASSISTANCE MAY BE REQUIRED TO POST A BOND IN ALL OR PART OF THE FULL GRANT AMOUNT. AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(6) MR. FOX MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT PAGE (4), ITEM 7, PARAGRAPH 8 CONTAIN ADDITIONAL WORDING AS FOLLOWS: "LIMITATION, SPECIFICATIONS, AND REQUIREMENTS ON LIABILITY AND INSURANCE ARE

SUBJECT TO ACTION BY THE IAC AT ITS MARCH 1991 MEETING." AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(7) QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED. MR. JONES AND MR. COSTELLO VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT STAFF INCLUDE IN THE MANUAL OTHER SUGGESTIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, (HEARINGS, SPECIFICATIONS RE TERMS OF PUBLIC USE AND ANY RESTRICTIONS) AND ALSO, TO REVIEW THE MATTER OF ELIGIBILITY OF INDIAN TRIBES.

The Committee recessed at 3:00 P.M., and reconvened at 3:10 P.M.

**IV. A. 2 FIREARMS RANGE APPLICATION MANUAL:** Mr. Fairleigh referred to the Firearms Range Application Manual, making reference also to the proposed deletions and additions (AMENDMENTS) on pages 5, 8, 15, and 2: delete references and text regarding Program Narrative; add certain evaluation question responses; and add that sponsors provide a written response to each applicable evaluation question. (THIS MANUAL FOLLOWED THE STANDARD GUIDELINES IN THE OTHER FUNDING PROGRAMS OF THE IAC WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS FOR THE FIREARMS PROGRAM.)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MR. EDWARDS THAT THE FIREARMS RANGE PROGRAM APPLICATION MANUAL BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**IV. D. NOVA - NONHIGHWAY ROAD PROJECTS CONSIDERATIONS:**

Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Nonhighway Road Project Applications":

(1) Fifteen (15) projects were submitted for Committee review. Table I represented the relative ranking of each project as evaluated by the NOVA Committee using the process and evaluation questionnaire approved by the Interagency Committee.

(2) Grants of up to 100% with a maximum IAC share of \$150,000 are allowed in the NHR Program.

(3) An amended Table I (green) was distributed to the Committee as well as a new resume' for the USDA, Forest Service, Chiwawa Equestrian Proposal, IAC #91-131D.

Staff presented the projects for consideration using slides and verbal narration. Those projects receiving comments from the Committee were as follows:

**USDA, Forest Service, Pete's Creek/Col. Bob Trail, IAC #91-124D:**

The trailhead and new trail connector site area were clarified for Dr. Scull.

TABLE 1 - NHR PROJECTS - NOVEMBER, 1990

Score Rank	Proj No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Requests
114.00	1	91-089D Teepee Trailhead	USFS Umatilla National Forest	20,657	20,534	41,191	20,657
112.50	2	91-715D Nicholson Trail/Sahara Camp	Department of Natural Resources	107,405	72,334	179,739	128,062
106.40	3	91-092D Rattlesnake Trailhead	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	11,000	3,450	14,450	139,062
105.80	4	91-151D Thornton Lake Trailhead	NPS North Cascades National Park	15,000	7,000	22,000	154,062
104.80	5	91-124D Pete's Creek/Col Bob Trail	USFS Olympic National Forest	31,550	65,000	96,550	185,612
103.25	6	91-090D Walupt Horse Camp	USFS Gifford Pinchot Nat. Forest	61,160	18,000	79,160	246,772
103.20	7	91-154D Pelton Basin/Sahale Arm	NPS North Cascades National Park	30,000	12,000	42,000	276,772
102.40	8	91-131D Chiwawa Equestrian	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	113,400	27,700	141,100	390,172
102.00	9	91-182D Grand-Badger Valley Rehab.	NPS Olympic National Park	61,486	24,566	86,052	451,658
101.60	10	91-061A Noisy Creek Trail	USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Nat For	150,000	192,000	342,000	601,658
100.40	11	91-126D High Steel Bridge	USFS Olympic National Forest	85,000	85,000	170,000	686,658
95.40	12	91-116D Hoodoo Canyon Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	46,425	10,000	56,425	733,083
94.60	13	91-071D North Fork, Silver Creek Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	60,395	3,179	63,574	793,478
94.00	14	91-509D Cross Country Ski Trails	State Parks	75,504	0	75,504	868,982
83.80	15	91-172D Loup Loup Summit Recreation Area	USFS Okanogan National Forest	150,000	119,000	269,000	1,018,982
		Totals		1,018,982	659,763	1,678,745	

USDA, Grand Valley Rehabilitation, IAC #91-182D: In response to Mr. Fearn, Mr. Johnson explained that a social trail is a trail which has through time been "user-built"; one which may start out as a path and end up being used by many persons as a short cut, etc., eventually becoming a much used trail.

USFS, Okanogan National Forest, Loup Loup Summit Recreation Area, IAC #91-172D: Dr. Scull stated there had been some local rumors about the financial viability of the Loup Loup Ski Area and he asked if staff could comment on them. Mr. Don Clark, Project Manager, stated the cost of the project was quite high and that seemed to have a great deal to do with the scoring of the project. It will provide only for restroom facilities with appropriate sewage treatment. The financial viability of the ski area was not a factor at all in discussions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Mr. Fairleigh distributed memorandum of November 8, 1990, "NHR Projects Funding Recommendations", citing the following criteria:

- (1) All projects met all legal and procedural requirements for funding consideration.
- (2) The relative ranking of projects as determined by the project review and evaluation process.
- (3) Source of funding and fund source restrictions.
- (4) An attempt to fund as many projects as possible.

Available Funding: Available funding was indicated as \$384,927.

Mr. Tveten referred to the USFS Olympic National Forest, Pete's Creek/Col. Bob Trail, IAC #91-124D Project as an example and noted that because of the matching funds and the evaluation process, that project had been given 104.80 points; whereas, the State Parks Project, Cross Country Ski Trails, IAC #91-509D, had received only 94.00 points because it did not have matching funds which would have given it a higher ranking. State Parks is attempting to build up the cross-country ski trail and add another six miles. Most of the Nonhighway funds were being allocated to the federal government, and he felt though there is a need to assist the federal government projects, there is a need also to assist state agencies' projects due to public demand for state park facilities. Mr. Fearn agreed stating his recommendation would be to fund the state agencies' projects first and then use the rest of the funds for federal government projects. He observed that most of the NHR projects reviewed were for horse-oriented programs and there were none for cross-country skiing except the State Parks' project.

Dr. Scull felt there should be discussion to determine whether there was a bias in the evaluation process. Mr. Wilder agreed stating staff is always ready at any time to change the evaluation system to meet the needs. He noted the matching fund policy does generate additional dollars and, therefore, makes good sense. At the March

13:10 11/06/1990

TABLE 2- STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION  
NHR PROJECTS - NOVEMBER, 1990

Score Rank Proj No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Requests
114.00 1	91-089D Teepee Trailhead	USFS Umatilla National Forest	20,657	20,534	41,191	20,657
112.50 2	91-715D Nicholson Trail/Sahara Camp	Department of Natural Resources	107,405	72,334	179,739	128,062
106.40 3	91-092D Rattlesnake Trailhead	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	11,000	3,450	14,450	139,062
105.80 4	91-151D Thornton Lake Trailhead	NPS North Cascades National Park	15,000	7,000	22,000	154,062
104.80 5	91-124D Pete's Creek/Col Bob Trail	USFS Olympic National Forest	31,550	55,000	96,550	185,612
103.25 6	91-090D Walnut Horse Camp	USFS Gifford Pinchot Nat. Forest	61,160	18,000	79,160	246,772
103.20 7	91-154D Pelton Basin/Sahale Are	NPS North Cascades National Park	30,000	12,000	42,000	276,772
102.40 8	91-131D Chimawa Equestrian	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	113,400	27,700	141,100	390,172
102.00 9	91-192D Grand-Badger Valley Rehab.	NPS Olympic National Park	0	0	0	390,172
101.60 10	91-061A Noisy Creek Trail	USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Nat For	0	0	0	390,172
100.40 11	91-126D High Steel Bridge	USFS Olympic National Forest	0	0	0	390,172
99.40 12	91-115D Hoodoo Canyon Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	0	0	0	390,172
94.60 13	91-071D North Fork, Silver Creek Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	0	0	0	390,172
91.00 14	91-509D Cross Country Ski Trails	State Parks	0	0	0	390,172
83.80 15	91-172D Loup Loup Summit Recreation Area	USFS Okanogan National Forest	0	0	0	390,172
Totals			390,172	226,018	616,190	

Total Available per Funding Memo \$ 384,927  
 Available from close short 9,943  
 -----  
 Currently Available 394,870  
 Funding Recommendation 390,172  
 -----  
 Balance Available \$ 4,698

1990 IAC meeting, the Committee had adopted a new scoring system with the purpose of leveraging the dollars available. Historically, the program was 100% funding. The Committee and staff recognized the need for more commitment from sponsors and the matching issue evolved. Another factor involved the new Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) which would be assisting all types of trails as well as cross-country trails. He did not feel cross-country skiing needs were being overlooked.

Ms. Lorenz pointed out that regardless of where these trails are provided, they are placed in areas of greatest need to serve the greatest number of users statewide.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY PRIOR TO FUNDING OF NONHIGHWAY PROJECTS:**

The chair called for public testimony:

**Jack Galloway, Olympic National Park, Landscape Architect, Grand-Badger Valley Rehabilitation, IAC #91-182D:**

(1) Felt Eric Johnson, Project Manager, had made good presentation.

(2) Deduced from the discussion that it would be necessary to have more matching funds to score higher.

(3) Considered the IAC program for NOVA projects very good, and the Grand-Badger Valley Rehabilitation project one that should be funded.

Dr. Scull asked if this project were not funded, was there the possibility that NPS would proceed on its own to fund it. Mr. Galloway replied it might be possible to do so if the base operating funds were increased, but he could not state this as fact at this time. He noted that the revegetation part of the trails have been historically underfunded. These types of projects compete with other improvement to trails projects.

**Ms. Connie McClellan, Past President, Olympians, Inc., Montesano, USFS Olympic National Forest, Pete's Creek/Col. Bob Trail, IAC #91-124D:**

(1) Supported the project. Trail is used actively by Olympians, Inc., and many others who are not members of the group.

(2) Forest Service for a number of years has tried to get funding for this trail. It will open up an avenue of access for equestrians. Asked that the project be funded.

**Uwe Nehring, Ross Lake Area Ranger, North Cascades National Park, All NOVA Nonhighway Projects:** The National Parks Service has the second largest trail inventory in Washington State. Eighty percent of the users are from Washington State. Commended the IAC in regard to its NOVA projects - felt the money was well-invested.

**Al Brenner, Backcountry Horsemen, All NOVA Nonhighway Projects:** Wanted to be sure that volunteer hours were taken into consideration

in all of the NOVA projects. (Mr. Fairleigh assured him this was already included in the evaluation system.)

Mr. Edwards commented on DNR's Nicholson Trail/Sahara Camp Project, IAC #91-715D: DNR has many hours of additional volunteer time and resources which it was not able to use on this particular project. People who are involved in constructing new trails and reconstituting older ones. However, the \$72,334 match being provided is coming from volunteers planning, designing, etc. He said DNR had a listing of ten to 15 projects which did not have a match and thus he was unable to submit them. Ms. McClellan said the Olympians, Inc., had done volunteer work for many years on various trails and do this yearly. Dr. Scull complimented groups who volunteer their time to maintain trails and said it was very important to have this type of assistance.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. EDWARDS, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 31 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) [WASHINGTON OUTDOORS: ASSESSMENT AND POLICY PLAN] AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON MARCH 22, 1990, AND

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 31 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

**III. D. WETLANDS ACTION PLAN DEFINITION STATUS:** IAC Report #90-5, Special Report, Wetlands Action Plan, was distributed to the Committee. Mr. Lovelady, referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Wetlands Action Plan Definition Status":

(1) IAC staff is working on a definition for "wetlands". Reported it is a complicated issue and cited the two definitions on page (2) of the memorandum (a) for Inventories and Tracking and (b) for Site Plan and Project Review.

(2) Staff did not propose any specific wetlands definition for use in its manuals at this time. The IAC will continue

its work with the Department of Ecology and the issue will be resolved in 1991.

Mr. Edwards wanted to ensure language would be included in the IAC contracts which sponsors will sign so that there will be no net loss or no impact to wetlands if these areas are in specific projects. Mr. Lovelady stated staff would be working toward clarifying this issue to ensure a sponsor would know whether or not there was a wetland on the site. There are various wetland types which need to be addressed. Mr. Fairleigh said staff would be providing assistance to local government on wetlands.

At 4:00 P.M., Dr. Scull advised those in attendance that the Committee would reconvene Friday, November 8, 1990, at 9:00 a.m. for continuation of the agenda. Funding consideration for the NOVA Off-Road Vehicle Capital and Planning Projects would be the first item of business.

The Committee recessed at 4:05 P.M.

---

**FRIDAY - NOVEMBER 9, 1990**

Dr. Scull, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Quorum was declared: SCULL, TVETEN, FEARN, FOX, JONES, LORENZ, EDWARDS, COSTELLO, FENTON.

The attendees were advised of the Committee's agenda as discussed at the November 8th meeting: NOVA ORV Off-Road and Capital Projects, Thurston County Sports Park Proposed Cost Increase, Maintenance and Operation Set-Aside, Adoption of the Washington State Trails Plan, followed by a discussion of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, funding matters, and other items the Committee might want to discuss.

**IV. F. 2. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION SET-ASIDE:** Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff distributed to the Committee, dated November 8, 1990, "Maintenance and Operation Set-Aside":

- (1) The Capital Projects and M&O Projects are expanding and demand for funds has greatly exceeded that which is available.
- (2) In November, 1989 the Committee approved a guideline of \$300,000 for M&O projects.
- (3) March, 1990, a total of \$355,000 was granted with excess given to the Thurston County ORV Sports Park.

(4) Staff estimated 1991 requests:  
M&O for 3 Sports Parks \$375,000; Other M&O \$50,000; Trail M&O \$55,000 - for a total of \$470,000.

(5) \$450,000 total requests are anticipated for March 1991, but the set-aside is \$300,000.

(6) Staff recommended that (a) the Committee move to target M&O grants at \$300,000 per year and that amount be set-aside from capital funds reported as available each year.

That the Staff and NOVA Committee recommend to the IAC possible actions to prioritize and stretch the use of available M&O funding (i.e., per project grant limits, required matching shares, declaring certain activities ineligible, etc.), and

That there be consideration of guidelines which would restrict or discourage capital projects which would result in future M&O requests to the IAC.

(7) Staff asked that a determination on Item (6) above be made by the Committee later at today's meeting.

**IV. F. 1. THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK COST INCREASE REQUEST:**

Memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "Thurston County Sports Park Cost Increase Request, ORV #91-003M", was referred to by Mr. Fairleigh:

(1) In March, 1990 the IAC funded M&O for the Thurston County ORV Sports Park = \$140,000 (\$50,000 IAC/\$90,000 Thurston County). The County had requested \$167,234. County's share was to come from the Park's reserve funds and 1990 park revenues.

(2) Thurston County requested a **cost increase of \$71,453** and a reduction in the matching share. (IAC \$121,453; \$50,000 Thurston County; Total project cost: \$171,453.)

(3) The cost increase is required in order for the Sports Park to meet debt payments. Through Thurston County's established policy, no County funds may be spent on this project.

(4) Cost increase would allow full operation of the park for the next five months - November '90 to March '91.

(5) History and Use of the Park since its inception was reviewed by Mr. Fairleigh. A total of \$2,711,359 has been granted the Park over the years. Use has been declining.

(6) The park incurred a \$200,000 debt in 1982 being retired through twelve payments (from park revenues) of \$27,000 per year to another county fund for a total pay-out of \$324,000.

(7) The current financial considerations were cited:

Funded in March \$140,000 total (\$50,000 NOVA funds);  
Current debt balance: \$216,000 with 8 payments to be  
made.

\$140,000 March grant expended through 9-30-90: IAC 36%  
\$34,999 and County 64% \$62,218 = Total \$97,217.

Cost per visitor approximately \$11.21 (users and  
spectators); cost per user approximately \$18.80.

Fees: \$2.00 per visitor; projected to be \$3.00 per  
event, \$5.00 day-use in 1991.

In 1990 revenues to off-set operating costs were about  
\$7,000.

Seasonal operation suggested (i.e., due to cost of  
operation, high per visitor subsidy, and growing gap  
between ORV funds requested versus ORV funds available).

(8) Staff has indicated willingness to support and recommend a  
\$52,000 cost increase (\$2,000 admin. costs; \$50,000 M&O costs).

(9) County has indicated it may close the park if full cost  
increase (\$71,453) is not forthcoming.

(10) County has continued to manage the park with no major  
management actions to match operating costs with funds available.

(11) If park remains open, County will be requesting in four  
months' time M&O funding for April 91 to March 92 in excess of 1990's  
request.

(12) Options Cited:

- a. Seasonal operation with cost reduced accordingly.
- b. Complete study to determine function and level park  
should operate.
- c. \$52,000 cost increase to cover period until March  
31, 1991 - however, County states it requires \$71,453.
- d. Grant full \$71,453 cost increase - maintain  
status quo.
- e. Provide no cost increase (leading to closure of  
the park and conversion of use).
- f. Provide no cost increase and request the County  
to close the park for year until a study can be completed  
and a supportable direction and scope determined.

Following Mr. Fairleigh's presentation, questions were asked of staff  
relating to comparison of Thurston County Parks with the other two  
sports parks; declining visitor usage, reasons concerning Thurston  
County's unwillingness to place funds in the park project, numbers of

county staff people in charge of the project (and their salaries), usage of the park in winter months as opposed to summer and fall months; types of usage in the park, the debt problem (loan not signed by IAC but by the County), and DNR's available lands adjacent to the park.

Prior to presentation of the projects, Mr. Wilder distributed to the Committee a copy of a letter, dated November 7, 1990, from Ron Morgenthaler, Northwest Motorcycle Association, advising of their support for the two acquisition projects proposed for Grant County.

#### **IV. F. NOVA OFF-ROAD VEHICLE CAPITAL AND PLANNING PROJECTS**

**CONSIDERATIONS:** Mr. Fairleigh distributed a new Table I (buff) for the Off-Road Vehicle Project applications and a new resume' (green) for **Ferry County Parks and Recreation Project - Abandoned RR Right-of-Way, ORV #91-078A.** Reference was made to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Project Applications":

(1) Nineteen projects were submitted this year as indicated in Table I. NOVA Committee evaluated each project on October 19, 1990.

(2) No funding limits or required matching shares are in the Off-Road Vehicle Program.

Each project was presented to the Committee by Project Services staff using slides and verbal summaries.

Those projects receiving comments or questions from the Committee members while being reviewed were as follows:

**USFS Umatilla Natl. Forest, Spangler Complex, ORV #91-088D:** Ms. Lorenz asked about advertising costs in the project. Mr. Johnson explained the IAC requires advertising in order to inform the public of public hearings notices. PSA's are free, but public announcements must be paid for. Dr. Scull was advised this project did not provide for construction of trails at this point. The Umatilla National Forest sponsor will return next year for consideration of a construction grant.

**Grant County, Moses Lake Sand Dunes Acquisition South, ORV #91-264A:** Mr. Edwards was informed this project was for acquisition only of the south portion of the Moses Lake Sand Dunes project (320 acres).

**Thurston County Sports Park Study, ORV #91-201A:** Mr. Jones was informed that the "environmental mitigation" element in the project was necessary to evaluate the stream and sedimentation factor in the park. DOE has expressed concern regarding the sedimentation. Also, most of the usage of the park does create environmental problems which need to be reviewed.

TABLE 1 - ORV PROJECTS  
NOVEMBER, 1990

Score Rank	Proj. No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Requests
106.34	1	91-088D Spangler Complex	USFS Umatilla National Forest	12,415	13,955	26,370	12,415
93.50	2	91-065A Moses Lake Sand Dunes North	Grant County	401,500	0	401,500	413,915
92.84	3	91-201P ORV Sports Park Plan Update	Thurston County	40,000	0	40,000	453,915
-	4	91-127P South Fork, Skokomish Plan	USFS Olympic National Forest	38,000	0	38,000	491,915
89.75	5	91-125P North Quilcene Design Plan	USFS Olympic National Forest	41,000	0	41,000	532,915
89.00	6	91-134P Feasibility Study	USFS Gifford Pinchot Nat. Forest	30,000	0	38,000	570,915
89.00	6	91-244A Moses Lake Sand Dunes South	Grant County	401,500	0	401,500	972,415
89.00	6	91-162P Saddle Mountain Recreation Plan	Bureau of Land Management	38,947	11,004	49,951	1,011,366
84.75	7	91-070P North Fork, Chewelah Creek	USFS Colville National Forest	6,075	675	6,750	1,017,436
81.00	8	91-091D Horn Rapids ORV Park 1991	Richland	40,780	0	40,780	1,058,216
81.00	8	91-243F Entiat/North Tommy Trail Ext.	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	17,590	2,483	20,073	1,078,289
80.25	9	91-044D LFO ORV Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	39,208	2,064	41,272	1,119,561
77.20	10	91-083D Eagles Track Trailhead	Ferry County	141,720	23,448	165,168	1,284,729
76.50	11	91-051P Huckleberry Trailhead	USFS Colville National Forest	6,830	360	7,190	1,291,919
76.25	12	91-242D ORV Park	Spokane County	466,015	0	466,015	1,757,934
76.17	13	91-114P Comprehensive Plan	Douglas County	13,548	0	13,548	1,771,482
74.50	14	91-078A Railroad Right-of-Way	Ferry County	12,000	17,150	29,150	1,799,632
64.30	15	91-713D Jones Creek Trailhead	Department of Natural Resources	78,231	0	78,231	1,877,863
61.25	16	91-098D Naches Signs	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	41,000	0	41,000	1,918,863
		Totals		1,874,359	71,139	1,945,498	

**Olympic National Forest, South Fork Skokomish ORV Plan, ORV**

**#91-127P:** Mr. Tveten asked if this project would involve constructing new roads in addition to the logging roads which were already in existence. Mr. Johnson replied the sponsors would be looking at the existing logging roads as possible routes, and may use them as trail corridors. This is a part of the planning process. No construction is involved in the project at this time.

**Olympic National Forest, North Quilcene ORV Design Plan, ORV**

**#91-125P:** In response to Mr. Jones' question, Mr. Johnson stated the sponsor has a master performer involved in the project who will be required to travel in order to begin putting the plan together. In addition, funds will be needed to pay travel/mileage expenses of people actually performing the study.

**City of Richland, 1991 Horn Rapids ORV Park - Capital Improvements, ORV #91-091D:**

Dr. Scull asked whether the pattern of usage was declining or increasing. Mr. Fairleigh replied for the project sponsor who was unable to be present stating that to his personal knowledge there did not seem to be a decrease or increase in usage. He also informed Mr. Tveten that the M&O grant in March, 1990 had been \$127,000, with a \$37,000 local match. Total of \$164,000.

**USDA - Forest Service, Huckleberry ORV Trail and Trailhead, IAC**

**#91-051P:** In answer to questions of the Committee members staff stated (1) there is other recreation provided in the area (skiing, etc.), but there are no campsites, (2) there appears to be no local opposition to the project and, in fact, considerable support for it, and (3) various use areas will be "spread out" to allow different usage in different areas.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "ORV Project Funding Recommendations" was distributed to the Committee members and attendees. Mr. Fairleigh referred to the following criteria and information:

- (1) All projects have met all legal and procedural requirements for funding consideration by the IAC.
- (2) Relative ranking of projects as determined by the project review and evaluation process.
- (3) Source of funding and fund source restriction.
- (4) Attempt to fund as many projects as possible.
- (5) Available Funding:

Balance 3/21/90 IAC meeting	\$ 188,860
Income (fuel tax receipts, permit fees)	866,160
Less administration	(31,163)
Less Dept. Licensing	
Reporting Error	(273,182)
	<u>\$ 750,675</u>

TABLE 2 - STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION  
ORV PROJECTS - NOVEMBER, 1990

Score Rank	Proj. No.	Project Name	Sponsor Name	Request	Match	Total	Cum. Requests
106.34	1	91-088D Spangler Complex	USFS Umatilla National Forest	12,415	13,955	26,370	12,415
93.50	2	91-065A Moses Lake Sand Dunes North	Grant County	401,500	0	401,500	413,915
92.84	3	91-201P ORV Sports Park Plan Update	Thurston County	40,000	0	40,000	453,915
91.75	4	91-127P South Fork, Skokomish Plan	USFS Olympic National Forest	38,000	0	38,000	491,915
89.75	5	91-125P North Quilcene Design Plan	USFS Olympic National Forest	41,000	0	41,000	532,915
89.00	6	91-134P Feasibility Study	USFS Gifford Pinchot Nat. Forest	38,000	0	38,000	570,915
89.00	7	91-264A Moses Lake Sand Dunes South	Grant County	401,500	0	401,500	972,415
89.00	8	91-162P Saddle Mountain Recreation Plan	Bureau of Land Management	23,260	11,004	34,264	995,675
84.75	9	91-070P North Fork, Chewelah Creek	USFS Colville National Forest	0	0	0	995,675
81.00	10	91-091D Horn Rapids ORV Park 1991	Richland	0	0	0	995,675
81.00	11	91-243P Entiat/North Tommy Trail Ext.	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	0	0	0	995,675
80.25	12	91-044D LPO ORV Trail	USFS Colville National Forest	0	0	0	995,675
77.20	13	91-083D Eagles Track Trailhead	Ferry County	0	0	0	995,675
76.50	14	91-051P Huckleberry Trailhead	USFS Colville National Forest	0	0	0	995,675
76.25	15	91-242D ORV Park	Spokane County	0	0	0	995,675
76.17	16	91-114P Comprehensive Plan	Douglas County	0	0	0	995,675
74.50	17	91-078A Railroad Right-of-Way	Ferry County	0	0	0	995,675
64.30	18	91-713D Jones Creek Trailhead	Department of Natural Resources	0	0	0	995,675
61.25	19	91-098D Waches Signs	USFS Wenatchee National Forest	0	0	0	995,675
		Funds Available	Totals	995,675	24,959	1,020,634	
		Staff Recommendation					

NOTE: As per the provisions of RCW 46.09.280, the organized ORV representatives on the NOVA Committee have recommended the following projects for receipt of permit funds collected under RCW 46.09.110:

- 91-243P Entiat/North Tommy Trail Ext. USFS Wenatchee National Forest
- 91-134P Feasibility Study USFS Gifford Pinchot Nat. Forest
- 91-044D LPO ORV Trail USFS Colville National Forest
- 91-070P North Fork, Chewelah Creek USFS Colville National Forest

60% of total receipt 10/90-1/91	\$ 420,000
Less M&O Set-Aside 3/91-9/91	(175,000)
(assumes \$300,000 for M&O at 3/91 IAC meeting)	
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$ 995,675</b>

(6) Two of the acquisition projects, Grant County, Moses Lake Sand Dunes North, ORV #91-065A and Grant County, Moses Lake Sand Dunes South, ORV #91-264A, had been considered by staff and the NOVA Advisory Committee to be critical. There are only two sand dunes in the area. If the Moses Lake Sand Dunes North and South are not acquired, they will likely be procured to use for agricultural purposes (potatoe fields). The dunes are heavily used by recreationists. Letter of support had been received from the Northwest Motorcycle Association.

Appraisals and the value of the land was discussed. Owners of the land were cited: Dune North - Several private parties; Dunes South - Isaak Land, Inc.

The project had been "split" into two separate projects. Mr. Fairleigh explained the property involved was exceedingly expensive and it was the desire of the NOVA Advisory Committee to have two separate projects so that there would not be one large application going through the system.

**John Melvin, Grant County**, explained the south half of the parcel will no doubt be developed into potatoe fields if it is not acquired. There will continue to be minimal facilities for recreationists during the heavy use periods. The Committee was shown on the slides the various pieces of property under consideration and explanations were given as to ownership. DNR's adjacent lands were described as well as the Department of Wildlife's lands. Ms. Fenton pointed out that DOW is presently evaluating its land for recreation. Mr. Edwards said DNR's land would continue to be leased to Grant County. Mr. Tveten was assured the plans being pursued were in compliance with the County's Comprehensive Plan for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Fox was concerned with using agricultural land for ORV purposes and asked if the County Commissioners had agreed that the land should be turned over for recreational use. Mr. Melvin replied the Commissioners are in full support of the proposal to obtain the land for recreationists. The land was not recognized as agricultural land at the time it was being reviewed by the Commissioners. Up to last year it had been heavily used as a part of the ORV riding area.

**Thurston County ORV Sports Park, IAC:** Ms. Lorenz asked why Thurston County's ORV Sports Park Plan Update, \$40,000, had received so many points. Mr. Johnson replied the Evaluation point system provides for "need for any additional or improved ORV facility in the area", and thus the project had garnered a high need value.

Secondly, the study plan will provide information the IAC and Committee require to evaluate the park and determine how it should be funded. Ms. Lorenz was informed that the project was for the study and interrelated with that was the cost increase for M&O which the Committee will need to consider.

Consideration was given to the park's closure or its being converted to other park and recreation use. The Committee was advised that staff recommended \$50,000 for the proposed cost increase; the County request was for \$71,453; the Study Project or Plan Update, ORV #91-201P, was for \$40,000 -- two separate decisions to be made by the Committee. If the Committee approved a cost increase, that amount would be deducted from available funds for the list of ORV projects recommended for approval by staff and NOVA. The \$50,000 cost increase, if approved, would carry the project through to March 1991.

**TESTIMONY FROM SPONSORS AND AUDIENCE PARTICIPANTS:**

**Mr. Michael Welter, Director, Parks and Recreation, Thurston County - Thurston County ORV Sports Park Project:** Mr. Welter introduced **Mr. Tom Fitzsimmons, Thurston County Administrator.** Mr. Fitzsimmons stated:

(1) The two requests for M&O and Plan Update (study) were interrelated.

(2) The facility is not provided General Fund monies from the County and relies on IAC's support from ORV funds.

(3) If IAC does not grant the requested cost increase, it will be necessary to close the facility. IAC funding assistance is presently behind meeting the demand and requirements of the present needs. The County recognizes, and is concerned about, the debt problem and is attempting to retire it. However, the park has been operating under the assumption that the County had an agreement with the IAC that over time the monies generated at the park would be used to retire the debt. The County is now being asked by IAC to run the park with those revenue monies.

(4) The County is unable to do this and feels this project is one of a cooperative partnership with the IAC.

(5) Users have met and have agreed to increase their fees to help pay for their use of the park.

(6) \$71,453 is the amount required to continue operation of the park to March, 1991. However, if the IAC places those funds 100% toward administration, then the County is left with even less money to operate the park.

(7) County is willing to work with the IAC and the Committee to work out and plan perhaps converting the park to another use, and it is open to any ideas.

(8) The County is proposing to place \$50,000 as a match if the IAC grants a cost increase. This would reduce the debt immediately by \$100,000.

Dr. Scull asked what the effect would be if the park converted to seasonal operation and closed for the winter? Mr. Fitzsimmons said

this would result in a reduction in revenue which is necessary to the park's operation. Mr. Welter noted that the entire budget is to be spent, and if the park converted to seasonal, there would be loss of full-time staff. There are at present two full-time staff members at the park who provide consistency in seeing that the park is maintained and operated. There is considerable use of the park through winter months as well.

Mr. Welter advised the percentage of revenue taken in during the off season was approximately 20%. Mr. Johnson supplied information on the \$45,000 in revenue and the expenses which are taken from that source. Ms. Lorenz asked if the users as a group had ever considered types of fund raising to enable the park to eliminate the debt. Mr. Fitzsimmons said it was not possible for users to make up for the "hole" which would be there if only a \$52,000 increase was given to the park's budget. Users believe they are already paying for use of the park through the fees they are charged and for their permit costs. Mr. Welter advised there would be a new fee structure beginning January 1, 1991. This will result in a 56% increase in the amount of revenue. Users have stated that they will support this new fee structure and hope to keep the park open.

Mr. Fitzsimmons summed up the County's offer: a 56% increase in fees by users; a request for \$71,453 cost increase for O&M be granted through March 1991, \$50,000 additional from the IAC and a contribution of \$50,000 from the County towards reduction of the debt, and a master study plan funding of \$40,000. The County will then come to the Committee in March with information on revenues being generated and improvements which will be required. If this package is not acceptable, then the County will need to talk about other alternatives.

Mr. Wilder asked about the contribution of the \$50,000 from the County, and was informed this was "new county money" from the County's Capital Improvement Fund over and above the funds being discussed (paragraph above). Mr. Jones asked about the "long standing administrative policy that no County funds would be spent on the project". Mr. Fitzsimmons stated it was a policy issue. General Tax monies should not be expended on a special interest facility to benefit specific recreational interests. The County will now however, consider expending \$50,000 from its Capital Improvement Fund for this project.

Other discussions included the fact that 11% of the users are local; the remainder are people coming from other counties. Seventy-five percent (75%) come from King and Pierce counties; the remainder from other counties throughout the state. There is no economic benefit since most are specific recreation users of an isolated recreational area. Any economic benefit probably would be inside the city limits. Most users expend monies for transportation to and from the site and for participation in the activities at the park. No study has been made concerning an economic benefit factor. The County has some

General Fund monies placed in its other County park programs - for possible acquisition - and for support of the annual programs.

Dr. Scull asked if a private concern could take over the park's operation. Both Mr. Fitzsimmons and Mr. Werner replied they did not have knowledge of any private interests, but noted that the park had at one time been privately financed and had ceased to function. The County will be modifying its policy not to place funds in the park by using County funds which will come in under the real estate tax option of counties.

Mr. Wilder was unsure if the additional \$50,000 could be given to the park's debt clearance since legality of this option had not been discussed with the Assistant Attorney General. Mr. Fitzsimmons stated if the IAC could not contribute the additional \$50,000 toward the debt clearance, the County would still commit that amount to assist in clearing the debt. Ms. Lorenz asked for clarification of the County's additional \$50,000. Mr. Fitzsimmons stated the County had requested \$167,000, but the IAC is recommending only \$40,000 for a study and a cost increase of \$52,000. The County is willing to contribute \$50,000 to reduce the debt if the IAC could contribute a like amount. Mr. Johnson assured Mr. Fox that staff's recommendation (\$52,000) was fully supported by the NOVA Advisory Committee. As a group the NOVA Committee had voted in favor of the cost increase to Thurston County.

Buck Murphy, Tacoma Motorcycle Club, Thurston County ORV Sports Park:

(1) Has been actively working with the ORV Park the last four years. Drop off in use has been because the track is in very poor condition.

(2) Tacoma Motorcycle Club has scheduled five events at the park; one being a two-day event. There is a Ready-to-Ride Program; children participate from the cities; there are ATV Safety Classes held there. The park does more than just provide a riding outlet. There are campouts held, etc.

(3) Would be a shame to see the park closed. There are a lot of user funds in the park already; thousands of volunteer hours in building picnic tables, working with the Northwest Four-Wheel Drive people, and so on.

(4) If decent track were provided, drop off in use of the park would vanish. With fees increased, more people attending, the park will help produce revenues.

(5) Commended staff at the park and Mike Welter for what they are trying to do.

(6) Washington State experiences high sales of ATV's and people need places to ride. This is the only park of its type north of California on the west coast, and there is a high demand for it.

(7) Keep park open for the public.

David McMains, Pacific Northwest Four-Wheel Drive Association, Moses Lake Sand Dunes - both projects (ORV #91-065A and ORV #91-264A):

(1) Aware of need for the Moses Lake Sand Dunes area to be acquired.

(2) Is unique; there isn't any other open riding area in Central Washington as large as this area or that can accommodate the user population, which is growing. It should be kept open for use.

(3) Area has been used for many, many years and in some cases there are third generation riders.

(4) If area is not acquired now, the price will go up. There will be either development taking place or the land used as potatoe fields.

Mr. Fearn asked if Mr. McMains would be willing to pay a fee to use the area. Mr. McMains said he would not have a problem with paying a fee, but it would be difficult to enforce because of the several accesses into the sand dunes. Ms. Lorenz asked if given a choice which area (north or south sand dunes) would he support. Mr. McMains replied the north because it would tie in with present use and it would not be necessary to cross private land to get into it. But, he stated that both areas are needed.

**John Melvin, Grant County Sheriff's Office, ORV Coordinator - both projects - Moses Lake Sand Dunes (ORV #91-065a and ORV #91-264A):**

(1) Commented it would be difficult to collect fees on the sand dunes sites.

(2) Informed Mr. Tveten that it was also difficult to be knowledgeable about transgressors over the private land. There have been markers established to indicate the boundaries which have seemed to work very well. There are few violations. People seem to comply fairly well with the rules and regulations. The problem is the casual rider who doesn't know the rules.

**Jim Fisher, Area Manager, USDI, Bureau of Land Management - Saddle Mountain Recreation Plan (ORV #91-162A):**

(1) Saddle Mountain area in this project has had historical use for ORVs.

(2) Some areas closed down because of private lands. With some land exchanges, this situation will be resolved.

(3) Matching funds not possible at this time because budgets are "set" for the following year.

(4) Recommended funding of the project and appreciated the opportunity to address the Committee.

**Carol Jensen, Member of NOVA Advisory Committee - concerning several projects:**

(1) President of Four-Wheel Drive Association. Users have a different perspective than ORV users. Jeeps, Toyotas, pick-up trucks, etc., four-wheel drive vehicles are their recreational outlet.

(2) Four-wheel drive vehicles are unable to use ORV (motorcycle) areas in the state because the trails are too narrow.

(3) USFS Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Feasibility Study, ORV #91-134P: The study will look at opportunities for four-wheel drive use - determine potential locations which might be developed.

(4) Thurston County ORV Sports Park: Thirty percent of the 1,000 members of the Four-Wheel Drive Association have a competition vehicle. Approximately ninety percent of the members have trail type vehicles which can use this park.

(5) Grant County Sand Dunes - both projects: Four-wheel drive recreationists use this area also.

(6) USFS, Olympic National Forest, South Fork, Skokomish Plan, ORV #91-127P: Would be of benefit to Four-wheel drive recreationists.

(7) USFS, Wenatchee National Forest, Naches Signs, ORV #91-098D: It is important to have the signing in this area.

The Committee recessed at 11:12 A.M., and reconvened at 11:30 A.M.

**IV. F. 1. THURSTON COUNTY ORV SPORTS PARK:** Chairman Scull announced the first order of business would be to make a decision concerning the Thurston County ORV Sports Park staff recommendations.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Johnson presented the history of the 1982 loan of \$200,000, and stated that the IAC did not have any role in the County's action in taking out the loan. With that in mind, Mr. Tveten said there was no way that the Interagency Committee could give a grant to the County to pay off the debt. He suggested funding the \$40,000 study project, and instead of granting the cost increase, delete the last project on the listing of approved projects (Saddle Mountain Recreation Plan, \$23,260) and delete the Feasibility Study for the USFS Gifford Pinchot National Forest - \$38,000. This would provide \$61,000 plus which would be half-way toward meeting the additional \$50,000 contribution towards paying off the debt.

Mr. Fairleigh stated the Committee could tap the \$175,000 set-aside for the March 1991 meeting if it so desired, recognizing that there would then be fewer dollars for the March funding session. In response to Mr. Tveten, Ms. Smith (Asst. Atty. Gen.) stated it would not be proper to do this. Mr. Tveten felt it was absolutely necessary that the study be carried out to establish a course of action for the park. Mr. Edwards noted that the Thurston County Sports Park issue of M&O and the debt problem comes to the Committee's attention year after year, and the Committee needed to make a decision policy-wise whether or not the ORV Sports Park facility should be in western Washington. The study is needed to provide this type of information. Two decisions need to be made: the Operations and Maintenance request and the \$40,000 study.

Ms. Lorenz wanted to keep the study project viable, but not take monies from any other project to assist the Thurston County Sports Park project.

Dr. Scull asked Mr. Welter if the park could be maintained with the additional \$61,000 proposed by Mr. Tveten. Mr. Welter stated the Committee will need to fund over the ten percent administrative cost

increase in order to keep the park at its level of operation until March 1991. He felt keeping the park open was more important at this time than the study. But, he acknowledged it would be necessary also to have some sort of study of the park's situation.

Mr. Fearn said he had a problem extending funds to a project which obviously has been in violation for some time. He did not feel it was possible to justify a seasonal kind of operation on a year-round basis. He wanted to reduce the operating cost, at least to the level that the staff had recommended and close the park until March 1991, at which time the Committee would be considering an M&O request.

Mr. Welter said it was possible to go to a seasonal function, but that would not solve the problems being addressed. This would mean closing down the park. Staff could be cut for just maintenance and part-time if it was necessary, but this, too, would not solve the park's present situation.

Staff advised Mr. Tveten that it would not be possible to have the park study done by March 1991. In response to Mr. Jones, Mr. Welter reported that the \$61,000 proposed by Mr. Tveten would be used for salaries - to maintain the staff. Mr. Johnson stated: \$16,700 would be for salaries and \$25,200 for maintenance staff on site from the present time to March 1991. Remaining funds would be for equipment, supplies, etc.

Ms. Fenton asked if IAC staff would be able to undertake the study. Mr. Fairleigh replied though staff would be involved in it, the County would be undertaking the study itself. Mr. Wilder said staff would be closely associated with the study, but would not be taking the full responsibility for it. Mr. Fox was assured that the monitoring of the Thurston County Sports Park and related studies was not a "burden" for staff.

Mr. Fox expressed his opinions concerning the park's request and situation. He agreed with Mr. Jones that the study was necessary. The Committee needs to decide whether the park should continue to function or whether, because of the problems associated with it, the park should be closed. Lack of support from Thurston County is involved and there should be more commitment from that source. User commitment is also necessary, and he was pleased to hear of the increased fees which had been approved by user groups.

Ms. Lorenz was in favor of funding the \$40,000 study and discontinuance of M&O. She suggested the park be closed. MS. LORENZ MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVE THE THURSTON COUNTY, ORV SPORTS PARK PLAN UPDATE, ORV #91-201P \$40,000, AND DISAPPROVE ANY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION FUNDING UNTIL MARCH 1991.

Ms. Fenton was concerned about pulling all funds from the project. To reopen facilities is difficult. She suggested leaving at least one staff person at the facility with necessary supplies and

materials so that the park could be maintained through March 1991. Mr. Jones also had reservations about closing the park completely, but felt it could be the impetus for the County to review the park's current situation and consider ways to cope with it.

In reply to Ms. Lorenz, Mr. Welter reported the M&O funds were completely exhausted in October and the park is presently using "use-revenues" to keep operating. Mr. Johnson called attention to the staff's report on the park, page (1), noting that through September 30, 1990 of the \$140,000 approved in March expenditures were \$34,999 IAC/County \$62,218 for a total of \$97,217.

MS. FENTON AMENDED THE MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. JONES, THAT THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK PROJECT (ORV #91-201P [40,000]) BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO CLOSE SUPERVISION BY THE IAC STAFF; THAT THE PARK NOT BE CLOSED IF FEASIBLE; THAT ONE KEY STAFF PERSON BE ON SITE UNTIL MARCH 1991, AT A COST OF APPROXIMATELY \$24,000 (PLUS WHATEVER IAC STAFF FEELS IS APPROPRIATE FOR SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS); AND THAT A PROGRESS REPORT AS TO THE PRELIMINARIES OF THE STUDY BE PREPARED FOR THE IAC COMMITTEE AND PRESENTED AT THE MARCH 1991 IAC MEETING.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

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

**IV. F. 2. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION SET-ASIDE:** Mr. Fairleigh recapped the need for a maintenance and operation set-aside as previously discussed by the Committee. Attention was called to staff recommendation on page (2) of the memorandum. In response to Mr. Edwards, Mr. Fairleigh noted that M&O was being requested for certain trail projects: Evans Creek, Wenatchee area, Ferry County, and some M&O for the sand dunes projects, as well as the three ORV Sports Parks. Mr. Fox asked if the Grant County projects were funded, could the IAC then anticipate M&O requests later? Mr. John Melvin, Grant County Sheriff's Office, said the County anticipated its M&O requests would be as in past years, with an increase from \$42,000 to \$46,000 per year. There will be no increase due to the added 640 acres in the sand dunes. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. JONES, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN

THAT M&O GRANTS BE TARGETED AT \$300,000 PER YEAR AND THAT AMOUNT BE SET ASIDE FROM CAPITAL FUNDS REPORTED AS AVAILABLE EACH YEAR;

THAT STAFF AND THE NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO PRIORITIZE AND STRETCH THE USE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS - WHICH MAY INCLUDE: (A) PER PROJECT GRANT LIMITS, (B) REQUIRED MATCHING SHARES, (C) DECLARING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES INELIGIBLE, ETC.

THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO GUIDELINES WHICH WOULD RESTRICT OR DISCOURAGE CAPITAL PROJECTS WHICH WILL RESULT IN FUTURE M&O REQUESTS TO THE IAC.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. TVETEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. FENTON, THAT THE \$24,000 ALLOCATED EARLIER BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO THE THURSTON COUNTY SPORTS PARK TO PROVIDE FOR CARETAKER SERVICES AND THE NECESSARY MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO MARCH 1991, BE OBTAINED BY DELETION OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'S PROJECT, SADDLE MOUNTAIN RECREATION PLAN, ORV #91-162P.

Mr. Edwards presented an alternative plan: Drop the two Moses Lake Sand Dunes Projects of Grant County (totaling \$800,000 plus) which would allow funding of practically all of the rest of the projects on the list. Mr. Fearn suggested: Leave the \$23,260 Saddle Mountain Recreation Plan project as it is; drop the second acquisition project, Moses Lake Sand Dunes North; and with that accumulated amount fund the capital projects on the rest of the list as opposed to the planning projects, down through Spokane County's ORV Park project to be funded at \$244,000 rather than \$466,015. To some degree, he said, Spokane County would be able to complete some of the construction required in the project.

Dr. Scull felt the acquisition of both Sand Dunes Projects was critical even though this would call for a large expenditure of ORV dollars. If these projects are not acquired, the County will have lost an opportunity forever.

Ms. Lorenz suggested taking the \$24,000 for the Thurston County Sports Park from the \$175,000 monies which staff has available for the March 1991 meeting. There followed discussion on the \$300,000 which the Committee had approved by motion previously as a set-aside for M&O in 1991. Mr. Tveten was against any motion which would tap the \$300,000 figure, stating this would be unfair to eligible sponsors requesting funding in March 1991. Mr. Fairleigh reminded the Committee that staff's recommendation is based on the fact that if Grant County is unable to complete the necessary work towards acquisition of the projects, that the dollars (\$803,000) would be "freed up" and applied against the listed projects. Mr. Tveten reiterated the suggestion to delete the Saddle Mountain project to allow \$24,000 to be granted to the Thurston County Sports Park, and added that this project would be subject to reconsideration at the March meeting if the Grant County projects do not proceed with the acquisition of the lands. Mr. Fairleigh said to include the \$40,000 with the same stipulation.

Jim Fisher, Bureau of Land Management, said that if the additional contributions BLM had for its project had been included earlier, it would have scored higher in the evaluation process. This unfortunately was not shown on the funding recommendations.

John Melvin, Grant County Sheriffs' Office, said the sand dunes projects would in all likelihood not be available to bring back to the Committee for future funding consideration. Now is the opportunity to acquire it and the owners are ready to sell.

Mr. Tveten restated his motion (PAGE 47) as seconded by Ms. Fenton.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. FENTON, SECONDED BY MS. LORENZ, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 49 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN (SCORP) [WASHINGTON OUTDOORS ASSESSMENT AND POLICY PLAN] AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON MARCH 22, 1990, AND

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLES PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 49 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

MR. FEARN VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

**IV. B. WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN ADOPTION;** At 1:45 p.m., Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "Washington State Trails Plan":

(1) RCW 67.32 states the need for a Trails Plan and specifies the IAC as the agency to prepare a State Trails Plan as part of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).

(2) The Plan consists of four documents: Action document; Policy document; Process document; and Technical assistance document.

(3) Previously mailed to the IAC members for review were the first two documents (Action and Policy), which are recommended for adoption today.

(4) Public Involvement: The State Trails Advisory Committee (STAC) was reactivated in 1989; has assisted in the drafting

and review process. First meeting of STAC was held 5-12-89; and subsequent meetings: 10-13-89; 11-17-89; 1-26-90; 4-6-90; 5-18-90; and 9-17-90.

a. Public meetings and open houses were held in February and March, 1990 (Port Angeles, Seattle, Yakima, Spokane, Vancouver.)

b. Speaking engagements were accepted by staff to various clubs, groups, and organizations.

c. Comments were solicited from private landowner interests with copies of the plan being mailed to various reviewers.

d. Staff reviewed public comment on the drafts of the Forest Plans of the seven National Forests in Washington State.

Mr. Lovelady called upon Jim Eychaner, Recreation Resource Planner, for a presentation of the state's trails mapping. Using maps of the state on a display board, Mr. Eychaner indicated Washington's existing trails. He reported that many agencies involved in trails and trail planning were contacted. There are some "gaps" on the maps since there was not a 100% return of information, but for the most part the maps are fairly accurate.

The cross-state trail was indicated on the map by Mr. Eychaner. He noted that it is not possible to cross the state west to east by trail. There is a way to traverse the state by trail from Portland up to Canada. He pointed out that the majority of trails are not where people are; that it is usually necessary to travel to get to trails for hiking and other recreational pursuits. It is easy to predict where high use trails will be and where there may be considerable conflict. Most of the trails in the state are not usable during winter months. Staff is presently meeting with STAC, managing agencies, and other interest groups to locate where trails should be connected.

In response to Dr. Scull, Mr. Eychaner stated there is a coordinating effort between adjoining states and British Columbia concerning trails and trail connections.

Memorandum of staff dated November 8, 1990, "Staff Recommended Changes to the Washington State Trails Plan", dated November 8, 1990, was called to the Committee's attention by Mr. Lovelady. He reviewed the changes as indicated. Certain questions were asked by the Committee members and information given:

(1) Page 2, Item 2 - "Establish a lead agency for rail-trail projects." Mr. Tveten felt this was a necessity. State Parks is involved in the review of railroad abandonment of right-of-way as is the Department of Transportation. Further,

the Senate and House Transportation Committees feel that State Parks is competing with DOT on these types of projects. The abandonments are being taken for transportation corridors and not for recreation. The legislative committees will be dealing with this in the next Legislative Session. There needs to be a decision made as to priority for use of the corridors being abandoned - recreation or transportation. He felt there ought to be in the Washington State Trails Plan the fact that there are other entities and other RCW's pertaining to railroad right-of-way abandonment.

(2) Ms. Ittner suggested that the title on page 4 B 1. 2 "Center for Voluntary Action" be properly identified as a state agency; "Washington State Center for Voluntary Action".

(3) Mr. Eychaner discussed USDA REGION 6 and the willingness of personnel to assist with the State Trails Plan and support it. He referred to page 6 and 7, Items 4 through 7.

(4) Changes by Mr. Fearn were explained by Mr. Eychaner as listed on page (8) of the memorandum.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN TO ADOPT THE WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN.  
(THERE WAS NO SECOND AT THIS TIME.)

Mr. Tveten asked if staff had had any contact with either the legislative transportation committees or with the Department of Transportation on the State Trails Plan. He was informed that Mr. Don Lund, DOT, is a member of STAC and has been involved in its meetings. Mr. Lund has stated that DOT, with cities and counties, is working on a Transportation Plan. They recognize the nonmotorized modes as an important part of the DOT system. No contact has been made with the staff of the legislative transportation committees. Mr. Tveten asked that IAC staff make this connection and obtain the names of those to contact from Bill Bush, State Parks' staff.

INTRODUCTIONS: Mr. Eychaner introduced Mr. Jack Steiverson, USDA, Forest Service, and Ms. Peggy Dolinich of the National Park Service

TESTIMONY FROM ATTENDEES:

Ruth Ittner, NOVA Committee Member:

(1) Very pleased to see that earlier drafts of the Plan have been corrected to include all the necessary changes.

(2) Concurred in the goals and the strategies and supported the efforts which had been put forth thus far on the plan.

(3) Asked that the Committee adopt the plan. Will coordinate with the IAC in its implementation.

Ms. Claudia Peters, Pierce County Trail Coordinator: Appreciated efforts of staff and would like to see the plan adopted. Asked that the Committee not stop at this point with the Trails Plan but

continue to recognize the need for more trails and additional mapping of them.

**Mr. Mick Gillispie, Pierce County Regional Trails Advisory Commission:**

(1) Recommended adoption of the plan and continued update of the trail mapping so that progress can be seen on all statewide trails.

(2) Urged consideration of obtaining railroad right-of-way abandonments for trail purposes. This will preserve the greenways and preserve open space for the people.

(3) Suggested DOT provide trails along highways safer for people to use, especially children.

**Jack Stieverson, USDA, Forest Service Region 6, Trails Program Manager:**

(1) Strongly support the plan's adoption. State and federal planning of trails can be coordinated very well. Some of the goals are much the same.

(2) There is a need to develop trails that link with urban centers, as well as forest trails and high mountain trails.

(3) The Forest Service will continue to cooperate in providing trails and will tie these in with its five-year capital program.

**Ms. Peggy Dolinich, National Park Service:**

(1) Exciting to work with Jim Eychaner and staff on the development of the plan.

(2) The plan will be used as a model plan for other states who are interested in doing much the same thing.

(3) The plan should be implemented and not "just put on the shelf". It is extremely important.

(4) Thanked the Committee for support of trails projects.

**Loren McGovern, NOVA Committee Member:**

(1) There is a great need for connecting trails systems.

(2) Private developer in his area recently developed 640 acres in five equal parcels which is connected to a horse trail. Part of the agreement is that a 12 foot right-of-way will be there for access to trails.

(3) Ten years ago this type of cooperation would not have happened.

Mr. Tveten assured Ms. Dolinich the plan would not "sit on a shelf", but trails will require a funding source. He commended staff on the outline regarding the funding sources available for trails projects. Mr. Eychaner gave a run-down on these available fund sources.

He referred to page (10) of the State Trails Plan - Goal #5: "Strengthen existing funding sources and create new funding sources for trail maintenance, construction, and reconstruction" and Goal #4: "Increase the miles of trail available in semi-primitive and other remote settings. To implement and fund trail elements of National Forest Plans and other federal agency plans at preferred alternative levels." It was staff's opinion, he said, that if this could be implemented and certain trails could be funded through the Forest

Service Plans and the National Park Service Plans, there could be a significant increase in dollars for trails. Another solution was RCW 47.30, Dept. of Transportation's trails authority. Planning staff suggested there be coordination and cooperation in order to maximize the activities of those dollars.

MR. EDWARDS SECONDED MR. FEARN'S MOTION.

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS PREPARED A WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN IN COMPLIANCE WITH RCW 67.32.050, AND

WHEREAS, THERE HAS BEEN AMPLE OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS, AND

WHEREAS, THE WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT #CA-9000-9-0001 BETWEEN THE IAC AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY CONDITIONALLY ADOPT THE OCTOBER 12, 1990 DRAFT OF THE ACTION AND POLICY DOCUMENTS, AS AMENDED AT THE NOVEMBER 8, 1990 IAC MEETING, AS THE OFFICIAL WASHINGTON STATE TRAILS PLAN AND AUTHORIZES ITS SUBMITTAL TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE FOR APPROVAL.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THIS ADOPTION IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLAN BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(Inadvertently there were two motions made to adopt the Trails Plan. The first by Mr. Fearn, seconded by Mr. Edwards; the second by Ms. Fenton, and seconded by Mr. Fox.)

#### IV. G. 1991 IAC MEETINGS:

Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff, dated November 8, 1990, "1991 IAC Meetings". Following his explanation of the steps taken in order to set up the dates (checking with various state agencies, organizations, etc.), IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FEARN, SECONDED BY MR. FOX THAT THE FOLLOWING REMAINDER OF MEETINGS FOR 1991 BE ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE:

JULY 25-26, 1991	PLACE TO BE DETERMINED
SEPT. 19-20, 1991	OLYMPIA
NOV. 14-15, 1991	OLYMPIA

(MEETING WAS ALREADY APPROVED FOR MARCH 21-22, 1991.)

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Dr. Scull stated he would be unable to be at the March meeting and appointed James Fox as Vice-Chairman.

**V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS AND DISCUSSION:** Mr. Wilder reiterated the need for the Committee and staff to review, update, and refine code 286, Washington Administrative Code, for the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. Due to new programs (Washington Wildlife and Recreation, Firearms Facilities, etc.) it is necessary to ensure that the WACs of the agency contain the proper guidelines. This will augment the Committee's various participation and guidelines manuals. He advised that there would be drafted policies mailed out for review and he asked that the Committee members become involved and send back their thoughts and input.

**WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM:** Dr. Scull mentioned that several members had discussed the issue of a discretionary fund which could be used for emergencies in the WWRP program. He said this would be of use to local government, but not to the state agencies. The \$4 million set aside in the WWRP program for state agencies was discussed. There has been no decision as yet received from OFM on this item. Mr. Wilder stated if there were an emergency fund set up, there would definitely have to be another funding session of the Committee to meet the demand.

Mr. Tveten felt the July meeting had in actuality already set up a state agencies' "emergency fund". He was comfortable in putting the \$4 million aside (\$2M Outdoor Recreation Account; \$2M Habitat Conservation Account). However, he felt next session the Committee ought to approach the Legislature with specific projects to ensure receiving funding. He suggested the \$4 million figure not be increased since there could be a risk of losing monies.

Mr. Edwards acknowledged there would be a WWRP funding program once again, but that it would still necessitate going back through the Governor for his approval and thence to the State Legislature. Ms. Fenton said there was as yet no specific determination as to whether or not the list of projects would need to go back through the Legislature. The need to clarify (add to, etc.) the WACs is necessary in order to assist the program. Mr. Wilder agreed there needed to be procedures clarified to implement the particular categories.

**NONHIGHWAY AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES PROGRAM;** Mr. Edwards discussed the number of federal projects being received for funding in relation to the state agencies. He asked, "Do we want to continue to fund federal projects at the expense of state agencies' projects" - or should state projects perhaps have some additional points which would help them in the evaluation system? Mr. Fearn noted the fact that the federal projects do have matching ability, and said that some of the projects funded today included rangers' salaries to begin planning. Should this be continued? He felt there ought to be a way

to fund state and local projects and then if there are funds left over consider those for federal projects.

Mr. Wilder recalled the All-Terrain Vehicle Program which did not work as well as the NOVA thus some agencies were unable to use the funds. The legislation was amended so that it became more workable and grants are now coming in and projects are being completed. He noted that the land base is controlled by the federal government. Users are using the federal land base for NOVA projects and it is working very well. Mr. Fearn acknowledged this was true, but he suggested a change of direction in order to give local and state agencies an opportunity for trails -- many are needed in urban areas as well as forested. He noted the Spokane Project, which did not have matching funds, and thus was not in the category of being funded. If it had had a match, it would have been higher on the listing. Ms. Lorenz agreed that the points given for matching funds needed to be reduced, but at the same time there is a need to fund the federal projects -- the areas where people use ORV's.

Dr. Scull said that as a citizen of the state, it really didn't make any difference to him whether federal projects were funded but the resources are there and are to be used for the benefit of the citizens. It is the "fairness of competing" that needs attention. Mr. Tveten said if the federal government is "in the business", they also ought to have the responsibility to provide the funding and not look to the state. As the evaluation system is set up at the present time, the state agencies will continue to have difficulty in obtaining funding because they do not qualify for the matching ability. Mr. Fox said it was most necessary to rethink the point system to allow fair competition.

Mr. Wilder stated staff would be willing to go back and review the Evaluation System and come up with something which would better meet the needs. Ms. Ittner noted that the projects had all been scored before there was a State Trails Plan in existence. She felt now that the plan is going to be implemented, this would take care of many of the problems discussed by the Committee since sponsors would have to be in compliance with it. Dr. Scull instructed the secretary to note that it was the CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT STAFF REVIEW THE EVALUATION SYSTEM FORMULA FOR NOVA PROJECTS AND COME BACK TO THE COMMITTEE WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES.

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 286 - INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION: At this point, Mr. Wilder said the Committee could possibly review WACs in March and adopt them in July. Staff and the Assistant Attorney General will be working toward this time schedule.

In this connection, Mr. Fox presented three policy actions of the Committee at this meeting which had not been formally adopted: (1) the \$1 million cap; (2) No indoor recreational projects would be considered for funding, and (3) only acquisition projects would be funded and no development projects. He said there was a need for

formal policy in those areas and others that the Committee has discussed. He noted the amount of work which needed to be undertaken by staff and hoped that some direction would be going to applicants soon on policy matters. Mr. Wilder replied the Committee by its action at this meeting had established the policy direction for the funding session. Staff has the responsibility to make its recommendations to the Committee, which had been done. The Committee can opt to change those recommendations and has full authority to do so. Also, there was a time element in dealing with the WWRP program at the September funding session and staff as well as the Committee had to take the initiative to get the job done. He wanted to ensure that the Committee retained its flexibility and would not become a "rubber-stamp" Committee.

Mr. Fairleigh outlined the coming funding deadline dates, and stated there would be timely instructions to applicants. Mr. Fox accepted his explanation stating it was reasonable as long as sponsors don't come to the IAC with false expectations. It was Ms. Lorenz' concern that sponsors be made aware that the Committee does have these responsibilities and that policy matters can change. But, she said that it was necessary in instances where policy would change drastically that sponsors be notified before coming to the meeting -- not after the fact.

At the end of this discussion, Mr. Fox said he was comfortable with the explanations and the fact that sponsors would be informed of policy decisions.

Ms. Lorenz announced this was her last meeting and expressed her appreciation to everyone for all of the assistance and help during her tenure. She thanked Peggy Frazier, Administrative Assistant, for her helpfulness and for the minutes written over this time. She also thanked the staff of the IAC for their availability at any time and for their answers to questions she had. The Committee members thanked Ms. Lorenz for her voluntary services over the past four years.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE *as amended/corrected*

5/21/91  
DATE

*[Signature]*  
CHAIRMAN