

**INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

DATE: September 23-24, 1996
TIME: 8:30 a.m..

PLACE: Natural Resources Building, Room 175
Olympia, Washington

- Contents -

1.	MEETING CALLED TO ORDER	1
2.	MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS.....	1
3.	1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE.....	3
4.	WWRP REVIEW AND FRAMEWORK.....	4
5.	HABITAT CONSERATION ACCOUNT - NATURAL AREAS	5
6.	HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - URBAN WILDLIFE.....	5
7.	HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - CRITICAL HABITAT	6
8.	HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - RANKED LISTS.....	7
9.	HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - 2 ND YEAR & UNALLOCATED FUNDING	9
	1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (Continued)	10
10.	REDISTRIBUTION OF WWRP FUNDS	11
	1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (Continued)	11
11.	NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS FUNDING ACT (NRTFA).....	11
12.	OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - STATE PARKS.....	13
13.	OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - TRAILS.....	14
14.	OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - WATER ACCESS.....	15
15.	OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - LOCAL PARKS.....	16
	1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (Continued)	16
16.	OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - 2 ND YEAR & UNALLOCATED FUNDING	17
	NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS FUND ACT (Continued).....	19
	REPORTS FROM PARTNER AGENCIES.....	20
	OTHER BUSINESS.....	20

**INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

DATE: September 23-24, 1996
TIME: 8:30 a.m.

PLACE: Natural Resources Building, Room 175
Olympia, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donna M. Mason, Chair	Vancouver
Mary Ann Huntington	Port Orchard
Ralph Mackey	Everett
Robert Parlette	Wenatchee
Art Stearns	Designee, Department of Natural Resources (David Traylor - Tuesday)
Cleve Pinnix	Director, Parks and Recreation Commission
Elyse Kane	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife (Gene Tillett - Tuesday)

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A VERBATIM RECORDED TAPE OF THE MEETING'S PROCEEDINGS IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

ITEM 1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Donna M. Mason, Chair, called the September 23, 1996 meeting to order at 8:37 a.m. She welcomed attendees, called for self-introductions and determined a quorum was present.

The Chair requested approval of the summary minutes as distributed from the July 11-12, 1996 meeting in Vancouver. Bob Parlette moved approval and the minutes were approved as submitted.

Director Laura Johnson outlined the agenda for the meeting which included management reports and approval of the 1997 meeting schedule. The remainder of the meeting will focus on approval of the ranked lists of projects for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program and consideration of the distribution of whatever funds might be made available to fund the projects as well as unallocated and 2nd year funding of WWRP. Monday afternoon's agenda will conclude with a discussion of staff recommendations for the National Recreational Trails Funding Act.

ITEM 2. MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

The Director's report was presented by Laura Johnson. She highlighted the following items:

- Since the July meeting, staff has been busy evaluating WWRP projects in order to prepare slide presentations and funding recommendations for committee considerations. She thanked staff for the team effort required to get the job done effectively and efficiently.
- Another national effort is developing to address the Land and Water

Conservation Fund deficiencies. A conference is being planned for January, 1997 at Asilomar, California. Invitations are being sent to about 150 leaders of state and local governments, major environmental groups and recreation equipment manufacturers.

- The litigation between manufacturers of personal watercraft ("jet skis") and San Juan County is scheduled for a hearing in Whatcom County on September 30. Members were reminded that San Juan County established a two-year prohibition on the use of jet skis on the marine waters of that county. Although not named as a litigant, IAC appears prominently. The manufacturers have alleged that the County, having received IAC grant funds, should not be permitted to regulate water access sites, particularly on those facilities that received 215 Boating Facilities funds. On the opposite side, the County maintains that IAC policy manuals and WACs permit regulation of facilities for time, place, manner, reasonable environmental protection and facility protection. At some point in the future, the Committee may be asked to consider what limits land managers can place on IAC-funded facilities.
- There have been a number of dedications this summer, the projects were funded 2-3 years ago.

Debra Wilhelmi presented IAC's financial and management services report. She highlighted the following items:

- Operating expenditures are on target and capital expenditures are lagging, as anticipated. Staff continues to work with project sponsors to get projects completed, billed and paid. Boating and NOVA revenues are on target. Firearms Range revenue continues to come in significantly under budget.
- PRISM functioned extremely well during the project evaluations and in preparation for this meeting. Staff attention is focused on the design and development of reports and user manuals as well as providing training for new users. Although the NASORLO conference in Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina was canceled due to hurricane damage, Director Johnson is planning to meet with staff from North Carolina, New Jersey and Colorado to discuss the purchase of PRISM. Other state agencies have also indicated an interest in the system. The goal is to reimburse the Boating Facilities Fund and the Land & Water Conservation Fund.
- Operating and capital budgets have been submitted to the Office of Financial Management.

Greg Lovelady presented the Planning Services report. He highlighted the following activities:

- Revision of the agency's policy manuals continues. The FARR program and funded projects manuals will be presented at the November meeting.
- The niche process, which is meant to examine state agency roles and responsibilities in outdoor recreation and habitat activities, continues. After the July IAC meeting, it was agreed that better direction was needed to help ensure that future staff effort would be most effective. The group suggested that Director Johnson consider asking IAC partner agencies to form a "managers' sub-committee". That proposal is under review at this time.
- IAC planning staff was asked by State Parks to assist with a review of trail use on State Parks properties. In response, a draft report was completed and forwarded to State Parks for review.
- Staff recently began the recruitment process to fill the vacant Recreation Resource Planner 2 position. The individual will provide assistance in the planning program, including boating access implementation, recreation gap analysis, public lands inventory, and geographic information systems support.

The Project Services report was presented by Eric Johnson. He highlighted the following activities:

- Staff time has been spent facilitating the evaluation of Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program projects.
- NOVA (ORV and NHR) project evaluations are scheduled in Olympia, October 16-17. At the November meeting, IAC members will review these project requests for funding consideration.
- Local Agency Boating Facilities will be evaluated October 15. At this time, there are more funds available than are being requested by project applicants.
- Staff continues to provide feedback to the National Park Service (NPS) regarding proposed modifications to existing conversion procedures. IAC has suggested that NPW delegate more authority to states for program administration.

ITEM 3. 1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Director Johnson explained that the March, September, and November meetings have been planned for Olympia and the suggested location for July is Yakima with the meeting being held at the Arboretum. The September meeting may be scheduled in Seattle at the new Port facility.

Several members indicated scheduling problems with Tuesdays and agreed to discuss the issue and bring forward a recommendation later in the meeting.

ITEM 4. WWRP REVIEW AND FRAMEWORK

Eric Johnson explained the WWRP project evaluation process which led to this funding recommendation meeting (see notebook). After receiving approximately 300 "letters of intent" from project applicants, staff conducted application workshops throughout the state. On May 1st, 238 applications were received, approximately half being submitted on-line using the PRISM system. For the first time, rather than having project managers meet individually with each sponsor, pre-evaluation workshops were held in July in three locations. Project evaluation teams met in August and ranked projects in all WWRP categories.

Jim Fox reminded members that the biennial appropriation, which has not yet been determined, must be distributed as set forth in RCW 43.98A and described as follows (see hand-outs):

Habitat Conservation Account:		50% of the total appropriation
Critical Habitat	35%	
Natural Areas	20%	
Urban Wildlife	15%	
Unallocated	30%	
Outdoor Recreation Account:		50% of the total appropriation
Local Parks	25%	
State Parks	25%	
Trails	15%	
Water Access	10%	
Unallocated	25%	

Within the ORA, a certain percentage of the statutory funds (not unallocated funds) available must go to acquisition: 50% in Local Parks, 75% in State Parks and 75% Water Access.

In addition, statutes require an annual (rather than biennial) grant cycle for local agency projects. Therefore, a portion of the 1997-99 biennial appropriation should be set aside for a second-year (FY99) funding cycle. In the past, the decision on how much to set aside for the second-year grant cycle has been made prior to legislative action on the capital budget, in order that legislators could evaluate the implications of different proposed WWRP funding levels. However, that action forced IAC to decide on the second-year set-aside *before* the total amount of the biennial appropriation and the number of projects applying for second year funds was known.

Mr. Fox continued by discussing actions IAC should take prior to the 1997 legislative session (see notebook and hand-outs):

- A. Approve ranked lists of the first-year (FY98) WWRP projects for each of the seven funding categories;
- B. Decide what portion of the 1997-99 biennial appropriation to be set aside for the

- second year (FY99) grant cycle;
- C. Decide how to assign unallocated funds; and
 - D. Discuss the number of alternate projects to be included on the list of first-year projects to be forwarded to the Governor.

ITEM 5. HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - NATURAL AREAS
(Item #6 on original agenda)

Eric Johnson announced that 7 Natural Area Category projects, seeking \$11,489,400, were evaluated on August 5, 1996 by a nine-member team (see notebook). As part of the Habitat Conservation Account, this category is eligible to receive 20 percent of the WWRP funds available in this account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC.

Feedback from the evaluators suggested the addition of a "project scope" question that would help distinguish between the scope of the individual project and ways that scope relates as a buffer or core to the Natural Area. In addition, team members voiced concern that very good projects may be ranked low due to the many questions that have nothing to do with "natural" elements such as cost efficiencies, project support, etc. (NOTE: many of these criteria are required by statute).

Staff used supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be protected or developed.

During Committee discussion, Cleve Pinnix expressed concern about the DNR projects which included multiple sites.

ITEM 6. HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - URBAN WILDLIFE
(Item #7 on original agenda)

Eric Johnson explained that 13 Urban Wildlife Category projects, seeking \$9,408,182, were evaluated on August 7, 1996 by a 9-member evaluation team (see notebook). As part of the Habitat Conservation Account, projects in this category are eligible to receive 15% of the WWRP funds available in the account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC.

Feedback from the evaluators showed confidence with the outcome given the process and the evaluation criteria. However, they felt the process, and in particular the evaluation criteria for this category, should be reviewed. Concerns included ecological quality, project scope, connectivity, question multipliers, the definition of "urban" and questions having nothing to do with "habitat" (see notebook for details).

Staff used supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be protected or developed.

ITEM 7. HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - CRITICAL HABITAT
(Item #5 on original agenda)

Eric Johnson reminded members of the packet of letters received regarding projects in this category. He continued by explaining that 18 Critical Habitat Category projects, seeking \$37,721,565, were evaluated on August 5-6, 1996 by a 9-member evaluation team (see notebook). As part of the Habitat Conservation Account, projects in this category are eligible to receive 35 percent of the WWRP funds available in the account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC.

Evaluators echoed the same concerns as noted above in the Urban Wildlife Category.

In response to a question, Mr. Johnson explained that the number of projects is approximately half of that submitted in the previous biennium because the Department of Fish and Wildlife did a much more extensive internal review of projects before submitting them to the IAC for evaluation. Additionally, members were directed to the notebook memo referring to pre-scores and reminded that a further discussion would occur after the presentation of the projects.

Staff used supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project locating, elements and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be protected or developed.

It was suggested that project #16, "Rattlesnake Mountain", be renamed "Rattlesnake Ridge" to more accurately define the geographic area proposed by DNR.

After the slide presentation, Chair Mason introduced Bern Shanks, newly appointed Director of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Director Shanks told the Committee that public lands and the IAC grant programs would be receiving much more attention in his administration than in the past.

Eric Johnson referred members to the memo behind Tab #5 relating to pre-scores (see notebook and hand-outs). After the Critical Habitat category projects were evaluated and ranked, it became apparent that an error had been made in the pre-scoring of the question relating to "Endangered and other Sensitive Elements." Project #8, the Methow Wildlife Corridor" received 3 points for the question instead of 4 points as required in the Critical Habitat evaluation instrument. In addition, some important data (i.e., numbers of specific species) from the Department of Fish and Wildlife which would affect ranking was received after the pre-scoring had already been completed.

Director Johnson expressed concerns about making changes in the ranked list based on the late arriving information since IAC has traditionally been very rigorous in keeping to project submittal deadlines. However, staff is also concerned that the Committee have correct information about projects.

Cleve Pinnix suggested the Methow Wildlife Corridor should receive a score adjustment to correct the error. However, in order to protect the integrity of the IAC evaluation process, the other adjustments should not be made.

Elyse Kane apologized, on behalf of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, for the situation which has been created and urged correction of the first error and consideration of the other issues.

ITEM 8. HABITAT CONSERVATION ACCOUNT - RANKED LISTS

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

- Joyce Mulliken State Representative, 13th District
Opposed Lower Swauk Creek/Tang Ranch Proposal. Would support land exchange to preserve land without jeopardizing the Kittitas County tax base.
- Ray Owens Kittitas County Commissioner
Opposed Lower Swauk Creek/Tang Ranch acquisition. Expressed concern about public acquisition of lands and dwindling tax base in Kittitas County. Would also support a land trade with another government entity so that there would be no net loss of private property in Kittitas County.
- Fritz Glover Central Washington University (CWU) Trustee
Favored acquisition of Tang Ranch.
- Daniel Beck Assistant Professor of Biology, CWU
Favored acquisition of Tang Ranch and addressed biological values and high management potential of the habitat area. In response to a question, Dr. Beck explained the proposed management plan for the site.
- Mark Young Vice President, University Advancement, CWU
Favored Tang Ranch proposal. Described University support and ways the project fit into the mission of CWU.
- Teresa Ryan Student, CWU
Supported Tang Ranch proposal and addressed the needs of students to have opportunities to apply field analysis skills as they learn to protect and manage crucial habitat.
- Morris Uebelacker Professor of Geography and Land Studies, CWU
Supported Tang Ranch proposal and explained how acquisition would benefit the graduate program in resource management and enhancement.
- Charles M. Ruben Faculty Member, Department of Geology, CWU
Favored acquisition of Tang Ranch and addressed long term maintenance and potential funding for the site.

Louise Baxter Assistant Professor of Biology/Science Education, CWU
Supported Tang Ranch proposal and described the training of elementary science teachers in the field of outdoor environmental education.

Richard Mack Professor of Economics, CWU
Supported acquisition of Tang Ranch and addressed the educational and economic benefits to Washington citizens.

IAC member Bob Parlette remarked that that issue seemed to revolve around tax questions, not whether or not the property should be preserved for public use. Discussion continued about whether or not the Department of Fish and Wildlife would be required to pay a portion of the property taxes if it were to acquire the property. The University would be required pay certain fees "in lieu" of taxes, however those fees are less comprehensive than those required of the WDFW. Although WDFW does pay some property tax, the amounts are capped by statute.

John Hayes Land Use Planner, Methow Institute Foundation
Supported the Methow Wildlife Corridor Project and urged the Committee to correct the mathematical error (see discussion above).

Maggie Coon Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition
Complimented staff and project evaluation teams on outstanding service. Also, explained why pre-scoring of the "threatened and endangered species" evaluation questions is important and urged members not to change project ranking based on information received after the application deadline.

After a lunch break, Chair Mason reconvened the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

Jane Brown Public School Teacher
Supported the Tang Ranch proposal and explained why the CWU/public school connection is necessary to ensure quality use and future stewardship.

R. Steve Herman Professor of Natural History, The Evergreen State College
Supported funding for the acquisition of Tang Ranch for the study of natural history.

Elizabeth Rodrick Conservation Manager, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Assured members that WDFW and DNR were in agreement about the scoring error in the Critical Habitat category (i.e., Methow Wildlife Corridor project).

Cleve Pinnix **moved** that the scoring for the Methow Wildlife Corridor in the Critical Habitat Category be corrected and that the ranked order of the list be changed accordingly (see Table 1). Bob Parlette **seconded**. During Committee discussion, Mr.

Pinnix clarified that the Methow Wildlife Corridor score would increase to 66.5556 and the project would be ranked third. **MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED** (Resolution #96-20).

Chair Mason reminded those who testified to work with local state legislators to ensure adequate funding for the projects.

Ralph Mackey **moved** adoption of the ranked list of Natural Area Category projects. Bob Parlette **seconded**. **MOTION CARRIED** (Resolution #96-21)

Mary Ann Huntington **moved** adoption of the ranked list of Urban Wildlife Habitat Category projects. Ralph Mackey **seconded**. **MOTION CARRIED** (Resolution #96-22).

ITEM 9. HCA - 2ND YEAR & UNALLOCATED FUNDING

Jim Fox reminded Committee members that, having adopted the ranked list of projects in the Habitat Conservation Account categories which will be competing for funding in the first year (FY97), they must now decide what portion of the biennial appropriation to set aside for the second year (FY98) funding cycle and what percentage of unallocated funds to distribute to each of the ORA and HCA categories.

Mr. Fox outlined two options available for consideration and explained the advantages and disadvantages of each option (see hand-outs):

Option #1 (Staff Recommendation
60% statutory urban wildlife \$ in 1st year

Option #2 (Current Method)
Set aside a percentage of urban wildlife and unallocated for 2nd year

100% of other statutory \$ in 1st year

Assign most 1st year unallocated funds, by percentage to each category, before session

100% of unallocated \$ in 1st year by percentage to each category

Set aside a portion of 1st year unallocated funds to distribute after session

Critical Habitat 40%
Natural Areas 20%
Urban Wildlife 40%

No state agency resubmittals in 2nd year

State agencies can re-submit projects in 2nd year to compete for unallocated funds

The staff recommendation for unallocated distribution is based on the following:

- historic funding patterns in each category
- the number of requests in each category
- the total dollar amount requested in each category

- the number of projects in each category considered by project staff and evaluators as "high priority"
- the geographic distribution of projects in each category
- results of the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan needs assessment
- stakeholder input
- ease of explaining the process and outcome

Committee members were directed to additional hand-outs (see salmon and gray sheets) which illustrated funding levels for both options based on an appropriation of \$112.5 million, as approved by the Committee at the July meeting. Staff responded to questions relating to the options presented.

Staff clarified the status of the "delayed list" (projects which failed to receive approval when the 1996 capital budget was not passed by the legislature). If IAC fails to receive approval for funding in the 1997 session, those projects will be rolled into the 1997-99 lists. At that point, the unallocated funds, particularly for the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA), become significant.

In response to a question, staff explained that a 2nd year funding cycle is required by statute for local agencies but is optional for state agencies. In addition, a university would be considered a state agency for funding purposes.

Elizabeth Rodrick Department of Fish and Wildlife
Supported the ability of state agencies to compete in both years of the funding cycle.

Maggie Coon Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition
Endorsed Option 1 (see above) and explained that local governments should be eligible for 2nd year funding to maintain continued incentive to propose projects.

Martha Lindley Director of Government Relations, CWU
Supported Option 2 which would allow for state agency resubmittals. (After further discussion of the issue, Ms. Lindley voiced support for Option 1 assuming it provided more funding for the first year projects.)

Although general Committee consensus was Option #1, staff was asked to discuss the options with stakeholders and recommend action at the November meeting.

1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (continued)

Chair Mason announced that Thursday/Friday meetings would be most convenient for citizen members but acknowledged that State Parks and the Fish and Wildlife Commission meetings were also scheduled on Fridays. (Action Deferred).

ITEM 10. REDISTRIBUTION OF WWRP FUNDS

Phil Trask announced that \$402,950 has been returned from two local government WWRP 1991-93 projects in the Urban Wildlife Habitat Category. IAC staff recommends redistribution of the funds to King County's Three Forks Park and Seattle's Duwamish Head Greenbelt (Phase 1) projects.

Staff researched the redistribution of these funds from several perspectives (see notebook). Because unfunded projects from the 1991-93 biennia are nearly completed, redistribution options proved to be limited.

Mary Ann Huntington **moved** adoption of the staff recommendation for redistribution of WWRP funds, 1993-93 Habitat Conservation Account. Art Stearns **seconded**.
MOTION CARRIED (Resolution #96-32).

After a short break, Chair Mason reconvened the meeting.

1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (continued)

Director Johnson announced that the July 10-11, 1997 meeting would be scheduled in Yakima, as recommended. Dates for March, September and November would be determined at the next IAC meeting after members were consulted.

ITEM 11. NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS FUNDING ACT (NRTFA) (Item #10 on original agenda)

Director Johnson reminded the Committee that federal funds totaling \$544,778 are available for distribution for federal FY96 and 97 for trail-related projects. She reviewed actions of the NRTFA Task Force to date (see notebook). The group was comprised of representatives from user groups who regularly participate with IAC's existing NOVA program, as well as other trail users who are not regular participants, particularly snowmobile and cross-country ski users. The Task Force met twice during August. No public hearings were held.

The initial meeting of the Task Force focused on introductions and program overview. Information regarding the Volunteer Trailwork Coalition proposal presented at the July IAC meeting was discussed, but members were not comfortable proceeding with the VTC proposal in a separate or expedited process. Strong support was expressed for establishment of a competitive grant process.

The second meeting focused more on establishment of the grant application process and it was determined that existing IAC grant programs did not adequately cover the range of NRTFA activities and eligible applicants. IAC staff was asked to prepare a "simple" application process and sample formats for review.

Task Force members expressed the need to "get the money on the ground as soon as possible". After reviewing the scheduling opportunities, IAC staff believe there are two

reasonable options for fund distribution: Option #1 would enable the IAC board to approve grants at its March 1997 meeting and Option #2 would add the NRTFA grants to the existing NOVA process calling for approval of grants in November 1997.

Bobbie Barnett, IAC Intern, reviewed the proposed application form (see blue sheets in notebook). She explained that there was a slight preference for an essay question format which allows applicants to prepare written materials rather than the formal slide show method. In lieu of presentation to an evaluation team, applicants would agree to be available for questions from the evaluation team during the review process.

Director Johnson described the composition of the NOVA Advisory Committee which is established to evaluate motorized and nonmotorized trail projects and explained that members of the "pedestrian" (walking, hiking, etc.) community want to provide more of a balance on the NRTFA evaluation team.

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

Ruth Ittner Citizen
Supported funding for the Volunteer Trailwork Coalition project proposal and urged the Committee to take action soon so volunteer groups can plan their efforts for the coming year.

Suse Altengarten Board Member, Volunteers for Outdoor Washington
Expressed support for the Volunteer Trailwork Coalition and urged a quick decision so the funds could be used efficiently during the 1997 season. Also commented on the need to sustain the enthusiasm and momentum of the partnership. Reminded members that the total VTC request is \$69,000 which would include the master schedule and the training for the crew leaders.

During discussion, Committee members expressed guarded support for the VTC proposal but felt the integrity of the IAC process might be compromised without a complete evaluation of all proposals. On the other hand, members were concerned about delaying the application and evaluation process until March, 1997. Director Johnson reminded members that federal guidelines, while encouraging, do not require constituent input when designing the grant program.

Wayne Mohler Washington State Snowmobile Association
(Also member of VTC and NRTFA Task Force)
Explained the viewpoints of various Task Force members relating to the VTC proposal.

Chair Mason suggested that interested constituency groups be notified immediately that IAC is receiving grant applications for trail-related projects. In addition, she proposed 1) using the NRTFA Task Force (rather than the NOVA Advisory Committee) as the evaluation team; 2) setting a timeline which would allow evaluation of the applications as recommended by staff; and, 3) considering the use of a point scoring system.

IAC members agreed to postpone a decision if the projects submitted did not meet the criteria or were considered lacking in quality.

Suse Altengarten Volunteers of Washington
Commented on the need to move forward as quickly as possible;
some project quality would be lost by waiting until January or
March.

Staff was asked to review the information, develop a timeline, and report back to the Committee during Tuesday's meeting. Director Johnson recommended Committee review at the November meeting rather than trying to schedule a special meeting in December or January.

Chair Mason recessed the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Tuesday, September 24, 1996

Chair Mason reconvened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. and determined a quorum was present. Gene Tillett was introduced as the designee for the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Director Johnson announced that the NRTFA federal trails funds distribution could be done on a "fast track" and a proposed schedule and application form would be presented before the end of the day.

ITEM 12. **OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - STATE PARKS **(Item #11 on original agenda)****

Eric Johnson announced that 14 State Parks projects, requesting \$14,065,912, were evaluated on August 8, 1996 by a nine member team (see notebook). This category, as part of the Outdoor Recreation Account, is eligible to receive 25 percent of the WWRP funds available in the account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC. Acquisition and development projects are eligible for funding; renovation projects are ineligible.

Feedback from evaluation team members expressed their difficulty in understanding how State Parks developed the projects submitted for evaluation. "Cost efficiencies" and "immediacy of threat" were also difficult to define and evaluate.

Staff provided supplemental information supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements, and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be protected or developed.

During Committee discussion, Cleve Pinnix distributed a revised Table 1 (see notebook) which reflected the ranked order of the State Parks projects as recommended by the State Parks and Recreation Commission:

1. Camano Island Cama Beach, Phase 3
2. Moran State Park - Cascade Lake
3. Statewide Acquisition of Inholdings
4. Beacon Rock State Park
5. Deception Pass-Ben Ure Island
6. Lime Kiln State park, Phase 2
7. Nisqually-Mashel, Phase 4
8. Kanasket-Palmer Campground
9. Sun Lakes -Park Lake
10. Green River Gorge, Phase 6
11. Grayland Beach - Ticor
12. Maryhill State Park Day use
13. Sucia Island - North Finger Island
14. McMicken - Hartstene Island - Scott

He explained some of the rationale used to rank the projects, including immediacy of threat by development.

Cleve Pinnix **moved** adoption of the revised ranked list of projects in the State Parks Category. Ralph Mackey **seconded**. During discussion, Chair Mason asked if it was important to continue evaluation team scoring for this category since the Committee ultimately accepted the ranked list as recommended by the State Parks Commission. Director Johnson explained that the category needs to fit in with the package sent to the legislature and the distribution of unallocated funds follows the IAC ranked list, not the State Parks revised list. **MOTION CARRIED (Resolution #96-26, as amended).**

ITEM 13. OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - TRAILS
(Item #12 on original agenda)

Eric Johnson reported that 20 trails projects, requesting \$9,296,330, were evaluated by a nine member team on August 13-14, 1996 (see notebook). He reminded members that, as a part of the Outdoor Recreation Account, the Trails Category is eligible to receive 15 percent of the WRRP funds available in the account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC. Acquisition and development projects are eligible for funding in the category; renovation projects are ineligible.

Several weeks after the evaluation, five of the nine team members reconvened to discuss the results. Several evaluators were concerned that the Palouse Path did not rank higher. In reviewing the scores, it was evident that the population proximity and GMA criteria in the evaluation instrument was not advantageous to this project. Evaluators suggested an "evaluator's choice" question which would provide points to a project that might not otherwise have been evident in other criteria. The team expressed concern about the large dollar amounts being requested and discussed whether to establish a "target cap" on project applications in an attempt to fund more projects.

Staff provided supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements, and significant issues surround the recreational resource to be protected or developed.

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

Dane Spencer Kitsap County Parks
Provided further explanation of the Clear Creek project and introduced others who spoke in favor of the project.

Pahl Brittain Kitsap Land Trust
Supported Clear Creek project and listed other supporters and financial sponsors.

Tex Lewis Co-Chairman, Clear Creek Trail Task Force
Explained community support for project and urged favorable Committee consideration.

Ralph Mackey urged those testifying to work with local legislators to support the WWRP when it comes before the next session.

Mary Ann Huntington **moved** adoption the ranked list of WWRP Trails Category projects. Cleve Pinnix **seconded**. Bob Parlette abstained explaining his role as co-chair of the Complete the Loop Coalition which has been involved in raising private funds for the local match for the Rocky Reach Trailway. Ralph Mackey abstained as the Chair of the Snohomish County Park Board (Project #6 - Centennial Trail Development is sponsored by Snohomish County). Director Johnson explained that the ethics rules for boards and commissions are still unclear except when there is clearly personal (or family) financial benefit. Mary Ann Huntington announced that she is a resident of Kitsap County but has not participated in any of the projects proposed. **MOTION CARRIED WITH PARLETTE AND MACKEY ABSTAINING (Resolution #96-27).**

After a short break, Chair Mason reconvened the meeting and announced that David Traylor would replace Art Stearns as the DNR designee for the remainder of the meeting.

**ITEM 14. OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - WATER ACCESS
(Item # 13 on original agenda)**

Eric Johnson reported that 15 Water Access Category projects, requesting \$7,868,251, were evaluated by a nine member team on August 9, 1996 (see notebook). As part of the Outdoor Recreation Account, projects in this category are eligible to receive 10% of the WWRP funds available, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC. Acquisition and development projects are eligible for funding, however, renovation projects are ineligible.

Staff provided supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements, and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be protected or developed.

Following the slide presentation, staff responded to questions regarding conversions and the difference between "parks" and "water access" projects. In addition, members were directed to letters of support for several projects in this category.

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

Harry Laban City of Seattle, Parks
Complimented the IAC staff and expressed support for the evaluation process which has developed. Suggested that IAC develop a technical assistance program to assist local governments for local park and recreation bonds. Urged Committee support for Smith Cove and Fairview Olmstead Parks.

Phil Best Kitsap County Commissioner
Supported Old Mill Site project.

Mary Ann Huntington **moved** approval of the ranked list of projects for the Water Access Category. Bob Parlette **seconded**. **MOTION CARRIED WITH RALPH MACKEY ABSTAINING** (Resolution #96-28).

ITEM 15. OUTDOOR RECRETION ACCOUNT - LOCAL PARKS
(Item #14 on original agenda)

Eric Johnson announced that 62 Local Parks Category projects, requesting \$14,974,082, were evaluated by a nine-member team on August 12-15, 1996. As part of the Outdoor Recreation Account, this category is eligible to receive 25 percent of the WWRP funds available in the account, plus any unallocated funds as determined by the IAC. Acquisition, development, and renovation projects are all eligible to receive funding in the Local Parks Category, however, at least 50 percent of the statutory funds must go to acquisition projects.

When the team reconvened for a review of the evaluation process, concerns were expressed regarding the "immediacy of threat" question. Evaluators wanted to know what would happen if the property were not acquired.

Staff used supplemental information and slides to assist in describing project location, elements and significant issues surrounding the recreation resource to be acquired or developed.

After a lunch break, Chair Mason reconvened the meeting.

1997 IAC MEETING SCHEDULE (continued)

Director Johnson announced that the July 1997 meeting in Yakima would be moved to Thursday and Friday, July 17-18 (rather than July 10-11 as originally planned). The State Parks Commission will be dedicating the new Rasar State Park on July 12th and IAC members and staff may wish to attend.

OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT - LOCAL PARKS (continued)

Project staff continued the slide and narrative for the Local Parks category projects.

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

Wyn Birkenthal Spokane County Parks Manager
Expressed support for the Pavillion Park and Plantes Ferry projects. Also urged Committee to use unallocated funds to meet the need of Local Parks Category development projects.

Jim Frank Pavillion Park Association, Spokane County
Supported Pavillion Park development project. Echoed Mr. Birkenthal's remarks regarding the use of unallocated funds.

Gib Brumback Citizen
Supported Plantes Ferry Park - Sports Complex. Urged the Committee to use unallocated funds to meet the needs of local park development.

Harry Laban City of Seattle Parks
Supported two City of Seattle projects (ranked #8 and #16).

Bob Parlette **moved** adoption of the ranked list of Local Parks category projects. Mary Ann Huntington **seconded**. In response to a question, Director Johnson clarified the need to allocate 50% of the available funds to acquisition and 50% to development.
MOTION CARRIED WITH RALPH MACKEY ABSTAINING (Resolution #96-29)

**ITEM 16. ORA - 2ND YEAR & UNALLOCATED FUNDING
(Item #15 on original agenda)**

Jim Fox reminded Members that, having adopted the ranked lists of ORA projects, they would need to decide what portion of the biennial appropriation to set aside for the second-year (FY99) funding cycle and what percentage of unallocated funds to distribute to each of the ORA categories.

Two options are proposed by staff:

1. **This new method** would apply most statutory funds to the first -year grant cycle and all unallocated funds to the second-year grant cycle, setting aside only a portion (either a percentage or specific dollar amount) of *local parks* statutory funds for the second year. Second-year competition in the *state parks, trails, and water access* categories would be for unallocated funds only.
2. **Follow the current practice** of setting aside a percentage of funds in each category for the second year and distributing first year unallocated dollars to the four funding categories by percentage. Allowance would have to be made for the *state parks* category which would need unallocated funds only for appropriation levels lower than \$112.5 million.

Jim Fox explained the advantages and disadvantages of each method (see notebook and hand-outs) and responded to Committee questions. He also described the process to be taken to provide 50% to acquisition and 50% to development projects.

Staff recommends Option 1 which would call for:

- 65% statutory *local parks* funds in 1st year
- 100% of other statutory funds in 1st year (*state parks, trails and water access*)
- all unallocated funds in 2nd year

Bob Parlette expressed frustration at the complexity of the process and asked if there was any staff and/or committee support for legislation which would make it easier to understand. Jim Fox explained that the current process was designed to give some minimal level of funding for certain types of recreational and habitat opportunities and to leave the rest of the funding decisions to the Committee.

Mr. Parlette also asked if it was possible to have two separate lists in the local parks category - one for acquisition and one for development. Mr. Fox said that could be done and agreed that it would be a good idea, especially if development projects continue to dominate the category. He also explained that the 50/50 split needed to occur over the life of the program. Since the acquisition level is approximately \$6 million over the development level (over the life of the VWRP), the Committee could choose to deviate from the historic 50/50 split and fund more development than acquisition projects.

Director Johnson added that a trend towards development seems to be occurring and the Committee should acknowledge that trend in an appropriate manner.

Cleve Pinnix urged caution and asked staff to meet with stakeholders for further discussion.

Staff responded to questions about the status of the "delayed list" and how it could impact the 1997-99 ranked list if funding is not approved during the early weeks of the 1997 legislative session.

Committee members expressed the desire to get as much money "out the door" in the first year. Option #1 would fund \$9.1 million in the first year and provide more flexibility; Option #2 would fund \$8.6 million.

Chair Mason called for public testimony.

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Harry Laban | City of Seattle, Parks
Urged the Committee to fund as many local parks as possible and suggested that all of the unallocated funds go to the local parks category. |
| Helen Wickstrom | City of Kent Parks and Recreation Department
Supported adding some of the unallocated funds to Option #1 to fund more development projects in the local parks category. |
| Mike Ryherd | Lobbyist, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition
Supported 50% for acquisition in the local parks category and use of unallocated for emergencies. Suggested that unallocated funds |

go to development in the local parks category without applying the 50/50 split since the legislature has mandated that unallocated funds be used for the "greatest need".

Doug Hagedorn Clark County Parks and Recreation, Landscape Architect
Supported 50/50 split in the local parks category. Suggested that acquisition and development projects be evaluated separated and that two ranked lists be developed.

Shelly Morelli City of Newcastle, Parks and Recreation Manager
Supported funds for acquisition in the local parks category because many of the newer communities are still working to acquire land for new parks and are not yet ready to develop.

Director Johnson suggested waiting until the November IAC meeting to make a final decision. Hopefully, the Governor's request for the WWRP will be known and staff can bring forward a recommendation for Committee action.

In response to a question, Jim Fox explained that some local governments are in favor of retaining the 2nd year cycle because they plan and operate on an annual basis and want to have a yearly opportunity to apply for grant funds.

Cleve Pinnix suggested a variation on Option #1 which would use a majority of the unallocated funds in the 1st year with distribution going to local parks, trails and water access categories.

NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS FUNDING ACT (continued)

Director Johnson reminded Committee members of their previous discussion on the NRTFA funds and distributed a revised application form and resolution (see hand-outs). The resolution calls for distribution of the federal FY96 funds (up to \$270,000) with a very fast-track application process which could result in Committee decision at the November IAC meeting. The timeline would be as follows:

Mailing of application forms to interested groups/persons	September 30
Application Due Date	October 23-25
Evaluations	1 st week of November
Committee Approval	November 13 th

Director Johnson reviewed the proposed application form. Projects would be reviewed by evaluators who would meet for one-day to come to consensus and develop a funding recommendation for Committee action. Materials will clearly state that IAC can choose to fund up to the maximum FY 96 funds or nothing if the Committee is not comfortable with the results of the competition.

Chair Mason suggested using numerical values for the scoring process so that a ranking system of some sort would be available.

The evaluation team of 9-11 members would be comprised of:

- 2-3 pedestrian users
- 2-3 motorized users (would be equal to pedestrian number)
- 1 cross-country skier
- 1 snowmobiler
- 1 equestrian
- 1 mountain bike
- 1 city
- 1 state agency
- 1 federal agency

Ralph Mackey **moved** approval of the staff recommendation for the National Recreational Trails Fund Act Grant Process. Bob Parlette **seconded**. Committee members complimented staff on a quick response to their request for revisions to the materials. **MOTION CARRIED** (Resolution #96-25)

REPORTS FROM PARTNER AGENCIES

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

Bob Parlette asked IAC staff to consider whether coordinated state trail planning is needed. He suggested that a trail the length of the Columbia River might be a project that IAC could promote. Director Johnson agreed to review and possibly revise the State Trails Plan to accommodate such a project. Additionally, a state trails conference might be useful to bring interested persons together to talk about trail needs. She assured Mr. Parlette that staff will look at various options and will bring recommendations back to the Committee at the November meeting.

There being no public comment or further business, Chair Mason adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m..

IAC APPROVAL CERTIFIED BY



Donna M. Mason, Chair

11/12/96

Date

Next Meeting: November 12-13, 1996
Natural Resources Building, Room 175
Olympia, Washington

RESOLUTION #96-20

**Fiscal Year 1998 Critical Habitat Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 18 Critical Habitat Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Habitat Conservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 18 Critical Habitat Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for Critical Habitat category as depicted in 96-20, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Cleve Pinnix

Resolution seconded by: Bob Parlette

Adopted / Defeated (circle one) *Adopted as amended.*

AMENDMENT:

Cleve Pinnix moved that the scoring for the Methow Wildlife Corridor in the Critical Habitat Category be corrected and that the ranked order of the list be changed accordingly (see attached Table 1). Bob Parlette seconded.

Table 1 - WWRP, Critical Habitat Ranked List of Projects

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Request	Sponsor Share	Total Cost	IAC Cumulative Total
1 of 18	96-1005 A	Table Mountain NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	3,000,000		\$3,000,000	3,000,000
2 of 18	96-1004 C	Trout Lake Wetlands NAP	Natural Resources, Dept of	3,053,700		\$3,053,700	6,053,700
3 of 18	96-1046 A	Methow Wildlife Corridors, Phase 3	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	2,480,000		\$2,480,000	8,533,700
4 of 18	96-1045 A	Asotin Creek	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,115,000		\$1,115,000	9,648,700
5 of 18	96-1123 A	Tang Ranch	Central Washington University	4,031,865		\$4,031,865	13,680,565
6 of 18	96-1007 C	Mount Si NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	2,850,000		\$2,850,000	16,530,565
7 of 18	96-1006 A	Teal Slough NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	1,600,000		\$1,600,000	18,130,565
7 of 18	96-1056 A	East Hood Canal/Riparian Corr., Phase 2	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,000,000		\$1,000,000	19,130,565
9 of 18	96-1054 A	Dungeness River	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,600,000		\$1,600,000	20,730,565
10 of 18	96-1055 A	Tarboo Creek	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,000,000		\$1,000,000	21,730,565
11 of 18	96-1047 A	Sharptail Grouse	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	2,300,000		\$2,300,000	24,030,565
12 of 18	96-1090 A	Skagit Samish Flats	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	2,000,000		\$2,000,000	26,030,565
13 of 18	96-1034 A	Sprague Lake Wildlife Area	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,618,000		\$1,618,000	27,648,565
14 of 18	96-1127 A	Eagle Island	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,290,000		\$1,290,000	28,938,565
15 of 18	96-1011 A	White Salmon Oak NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	275,000		\$275,000	29,213,565
16 of 18	96-1008 A	Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area	Natural Resources, Dept of	2,000,000		\$2,000,000	31,213,565
17 of 18	96-1049 A	Rattlesnake Mountain Wildlife Area	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	6,000,000		\$6,000,000	37,213,565
18 of 18	96-1113 A	Western Gray Squirrel, Phase 2	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	508,000		\$508,000	37,721,565
				\$37,721,565	\$0	\$37,721,565	

RESOLUTION #96-21

**Fiscal Year 1998 Natural Area Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 7 Natural Area Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Habitat Conservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 7 Natural Area Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for Natural Area category as depicted in 96-21, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: *Ralph Mackey*

Resolution seconded by: *Bob Parlette*

 Adopted / Defeated (circle one)

September 23, 1996

Table 1 - WWRP, Natural Areas Ranked List of Projects

Resolution 96-21

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Project Sponsor</u>	<u>IAC Request</u>	<u>Sponsor Share</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>IAC Cumulative Total</u>
1 of 7	83.9444	96-1015 C	Coastal NAPs	Natural Resources, Dept	3,000,000		3,000,000	3,000,000
2 of 7	83.6111	96-1009 C	Puget Trough Estuarine NAPs	Natural Resources, Dept	989,400		989,400	3,989,400
3 of 7	82.4444	96-1002 C	Cypress Island NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept	2,500,000		2,500,000	6,489,400
4 of 7	74.8889	96-1010 C	Arid Lands NAPs	Natural Resources, Dept	550,000		550,000	7,039,400
5 of 7	74.5556	96-1016 A	Puget Trough Freshwater NAPs	Natural Resources, Dept	3,000,000		3,000,000	10,039,400
6 of 7	71.2778	96-1094 A	South Puget Prairie	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,000,000		1,000,000	11,039,400
7 of 7	69.1111	96-1075 C	Mima Mounds NAP	Natural Resources, Dept	450,000		450,000	11,489,400
					11,489,400		11,489,400	

RESOLUTION #96-22

**Fiscal Year 1998 Urban Wildlife Habitat Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 13 Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Habitat Conservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 13 Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list Urban Wildlife Habitat category as depicted in 96-22, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Mary Ann Huntington

Resolution seconded by: Ralph Mackey

Adopted / Defeated (circle one)

September 23, 1996

Table 1 - WWRP, Urban Wildlife Ranked List of Projects

Resolution 96-22

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Project Sponsor</u>	<u>IAC Request</u>	<u>Sponsor Share</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>IAC Cumulative Total</u>
1 of 13	81.6878	96-1014 C	West Tiger Mountain NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
2 of 13	79.5233	96-1143 A	Lewis River Lowlands	Clark, County of	1,174,981	1,174,982	2,349,963	2,924,981
3 of 13	77.8033	96-1155 A	O'Grady Connection	King County Parks Department	300,000	300,000	600,000	3,224,981
4 of 13	74.8800	96-1013 A	Kitsap Forest NAP	Natural Resources, Dept of	825,000		825,000	4,049,981
5 of 13	74.6144	96-1012 C	Woodard Bay NRCA	Natural Resources, Dept of	800,000		800,000	4,849,981
6 of 13	72.8211	96-1146 A	Port Townsend Urban Wildlife Corridor	Port Townsend, City of	185,701	185,703	371,404	5,035,682
7 of 13	72.0644	96-1053 A	Central Kitsap Riparian Corridor, Ph. 2	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	1,000,000		1,000,000	6,035,682
8 of 13	71.9867	96-1126 A	Morse Creek	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	950,000		950,000	6,985,682
9 of 13	68.8411	96-1112 A	South Issaquah Creek Greenway Project	Issaquah, City of	367,500	367,500	735,000	7,353,182
10 of 13	66.1022	96-1192 A	Woodway Reserve	Woodway, Town of	900,000	900,000	1,800,000	8,253,182
11 of 13	65.7111	96-1115 A	Shillapoo - Slough	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	465,000		465,000	8,718,182
12 of 13	51.8267	96-1095 A	Dollar Island	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	540,000		540,000	9,258,182
13 of 13	51.4522	96-1129 A	Germany Creek	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	150,000	150,000	300,000	9,408,182
					9,408,182	3,078,185	12,486,367	

RESOLUTION #96-26

**Fiscal Year 1998 State Parks Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 14 State Park Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 14 State Park Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for the State Parks category as depicted in 96-26, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Cleve Pinnix

Resolution seconded by: Ralph Mackey

Adopted / Defeated (circle one) *as amended*
September 24, 1996.

Cleve Pinnix moved adoption of the revised ranked list of projects in the State Parks Category. Ralph Mackey seconded.

Table 1 - WWRP, State Parks Ranked List of Projects

Resolution 96-26

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Project Sponsor</u>	<u>IAC Request</u>	<u>Sponsor Share</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>IAC Cumulative Total</u>
1 of 14	96-1079 A	Camano Island - Cama Beach, Phase 3 Acq.	State Parks	1,434,545	1,503,000	2,937,545	1,434,545
2 of 14	96-1078 A	Moran State Park-Cascade Lake Acquisitio	State Parks	700,000		700,000	2,134,545
3 of 14	96-1122 A	Statewide Acq. of Inholdings & Matching	State Parks	500,000		500,000	2,634,545
4 of 14	96-1081 D	Beacon Rock - Doetsch Campground Dev.	State Parks	1,392,705		1,392,705	4,027,250
5 of 14	96-1084 A	Deception Pass - Ben Ure Island, Acquisi	State Parks	800,000		800,000	4,827,250
6 of 14	96-1144 D	Lime Kiln Point - PH 2 Development	State Parks	184,606		184,606	5,011,856
7 of 14	96-1077 A	Nisqually/Mashel - Phase 4 Acquisition	State Parks	2,416,681		2,416,681	7,428,537
8 of 14	96-1024 D	Kanaskat-Palmer - 50 Unit Campground	State Parks	988,000		988,000	8,416,537
9 of 14	96-1118 A	Sun Lakes - Park Lake Phase 1	State Parks	1,090,025		1,090,025	9,506,562
10 of 14	96-1073 A	Green River - Phase 6	State Parks	1,585,925		1,585,925	11,092,487
11 of 14	96-1071 A	Grayland Beach - Titor	State Parks	264,425		264,425	11,356,912
12 of 14	96-1133 D	Maryhill Day Use Expansion	State Parks	639,000		639,000	11,995,912
13 of 14	96-1072 A	Sucia Island - North Finger Island	State Parks	1,250,000		1,250,000	13,245,912
14 of 14	96-1099 A	McMicken/Hartstene Island - Scott Proper	State Parks	820,000		820,000	14,065,912
				14,065,912	1,503,000	15,568,912	

RESOLUTION #96-27

**Fiscal Year 1998 Trails Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 20 Trails Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 20 Trails Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for Trails category as depicted in 96-27, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Mary Ann Huntington

Resolution seconded by: Cleve Pinnix

Adopted / Defeated (circle one) with Bob Parlette and Ralph Mackey abstaining.

September 24, 1996

RESOLUTION #96-28

**Fiscal Year 1998 Water Access Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 15 Water Access Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 15 Water Access Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for Water Access category as depicted in 96-28, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Mary Ann Huntington

Resolution seconded by: Bob Parlette

Adopted / Defeated (circle one) *with Ralph Mackey Abstaining.*

September 24, 1996

Table 1 - WWRP, Water Access Ranked List of Projects

Resolution 96-28

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Request	Sponsor Share	Total Cost	IAC Cumulative Total
1 of 15	60.0556	96-1117 A	Deadman Bay	San Juan County Land Bank	438,912	438,912	877,823	438,912
2 of 15	59.1667	96-1080 D	Camano Island - Cama Beach, Initial Dev	State Parks	750,265	1,189,177	750,265	1,189,177
3 of 15	59.0000	96-1248 D	Fairview Olmsted Park	Seattle, City of	300,000	1,489,177	651,685	1,489,177
4 of 15	58.4444	96-1214 A	Smith Cove Park	Seattle, City of	1,000,000	2,489,177	2,000,000	2,489,177
5 of 15	56.0000	96-1165 A	Flaming Geyser Addition	King County Parks Department	290,000	2,779,177	665,000	2,779,177
6 of 15	54.7778	96-1194 A	Lake Goodwin County Park	Snohomish, County of	1,005,575	3,784,752	2,011,150	3,784,752
7 of 15	54.2222	96-1098 D	Dickman Mill Development, Phase I	Tacoma MPD	554,530	4,339,282	1,109,060	4,339,282
8 of 15	52.4444	96-1027 D	Fox Island Fishing Pier	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	405,000	4,744,282	405,000	4,744,282
8 of 15	52.4444	96-1182 A	Old Mill Site Acquisition	Kitsap, County of	756,650	5,500,932	1,513,300	5,500,932
10 of 15	52.1111	96-1058 A	Utsalady Beach Acquisition	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	250,000	5,750,932	250,000	5,750,932
11 of 15	51.8889	96-1207 A	Deep Lake Park Acquisition	Thurston, County of	600,000	6,350,932	1,200,000	6,350,932
12 of 15	51.5556	96-1108 D	Heritage Park: Arc of Statehood	General Admin., Dept. of	500,000	6,850,932	6,045,480	6,850,932
13 of 15	44.4444	96-1043 D	North Bay, Case Inlet	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	395,305	7,246,237	395,305	7,246,237
14 of 15	41.5556	96-1082 D	Doug's Beach - Windsurfing Facilities De	State Parks	341,844	7,588,081	341,844	7,588,081
15 of 15	36.1111	96-1044 D	Scatchet Head	Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of	280,170	7,868,251	186,776	7,868,251
					7,868,251	10,814,608	18,682,858	

RESOLUTION #96-29

**Fiscal Year 1998 Local Parks Category
Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for fiscal year 1998 of the 1997-1999 biennium, 61 Local Park Category Projects are eligible for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, these 61 Local Park Category Projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Committee Members; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the ranked project list for the Local Parks category as depicted in 96-29, Table 1 is approved.

Resolution moved by: Bob Parlette

Resolution seconded by: Mary Ann Huntington

Adopted / Defeated (circle one) with Ralph Mackey Abstaining.

September 24, 1996

Table 1 - WWRP, Local Parks Ranked List of Projects

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC		Sponsor Share	Total	
				Request	Cost		Cost	Cummulative Total
1 of 61	96-1170 D	Evergreen Park Renovation - Phase 1	Bremerton, City of	298,150	298,150	298,150	596,300	298,150
2 of 61	96-1150 D	Angle Lake Park, Phase I	SeaTac, City of	300,000	321,684	321,684	621,684	598,150
3 of 61	96-1218 D	Lake Boren Park	Newcastle, City of	268,063	268,063	268,063	536,126	866,213
4 of 61	96-1233 D	Kennewick Youth Skate Park	Kennewick, City of	50,000	50,000	50,000	100,000	916,213
5 of 61	96-1212 D	Pavillion Park PH 2	Spokane, County of	200,000	200,000	200,000	400,000	1,116,213
6 of 61	96-1178 D	Frank Geri Complex - Field 4	Bellingham, City of	250,000	250,000	250,000	500,000	1,366,213
7 of 61	96-1223 D	Planters Ferry Park Phase 1 Development	Spokane, County of	300,000	661,214	661,214	961,214	1,666,213
8 of 61	96-1191 D	Last Open Space in Lake City	Seattle, City of	177,203	177,203	177,203	354,406	1,843,416
8 of 61	96-1224 D	East Hill Park Expansion Development	Kent, City of	300,000	434,289	434,289	734,289	2,143,416
10 of 61	96-1158 D	The Park at 92nd Street	Mukilteo, City of	300,000	300,000	300,000	600,000	2,443,416
11 of 61	96-1091 D	Wilmot Park	Woodinville, City of	300,000	1,110,296	1,110,296	1,410,296	2,743,416
12 of 61	96-1215 D	Sandhill Park	Mason, County of	210,909	210,909	210,909	421,817	2,954,325
13 of 61	96-1168 D	Puyallup Sports Field Complex, Phase 3	Puyallup, City of	294,055	306,105	306,105	600,160	3,248,380
14 of 61	96-1153 D	Smallwood Park Improvements	Eatonville, Town of	89,220	89,220	89,220	178,440	3,337,600
15 of 61	96-1210 D	West Valley Community Park, Ph 2	Yakima County Parks	214,000	214,379	214,379	428,379	3,551,600
16 of 61	96-1160 D	Garfield Ballfields	Seattle, City of	300,000	381,913	381,913	681,913	3,851,600
17 of 61	96-1188 A	Southwest Park	Quincy, City of	67,500	67,500	67,500	135,000	3,919,100
18 of 61	96-1208 D	Loutsis Park	Carnation, City of	67,097	67,098	67,098	134,195	3,986,197
19 of 61	96-1200 A	Orchards Highlands	Clark, County of	66,117	66,118	66,118	132,235	4,052,314
20 of 61	96-1087 C	McDonald Recreation Field, Phase I	Colfax, City of	110,540	310,850	310,850	421,390	4,162,854
20 of 61	96-1204 D	Park at Bothell Landing Renovation PH1	Bothell, City of	300,000	343,000	343,000	643,000	4,462,854
22 of 61	96-1154 D	Camas Pool Renovation Project	Camas, City of	95,778	95,778	95,778	191,555	4,558,631
23 of 61	96-1092 D	North Dam Park Improvement Phase 2	Grand Coulee, City of	175,500	175,500	175,500	351,000	4,734,131
24 of 61	96-1169 D	Ravensdale Park	King County Parks Depart	146,045	146,045	146,045	292,090	4,880,176
25 of 61	96-1152 D	Carbonado's 8th Avenue Park	Carbonado, Town of	31,300	31,300	31,300	62,600	4,911,476
26 of 61	96-1222 A	DOT Property	Newcastle, City of	313,025	313,025	313,025	626,050	5,224,501
27 of 61	96-1198 A	Tenny Creek Park	Clark, County of	272,600	272,600	272,600	545,200	5,497,101
28 of 61	96-1174 A	Railroad Bridge Park Expansion	Jamestown S'Klallam Trib	75,000	75,000	75,000	150,000	5,572,101
29 of 61	96-1085 A	Betz North Park	Cheney, City of	137,500	137,500	137,500	275,000	5,709,601
30 of 61	96-1202 D	Ben Burr Park Development	Spokane, City of	300,000	342,510	342,510	642,510	6,009,601
31 of 61	96-1221 C	Birchwood Neighborhood Park	Bellingham, City of	325,000	410,000	410,000	735,000	6,334,601
32 of 61	96-1176 D	South Neighborhood Park	Mill Creek, City of	64,915	64,915	64,915	129,830	6,399,516
33 of 61	96-1180 C	Highlands Grange Park	Kennewick, City of	300,000	300,000	300,000	600,000	6,699,516
34 of 61	96-1201 A	Nelson Property	Poulsbo, City of	253,050	253,050	253,050	506,100	6,952,566
34 of 61	96-1216 A	Henderson Inlet Park	Thurston, County of	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,000,000	7,452,566

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Project Sponsor</u>	<u>IAC Request</u>	<u>Sponsor Share</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Cummulative Total</u>
36 of 61	96-1096 A	Peltola Property Acquisition-South I-90	Bellevue, City of	500,000	1,742,992	2,242,992	7,952,566
37 of 61	96-1189 D	Vista Park Expansion	Wahkiakum County, Port	230,510	250,610	481,120	8,183,076
38 of 61	96-1186 D	Badger Mountain Community Park, Phase	Richland, City of	297,945	297,945	595,890	8,481,021
38 of 61	96-1203 A	Pacific Community park	Clark, County of	500,000	1,188,248	1,688,248	8,981,021
40 of 61	96-1245 D	Naselle Recreation, Health and Fitness	Pacific, County of	84,895	84,895	169,790	9,065,916
41 of 61	96-1161 D	H. J. Carroll Park - PH 2	Jefferson, County of	192,184	192,186	384,370	9,258,100
42 of 61	96-1195 D	Old Mill Campground	Manson Park District	300,000	383,294	683,294	9,558,100
43 of 61	96-1159 D	Robbins Addition Park	Longview, City of	134,000	134,000	268,000	9,692,100
44 of 61	96-1086 A	Bender Recreation Facility Expansion	Lynden, City of	500,000	605,000	1,105,000	10,192,100
45 of 61	96-1109 D	Tibbetts Valley park Phase 3 Improvement	Issaquah, City of	102,025	102,025	204,050	10,294,125
46 of 61	96-1114 A	Issaquah Creek Greenway Acquisition	Issaquah, City of	311,000	767,357	1,078,357	10,605,125
47 of 61	96-1231 A	McDonalds Barn Park	Marysville Parks & Rec,Ci	364,125	364,125	728,250	10,969,250
48 of 61	96-1184 D	Tonasket Youth Common - Phase 2	Tonasket, City of	113,565	114,000	227,565	11,082,815
49 of 61	96-1156 D	East Everett Athletic Fields: Phase 1	Everett, City of	300,000	680,110	980,110	11,382,815
50 of 61	96-1151 A	Edgewater Park Extension, Phase 2	Mount Vernon, City of	500,000	562,000	1,062,000	11,882,815
51 of 61	96-1121 D	McElroy Park, Phase 1B	Ellensburg, City of	185,760	185,760	371,520	12,068,575
52 of 61	96-1183 D	Gazzam Lake Park (LP)	Bainbridge Island Park Di	300,000	853,715	1,153,715	12,368,575
53 of 61	96-1147 A	Cathcart Regional Park	Snohomish, County of	500,000	1,108,900	1,608,900	12,868,575
54 of 61	96-1119 A	Cascade View Park	Tukwila, City of	136,575	136,575	273,150	13,005,150
55 of 61	96-1145 D	Waterfront Interpretive Trail	Medical Lake, City of	8,750	8,750	17,500	13,013,900
56 of 61	96-1177 A	Neighborhood 4W Land Acquisition	Kennewick, City of	275,000	275,000	550,000	13,288,900
57 of 61	96-1097 C	Nelson Nature Park	Edgewood, City of	215,709	215,710	431,419	13,504,609
58 of 61	96-1217 A	Pigeon Point Park	Seattle, City of	500,000	1,600,000	2,100,000	14,004,609
59 of 61	96-1172 D	Narbeck Park	Everett, City of	300,000	388,388	688,388	14,304,609
60 of 61	96-1190 A	Mill Creek Regional Athletic Complex	Snohomish, County of	440,950	440,950	881,900	14,745,559
61 of 61	96-1171 A	Station Plaza	Tacoma, City of	217,681	217,681	435,362	14,963,240
				14,963,240	22,145,429	37,108,669	

**RESOLUTION #96 - 32
WWRP Re-distribution of Funds
1991-93 HCA**

WHEREAS, 57 Habitat Conservation Account projects were considered for funding by the IAC as a part of the 1991-93 Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, an alternate ranked list of projects to be considered for funding has been completed; and

WHEREAS, the Habitat Conservation Account for the 1991-93 biennium has received \$402,950 in returned funds, including \$175,950 from Tacoma Metropolitan Park District's Snake Lake project and \$227,000 from the City of Bellevue's Mercer Slough project; and

WHEREAS, two projects, as originally presented to the IAC, and approved by the 1991 Legislature are still viable and in need of funding:

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Request</u>
King County	Urban Wildlife Habitat	Three Forks Park	\$1,150,360
Seattle	Urban Wildlife Habitat	Duwamish Head	\$2,750,000

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC hereby approves funding for the following projects:

<u>Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
91-235	King County	Three Forks Park	\$150,360
91-247	Seattle	Duwamish Head	\$252,590

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to allocate any additional local agency Urban Wildlife Habitat moneys to Seattle's Duwamish Head Project, up to \$469,425, as they become available; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to execute any and all project agreements necessary to facilitate prompt project implementation.

Resolution moved by: Mary Ann Huntington

Resolution seconded by: Art Stearns

Adopted/Defeated (circle one)

September 24, 1996

RESOLUTION 96 - 25

National Recreation Trails Fund Act Grant Process

WHEREAS, the IAC is the administrator of the National Recreational Trails Funding Act (NRTFA) for Washington: and

WHEREAS, IAC has received advice from a Task Force of trail users, concerning program administration

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. Federal Fiscal 1996 National Recreational Trails Fund Act [NRTFA] grant funds be applied for in a competitive grant program using an application format substantially as shown on Attachment 1.
2. The application form shall be available to applicants not later than October 5, 1996.
3. Application due date for the FFY 1996 NRTFA will be no later than October 25, with an IAC funding decision at the IAC November 1996 meeting date.
4. Applications will be reviewed by an evaluation team consisting 9 or 11 persons representing pedestrian/hiking, motorized, equestrian, cross-country ski, snowmobile, and bicycle users, local government, state trail managers, and national government. The Director shall make such appointments following nomination and review with user groups and interested parties. The NRTFA evaluation team shall be advisory to the Director and IAC Committee. IAC staff shall support the activities of the NRTFA evaluation team.

5. The IAC Committee reiterates its strong support for use of the NRTFA funds in the manner most conducive to address the state's trail maintenance problems in innovative, user-based projects. The IAC Committee will accept recommendations for several NRTFA projects, or, if suggested by the evaluation team, for a single project that meets the NRTFA requirements. In reviewing FFY 1996 NRTFA proposals at the November, 1996 meeting, IAC reserves the right to grant less than the full FFY 96 allocations available. Any FFY 96 funds not allocated at the November, 1996 IAC meeting will be distributed in the subsequent FFY 97 funding process.

6. Staff are to emphasize working with constituents and the Task Force on methods for distribution of Federal Fiscal 1997 funds. A staff report shall be provided at the November, 1996 IAC meeting.

Resolution Moved By *Ralph Mackey*

Resolution Seconded By *Bob Parlette*

Adopted / Defeated (Circle one)

September 24, 1996