

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 16, 2006

*PLACE: Natural Resources Building,
Room 172, Olympia, Washington*

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER.....3

MANAGEMENT STATUS REPORTS.....3

CONSENT CALENDAR4

URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT CATEGORY - POLICY REVIEW UPDATE.....4

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR STATE AGENCIES- REVIEW AND
APPROVAL OF COST INCREASE6

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR STATE AGENCIES - REVIEW AND
APPROVAL OF GRANTS.....7

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR LOCAL AGENCIES - REVIEW AND
APPROVAL OF GRANTS.....8

NOVA - REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF 2006 GRANTS8

NOVA - EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT - 2007 CHANGES, INITIAL13

NRTP 2007 FUNDING CYCLE ADJUSTMENTS13

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.....14

PUBLIC COMMENT.....15

ANNUAL STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT16

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS.....17

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

Day 1

*DATE: November 16, 2006
TIME: 9:30 a.m.*

*PLACE: Natural Resources Building
Room 172, Olympia, Washington*

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Rex Derr	Director State Parks
Steven Drew	Olympia

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

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Val Ogden called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

The Chair welcomed everyone and asked committee members to introduce themselves.

The agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

MANAGEMENT STATUS REPORTS

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2 for details.)

Director Johnson highlighted several items that staff has worked on since the last meeting:

- This will be Neil Aaland's last IAC meeting
- Staff has been working very hard
- Working on hiring the new Deputy Director
- Clover Lockard is the new Invasive Species Council executive coordinator
- First meeting of the Invasive Species Council will be on November 28, 2006
- Due to Greg Lovelady's hard work the Trails Conference was a success

Chair Ogden reported that there were several people from her area that attended the trails conference and couldn't say enough about what a great conference it was.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Approval of IAC Minutes - September 21 & 22, 2006 and October 27, 2006
- b. Time Extensions
- c. Project Changes
 - #69-609A – Department of Fish and Wildlife, L.T. Murray Wildlife Area – Conversion Request
 - #91-215A – Snohomish County Parks, Centennial Trail – Conversion Request
- d. Service Recognition – LWCF and NRTP

Director Johnson asked to have both the September and October meeting minutes removed from this consent agenda as several technical issues were noted.

Resolution # 2006-38

Bill Chapman **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-38 as amended to remove subsection

a. (approval of minutes). Craig Partridge **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ogden read into the record the service recognition recipients.

Resolution #2006-38 **APPROVED** by Board as amended.

URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT CATEGORY – POLICY REVIEW UPDATE

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Neil provided a presentation on this agenda item. He went over the background issues including changes that have been made since 1991. He identified three major trends and explained the initial options for advisory committees. Neil listed five options to consider for the next steps:

1. Revise criteria and scoring system
2. Set a cap
3. Revise geographic eligibility criteria
4. Reserve some funding for state or local government, or desired project types
5. Have a second year grant round limited to specific agencies/grant types

Karen suggested having staff come back with specific feedback on three of the options and to then have the full Board analyze the repercussions of the different options.

Her suggestions included:

- Setting aside a percentage of UWH funds for local projects (option four)
- Taking the second year grant cycle off of the table (option five)

Karen agreed that revising the evaluation criteria and setting a cap should be options number one and number two. She suggested an alternative idea, which would be to create a subcommittee of the IAC to work on this and come back to the Board with results.

Steven Drew thought that this subcommittee could get recommendations from the interest groups.

Bill Chapman **MOVED** that the matter be looked at by a subcommittee of IAC members who would get input from the interest groups. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Craig Partridge would not object to that as long as the affected grant applicants have an opportunity to provide input. He is pleased to see that the staff recommendation included attachment A and that the statutory intentions were listed correctly. Craig would like to see attachment A augmented by including the statutory definition of Urban Wildlife Habitat in RCW 79A. 150.10 (11), which refers to lands that provide habitat important to wildlife in proximity to an urban area.

Craig would like the record to show that the state-sponsor projects which have been funded in the past are good projects.

Bill agrees with Craig and stated that it should be the intent of the motion to include Craig's comments. He also believes Craig and Karen should be part of the subcommittee.

Director Johnson appreciates the comments. She hopes to have a lengthy discussion and a report on the issue in February. She also hopes to have a decision made at the summer meeting.

Karen requested to have her June 2007 deadline met.

Public Testimony:

Mike Rhyerd, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, suggests having a citizen subcommittee to ensure people feel included. This is a local level program and needs to have locals involved in the process. He suggested opening up to non-profits and bringing them into the discussion as well.

Steven doesn't believe Mike's comments are inconsistent with the proposed subcommittee. He also agreed with Craig's point to include the language that defines Urban Wildlife from the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Instead of being summarized he would like it to be front and center, including the original language.

Rex Derr is a little worried about rushing to do something by February due to the amount of work and limited staff in the office, especially if they try to add a thorough public discussion that includes municipalities and non-profits.

Director Johnson noted that staff can get something out for public comment by January 15, 2007, but they won't have time for a lot of details.

Karen clarified that she was not expecting final information by February, but rather by June 2007. She will volunteer her time to work on this.

Steven would like to use the February meeting for public testimony.

Bill Chapman noted that it would be better to have a couple of options before getting the information out for public review and comment. He would like to have the subcommittee make the original recommendation.

Jeff Parsons believes it is extremely important to get feedback from groups who feel the program has departed from the original intention so those groups feel like they have been listened to. He also stated that it is important to address the loss of people's wildlife connection in the urban areas regarding opportunities for education, stewardship, and recreation.

A subcommittee including Karen, Jeff and Craig will be working with Director Johnson.

Karen suggested eliminating options three and five today.

Steven volunteered to be an alternate on the subcommittee.

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to eliminate options three and five, since option three is actually included in option one. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Craig asked for a friendly amendment to include the statutory definition as he discussed.

Karen accepted the amendment.

Motion unanimously **APPROVED** by Board.

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR STATE AGENCIES – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF COST INCREASE

Marguerite Austin and Myra Barker presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

- #00-1662 – WDFW, Pt. of Manchester Boating Access

Myra provided the background of this request for a cost increase.

Jeff Parsons asked why it took five years to get from approval to bid?

Myra explained that re-scoping the project and permitting took additional time.

Steven asked if any of the funds had been spent yet?

Myra reported that about 24 percent has been spent on design and development.

Steven asked if there had been any funding cycles between 2001 and now?

Myra reported that yes, there were two grant cycles.

Steven then asked why this money hadn't been given to a project that was ready to go.

Director Johnson explained that this was one of the alternate projects on the 2001 list, so it didn't actually get funded until 2003. Including the scope changes it took longer than expected.

Marguerite noted that a couple of grant cycles ago, the full list was funded with additional funding available, so the Board gave staff approval for cost increases.

Resolution # 2006-39

Steven Drew **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-39. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2006-39 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR STATE AGENCIES – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF GRANTS

Marguerite Austin and Marc Duboiski presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

The Boating Facilities Program (BFP) provides funds for state agency sites and facilities that support motorized recreational boating. Eighteen State Agency category projects requesting more than \$7.7 million were submitted for BFP funding consideration. There is no per project fund limit. Funding available for this grant program is approximately \$4.6 million.

Marc presented the top two ranked projects for the state agency category:

- #06-1974 Lake Sammamish Handling Piers-Phase 2, Washington State Parks
- #06-1776D Silver Lake Boat Launch, Fish and Wildlife

Steven Drew asked if there were treated products (e.g., creosote) in any of the projects on the list.

Marguerite reported that there is not.

Steven would like to have a discussion and policy to preclude the use of treated materials for projects across the grant programs. He would like this before the next funding cycle.

Resolution # 2006-40

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-40. Rex Derr **SECONDED**.

Public Testimony:
No public testimony

Resolution #2006-40 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM FOR LOCAL AGENCIES – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF GRANTS

Marguerite Austin presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

This program provides funds for planning, acquisition, development, and renovation of local agency and Native American Tribe sites and facilities for motorized recreational boating. Eleven Local Agency category projects requesting \$4 million were submitted for BFP funding consideration. Maximum grant amount of \$1 million and 25 percent sponsor match required.

Kammie Bunes presented the top three projects in the local agency category:

- #06-1656D North Recreational, City of Castle Rock
- #06- 1885 Clover Island Marina, Port of Kennewick
- #06- 1717 Svensen Park, Port of Wahkiakum

Resolution # 2006-41

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-41. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Public Testimony:
No public testimony

Resolution #2006-41 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

PRISM PRESENTATION

Scott Chapman, PRISM manager, provided an overview of the PRISM system and highlighted some of the new features being developed for PRISM.

NOVA – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF 2006 GRANTS

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item with Scott Chapman's assistance. (See notebook item #8 for details.) There are grant opportunities in three categories:

- a. Off-Road Vehicles
- b. Nonhighway Road
- c. Nonmotorized

Greg noted a couple of typos in memorandums 8a and 8b. He stated that the corrections should list November 2006 (FY 2007) on both tables.

Greg reviewed items in the notebook.

NOVA – ORV Projects

Twenty-three ORV projects requesting \$2,362,143 out of an available pool of \$2,255,555 in NOVA program motor vehicle fuel tax funds and permit fees are presented for funding approval. Matching funds are not required but encouraged.

Steven asked Greg to explain how the various fund amounts are decided. In response Greg reviewed the chart on page three of the NOVA ORV memorandum.

NOVA – Nonhighway Road Definition

Greg explained the significance of the Nonhighway Road concept and how it applies to qualifying projects for the Nonhighway Road and Nonmotorized categories.

NOVA – Nonhighway Road Projects

Eight Nonhighway Road projects requesting \$386,187 out of an available pool of \$565,846 in NOVA motor vehicle fuel tax are presented for funding approval. There is a limit of \$100,000 per project.

NOVA – Nonmotorized Projects

Twenty Nonmotorized projects requesting \$1,384,199 out of an available pool of \$568,293 in NOVA motor vehicle fuel tax funds are presented for funding approval. Projects are limited to \$100,000. No match share is required.

Board Discussion:

Steven Drew asked about the first category and how the funds are returned. He noted that what is done with the funds from prior years is different than what is done with leftover funds from previous cycles. He felt this was a policy discussion the Board should have.

Greg noted that because the statute requires 30 percent funding for each category (Off-Road Vehicle, Nonhighway road, and Nonmotorized) that staff and the advisory committee's practice has been to recommend to the Board that unspent and carry-over¹ funds remain in their original categories.

Steven noted that the statute allows the Board to waive that distribution. He suggested that it be brought back and redistributed. When a category has a wealth of highly ranked projects, he would support waiving the 30 percent distribution formula.

Jim Fox explained that the funding is not actually "returned" but maybe better described as "excess" funds that are earmarked for later distribution.

¹ There are two types of left over money: • **"Unspent"** funds are monies granted to a project sponsor but ultimately not used. • **"Carry-over"** funds are monies that remain after completion of a grants cycle due to insufficient applications.

Steven pointed out inconsistencies in the policy manual. He believes the Board may want to look at clarifying this information. He also suggested voting to waive the 30 percent requirement and to combine the returned funds to provide a net affect of about \$200,000. Under ORV it would fund projects ranked 20-23 above the permit funding line and would partially fund the next project. In Nonmotorized it would fund projects ranked 10-15 and would still have funds left over to put in the pot for next year.

Greg would like to present this information to the Advisory Committee and get their input for such a change in a future grant cycle.

Chair Ogden would prefer to keep things the way they are and to look at changes for the next grant cycle. She is not comfortable moving projects and funding around today.

Jeff suggested that the Board needs public input in making a change such as this.

Chair Ogden noted that all three of the Non-highway and Off-road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) user groups worked very hard to put these recommendations in place and would not want to make a change without these groups having an opportunity to provide feedback and be involved in any policy changes.

Steven doesn't believe this is a policy change since it is okay to get rid of the 30 percent. He noted that no matter what the vote is today it would be a policy change since there is no policy in place for returned funds.

Director Johnson discussed the need for clarification and the importance of the Attorney General's input on this issue before making any changes. Staff has not had an opportunity to review the issue and look back to the history of this subject.

The Board discussed the different policy implications and what the vote today would mean concerning the policies.

Public Testimony:

Ruth Itner served eight years on the original NOVA committee. She stated that the Nonmotorized supporters worked really hard to get to the point where they are now and she would not make a change.

Rex Derr expressed appreciation for Ruth's comments as it helped him to see the bigger, longer term policy implications.

Steven continued his support for changing the distribution amount at today's meeting.

Jim Fox reported that the Legislature authorized the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) to waive the 30 percent under certain conditions, but the constituent groups feel very strongly about the amount that they receive. The Board previously

decided to keep the money in the category it was originally intended for. This is a policy that was worked on through the advisory committee.

Steven Drew **MOVED** that \$359,573 of ORV funds be returned from prior years and to be included in this year's gas tax revenue before funding projects. **MOTION DID NOT PROCEED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND.**

Steven Drew **MOVED** to take the funds left over from the last grant cycle from both the ORV and Nonmotorized for a total of \$233,572 and to set these funds aside to determine how to apply them. Craig Partridge **SECONDED** the motion for purposes of clarification.

Craig asked for clarification regarding this funding. He wanted to know if this included the funds that are identified under the 30 percent.

Chair Ogden stated that she intends to vote this time.

Vote was called for. Steven Drew was in favor of the motion. Bill Chapman, Craig Partridge, Karen Daubert, Rex Derr, Chair Ogden, and Jeff Parsons opposed. **MOTION FAILED.**

Steven made a **MOTION** that was consistent with both RCW 46.09.170(iii) and policy manual 14, page 8, which states that the committee may waive the 30 percent and reallocation. Steven **MOVED** to include \$179,659 in a category that needs the funds. **MOTION DID NOT PROCEED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND.**

Bill Chapman stated that Steven has done a lot of good work in preparing for this and brought up important issues. There are two issues. One is a policy issue and the other issue is about waiver authority. The Board may want to use the waiver authority in the future. He thanked Steven for the effort he put into this.

Chair Ogden agreed and noted one other issue which Steven raised. This is the issue of unspent funds. The Board has work to do in order to adjust the guidelines.

Craig called attention to the RCW noting that the Board can distribute unused funds per policy. He asked for clarification on how to determine when the policy is created.

Chair Ogden asked that the advisory committee start working on this.

She asked that the Board members get any concerns, issues, or comments to her as soon as possible after receiving notebooks.

Resolution # 2006-42, NOVA Off-Road Vehicle Funding
Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-42. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED.**

Resolution #2006-42 **APPROVED** by Board as presented. Steven opposed.

Resolution # 2006-43, NOVA Nonhighway Road Funding
Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-43. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2006-43 **APPROVED** by Board as presented. Steven opposed.

Resolution # 2006-44, NOVA Nonmotorized Funding
Craig Partridge **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-44. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Public Testimony:

Ruth Itner discussed a project that is number 14 (Iron Goat) on the Nonmotorized project list, which she believes should actually be a Nonhighway Road project. She discussed the project details and stated what a terrific project it is. Ruth believes that funding this project would make better use of an existing facility.

Director Johnson reported that this is a request to re-categorize and the request came in a couple weeks ago so Marguerite and her staff have worked on an option for the Board to consider.

Marguerite explained that there are additional projects which the applicants might also want transferred to another category. She recommends that staff go back and contact all of the project sponsors in this position and then provide information to the advisory committee. Depending on Board direction, she suggests re-evaluating the re-scoped projects and to then rank the projects. This may be a modified written process.²

Craig noted that with all of the alternate projects it still results in more projects than there are funds available. He also asked how the Iron Goat Trail would do in the different category.

Marguerite believes Iron Goat would do very well as would several other projects. It would be very competitive.

Bill Chapman stated that this discussion sounds like the September meeting where an applicant had been steered to another category only to find later that they may have done better in the first category. Is there a lesson to learn from that?

Marguerite noted that it is the staffs' job to look at the projects and let applicants know what the eligibility issues are, and to then find the best fit.

Bill's next question was regarding a threshold issue. He wondered if this was a compelling enough reason to put a lot of staff work into it?

² The final process is a modification of this. That is, staff first scoped each project to determine which projects are candidates for changing categories. Staff then checked with the applicants for the three resulting candidate projects.

Marguerite noted that staff wants to spend the money as quickly as possible. A supplemental round may be a better way to go. Another reason to do this is due to the recent flooding. There may be a need to have a supplemental cycle to help with these projects.

Steven discussed a policy to allow staff to move projects to a more appropriate category.

Resolution #2006-44 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to have staff, along with project proponents and the advisory committee, reevaluate the alternate projects under the Nonmotorized category to see which could be re-categorized as Nonhighway road and to evaluate them before bringing a recommendation back to the committee in February. Rex Derr **SECONDED**.

Steven asked for a friendly amendment to include projects in part or in total and to have staff after reconsidering projects in other categories, give a brief recommendation, as to what the policy might look like and how it would work.

Jeff clarified that there would be a new ranked list.

Craig confirmed that yes there would be.

The Board **APPROVED** the motion as amended.

NOVA EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT – 2007 CHANGES, INITIAL DISCUSSION

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item, which addresses two issues: (See notebook item #9 for details.)

- a) Change the way funding caps are applied (from individual employee and equipment caps to a per project cap of \$200,000).
- b) Increase the amount of matching resources required to receive evaluation points and add a new “non-governmental resources” evaluation question.

Greg reviewed the Board notebook memo and reported the status of this issue.

Board Discussion:

Craig appreciates the work that the staff and advisory committee has spent on this issue.

Public Testimony:

No public testimony.

NRTP 2007 FUNDING CYCLE ADJUSTMENTS

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #10 for details.)

Greg reviewed the meeting notebook item and provided comments received through the

public process. Greg explained that the approved list needs to be submitted to the federal government by September 30 each year. If for some reason we were to miss the September 30 deadline, we would lose all the funding. For this reason staff is recommending a one-time funding cycle adjustment that would put us 9-12 months ahead of the deadline. We would do this by asking applicants to submit applications in 2007 for both federal fiscal year 2007 and 2008.

This would cause a few issues. Applicants would need to spend more time to get both year's applications in. Additionally, in some cases it would be difficult for the applicants to anticipate the two year need. The Advisory Committee would need to evaluate more applications. However, besides getting us ahead of the deadline, this one-time adjustment would have the advantage of allowing applicants and staff to move projects from NRTP to NOVA or vice versa, that is, whichever program might be best able to provide project funding. Overall, some people are having trouble understanding the implications of this change.

Bill Chapman is in support of this change. He has heard from some nonprofits that also believe this is a good idea. He is also in support of increasing the cap.

Resolution # 2006-45

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution # 2006-45, authorizing NRTP grant applications for federal fiscal years 2007 and 2008 both in 2007. Rex Derr **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Steven Drew asked if there was any discussion or feedback on match and what that would do.

Public Testimony:

No public testimony

Resolution #2006-45 **APPROVED** by Board as presented.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mike Rhyerd, WWRC, provided an update on the WWRC's plan to make two minor amendments. The first one is to Farmland, to include forestland and the second amendment is on CREP leases. He wants to include the Conservation Commission to be eligible for riparian funding.

Neil asked about match requirements.

Mike reported that state agencies are not required to provide match.

Mike also noted that groups who are looking to transfer land rights need to stay tuned as there are some technical details to still work out.

The Board may get some questions on these topics and Mike didn't want the Board to be completely unaware of the situation.

Jeff asked if there was discussion about allowing Conservation Districts to apply for Farmland Preservation funds.

Mike reported no, because of some concern with the definition of Farmland and what the counties and cities want to protect. This is a topic that the WWRC doesn't want to get involved in.

Jim Fox reported that Director Johnson previously covered all of the other legislative issues in her management report.

Board discussion:
No questions for Jim.

Public Testimony:
No public testimony

PUBLIC COMMENT

Derek Tetlow and Kim Brackett discussed their concerns with the proposed soccer fields at Battle Point Park (Bainbridge). Mr. Tetlow reported he is not against soccer fields but is concerned with the artificial turf and its environmental impacts. He is also concerned that he has not been able to provide public testimony on this project. He reported that the matching funds have not been acquired and that the cost estimates are not correct.

Kim Brackett is also concerned with the environmental impact. She noted that this is a undeveloped park that has no drainage system and waters will drain into the watershed.

Bill asked what is being requested of the IAC.

Mr. Tetlow would like staff to investigate claims.

Chair Ogden reported that the agency does not release any money until the match is in hand.

Ms. Brackett reported that at the first and only public meeting on this issue it was reported that the soccer committee would be paying for the entire project and the park district would not be spending any funds.

Perry Barrett, Bainbridge Island Park District, appreciates IAC funding. The previous discussion is an on-going discussion. The fields are not new fields but old fields. The park board received information from Derek Tetlow and Kim Brackett on November 2 but the board has not met since receiving this information, so he is unable to provide park board comments. The project will also need to be reviewed by the City of Bainbridge

Island, since the park district is a separate entity.

Rex assumes environmental review will be done before any permits are approved.

Perry responded that yes, there will be information provided to the city for review and permitting. There has been one pre-application meeting with the city and Mr. Tetlow and Ms. Brackett were present at this meeting.

Steven asked Perry if there is a polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE) free turf available?

Perry is not aware of PBDE free turf, but has been looking for different alternatives.

Bill asked about the public process so far.

Perry reported on the public process to date.

Marguerite and Leslie provided some follow-up process clarification. Staff is changing the process on the application authorization page and the authorizing resolution. Staff wants to make sure that the applicants are clear on the need to have the matching funds and approval of city or county councils before technical deadlines. There are different due dates for different pieces of information and staff needs to look for ways to make the needs clear.

ANNUAL STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT

Susan Zemek presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #12 for details.)

Susan reviewed the strategic plan and process to date.

The Board discussed the difficulty in measuring outcomes from the projects that have been funded.

Board Discussion:

The Board discussed the red and yellow rated goals.

Chair Ogden wants to look only at the red goals today and to come back to the yellow goals later.

Craig would like to verify that we do need to have a recreation summit to be able to develop a plan.

Steven talked about the levels of service depending on the size of the city. He thinks that we could break the state down by certain criteria and then try to evaluate on a statewide basis.

Karen is impressed with the number of green and yellow goals that have already been met in this plan.

Director Johnson suggested having a process started to think about recreation needs. There is currently a level of service study going on and will be reported on later.

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS

No partner agency reports

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

IAC Approval

Bill Chapman, Acting for
Val Ogden, Chair

Feb 8, 2007
Date

Next meeting: February 8 & 9, 2007
Natural Resources Building, Room 172
Olympia, WA

RESOLUTION #2006-38
November 2006 Consent Agenda

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following October 2006, Consent Agenda items as amended to remove subsection a are approved:

- a) Approval of IAC Minutes – September 21 & 22, 2006 and October 27, 2006,
- b) Time Extensions,
- c) Project Changes
 - #69-609A – Department of Fish and Wildlife, L.T. Murray Wildlife Area – Conversion Request
 - #91-215A – Snohomish County Parks, Centennial Trail – Conversion Request
- d) Service Recognition – LWCF and NRTP

Moved by: Bill Chapman

Seconded by: Craig Partridge

Adopted / Defeated / Deferred (underline result)

Date: November 16, 2006



**Table 1
Boating Facilities Program - State
State Fiscal Year 2008**

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Request	Sponsor Match	Total Cost	Staff Recommends	Cumulative Request	
1 of 18	62.000	06-1974D	Lake Sammamish Handling Piers--Phase 2	State Parks	314,000	314,000	628,000	314,000*	314,000	
2 of 18	59.444	06-1766D	Silver Lake Public Access Phase 2	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	301,842		301,842	301,842	615,842	
3 of 18	58.222	06-1770D	Pleasant Harbor Boat Launch Phase 2	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	352,554		352,554	352,554	968,396	
4 of 18	55.667	06-1771D	Eloika Lake Public Access	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	345,607		345,607	345,607	1,314,003	
5 of 18	55.444	06-1642D	Birch Bay - Boat Launch Redevelopment	State Parks	440,611		440,611	440,611	1,754,614	
6 of 18	54.778	06-1774N	Jameson Lake Boat Launch	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	185,000		185,000	185,000	1,939,614	
7 of 18	51.111	06-1734N	Lake Chelan Boat Ramp Improvements	State Parks	133,000		133,000	133,000	2,072,614	
8 of 18	48.333	06-1644D	Sucia Island - ADA Moorage	State Parks	920,384		920,384	920,384	2,992,998	
9 of 18	48.000	06-1768N	Point No Point Boat Launch Planning	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	250,000	50,000	300,000	250,000	3,242,998	
10 of 18	45.889	06-2157D	Jones Island - ADA Moorage	State Parks	951,018		951,018	951,018	4,194,016	
11 of 18	45.667	06-1776N	Sidley Lake Boat Launch	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	102,500		102,500	102,500	4,296,516	
12 of 18	45.556	06-1665D	Cape Disappointment Boat Launch Paving*	State Parks	695,860		695,860	293,061	4,992,376	Partial
12 of 18	45.556	06-1643D	James Island - ADA Moorage	State Parks	966,807		966,807	Alternate	5,959,183	
14 of 18	45.111	06-1972N	Joemma Breakwater & Boat Launch Planning	State Parks	126,500	126,500	253,000	Alternate	6,085,683	
15 of 18	44.111	06-1645D	Sucia Island - Desalinization Plant	State Parks	567,471		567,471	Alternate	6,653,154	
16 of 18	43.889	06-1748D	Steamboat Rock State Park Boat Moorage	State Parks	664,160		664,160	Alternate	7,317,314	
16 of 18	43.889	06-1777D	Modrow Boat Launch	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	195,196		195,196	Alternate	7,512,510	
18 of 18	35.667	06-2142D	Joemma Beach Comfort Station	State Parks	253,325	253,325	506,650	Alternate	7,765,835	
					7,765,835	743,825	8,509,660	4,589,577		

NOTE: Estimated funds available \$4,589,577 (\$4,224,255 new funds 2007-2009 (requested, but not yet approved), \$365,322 unexpended funds)

1) 06-1974D, 06-1766D - Direct available unexpended funds to these projects. These projects have existing legislative authority.

2) 06-1665D and 06-1643D are both 12th ranked projects. The applicant has requested that funds be allocated to their first priority - Cape Disappointment.

Prepared: 10/25/2006



Resolution: 2006-41

Table 1
Boating Facilities Program - Local
State Fiscal Year 2007

Rank	Score	IAC Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Request	Sponsor Match	Total Cost	Staff Recommends	Cumulative Request
1 of 11	66.000	06-1656D	North Recreation Boat Launch	Castle Rock City of	1,000,000	339,754	1,339,754	1,000,000	1,000,000
2 of 11	61.556	06-1885D	Clover Island Marina Replacement	Kennewick Port of	237,000	965,826	1,202,826	237,000	1,237,000
3 of 11	60.889	06-1717D	Svensen Park Development	Wahkiakum County #2 Port of	319,500	106,500	426,000	319,500	1,556,500
4 of 11	60.333	06-1679N	Wind River Boat Ramp Improvements	Skamania County of	150,000	50,000	200,000	150,000	1,706,500
5 of 11	57.222	06-1979D	Marina Plaza Visitors Dock	Olympia Port of	198,553	161,797	360,350	198,553	1,905,053
6 of 11	54.333	06-2082D	Yakima River Access	Benton City of	157,279	52,427	209,706	120,241	2,062,332 Partial
7 of 11	53.333	06-1864N	Seaport Landing Engineering and Design	Grays Harbor Historical SA	200,000	103,300	303,300	Alternate	2,262,332
8 of 11	53.000	06-1765N	Kla Ha Ya Park Floating Pier	Snohomish City of	30,000	15,000	45,000	Alternate	2,292,332
9 of 11	47.778	06-2040D	Eagle Harbor Waterfront Park City Dock	Bainbridge Island City of	719,790	239,931	959,721	Alternate	3,012,122
10 of 11	46.111	06-1592D	Percival Landing Dock Replacement	Olympia City of	1,000,000	461,300	1,461,300	Alternate	4,012,122
11 of 11	44.556	06-2035D	Marina Mooring Buoy System	Poulsbo Port of	37,500	12,500	50,000	Alternate	4,049,622
					4,049,622	2,508,335	6,557,957	2,025,294	

NOTE: Funds available \$2,025,294 (\$1,817,943 new funds 2005-2007, \$207,351 in returned funds)

Date Prepared: 10/11/2006



Preliminary Evaluation Ranked List And Advisory Committee Funding Recommendation

Table 1 - Nonhighway & Off-Road Vehicle Activities - Off-Road Vehicle Category, State Fiscal Year 2007

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Amt	Sponsor Amt	Total Amt	Recommended Funding			Cum Amt
								30% Statutory Minimum	Competitive Dollars	ORV Permit Amt	
1 of 23	55.533	06-1722M	Tahuya/Green ORV Tra	Natural Resources Dept o	199,960	89,000	288,960	199,960			199,960
2 of 23	54.933	06-1757M	Capitol Forest ORV Tra	Natural Resources Dept o	138,952	62,600	201,552	138,952			338,912
3 of 23	53.867	06-1936D	Walker Valley Trail Imp	Natural Resources Dept o	169,202	44,990	214,192	169,202			508,114
4 of 23	52.933	06-2019M	Grant County Sheriff M	Grant County Sheriff Dept	43,400	42,768	86,168	43,400			551,514
5 of 23	52.533	06-1715M	Evans Creek ORV M&C	USFS MBNF Snoqualmie	95,340	50,500	145,840	95,340			646,854
6 of 23	51.667	06-1721D	Tahuya Bridge Replace	Natural Resources Dept o	142,700	5,100	147,800	142,700			789,554
7 of 23	50.667	06-1948M	Elbe Hills 4X4 M&O	Natural Resources Dept o	95,612	43,000	138,612	95,612			885,166
8 of 23	49.200	06-1696M	Entiat & Chelan Multiple	USFS WNF Entiat RD	154,344	45,000	199,344	154,344			1,039,510
8 of 23	49.200	06-1566D	Way Cr. Trail Reroutes	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	42,100		42,100	42,100			1,081,610
10 of 23	48.600	06-1874N	Yacolt Burn ORV Recre	Natural Resources Dept o	74,568	33,503	108,071	74,568			1,156,178
11 of 23	45.800	06-1616M	Cle Elum South Zone O	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	193,140	30,000	223,140	366	112,492	80,282	1,349,318
12 of 23	45.533	06-2037N	Rimrock 4 x 4 Rock Cra	USFS WNF Naches RD	16,000	3,000	19,000			16,000	1,365,318
13 of 23	45.133	06-1565D	Gooseberry Trail Rerou	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	8,200		8,200			8,200	1,373,518
14 of 23	44.933	06-1844N	Colville NF OHV Route	USFS Colville National Fo	112,943	25,400	138,343			112,943	1,486,461
15 of 23	44.800	06-1567D	Boulder-DeRoux Trail R	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	82,600		82,600			82,600	1,569,061
16 of 23	44.600	06-1795M	Naches R.D. Motorized	USFS WNF Naches RD	199,624	22,500	222,124			199,624	1,768,685
17 of 23	44.467	06-1865M	Olympic Region M & O	Natural Resources Dept o	175,117	46,550	221,667			175,117	1,943,802
18 of 23	43.800	06-1615M	Cle Elum North Zone O	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	176,411	25,000	201,411			176,411	2,120,213
19 of 23	43.667	06-1693M	Gifford Pinchot NF Motc	USFS GPNF Cowlitz Valle	83,560	45,259	128,819			83,560	2,203,773
20 of 23	42.133	06-1745M	Pend Oreille Valley ATV	USFS CNF Newport RD	30,000	9,500	39,500			30,000	2,233,773
21 of 23	39.800	06-1612N	Table Mountain Reroute	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	26,370		26,370			26,370	2,260,143
22 of 23	34.333	06-1725M	Alder Ridge Trail	USFS WNF Wenatchee F	80,000		80,000			80,000	2,340,143
23 of 23	33.933	06-1716M	Cle Elum ORV Mainten:	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	22,000		22,000			22,000	2,362,143
					2,362,143	623,670	2,985,813	1,156,544	112,492	1,093,107	2,362,143

\$565,846 (2006 funds)
+ \$359,573 ("returned")
+ \$231,125 (carryover from 2005)

\$1,098,664 available
[[\$1,094,995 (2006) + \$3,649 "returns"]
Leaves \$5,557 carry to 2007

10/26/2006



Resolution: #2006-43

**Preliminary Evaluation Ranked List
And Advisory Committee Funding Recommendation**

Table 1 - Nonhighway & Off-Road Vehicle Activities - Nonhighway Road Category, State Fiscal Year 2007

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Amt	Sponsor Amt	Total Amt	Recommended Funding 30% Statutory Minimum	Cum Amt
1 of 8	57.643	06-1975D	Federation Forest Barrier-Free	State Parks	100,000	629,000	729,000	100,000	100,000
2 of 8	54.714	06-2012M	DNR Northwest NHR M&O	Natural Resources Dept of	51,348	22,850	74,198	51,348	151,348
3 of 8	50.286	06-1630M	WRRD Developed & Disperse	USFS WNF Wenatchee Rive	31,258	33,200	64,458	31,258	182,606
4 of 8	49.786	06-1754N	Upper Cle Elum River Valley F	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	48,650	47,050	95,700	48,650	231,256
5 of 8	49.571	06-1655M	Dispersed Site and Trailhead	USFS MBNF Skykomish RD	45,885	45,250	91,135	45,885	277,141
6 of 8	45.714	06-1700M	Entiat's Developed & Disperse	USFS WNF Entiat RD	31,046	20,700	51,746	31,046	308,187
7 of 8	44.500	06-2027M	Recreation Facilities Maintena	USFS Gifford Pinchot NF	48,000	173,180	221,180	48,000	356,187
8 of 8	42.857	06-2071D	Strawberry Island Trailhead P	North Bonneville City of	30,000	3,400	33,400	30,000	386,187
					386,187	974,630	1,360,817	386,187	

\$565,846 (2006 funds)
\$179,659 (carry to 2007)

10/26/2006

RESOLUTION #2006-44
Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program
Nonmotorized Category Funding
Fiscal Year 2007

WHEREAS, through the early months of 2006, until the May 1 application deadline, the staff of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) provided publications, website updates, public workshops, and other outreach opportunities to communicate to interested parties the benefits and application procedures for the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program (NOVA); and

WHEREAS, in answer to these efforts, 20 Nonmotorized (NM) projects were submitted to IAC for funding consideration and subsequently evaluated by the statutorily mandated advisory/evaluation committee using IAC-approved criteria; and

WHEREAS, all projects meet the program requirements stipulated in statute, administrative rule, and policy; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC hereby approves the ranked listing in "*Table 1 – NOVA – Nonmotorized Projects, Funding Recommendations, State Fiscal Year 2007*"; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC's Director is authorized to execute the necessary project agreements to facilitate prompt project implementation.

Resolution moved by: Craig Partridge

Resolution seconded by: Jeff Parsons

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: November 16, 2006



Preliminary Evaluation Ranked List And Advisory Committee Funding Recommendations

Table 1 - Nonhighway & Off-Road Vehicle Activities - Nonmotor Category, State Fiscal Year 2007

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	IAC Amt	Sponsor Amt	Total Amt	Recommended Funding 30% Statutory Minimum	Competitive Dollars	Cum Amt
1 of 20	52.533	06-1838M	Three Wilderness M & O	USFS WNF Naches RD	66,896	55,000	121,896	66,896	-	66,896
2 of 20	51.800	06-1875N	Yacolt Burn NM Recreation Pla	Natural Resources Dept of	63,821	44,250	108,071	63,821	-	130,717
2 of 20	51.800	06-1876M	Capitol Forest NM Trail M&O	Natural Resources Dept of	90,000	39,555	129,555	90,000	-	220,717
4 of 20	51.667	06-1938D	Echo Improvements - Final Sta	USFS WNF Chelan RD	39,000	11,000	50,000	39,000	-	259,717
5 of 20	51.467	06-1866M	DNR Northwest NM M&O 1 (Tr:	Natural Resources Dept of	100,000	51,053	151,053	100,000	-	359,717
6 of 20	50.533	06-1993M	Ingalls Lake Restoration	USFS WNF Wenatchee River I	41,400	43,468	84,868	41,400	-	401,117
7 of 20	50.333	06-1850M	Non-motorized Trails Maintena	USFS Gifford Pinchot NF	48,000	103,440	151,440	48,000	-	449,117
8 of 20	50.067	06-1868M	DNR Northwest NM M&O 2 (Re	Natural Resources Dept of	95,300	46,647	141,947	95,300	-	544,417
8 of 20	50.067	06-1747M	Snoqualmie Unit Trail Maintena	Natural Resources Dept of	100,000	73,920	173,920	23,876	76,124	644,417
10 of 20	49.267	06-1881M	N.Fork/Pyramid Mtn Tr Area He	USFS WNF Entiat RD	65,915	29,200	95,115	alternate	-	710,332
11 of 20	49.000	06-1618M	Cle Elum Non-motorized M&O	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	82,000	48,000	130,000	alternate	-	792,332
12 of 20	48.667	06-1587M	Gifford Pinchot Wilderness Tra	USFS GPNF Cowlitz Valley RC	99,250	83,148	182,398	alternate	-	891,582
13 of 20	47.533	06-1854M	Pasayten Campsite and Trail R	USFS OKNF Methow RD	44,976	34,848	79,824	alternate	-	936,558
14 of 20	46.733	06-1609N	Iron Goat-Horseshoe Trail Plan	USFS MBNF Skykomish RD	21,750	36,000	57,750	alternate	-	958,308
15 of 20	45.800	06-1755D	Bumping Lake Trail #971 Reco	USFS WNF Naches RD	42,338	14,500	56,838	alternate	-	1,000,646
16 of 20	42.600	06-1742D	Swamp and Big Tree Trails Re	Issaquah City of	100,000	25,000	125,000	alternate	-	1,100,646
17 of 20	42.400	06-1660M	Bead Lake Trail Reconstructior	USFS CNF Newport RD	30,000	8,000	38,000	alternate	-	1,130,646
18 of 20	42.267	06-2020M	White River Indian Creek Loop	USFS WNF Wenatchee River I	100,000	27,000	127,000	alternate	-	1,230,646
19 of 20	42.000	06-1848M	DNR SW Non-Motorized Trail M	Natural Resources Dept of	100,000	44,924	144,924	alternate	-	1,330,646
20 of 20	41.067	06-1960N	Harts Pass Trailhead Parking	USFS OKNF Methow RD	53,553		53,553	alternate	-	1,384,199
					1,384,199	818,953	2,203,152	568,293	76,124	

\$565,846 (2006 funds) plus
\$2,447 (carryover from 2005)

RESOLUTION #2006-45

**National Recreational Trails Program:
Accepting-Encouraging 2007 and 2008 Applications in 2007**

WHEREAS, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) has received National Recreational Trails Program (NRTP) grant funds each year since 1994, which has proved to be a great benefit to those who use trails in Washington State, and

WHEREAS, the adoption by IAC of the funding list for projects in this grant program occurs so late in the federal fiscal year that loss of these funding is a regular risk, and

WHEREAS, this "timing issue" risk can be virtually eliminated by accepting applications for two grant cycles in May 2007, and then returning to the normal one year cycle in 2008,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that IAC will hereby accept and encourage NRTP grant applications for funds for 2007 and 2008, both in the year 2007.

Resolution Moved By: _____ Karen Daubert _____

Resolution Seconded By: _____ Rex Derr _____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: November 16, 2006