

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 13, 1984  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Tye Motor Inn, Tumwater, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Silva Whitfield, Vancouver  
Mrs. Virginia Warden, Spokane  
Mr. John H. Jessup, Jr., Chairman  
Mr. Ralph Mackey, Everett  
Mr. Jan Tveten, Director, Parks & Recreation  
Commission  
The Honorable Brian Boyle, State Land Commissioner,  
Dept. of Natural Resources (AFTERNOON)

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. William R. Wilkerson, Director, Department of Fisheries  
Mr. Frank Lockard, Director, Department of Game  
(Vacancy - one member resigned)

APPENDIX A - Local Agencies  
Letters re Projects \*  
APPENDIX B - ORV Agencies  
Letters re Projects \*

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: Chairman John H. Jessup, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. without a quorum (WARDEN, JESSUP, MACKEY, AND TVETEN). Mrs. WHITFIELD arrived at 9:33 making a quorum of five. [The Honorable Brian BOYLE, State Land Commissioner, DNR, attended the meeting in the afternoon - quorum, six members.]

Chairman Jessup welcomed the attendees to the meeting and called upon Robert L. Wilder and his staff members for introductions.

INTRODUCTIONS:

Richard L. Winters, Associate Regional Director, National Park Service, Seattle  
Ruth Anderson, Outdoor Recreation Planner, National Park Service, Seattle  
George Volker, Department of Game, Member Technical Advisory and Off-Road Vehicle Advisory committees  
Mike Werner, Director, Whitman County Park Department, Colfax  
Russ Cahill, Deputy Director, Department of Fisheries  
Don Clark, formerly City of Olympia, Parks and Recreation Department

AWARDS - CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION: Mr. Wilder called upon Gloria Tarver, Recreation Resource Planner, IAC, for presentation of Certificates of Appreciation to volunteers who had contributed their time and talent to the IAC in various areas of need.

Bill Watters - Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) mapping, locating sites funded by the IAC. Assisted with Washington Recreation Guide needs.

Dwight Riggs - Incorporated the capital improvement program into IAC computer system.

Both of these volunteers were present and accepted their certificates. Those not present received their certificates in the mail with letter from Mr. Wilder:

Rick Long - Assisted in location of the recreation sites in Washington State for the Recreation Guide.

\* = Appendices, if desired, may be obtained by writing to the IAC,  
4800 Capitol Blvd., Olympia, Washington 98504 KP-11

Christine Baker - Coordinated the library facilities of the Planner Services Section, IAC, and completed certain filing tasks. Also computerized the 1984 Capital Improvement Program.

Ralph Mackey presented three Certificates of Appreciation to former members of the IAC's Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Art McCartin, a member for the past twelve years, was present and received his certificate. Others were: James Montgomerie Director, Parks and Recreation, Pierce County, and Martin Carty, Director, Parks and Recreation, Cowlitz County. Mr. Wilder commented on the time and effort put forth by these former TAC members and expressed his appreciation on behalf of staff for their valued input concerning project matters and procedural guidelines for the Project Services Section's grant-in-aid program.

In the presentation of these Certificates of Appreciation, the Committee members affirmed the following resolutions:

- (1) WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION IS A SMALL AGENCY WITH MANY LARGE AND IMPORTANT TASKS, AND

WHEREAS, VOLUNTEERS HAVE CONTINUALLY CONTRIBUTED MUCH TO THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, AND

WHEREAS, RICK LONG, BILL WATTERS, CHRIS BAKER, AND DWIGHT RIGGS VOLUNTEERED THEIR VALUABLE TIME AND TALENT DURING 1984 TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND GREATLY ASSISTED IN THE PLANNING, PROJECTS, AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS OF THE AGENCY, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE THESE VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXCELLENT SERVICES RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF THE ASSISTANCE OF RICK LONG, BILL WATTERS, CHRIS BAKER, AND DWIGHT RIGGS TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION IN PERFORMING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS VOLUNTEERS TO THE COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS DO HERewith EXTEND THEIR THANKS AND APPRECIATION FOR JOBS WELL DONE.

- (2) WHEREAS, ART McCARTIN, MARTIN CARTY, AND JAMES MONTGOMERIE HAVE SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION'S TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND HAVE ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE THEIR DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THEIR TENURE, AND WISH THEM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF ART McCARTIN'S, MARTIN CARTY'S, AND JAMES MONTGOMERIE'S ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS DO HERewith EXTEND THEIR THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO THEM FOR THEIR SERVICES, AND

RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT COPIES OF THE RESOLUTIONS BE SENT TO THE RESPECTIVE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (WHITMAN COUNTY - ART McCARTIN; COWLITZ COUNTY - MARTIN CARTY) AND TO THE HONORABLE GOVERNOR-ELECT BOOTH GARDNER, PIERCE COUNTY EXECUTIVE, PIERCE COUNTY (JAMES MONTGOMERIE), WITH COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO EACH RESPECTIVE FORMER TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER NAMED IN THIS RESOLUTION.

The Chairman addressed the attendees pointing out the very limited funding available for the local agencies at this funding session. In former years, he noted that the IAC had been able to assist a considerable number of local sponsors in bringing worthy projects to completion for use by the citizens and visitors of the State of Washington. He recalled the IAC's funding of all projects brought to the Committee for funding at one time and had hoped this could be the case at this session. He asked the support from local sponsors and those benefiting from the IAC's programs in some of the proposed solutions to the problem of dwindling funding resources. He specifically asked that sponsors communicate with their legislators and make known their needs.

#### 11.B. FUND SUMMARIES:

In the absence of a quorum, Chairman Jessup called for the Fund Summaries reports. Mr. Ray Baker, Agency Accounts Officer, reported as follows:

1. Grant-in-Aid Projects - State/Local Agencies - Fund Summary:  
Referred to replacement Fund Summary report dated NOVEMBER 9, 1984. Gave explanation of the new format of the report and the comments concerning the negative Federal fund balances for some state agencies. Noted that the report did not include anticipated receipt of Land and Water Conservation Funds, nor anticipated Initiative 215 receipts through June 30, 1985, which is normally included. With receipt of Federal funding the negative balances will be "erased" and balance of biennium funding of state agencies affected will continue.
2. Off-Road Vehicles' Program Fund Summary:  
Referred to replacement Fund Summary report dated SEPTEMBER 30, 1984. Current Fund Status was changed from \$1,569,457.64 to \$1,734,424.35 to include another month's actual receipts from the funding source.

Department of Fisheries' - Audit: In relation to the Fund Summary report on Federal funds, Mr. Russ Cahill, Deputy Director, Department of Fisheries, informed the Committee of the current status of the Department of Fisheries' audit by the State Auditor's Office. Thirteen violations were cited in the Audit which now appear not to have actually existed. All difficulties will be resolved which will indicate that the Department of Fisheries had a good fiscal/accounting program and is in line with proper procedures for receipt of continued Federal Funds. A switchover to a new computerized system had caused the difficulties and resulted in an unfavorable audit report. By December 1, 1984, Mr. Cahill said the violations cited in the report would be cleared up.

11 C. PROJECT SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REPORT: Mr. James Webster, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "Project Services Division Report", citing the following:

- (1) 70 applications were received from local agencies' sponsors for consideration. Sixteen were withdrawn; fifty-four remain for Committee consideration.
- (2) The Technical Advisory Committee met September 5-6, in Moses Lake and September 10-11 in Tacoma for input and counsel regarding each of the projects.
- (3) Evaluation Team met during October 8-12 for review of each application and scoring. Appreciation was expressed to the following for their assistance:
  - Jim Barker, Douglas County Park and Recreation Department
  - Bill Bush, Washington State Park & Recreation Commission
  - Bill Hutsinpillar, King County Division of Parks and Recreation
  - Frank McCoy, Spokane Park and Recreation Department
  - Jim Pope, Chelan County PUD
  - John Webley, Renton Park and Recreation Department
  - Mike Valiga, Port of Friday Harbor
- (4) ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED PROJECTS:

<u>Department of Game</u>			
Munn Lake, Thurston County	\$20,900	Init. 215	\$20,900 LWCF
Construct Public Access			
<u>Department of Game</u>			
Kress Lake, Cowlitz County	\$24,000	Init. 215	\$24,000 LWCF
Construct Public Access			
- (5) 85 active State Projects are in various stages of completion.
- (6) LWCF - Jobs Bill Projects - reported one of the ten NPS Emergency Jobs Act of 1983 projects had been withdrawn:
  - Department of Game, Clear Lake \$11,000 LWCF

It was not possible to expend that money as an unexpended balance of the LWCF received by amending scope and costs of other Jobs Bill projects, and the monies were returned to the NPS.

- (7) Noted that LWCF Jobs Bill Program has been extended to March 1, 1985 in order to allow states to complete their billings, etc.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND: In response to Mr. Wilder's inquiry, Mr. Winters (Associate Regional Director, NPS, Seattle) stated the Certificate of Apportionment for LWCF is going through the usual channels; that the figure would be slightly higher for the State of Washington this year; however, nothing has been apportioned as of this date.

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION: Mrs. Virginia Warden presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Charles Butler, a seven year member of the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee. Mr. Butler in addressing the Committee stated he had enjoyed his association with the IAC through ORVAC and had especially appreciated the cooperation he had received from Mr. Greg Lovelady, the IAC ORV Coordinator. In presenting this Certificate the Committee affirmed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, CHARLES BUTLER, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION'S OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR SEVEN YEARS AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROGRAM, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING HIS LONG TENURE, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF CHARLES BUTLER'S ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS DO HERewith EXTEND THEIR THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO HIM FOR HIS SERVICES, AND

RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF YAKIMA COUNTY IN APPRECIATION OF CHARLES BUTLER'S SERVICES, WITH COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO CHARLES BUTLER.

A quorum was declared at 9:33 a.m. [WARDEN, JESSUP, MACKEY, TVETEN, AND WHITFIELD]

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - JULY 20, 1984: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 20, 1984 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA - NOVEMBER 13, 1984: Following a call by the Chairman for additions or deletions to the agenda, Mr. Rich Costello, Department of Fisheries, presented the Committee with a letter of request from William R. Wilkerson, Director, Department of Fisheries, dated November 13, 1984. The Department requested that the IAC approve a cost increase of \$63,200 for the Hood Canal Bridge Public Fishing Access project, increasing the total cost from \$380,000 to \$443,200. Implementation of the project had been held up for over four years as a result of the bridge damage/replacement and permit delays. The Department of Fisheries asked that the increase be approved from the unexpended balance of funds allotted to it for the Tacoma Fishing Pier Project, subject to the approval of the Office of Financial Management. Mr. Costello asked that this project be added to the agenda for discussion and action of the Committee. Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MRS. WARDEN, THAT THE REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES TO ADD THE HOOD CANAL BRIDGE PUBLIC FISHING ACCESS PROJECT - COST INCREASE - TO THE AGENDA BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED. (Added as Item IV C. to the agenda, November 13, 1984.)

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION: Chairman Jessup asked Mr. Ronald R. Pretti, former member of the Interagency Committee, to come forward to accept a Certificate of Appreciation for his service to the IAC during the past three years. On receiving his certificate Mr. Pretti thanked the Committee and expressed his appreciation for the work in which the members are involved. Having been a member, Mr. Pretti said he knew of the dedication of the IAC staff in bringing before the Committee the best projects and of their efforts to help all communities. He felt the Committee should continue to serve the public in the park, recreation, and conservation field as it has so ably done in the past.

In presenting Mr. Pretti's certificate to him, the Committee affirmed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, RONALD R. PRETTI HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AS A CITIZEN MEMBER THE PAST THREE YEARS, AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS

OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT AND RENOVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS DESIRE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE COMMITTEE DURING HIS THREE-YEAR TERM, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF RONALD R. PRETTI'S ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS DO HERewith EXTEND THEIR THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO HIM FOR HIS SERVICES, AND

RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE FORWARDED TO GOVERNOR JOHN SPELLMAN IN APPRECIATION OF RONALD PRETTI'S SERVICES, WITH COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO RONALD R. PRETTI.

#### II. D. PLANNING SERVICES

1. Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP): Mr. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, referred to memorandum of staff, "SCORP Update - Progress Report", dated November 13, 1984, reporting as follows:

a. Since July initial drafts have been completed on issue papers relating to: Roles and Responsibilities; Funding Considerations; Urban Considerations; Natural and Historic Heritage. A fifth issue paper was completed recently, Mt. St. Helens. This was added as (e) to the memorandum.

b. Initial draft on NEEDS has been completed.

c. A SCORP Technical Review Committee has been established, composed of 19 federal, state, local and private representatives, and will hold its orientation meeting November 16, 1984 in Tacoma. Introductions were made of some of the SCORP TRC members: Ken Attebery, Director of Planning, Port of Bremerton; George Volker, Department of Game representative; and Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries representative. [Other representatives are from the U. S. Forest Service, State Parks, Department of Natural Resources, Commerce & Economic Development Department, Department of Transportation, Chelan County PUD, Weyerhaeuser Company, and cities and counties representatives from park and recreation departments.]

d. Public hearings will be scheduled for January and/or February 1985, with Final draft to the Interagency Committee at its March 1985 meeting - for review and approval. The Office of Financial Management and the Office of the Governor also will review and approve the document. Submittal to the National Park Service is required by June 30, 1985.

2. Washington State Recreation Guide: Mrs. Tarver referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "Washington State Recreation Guide", stating:

a. It will be necessary to hold off publication until after the first of the year due to the changeover in governors. A letter from the Governor is included in the Guide welcoming visitors to the state and acknowledging the use of the guide by our own Washington citizens.

b. Map separates and site overlays have been completed and sent to the publisher. Review and edit of proofs is estimated to be completed by early December, 1984.

c. Noted that the Guide will be available to the public at \$2.00 per copy. A percentage of this revenue and of that generated through advertisements in the Guide will be used for initial publication (approximately \$50,000) and to establish a revolving fund for future updates.

d. Advised of the interest of certain persons in park /recreation field and in Tourism Region 7 of the state who are interested in a franchise for sales of the Guides.

There followed discussion on the fact that monies will revert to the Outdoor Recreation Account; that there would be an update printing with IAC receiving about 25% of the sales and 25% of the advertising; that the next issue of the Guide would include major/key local area park and recreation facilities; and that the need is great for this type of publication.

Mr. Tveten mentioned the evaluation of these sorts of programs made by a New York firm. The State of Idaho was found to have an excellent guide and it is listed in the evaluation as an example to follow. There has been criticism that this state has not had a tool visitors and citizens of the state could use to locate parks and recreation areas and facilities. The need is great, and Mr. Tveten felt this would be a first step in meeting that need. The State Parks and Recreation Commission receives approximately 24,000 telephone calls each summer from people inquiring where the facilities are located, what is included in them, etc.

3. Local Agencies' Technical Assistance: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "Local Agencies, Technical Assistance". (a) He stated that the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program statistics have been transferred to IAC agency computers, allowing easier access to the program and quicker update of new statistical information.

b. Current Capital Programs are on file for 163 cities, 37 counties, 53 port districts, 4 park and recreation districts, 4 school districts, 2 Indian Tribes and one public utility district. These 264 local agencies have identified acquisition, development, and renovation needs equaling \$584,524,970.

c. Currently there are 116 local comprehensive park and recreation plans on file. Staff is working with 22 others to update their plans.

d. Of the applications received for 1984 funding session, 28 agencies were immediately eligible to participate in the grant-in-aid program; 18 others were given five-year eligibility status through updates or developing a new plan; and interim eligibility was granted to seven on the basis that their plan would be completed and/or adopted in 1985.

4. Off-Road Vehicles' Grant-in-Aid Report: Mr. Greg Lovelady, ORV Coordinator, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, noting the following:

a. Project Status: There are 52 active ORV projects; 35 scheduled for completion by the end of the year. Seventy-three (73) projects have been completed

since the inception of the program in 1978.

Horn Rapids ORV Park: City of Richland is completing its first full year of operation for this ORV Park, and has been accepted by ORV users and non-users alike.

Grant County - Education and Enforcement Program: Grant County is completing its first full year of operation under ORV funds. Cooperation and coordination between the Grant County Sheriff's Office and the area Game Department staff has enabled the amount of land available for ORV use in the Moses Lake Sand Dunes to increase, while at the same time protecting the interests of the Game Department in that area.

b. Publications: A new publication, "Tacoma Off-Road Vehicle Study" (1984) has been released recently (Tacoma Metropolitan Park District). Sites are identified as potential sites for an ORV facility; plans designed to manage ORV activities are outlined in the report.

c. Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC): Committee has met three times in 1984: to review and become familiar with 1984 ORV projects; to discuss park maintenance and operations, and education and enforcement projects; and to review, on October 2, 1984, the 1984 applications in order to evaluate and make final recommendations.

d. Project Changes:

- Cost Adjustments were made administratively as follows:

Richland, City of - 83-30D, Horn Rapids ORV Development.  
Cost increase approved in the amount of \$3,565 to create a partial spectator viewing area.

Wenatchee National Forest - 83-6D, Four-Mile Ridge Trail  
construction.

Cost increase approved in the amount of \$3,400 for additional construction costs.

Mr. Mackey asked if information was made available to others about successful ORV Parks such as the Horn Rapids facility and was assured that this information is available from staff as well as those who have developed the facility and are now managing it. There is community interest and support in the Horn Rapids ORV Park, and at the same time there are those who oppose the facility. However, Mr. Lovelady pointed out that the site is located in an area not heavily populated; the City boundaries continue out into the desert. ORV users were able to locate the land and encourage the City to dedicate it to off-road vehicle recreational use.

Mr. Tveten thanked the IAC staff for working with Pacific County regarding ORV issues. State Parks will continue to work with staff and the County in order to put together a feasible plan for the area. Mr. Tveten pointed out that there are several King County ORV problems and he had received several letters about these. The ORV users feel there is not sufficient attention being paid to establishing ORV areas in the County. Mr. Lovelady stated King County had not been

heard from for several years in regard to promotion of ORV areas, mainly because there are no available lands. He noted that the Forest Service does have a small area off I-90, and a number of King County people use another area along I-90 Auburn cutoff. Mr. Wilder stated that in 1978 or 1979, King County had returned \$500,000 to the IAC of ATV monies that they had been unable to use. According to Mr. Tveten, State Parks and Recreation staff will be meeting with Issaquah people about the fact that there are no ORV facilities in King County. He suggested that Mr. Lovelady be involved. In response to Mrs. Warden's question, Mr. Tveten stated the reason there is a need in that area is that some King County residents are unable to travel a far distance to use the other available ORV facilities.

III. OLD BUSINESS A. Project Changes - 1. City of Langley, Langley Boat Harbor, IAC #78-045D, Cost Increase: Mr. Larry Fairleigh, Project Manager, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "City of Langley - Langley Marina (IAC 78-045D)", citing the following:

1. September 26, 1977 - IAC approved funding for City of Langley, Marina Project (IAC 78-045D) in the amount of \$300,000 (IAC \$240,000 - 75%); 42 slips, floating tire breakwater; completed in 1979.
2. Substantially completed in late 1979, but had some defects; defects were corrected; cost increase granted; total project cost \$334,376.
3. Port of South Whidbey contributed \$80,000 to the original local share and other funds to repair efforts.
4. Spring 1982 - the marina suffered extensive storm damage; sinking of the breakwater; major damage to the floats. City filed suit against the designer and contractor for replacement and damages.
5. Later 1983, City was awarded \$510,000 in an out-of-court settlement.
6. Engineering study was conducted to determine cost of replacement of the marina - one that would withstand severe wave action. This could be accomplished through the replacement phase at \$397,000 (minimum breakwater; 10 slips). Phase I and II could then follow: \$507,000, full breakwater, 18 slips, and \$700,000, full breakwater, 41 slips and fishing walkway, pier.
7. Outlined the deduction of the court award from the \$510,000, making a total of \$399,750 available on June 15, 1985 for the City of Langley..
8. Staff reviewed, with assistance of the Assistant Attorney General, the proposed "replacement project", and recommended there be a cost increase of \$100,000 (30%) to the current IAC contract to ensure a viable project.

Honorable Dolores Cobb, Mayor of City of Langley, addressed the Committee point-out the need for the project and asking their favorable consideration of the cost increase.

Jeff Layton designer of the proposed replacement marina, explained the defects in the first marina and the need for a breakwater which could withstand severe wave action which is common to the Langley harbor area. He noted that he had also designed the Anacortes marina and that facility is a good example

of a solid breakwater system giving the type of protection needed in the Langley harbor.

Following conversation, it was pointed out the facility would provide access to a fishing area for non-boaters in its later phases. Mayor Cobb noted there was a mini-park as a part of the area in existence and this facility received considerable use. Plans for the future include redeveloping this park to make it a better facility.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MRS. WHITFIELD, THAT,

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF LANGLEY, WITH ASSISTANCE FROM THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, AND THE PORT OF SOUTH WHIDBEY, HAD BUILT A 42-SLIP TRANSIENT MOORAGE MARINA IN 1979 (IAC #70-045D), AND

WHEREAS, DUE TO DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FLAWS THAT MARINA WAS DAMAGED BY STORMS TO THE POINT OF TOTAL LOSS, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF LANGLEY SOUGHT AND WON A JUDGMENT TO RECOVER COST OF THE ORIGINAL PROJECT, AND

WHEREAS, IT IS THE DESIRE OF ALL PARTIES TO REPLACE THE LANGLEY MARINA TO THE FULLEST EXTENT POSSIBLE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HEREBY ACCEPT A PHASE I DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW BREAKWATER AND A MINIMUM OF 18-SLIPS AT AN ESTIMATED COST OF \$507,000 AS REPLACEMENT FOR THE ORIGINAL PROJECT AS SPECIFIED IN IAC #78-045D, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE IAC AGREES TO ALLOCATE AN ADDITIONAL \$100,000 TOWARDS COMPLETION OF THIS REPLACEMENT PROJECT AND HEREBY EMPOWERS THE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

At 10:20 a.m., Chairman Jessup called for a recess. The Committee reconvened at 10:26 a.m.

Mr. Mackey suggested before the IAC commit the additional funds to Langley, or to any other project such as the marina breakwater, it might be advisable to obtain the approval of the Corps of Engineers as to the design. That agency has experience with these types of projects and could give valuable input. Mr. Webster stated the City of Langley would have to obtain a Corps permit regardless, and therefore the Corps does review the project prior to its construction. That does not necessarily mean they check into the engineering aspects, but this could be done if it was thought to be necessary. Mr. Wilder agreed this was a good suggestion and it would be passed on.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS CONSIDERATION: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "Local Agencies' Project Funding". Letters in regard to certain projects had been distributed to each Committee member prior to the meeting for review - those opposed and/or accepting of the projects. (APPENDIX "A" TO THESE MINUTES.) The Committee's attention was called to Table I of the memorandum, "Projects Requesting Funding, November 1984"

(SEE PAGE 11 OF THESE MINUTES)

Rank	Project Name	Req	Sponsor Name	Score	LWCF	Bonds	1 215	IAC Total	Sponsor Share	Project Total	%
1	Chuckanut Bay Tidelands	3	Bellingham, City of	172.6	136,230	0	0	136,230	136,230	272,460	50
2	Freshwater Bay Development Proj	1	Clallam County Parks	157.7	39,900	0	39,900	79,800	79,800	159,600	50
3	Public Boat Ramp Acquisition	3	Friday Harbor, Port of	166.7	50,000	0	100,000	150,000	300,000	450,000	50
4	Quanning's Property Acquisition	4	Tacoma Park District	163.7	120,000	0	30,000	150,000	743,000	893,000	50
5	Possession Point Waterfront Pk	3	South Whidbey Island, Port of	162.0	50,000	0	100,000	150,000	420,000	570,000	50
6	Alder Lake Recreation Area Ph2	4	Tacoma Dept of Public Utilities	161.5	100,000	0	50,000	150,000	756,600	906,600	50
7	Brackett's Landing Improvement	4	Edmonds, City of	160.3	95,528	0	0	95,528	95,528	191,056	50
8	Van Doren's Landing Park	4	Ken Park Department	159.0	111,000	0	0	111,000	111,000	222,000	50
9	South Lake Union Park	4	Seattle, City of	158.5	150,000	0	0	150,000	305,000	455,000	50
10	Kleegard Co. Park Renov/Devel	12	Whitman County P & R Dept.	157.1	79,800	0	0	79,800	79,800	159,600	50
11	Island Lake County Park	4	Kitsap County Parks Dept.	155.8	150,000	0	0	150,000	156,200	306,200	49
12	Waterfront Park Acquisition	4	Manchester, Port of	155.0	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000	200,000	50
13	Hose Valley Park Development	6	Skamania County	154.4	0	150,000	0	150,000	249,680	399,680	50
14	Port Orchard Visiting Boat Mrg	4	Brewerton, Port of	154.0	0	0	133,715	133,715	133,715	267,430	50
15	City Mooring Dock Extension	4	Sig Harbor, City of	152.0	0	0	33,400	33,400	33,400	66,800	50
16	Silverdale Waterfront Improv.	4	Silverdale, Port of	151.7	0	0	150,000	150,000	310,962	460,962	50
17	Waterfront Park	3	Coupeville, Town of	149.8	53,803	0	0	53,803	53,803	107,606	50
18	Poweroy Pool	13	Poweroy, City of	149.8	150,000	0	0	150,000	154,399	304,398	49
19	La Conner Guest Moorage	3	Skagit County, Port of	149.6	0	0	72,539	72,539	72,540	145,079	50
20	Martha Washington Park	4	Seattle, City of	147.2	150,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
21	Hillyard Pool Renovation	12	Spokane, City of	146.6	150,000	0	0	150,000	814,217	964,217	50
22	Boat Launch/Waterfront Park	6	Ridgefield, Town of	146.1	0	0	133,000	133,000	133,000	266,000	50
23	Lake Geneva Waterfront Park Dv	4	King County	146.0	100,605	0	0	100,605	100,605	201,210	50
24	Chattaroy Community Center	12	Riverside School District 416	143.9	110,992	0	0	110,992	110,992	221,984	50
25	Hund Memorial Park Development	9	Mattawa, Town of	143.6	63,115	0	0	63,115	63,115	126,230	50
26	City Beach Park Phase I	3	Oak Harbor, City of	142.1	149,931	0	0	149,931	149,932	299,863	50
27	Sand Hill Park Development Ph1	5	Mason County Parks	140.0	60,320	0	0	60,320	60,320	120,640	50
28	Prairie Elem. School Comm Rec.	5	Yelm School District	139.2	150,000	0	0	150,000	192,500	342,500	44
29	Dulbertson Memorial Park	2	Long Beach, Town/Ocean Sch S.D.	139.1	90,125	0	0	90,125	90,125	180,250	50
30	Beachview Park Improvement Proj	13	Clarkston, City of	138.1	150,000	0	0	150,000	204,984	354,984	42
31	Leslie Groves Park Phase 4 Dev	10	Richland, City of	137.7	0	150,000	0	150,000	207,600	357,600	42
32	Flowing Lake Co. Pk. Boating	4	Snohomish County P & R Div.	137.4	0	0	78,020	78,020	78,021	156,041	50
33	Marina Expansion-Transient Mrg	4	Edmonds, Port of	137.0	0	0	150,000	150,000	186,475	336,475	44
34	Horn Rapids Park Phase I Devel	10	Benton County P & R Dept.	132.2	150,000	0	0	150,000	200,000	350,000	42
35	Long Lake Park Development	5	Lacey, City of	132.0	150,000	0	0	150,000	194,500	344,500	45
36	Riverfront Park Tennis Court	11	Cusick, Town of	131.9	18,000	0	9,000	27,000	27,000	54,000	50
37	City Property Recreation Comp	11	Newport, City of	131.5	78,891	0	0	78,891	78,891	157,782	50
38	Recreational Expansion	9	Washtucna School District	128.3	66,300	0	0	66,300	66,300	132,600	50
39	Multi-purpose Field - Baseball	12	Oakdale, Town of	126.9	14,105	0	0	14,105	14,105	28,210	50
40	Coupeville Wharf Rehab & Impro	3	Coupeville, Port of	126.3	0	0	19,250	19,250	19,250	38,500	50
41	Kayak Point Co. Pk. Boating Fc	4	Snohomish County P & R Div.	125.1	0	0	37,346	37,346	37,347	74,693	50
42	Preston-Snoqualmie Trail Exten	4	King County	124.2	150,000	0	0	150,000	359,190	509,190	29
43	Nespelem Community Recrtn Park	7	Colville Confederated Tribes	119.1	114,437	0	0	114,437	114,438	228,875	50
44	Battle Point Park	4	Bainbridge Island P & R Dist.	119.1	83,750	0	0	83,750	83,750	167,500	50
45	Fairview School Ath. Facility	4	Central Kitsap School Dist 401	117.3	80,000	0	0	80,000	80,000	160,000	50
46	Riverfront Park	6	Longview, Port of	114.8	103,500	0	0	103,500	103,500	207,000	50
47	Siebethaler Park	4	Sumner, City of	113.6	78,106	0	0	78,106	78,106	156,212	50
48	Goldsmith Park Development	4	Bellevue Parks & Recreation	109.7	132,000	0	0	132,000	132,000	264,000	50
49	Grange Park Phase I Development	10	Kennewick, City of	108.3	133,822	0	0	133,822	133,822	267,644	50
50	Waterway Trail	2	Ocean Shores, City of	108.2	0	0	19,100	19,100	19,100	38,200	50
51	Golden Terrace Park	6	Goldendale, City of	105.4	13,350	0	0	13,350	13,350	26,700	50
52	Eastside Park	4	Enumclaw, City of	89.9	51,670	0	0	51,670	51,670	103,340	50
53	Little Mountain Viewpoint Park	3	Mount Vernon, City of	89.0	140,300	0	0	140,300	140,300	280,600	50
54	Willapaette Ball Field Complex	10	West Richland, City of	88.4	132,488	0	0	132,488	132,488	264,976	50

Mr. Mackey asked whether it would be possible to fund two more projects with the increased Federal funds mentioned earlier. Without knowing the actual amount, Mr. Webster said perhaps one project or a portion of one could be funded. Mr. Wilder stated Init. 215 and LWCF funds available for this funding session would be committed, and that any additional monies coming from LWCF would be figured into the calculations with a last project or portion thereof being funded. He informed the Committee there had been a rescission of LWCF monies one year recently, but that it was his hope Congress would not institute this again.

Mr. Webster noted that Initiative 215 monies could only be used for boating related projects as indicated in the funding tabulation (Table I), and \$150,000 in bond funds had been noted for two projects, respectively. Following established procedure, he stated each project would be presented to the Committee, utilizing slides and verbal summaries by the Project Services staff. Following staff presentations, the funding recommendations would then be presented to the Committee for its consideration. As in the past, staff had shared with the sponsors as a guideline funding levels of fifty percent IAC and fifty percent local participation.

At this point, the Chairman reminded members of the audience that if they wished to testify on behalf of any project (or in opposition to it), they should complete a Participation Registration Card for use of the Chairman.

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

- 85-063A Chuckanut Bay Tidelands, City of Bellingham: Mr. Mackey was informed that the Padilla Bay area was a considerable distance from this particular project.
- 85-033D City of Edmonds, Brackett's Landing Improvements: Mr. Fairleigh informed Mr. Mackey this was not a third phase project, that the City had received a total of three grants totaling \$353,447. The project would be funded at \$191,056 - 50% IAC; 50% local.
- 85-066A Port of Manchester, Land Acquisition-Waterfront Park: Mr. Taylor informed the Committee this project had been withdrawn, the General Obligation bonds proposed for the area having been defeated at the November 6th election.
- 85-017D Skamania County, Home Valley Park Development: Mr. Taylor pointed out this project was not eligible for Initiative 215 funds nor Land and Water Funds, and would therefore need to be funded from State Bond monies.
- 85-047D Town of Ridgefield, Waterfront Park - Boat Launching Facilities: Mr. Taylor stated a portion of local funds would come from the Department of Fisheries' Local Enhancement Fund; however, a portion of that fund is for the Department of Game and Fisheries to be used for certain activities. A portion of that fund is to be distributed to state agencies and local agencies through another process; thus, there is no definite assurance that the local funding is there for the project. There would need to be funding arrangements between Fisheries and Game. Mr. Tveten was informed \$25,000 was the amount involved from that particular fund.

o5-011D Riverside School District, #416, Chattaroy Community Center: In response to Mrs. Warden's questions, Mr. Fairleigh stated this project would be a part of the school complex, and matching funds would come from school funds.

Mrs. Whitfield complimented staff on the graphics being used in the slide presentations. They are most helpful in understanding where the projects are and specifics in the projects being funded.

85-032D Yelm School District, Community Recreation Facilities: Mrs. Warden asked why development funds were being considered for a school district since she felt they already had funds for this purpose. Mr. Taylor explained they have local levies to obtain capital funds, but these are inadequate to do the job. In the interests of providing a recreation complex for the community -- for use by all citizens -- school districts may apply for IAC funding over and above their normal facilities development.

85-001D Benton County, Parks and Recreation Dept., Phase I Development/Horn Rapids Park: The location of this park to the Off-Road Vehicle Horn Rapids Park was indicated for Mr. Mackey. Mrs. Warden noted that since the two were fairly near each other, people using the ORV Park might also take advantage of using the camping facilities at this park.

Staff concluded projects presentations at 11:43 a.m.

Chairman Jessup thanked staff for their well-coordinated slide program, their work and efforts over the past months, and their dedication to the communities applying for grant-in-aid funding.

For the record Mr. Mackey pointed out #12 on Table 1 - Port of Manchester, Waterfront Park Acquisition project and #44, Bainbridge Island Park and Recreation District, Battle Point Park project had been WITHDRAWN by the sponsors.

Mr. Jessup reminded the local agencies' sponsors that they could re-submit their projects for another funding session to be evaluated anew with all projects received for that session.

Mr. Tveten commented on Projects #6, #13, #22, and #50:

#6 - Tacoma Dept. of Public Utilities, Alder Lake Recreation Area, Ph 2: Felt that the project was an excellent idea; one that would bring in another resource to enhance public recreation opportunities at Alder lake.

#13 - Skamania County, Home Valley Park Development: Believed this to be an excellent site for recreation opportunities. Because it is a first phase of a combined regional waterfront day-use and overnight facility, it will enhance recreation as provided by other agencies.

#22 - Town of Ridgefield, Boat Launch/Waterfront Park: Asked for explanation of the monies to come from Force Account, Department of Fisheries. Since staff could not assure these funds would be available, suggested the project be in phase I and phase stages, leaving the Force Account monies out of the first phase. Felt the Committee would be placing itself in a difficult position if it approved this project including the Force Account money, and then found later that the Legislature did not approve it.

#50 - Ocean Shores, City of, Waterway Trail: Thought this was a meritorious project, one that is needed in that area, and hoped that the IAC would be able to fund it.

Mr. Jessup again reminded the audience of the limited funding at this session, and asked that all local sponsors continue to lend their assistance wherever possible toward obtaining additional funding for the IAC to fund worthy park and recreation projects. He especially asked for their help and cooperation in contacting legislators, particularly those newly elected, to ensure that they understand the park and recreation needs of the state and the role the IAC plays in filling that need. Mr. Wilder corroborated Mr. Jessup's statements, noting that this funding session had been one of the most difficult for the IAC. The need for additional funding is critical and those who benefit from the IAC programs will need to draw attention to the needs in parks and recreation. He brought out the fact that there would be a new Governor in Olympia, with a "new" Legislature, and the support of local sponsors and potential sponsors will be helpful in the upcoming days.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Projects staff distributed to the Committee and the audience memorandum dated November 13, 1984, "Local Agencies Project Funding Recommendations." Mr. Webster cited the criteria used in the recommendation:

- Amount of available funding for local projects
- Source of funding and relative restrictions.
- Relative ranking of the fifty-four (54) projects as determined through the Evaluation System.
- Suggested funding guidelines of maximum of 50 percent IAC participation with a \$150,000 ceiling.
- The attempt to fund as many worthy projects as possible.

A revised AVAILABLE FUNDING BREAKDOWN was distributed as follows: (Dated 11-13-84)

Source	Total	LWCF	INIT. 215	STATE BOND
Cash on Hand (Fund Summary)	\$ 421,212	\$ 114,292	\$ 192,346	\$ 114,574
Less: Langley Cost Inc.	-100,000	-	-100,000	-
Project Receipts:				
Estimated apportionment	600,000	600,000	-0-	-0-
Estimated Reapportionment	22,387	22,387	-0-	-0-
Estimated Receipts 215	578,800	-0-	578,800	-0-
Estimated Proj. Closures	69,412	-0-	-0-	69,412
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$ 1,591,811</b>	<b>\$ 736,679</b>	<b>\$ 671,146</b>	<b>\$ 183,986</b>
Possible additional LWCF	100,000	100,000	-0-	-0-
	<b>\$ 1,691,811</b>	<b>\$ 836,679</b>	<b>\$ 671,146</b>	<b>\$ 183,986</b>

Mr. Webster then informed the Committee that the staff recommendations would be contingent on a final apportionment amount of at least \$600,000 LWCF being received.

The projects as listed on page 15 of these minutes were recommended for funding by staff:



Following the reading of staff recommendations for funding, it was determined that the additional LWCF funds could be incorporated into the funding program for the local agencies "contingent" upon receipt of such LWCF funds.

#13 - Skamania County, Home Valley Park Development: In the ensuing discussion on the Home Valley Park Development project, it was brought out by staff that \$249,680 was being given to the County by the Federal Corps of Engineers. This plus the state bond money of \$150,000 made up the total project cost. Mr. Tveten stated he knew there were insufficient funds in the bond monies, but he felt the matching ratio of \$249,680 and \$150,000 was excellent and the IAC should attempt to fund that project. Mr. Taylor mentioned the money from the Corps would be available only this fiscal year. Mr. Tveten then stated the situation was critical and that if it were at all possible the Corps money should be accepted and the project funded through the IAC. He asked if the other projects using bond monies (#6 - Tacoma PUD, Alder Lake Recreation Area, Ph. 2; #8 - Kent Parks Department, Van Doren's Land Park; and #9 - City of Seattle, South Lake Union Park) could use other funds thus freeing some bond monies for the Home Valley Project. It was also brought out that there were additional funds in the City of Bellingham's project since it would be reducing its project by \$15,000. Mr. Webster totaled the amount available and came up with \$125,000 in bond monies. Mr. Jessup noted that the Committee, if it adjusted its funding, would be doing so without destroying its evaluation and scoring schedule.

The fact that the Committee, if it approved funding for the Home Valley Project, would be by-passing Project #11 - Kitsap County Parks Dept., Island Lake County Park, was mentioned by Mr. Webster. This project would be next in line for consideration in the event there were additional monies available. Mr. Larry Cote, Park Project Coordinator, Kitsap County Parks, was asked for his remarks. He informed the Committee that the Island Lake County Park project was in a populated area, centrally located; whereas, the only other park nearby is Wildcat Lake, which is receiving considerable use, and in fact is over-crowded at times for swimming. If the park were funded it would alleviate this pressure. Another project at Horseshoe Lake is far away from the populated area. The County, he said, is developing rapidly and population is increasing. The need for the park is desperate and he requested the Committee's careful consideration for funding.

Mr. Tveten felt the Home Valley Park area was a prime site for industrial development, and it would be lost to recreation if it did not receive funding. If the Corps does not find a local sponsor, the land will be released for non-recreational use. He felt this was detrimental to the IAC's program in locating areas of critical need and assisting communities to establish parks in those locations. Mr. Wilder reminded the Committee that staff recommendations were not based on the assumption there would be additional LWCF monies. If the Committee were to fund the Home Valley Project, it will need to work out some kind of an amendment to the recommendations of staff.

At this point, Chairman Jessup called for comments from Local Sponsors as logged on the Participation Registration Cards.

COMMENTS FROM PROJECT SPONSORS:

Honorable Brad Gingerich, Mayor, City of Pomeroy (Pomeroy Pool #85-048D):

1. Read a letter to the Committee concerning the Pomeroy Pool project.

2. Ranked 18th over all; highest non-waterfront project.
3. Felt the Evaluation System gives an unfair advantage to those projects which have waterfront.
4. If any monies remaining at this session, would like to have the Pomeroy project considered for some of that money.
5. Pomeroy Pool is the only supervised water access in the entire county; may need to be closed if does not get the needed repairs and renovation.
6. Applied for the funds in cooperation with Garfield County, and Garfield County is the only county in the state that has never received funds.

Mrs. Warden asked if the county-wide bond issue passed in the amount of \$200,000 in support of the project would still apply even though the project did not receive IAC funding. The Mayor replied it would, but it would not be possible to bring the pool up to the necessary improved level. Renovation needs are so great the items need to be done at the same time. Mr. Wilder noted that in a "normal" funding session, it would have been possible to reach the Pomeroy Pool project. Due to extremely limited funds, it was not possible to do so. Honorable Mark A. Hedman, Mayor of Mattawa, referred to C-1 and C-2 in the Evaluation System:

"C-1 Does the project provide boating access and/or boating destination facilities? 0 to 10 points.

"C-2 Does the project provide public access to water other than related boating? 0 to 10 points."

These, he felt, were slanted towards waterfront type projects and were a disadvantage to any other park project.

Mrs. Whitfield asked why there was this emphasis on boating projects. Mr. Wilder gave a short history of the Initiative 215, 1964 Marine Recreation Land Act, and its stipulation that monies must be in boater-related projects. The Evaluation System has been revised to indicate that boater-oriented facilities are the highest in the State of Washington -- this includes public access, marinas, etc. There are many types of water access, including rivers, lakes, etc. Mayor Hedman felt that the boaters already receive their share through Initiative 215, and eastside communities -- the smaller communities -- do not have any resource of this nature. The Mayor mentioned Section D-1 of the Evaluation System:

"D-1 To what extent does the project meet outdoor recreation needs as identified in local and state comprehensive plans (maximum 30 points)"

He felt the population breakdown was biased in the point system. 100,000 and above receive 10 points - 10,000 and below, 4 points.

Mr. Wilder stated he had instructed staff to give additional attention to the smaller communities where the need is great. This has been done, but, again, due to limited funding at this session, it was not possible to fund below the 14th project. He also stated the IAC is responding in its funding recommendations to the legislative mandate that parks and recreational areas be funded in the urban areas. Not only State Parks but the IAC have been asked to ensure consideration is given to urban areas where the population is greatest.

James Ford, Consultant, Central Kitsap School Dist #401 (Fairview School Athletic Facility 85-012D): Deferred.

Jeff Snider, City Administrator, City of Gig Harbor (City Mooring Boat Extension 85-049D): Thanked the Committee for funding the Gig Harbor project. Appreciated the opportunity to submit an application and staff's assistance in carrying it through the various steps.

Larry Hendrickson, Manager, Port of Skagit County (Guest Moorage, La Conner - Replacement Float 85-013D):

1. Would be next in line if there had been sufficient Initiative 215 funds.
2. Had excellent support from the staff and appreciated their assistance.
3. Will be back at next funding session. Understand the situation in limited resources at this meeting.

Honorable Mark Hedman, Mayor, Town of Mattawa (Hund Memorial Park Development 85-041D):

1. Mattawa project #25 on the schedule. Disappointed in Evaluation System. ~~(Delete) -> end agreed with remarks of Mayor Hedman, Mattawa.~~ First twenty questions are to the benefit of water-oriented projects.
2. Funding to the smaller communities is a "drop in the bucket" compared to the larger urban areas.
3. Noted that project #24, Riverside School District #416, Chattaroy Community Center, is the first project with athletic fields, a needed recreational outlet. The other 23 projects do not have any active recreational facilities in them.

Nabiel Shawa, City Administrator, City of Long Beach (Culbertson Memorial Park, 85-0140): Understood the dilemma of staff and the Committee in the present funding crisis. Will be back next year for further consideration of this project.

Tom Leggiere, Consultant for Port of Silverdale ( Silverdale Waterfront Improvement 85-045D) - (And R. Terry Fenton, Consultant):

1. Discussed with Ron Taylor funding projects below those recommended; felt there is considerable cost, time and effort into putting together a viable application.
2. Suggested holding projects over to the next session for recommendations in 1985.

Mr. Wilder pointed out the Committee and staff had historically kept the IAC grant-in-aid program on a Open Competitive Basis each funding session. Each session includes projects which are at that time considered to be the most critical and are addressing the highest priority needs for those particular communities throughout the state. Some communities are "waiting in the wings" and eventually are able to apply. They should be judged with others received at the same time - scored and evaluated accordingly. The Chairman encouraged those local agencies not funded at this session to return under the Open Competitive program.

At this point Ruth Anderson, National Park Service Planner, addressed the Committee. She explained that the State of Washington would receive the additional LWCF monies because those states that had met their expenditure targets for the Fiscal Year were being "rewarded". The extra funds, she said, could be \$200,000, but at this point LWCF funds have not been apportioned to the states.

Mr. Wilder pointed out it had not been just the IAC staff and Committee who had brought this about, but the local sponsors, state agencies, etc., who had the responsibility to expend the funds in a timely manner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING DISCUSSION: Mr. Webster was asked to read the revised recommendations of staff (SEE PAGE 20 - AS SUBSEQUENTLY PASSED BY THE IAC). Funding for the Bellingham project had been decreased by \$15,000 (Chuckanut Bay Tidelands); Three projects had altered funding for additional Land Water Conservation Funding (Alder Lake Recreation Area Ph. 2; Van Doren's Landing Park; South Lake Union Park); other funding changes were made in other projects as indicated on Page 20 of these minutes. In addition, the Committee added the Home Valley Park Development Project, Skamania County, \$125,000 Bond monies for funding. Mr. Webster asked that there be a stipulation in the motion of the Committee that projects with Land and Water Conservation funds are being recommended for funding contingent upon receipt of LWCF funding, and that it is agreeable with Skamania County and the Corps of Engineers that the \$125,000 in bond monies will be an acceptable figure for acceptance of the \$249,680 from the Corps.

Mr. Tveten outlined the funding of the projects one through 10 and #14, #15, #16, with the addition of #13, Home Valley Park Development. MR. TVETEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MACKAY, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 20 OF THESE MINUTES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON NOVEMBER 15, 1979, AND

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

WITH THE STIPULATION THAT LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDING SO APPROVED IN THESE PROJECTS IS CONTINGENT UPON RECEIPT OF THESE FUNDS FROM THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND, FURTHER,

THAT IT IS AGREEABLE WITH SKAMANIA COUNTY THAT \$125,000 IN BOND MONIES IS AN ACCEPTABLE FIGURE FOR GRANT-IN-AID TO ITS HOME VALLEY PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (IAC 85-017D) IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE \$249,680 FROM THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 20 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

-----

Mr. Mackey in his second to the motion had asked if it would be possible to fund the Kitsap County, Island Lake County Park Project, should there be any substantial savings in IAC grant-in-aid monies already committed. Mr. Wilder explained it was difficult to accomplish this since the IAC must retain a small reserve to meet other contingencies that do occur.

PROJECTS - LOCAL - APPROVED NOVEMBER 13, 1984 IAC MEETING - TYEE, OLYMPIA

Pg. 20  
IAC Minutes  
11-13-84

PROJECT	SPONSOR	LWCF	BONDS	INIT. 215	LOCAL	TOT
Chuckanut Bay Tidelands	Bellingham	128,730	0	0	128,730	257,460
Freshwater Bay Dev.	Clallam Co. Pks	39,900	0	39,900	79,800	159,600
Public Board Ramp Acq.	Friday Harbor, Port	47,000	0	103,000	300,000	450,000
Cummings Property Acq.	Tacoma Park Dist.	110,000	0	40,000	743,000	893,000
P session Point Wtrft. Acq.	So. Whidbey Is. Port	50,000	0	100,000	420,000	570,000
Alder Lake Rec. Area #2	Tacoma PUD	90,000	0	60,000	756,600	906,600
Brackett's Landing Improv.	Edmonds, City of	95,528	0	0	95,528	191,056
Van Doren's Landing Pk.	Kent Pks. Dept.	111,000	0	0	111,000	222,000
South Lake Union Pk. Acq.	Seattle, City of	101,292	48,708	0	305,000	455,000
Klemgard Co. Pk. Renov.	Whitman Co. P&R	79,800	0	0	79,800	159,600
Home Valley Pk. Dev.	Skamania Co.	0	125,000	0	249,680	374,680
Port Orchard Boat Mrg.	Bremerton, Port of	0	0	133,715	133,715	267,430
City Mooring Dock Ext.	Gig Harbor, City of	0	0	33,400	33,400	66,800
Silverdale Waterft. Imp.	Silverdale, Port of	0	0	150,000	310,962	460,962
		853,250	173,708	660,015	3,747,215	5,434,188

(14 projects: 4 acq.; 10 dev.)

LWCF \$ 853,250  
Bonds 173,708  
215 660,015

Local: \$ 3,747,215  
IAC: 1,686,973  
\$ 5,434,188

1,686,973 total IAC funding.

Legislation Items: Mr. Jessup and Mr. Wilder commented on the proposed legislation for funding sources to enhance the IAC grant-in-aid program. These included:

1. Short-Term General Obligation Bonds - \$12 million 1985-87 Biennium: Emphasis to be placed on rehabilitation and renovation of existing facilities; match federal/local allocations for park and recreation purposes.
2. Redirection of the Camper-Trailer Excise Tax: To the Outdoor Recreation Account for use to fund outdoor recreation projects, IAC.
3. New Organization - Friends of Parks: Outgrowth of Governor's Recreation Resource Advisory Committee. Will focus on legislation in behalf of IAC for its funding programs.

Mr. Pretti expressed his appreciation to the staff and to the Committee for their leadership and efforts. As a former member, he was aware of the deliberations necessary to bring these projects before the Committee. He was proud of the process and felt it would be an effective one for a long time.

The Committee recessed at 1:03.

Reconvened: 2:15 p.m.

QUORUM: WHITFIELD, JESSUP, MACKAY, WARDEN, TVETEN (BRIAN BOYLE ARRIVED LATER FOR THE AFTERNOON SESSION).

Introductions: Mr. Greg Lovelady introduced the following members of the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee:

Ms. Carol Jensen  
Mr. Tommy Thomson, Chairman, ORVAC  
George Volker, Dept. of Game

Mr. Pelton introduced Ruth Ittner, Chairman of the State Trails Advisory Committee.

The Chairman asked that the Committee turn to agenda item III. OLD BUSINESS.

B. Budgets:

B. IAC State Agencies 1985-87 Capital Budget: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "1985/87 IAC State Agencies' Capital Budget". As presented to the Office of Financial Management; the budget request consisted of two parts: Standard Capital Projects and Employment/Lands Improvement Projects:

Standard -- Dept. of Fisheries	\$ 3,217,000
Dept. of Game	1,691,500
Dept. of Natl. Resources	547,100
Parks and Rec. Commission	<u>4,623,700</u>
	\$ 10,080,000

(continued next page)

Employment/	--	Department of Game	\$	82,000	
Lands Improve.		Parks & Recreation Commission		718,000	
		General Administration Dept.		<u>200,000</u>	
					\$ 1,000,000

[Correction was made to indicate the Dept. of General Administration to receive \$200,000, not General Services Administration.]

The beautification of State Parks' facilities throughout the State through the Small Business Administration landscaping program was commented upon by Mr. Tveten. Many letters and verbal comments are being received about these renovation efforts from citizens and visitors to our state. He felt the program was a good one and recommended it be continued as outlined in the IAC's State Agencies' Capital Budget.

1985-87 Proposed Operating Budget: Mr. Stan Scott, Chief, Management Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "1985-87 Proposed Operating Budget - OFM Hearing", and reported as follows:

1. Total amount of \$25,151,799 for 1985-87 Operating Budget.
2. Submitted to the Office of Financial Management on August 29, 1984.
3. Conference held between representatives of OFM and IAC on October 24, 1984, 4:30 p.m.
4. Presentation consisted of flip charts/visual aids/concept of "Project 89"/ tremendous need for parks and recreation at all levels of government/ modest increase requested for additional programs/ and urgent need for state funding.
5. OFM reaction was friendly - but noncommittal at this stage.
6. Inquiries were:
  - a. ORV Plan update - and strategies to be used to accomplish this.
  - b. Recreation Guide - direction and focus to accomplish the job required by statute with minimum of expenditure from the Outdoor Recreation Account.
  - c. Obligations that are carried over to next biennium - needs, explanations, etc.
  - d. New funding for next biennium explained.

Introduction: Mr. Wilder introduced Commissioner Brian Boyle, Department of Natural Resources.

---

#### 1984 OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS PRESENTATIONS

At 2:30 p.m., Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, concerning the off-road vehicles' projects being proposed for funding. He called to the Committee's attention letters on various ORV projects (for and against) which had been received on specific projects and which had been mailed to the Committee members for review. (APPENDIX B TO THESE MINUTES).

Mr. Lovelady reported as follows:

1. A total of 33 projects were received for consideration. One withdrew; three were returned because they were incomplete. Since receipt by the Committee members of this memorandum in the kit, another project withdrew: ORV 31-P, Spokane, Deer Park Comprehensive Plan. Twenty-eight projects remain for Committee consideration.

2. Categories are: development, management, plans, coordination, and education/enforcement.
3. Approximately \$1.8 million of ORV deposits to ORA are available for allocation. Sponsor requests totaled: \$1,881,764.
4. All projects were reviewed and evaluated by the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee.
5. Attachments to the kit memo included:
  - I - 1984 Agency Request, by Category
  - IA - ORVAC Recommendations, by Category
  - IIA - 1984 Project Evaluation Scores, by Category
  - IIB - ORV Project Evaluation Format
  - III - 1984 ORV Project Summary

Slides of each ORV project were then shown by staff.... 10 development; 6 education/enforcement; 5 maintenance and operations; 7 plans and 1 coordinator.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE: During the presentation the following projects received comments from the Committee:

84-4D - Wenatchee Natl. Forest - McDonald Ridge Trail: Mrs. Warden asked if these trails would be for dirt bikes. Mr. Lovelady replied they would be multi-purpose trails, but the Committee would be considering support based solely on ORV usage.

84-17E - Thurston Safety Education: Mr. Lovelady explained this project was separate from the Thurston Grays-Harbor Sports Park. It is a safety/education program to reduce ORV related conflicts, promote safety, etc., in the Thurston-Grays Harbor area.

84-18M - Thurston ORV Park M/O 1985: Mr. Mackey questioned why office supplies were included in the operations of this facility. These could be furnished by the parks department. Mr. Lovelady pointed out this park was entirely funded through off-road vehicle funds for its maintenance and operations, and office supplies were a part of the project. In response to Mrs. Warden's question, Mr. Lovelady stated the project for maintenance and operation is submitted annually, and it is up to the Committee to judge the merits of ORVAC and staff recommendations.

84-20M - City of Richland, Horn Rapids ORV Park M/O: Mr. Jessup asked where the sponsor was getting the ten percent of funding from the project. Mr. Lovelady stated this would come from their ORV park gate receipts. This park is able to assist itself to this amount and every dollar they contribute is actually a contribution to other ORV areas since they are not using up to that amount. He explained that in the case of the Thurston County ORV Park, it was not possible to apply the gate receipts to this same level because that Park was in a debt status and they use gate receipt money to apply toward eradicating the debt.

84-30M - Riverside State Park ORV - M&O - State Parks & Rec. Commission: Mr. Lovelady noted that this project would be for a two year funding period.

At this point, Mr. Boyle asked if staff had comparative budgets for each one of the projects in the last couple of funding periods. Mr. Lovelady read

the figures for calendar years 1983 and 84 for Yakima County 84-15M, Thurston County 84-18M, and 84-20M, City of Richland. He noted that project 84-30M, State Parks' Riverside State Park ORV M&O had not been considered last biennium.

84-1P - Tinkham Trials Planning Area, USFS, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Natl. Forest:  
In response to Mrs. Warden's questions, Mr. Lovelady explained the need for observed trials recreation events, that this project would develop a plan and complete an inventory as to need in the area. This area, when developed, would be for the 2-wheeler recreationist, providing a rougher type of use area. This is an activity that is increasing and is becoming a popular sport.

At 3:15 p.m., staff distributed memorandum dated November 13, 1983, "Off-Road Vehicle Projects - Funding Recommendations", which included a listing of projects as recommended by ORVAC and as recommended by staff of the IAC together with a "Key to ORVAC and Staff Comments". (SEE PAGE 24A OF THESE MINUTES for listing of projects as recommended by ORVAC and staff.)

Mr. Lovelady stated the recommendations were based on information collected from site inspections, personnel interviews, and document reviews. Evaluation meeting was held with IAC's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee. Precepts which guided staff in making recommendations were:

1. Allow program to develop slowly/conservatively - especially in the area of developments;
2. Maintain education/enforcement projects at a high priority;
3. Ensure due process is followed in assessing environmental impacts;
4. Adequate planning is essential to long-term success of the program.

He explained each development project had undergone environmental analysis and public hearings. Some of the planning projects also were subject to an environmental analysis.

Staff recommended this year that the support level for non-capital projects be 50 percent of the estimated available ORV monies; for capital projects, it was set at 38 percent. Mr. Lovelady outlined reasons for the recommended deviation from IAC policy. Staff felt that intensive-use park developments should progress slowly - thus, funding for such projects is recommended significantly below requested levels. Another reason was lack of capital land acquisition proposals this year. He again noted that 84-031P, Spokane County Parks', Deer Park ORV Park, had been withdrawn.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

84-6D - Sawtooth Area Trailhead, Signs - USFS, Wenatchee National Forest: Mr. Jessup asked why staff had deleted the loading ramp in this project. Mr. Lovelady stated most users bring their own with them and it was decided the ramp was not necessary in the project.

84-10D - Little Pend Oreille ORV Trail Segment 1, Colville National Forest and 84-8D - Klone Peak, North Tommy Trail Redevelopment, Wenatchee Natl. Forest:  
Mr. Mackey asked why one Forest (Colville) was contributing a sum of \$3,329 to a Trail project while the other Forest (Wenatchee) was not contributing anything. Mr. Lovelady stated Colville's contribution was in the form of labor.

#### ORVAC-Staff Differences:

The Committee asked Mr. Lovelady to cite the differences in ORVAC and staff

## - ORV PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS - 1984 -

Project Number	Sponsor Name	Project Name	Request	Recommendations *	
				ORVAC	Notes
DEVELOPMENTS					
84-003D	USFS Wenatchee NF CleElum RD	Manastash Blowout-Blazed Trail Proj	\$ 59,258	\$ 59,258	\$ 59,250
84-004D	USFS Wenatchee NF Lk. Wen RD	McDonald Ridge Trail	185,107	185,107	185,100
84-005D	USFS Wenatchee NF Naches RD	Mt. Clifty-Quartz Mt. Loop	57,042	57,042 (1)	57,000
84-006D	USFS Wenatchee NF Chelan RD	Sawtooth Area Trailhead, Signs	7,990	7,500 (2)	7,500 (A)
84-008D	USFS Wenatchee NF Entiat RD	Klone Peak-No. Tommy Trail Redevel.	87,776	87,776	87,750
84-010D	USFS Colville NF Colville RD	Little Pend Greille ORV Trail Seg 1	65,200	65,200	65,200
84-012D	USFS Colville NF Newport RD	Batey-Bould Trail - Phase 2	76,135	76,135	76,100
84-016D	Yakima County ORV Program	Yakima County ORV Park Development	131,085	63,965 (3)	38,200 (B)
84-019D	Thurston County Parks	ORV Sports Park Development	38,900	17,775 (4)	17,750 (C)
84-021D	Richland	Horn Rapids ORV Sports Park Dev 4	196,448	93,000 (5)	93,000 (D)
		Subtotal	\$ 904,941	\$ 712,758	\$ 686,850
EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT					
84-013E	Yakima County ORV Program	ORV Education/Enforcement 7	\$ 43,315	\$ 40,000 (6)	\$ 38,000 (E)
84-017E	Thurston County Parks	ORV Safety/Education Program 6	38,000	0 (7)	35,000 (F)
84-022E	Richland	Benton/Franklin ORV Educ/Enforc 3	32,688	32,688	32,650 (G)
84-023E	Grant County Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement 2	75,952	55500/37000 (8)	73,300 (H)
84-024E	Kittitas County Sheriff	ORV Education/Enforcement 7	116,919	74,000 (9)	75,600 (I)
84-025E	Chelan & Douglas Counties	Coop ORV Education/Enforcement 6	68,464	60000/37000 (10)	61,500 (J)
		Subtotal	\$ 375,338	\$262,188/220,688	\$ 316,050
MANAGEMENT					
84-007M	USFS Wenatchee NF Chelan RD	Sawtooth Area Trail Maintenance	\$ 7,000	\$ 10,000 (11)	\$ 4,800 (K)
84-015M	Yakima County ORV Program	Suntargets ORV Park M & O - 1985	75,150	60,000 (12)	60,000 (L)
84-018M	Thurston County Parks	ORV Sports Park M & O - 1985	161,859	124,000	140,700 (M)
84-020M	Richland	Horn Rapids ORV Sports Park M & O	100,176	100,176	100,150
84-030M	State Parks & Recreation Com	Riverside State Park ORV M&O 85-87	160,905	70,000 (13)	160,900 (N)
84-027C	Yakima County ORV Program	ORV Program Coordinator	27,122	27,122	26,600 (R)
		Subtotal	\$ 532,212	\$ 391,298	\$ 493,150
PLANS & STUDIES					
84-001P	USFS MtBkr-Snoq North Bend RD	Tinkham Trials Planning Area	\$ 8,393	\$ 8,393 (14)	\$ 8,350 (O)
84-002P	USFS Sit-Pin NF Supvr Office	Comprehensive Forest ORV Plan	13,000	13,000 (14)	13,000 (O)
84-009P	USFS Wenatchee NF Entiat RD	Chumstick Area 4x4 Environ. Analys.	7,331	7,331 (14)	7,300 (O)
84-014P	Yakima County ORV Program	Naches 4x4 Trail Rehab. Plan	5,000	5,000	0 (P)
84-026P	Othello	ORV Mini-Park Study	9,000	9,000	9,000 (O)
<del>84-031P</del>	<del>Spokane County Parks</del>	<del>Deer Park ORV Park</del>	<del>33,000</del>	<del>33,000 (15)</del>	<del>33,000 (O)</del>
84-032P	USFS Colville NF Kettle Fall	Scalawag ORV Road - Proposed	26,549	26,549	26,550 (O)
		Subtotal	\$ 102,273	\$ 102,273	\$ 64,200
			\$1,881,764	\$ 1,435,517/	1,560,250
				1,394,017	

\* Staff recommendations rounded down to the nearest \$50.

recommendations as noted on the accompanying "Key to ORVAC and Staff Comments".

84-16D - Yakima County ORV Program - Park Development: Mr. Lovelady stated staff had deleted a 9,500 gallon water storage tank. It had a low priority on the County's list and in recent discussions with them, they had agreed to delete it.

84-19D - Thurston County Parks - ORV Sports Park Development: Staff recommended a slow development for this phase of the park; funding is, however, the same as ORVAC. Mrs. Warden asked if the caretaker's residence and gazebo had been built before the County took over the park. Mr. Lovelady stated only the caretaker's resident had been there prior to that time. It was Mr. Mackey's feeling that this park is already in considerable debt, and he would find it difficult to renovate the caretaker's residence and do other replacement or improvement items as listed for this park. This should come from County funds. Mr. Lovelady stated the County's policy was not to use any General Fund monies for this park, that the support should come from the Off-Road Vehicle fund.

Mr. Earl Williams, Director, Parks and Recreation, Thurston County, was called upon for clarification as to the park's current situation. He gave the historical background concerning the park. Because it is a regional facility and because the majority of users are outside of the two counties (Grays Harbor and Thurston), Thurston County officials felt no money from the County should go into the park. Previous administration in the County Park and Recreation Department had expected the park to generate large amounts of revenue. Based on that, the facilities were put into operation through an IAC grant. The expected revenues did not come in and the debt occurred. Mr. Williams said there was still a hope that monies would come in and gate receipts are now being collected and used to pay off the debt.

There followed considerable discussion about the park and its debt situation. Mr. Tveten asked if the County Park and Recreation Dept. had entertained the idea of submitting an application retroactively for some of the facilities. Mr. Williams advised this had been discussed, but no formal request had been made. There will be a study made in 1985 to see how the park is being used and funded. Resolution of the debt will be done and this matter will be a part of the study to be conducted. Mr. Williams informed Mr. Tveten that approximately 30,000 to 40,000 people use the park during the year, depending on the events that are scheduled there.

Mr. Tveten then pointed out this was one of the largest and most significant ORV Sports Parks in the State of Washington. If the forthcoming gate money would be set aside by the County Park and Recreation Department to apply on the debt, it would be about seven years before it was paid. But, meanwhile, if the facility is not funded through the ORV receipts, the state would lose an effective, regional facility for ORV users. It was Mr. Tveten's opinion that the park receive the funding as recommended by staff. Mr. Mackey presumed that the County would be able with the improvements to increase its gate receipts through additional use, and thus close the gap on the debt. He appreciated the remarks of Mr. Williams, whom he knew to be recently appointed to the position of Director, Thurston County Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Boyle felt the discussion did not so much relate to one county as to all of the ORV projects being considered for funding. Two years ago, he pointed out, the IAC had gone through an analysis of the criteria that the Advisory Committee uses to evaluate the projects. After that discussion, there were one or more workshops

held; the Advisory Committee came up with criteria. He said he could see variations in ORVAC recommendations and the staff recommendations, and that he depended upon the ORVAC recommendations since they were the user groups. He asked why the rules seemed to have been changed in some instances. He said his inclination would be to "go" with ORVAC recommendation down the line unless staff could substantiate their comments.

Mr. Wilder acknowledged there would be differences of opinion between ORVAC and the staff. Standards need to be developed and have been. For instance, education/enforcement has been given a high priority from the Committee's perspective. The program has also moved too fast in some areas and it is time to slow down and evaluate the programs. Staff has met with ORVAC and stands ready to explain those differences.

Mr. Lovelady continued to report on the "Key to ORVAC and Staff Comments".

84-13E - Yakima County ORV Program - Education/Enforcement 7: ORVAC and staff are in agreement with staff's recommendation for an additional 5% of the 1984 funding level plus \$3,000 for two motorcycles.

84-17E - Thurston County Parks, ORV Safety/Education Program 6: Staff recommended funding at 1984 level. This is the only program on safety/education for ORVs this side of the mountains and should be continued. ORVAC felt it was not necessary. Mrs. Warden felt education was most important in this recreational activity and it should be continued.

The Chairman called on Tommy Thomson, ORVAC Chairman, for explanation. Mr. Thomson stated ORVAC members did not feel there was a need for a full-time officer in safety/education. The only place to ride a four-wheel drive vehicle is in the Sports Park. Capitol Forest provides trails also, but only in the summer does it get high use. It is closed for the winter.

Mr. Williams answered Mr. Mackey's questions pointing out that there is a great need for educational services. The program is a non-enforcement approach to safety. The responsibilities would be to cover all of the schools in the area, giving programs on safety. This could be done during the winter months. Also, riding "schools" could be held for those interested. Mr. Williams also stated that there would be assistance to Kitsap and Mason counties if at all possible. However, there would be plenty for the individual to do in Thurston County alone.

At this point, Mr. Wilder outlined seven funding parameters as applying to the ORVAC program:

- (1) The program needs to move slowly and conservatively - a step at a time. Changes are made as needs develop through evolution not revolution.
- (2) Education and Enforcement remain as a high priority.
- (3) IAC develop and apply guidelines and standards as it accumulates data and experience.
- (4) Due process be followed in assessing environmental impacts.

- (5) Planning is essential to the long-term success of the program.
- (6) Projects and programs not only provide alternative recreational opportunities, but strive to protect the environment through sound resource management and/or the provision of alternatives.
- (7) Multiple-use of the ORV areas and facilities be encouraged. Provision of trails and trailheads for ORVs, hikers, hunters, fishermen, equestrians, and others.

These parameters appear to be in harmony with those received from the Committee and staff has applied these parameters to the ORV evaluation and funding program.

Staff Key Points - continued:

84-23E - Grant County Sheriff, ORV Education/Enforcement 2: Mr. Roger Dovel, ORV Project Manager, noted that staff had recommended funding the project for 2 FTEs. ORVAC had been unable to arrive at a single recommendation, and thus two recommendations were presented - - \$55,500 and \$37,000 (1.5 FTE and 1 FTE). Mr. Roger Dovel stated it takes two FTE's working full-time to get the job done in Grant County. There is a vast area to cover and the deputies are needed to solve problems. The figure of \$73,000 for this project is a well thought out total.

Chairman Jessup recognized Ruth Ittner, Snomobile Advisory Committee Ms. Ittner stated the Committee and staff ought also to think of other types of users in their funding of ORV projects. Hearings are sometimes held in smaller towns, or closest to the ORV area to be considered, and often as a result the large population areas do not have an opportunity to participate in the hearings. She suggested the Committee consider this fact in its funding program for ORV areas and facilities.

Mr. Tveten asked staff the basic difference between the \$55,000 recommended by ORVAC and the \$37,000 also in their recommendation. Staff replied the \$55,000 was a recommendation of two of the four voting members of ORVAC, that the County receive 1.5 FTEs. The \$37,000 recommendation was the vote of the remaining ORVAC members that the County should receive only one full time equivalent. Mr. Tveten then asked Mr. Thomson how he had arrived at one less than half FTE. Mr. Thomson stated the four-wheel drive representatives on ORVAC felt there was a need for 1.5 FTE's; motorcyclist representatives said only one person would be required. There are 2,500 Pacific NW Four-Wheel Drive members and 1,600 Northwest Motorcycle members. He felt ORVAC did not necessarily bring its personal views to the meetings for evaluating the projects; all members speak for their respective organizations and try to arrive at good decisions for expenditure of ORV monies. Mr. Tveten said it was then a perception; no one had actually analyzed the timesheets of the deputies.

Mr. Boyle was not sure it was merely a perception. This was the reason he had asked to see the explanation of staff of the substantial differences in ORVAC recommendations and those of the staff. He felt staff had done some extensive work with the law enforcement agency to determine their actual

needs. It was up to the staff, he said, in recommending projects at different costs than those recommended by ORVAC to substantiate these differences for the Committee's review.

John Dazell, ORV County Coordinator, Grant County Sheriff Department, addressed the Committee:

1. Pointed out the Committee has a decision to make in just a few hours; whereas staff has almost an entire year to analyze and come up with recommendations.
2. 95 to 98% of ORV users in Grant County are from out of the county.
3. The County provides 10% of the funding which they feel is available. More than 10% is spent when deputies are on extra patrols (many times injury cases involving ORVs).
4. Require services of at least two deputies; would like additional one but will settle for two. Later on, a third deputy will be needed. The workload is extensive even now.

There followed discussion concerning two-wheelers, four-wheel drives, and the newer sport - three-wheelers.

84-7M - USFS Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Chelan RD, Sawtooth Area Trail Maintenance:

Mr. Lovelady reported the funding criteria is the same as ORVAC. The dollar figure is based on revised USFS figures. Instead of maintaining trails in a small area of the Wenatchee National Forest, the Forest Service will maintain these trails throughout the forest in a specific way - removing only fallen trees, not brush, debris', etc.

84-18M - Thurston County Parks, ORV Sports Park M&O - 1985:

Tommy Thomson again addressed the Committee on this project and recommended that the Thurston County Park and Recreation Department go to a three-day week operation rather than the program they have now. Those are the days where gate receipts would be good. Also, he recommended there be more realistic administrative costs at this particular park.

Mr. Tveten asked how this would affect the park's permanent staff. Mr. Williams (Thurston County Park and Recreation Director) replied it would be impossible to retain permanent staff on that sort of basis. The park has more value than just for intensive week-end use. There are other uses during the week such as camping and casual riding. Mr. Tveten agreed this would not be feasible noting that snowmobile parks also receive extensive use three days out of five, but a working staff is needed for the full week to maintain continuity. Mr. Jessup suggested the County keep notes on the use of the facility as the year proceeds and report back to the Committee their findings.

84-30M - State Parks and Recreation Commission, Riverside State Park ORV M&O 85-87:

Mr. Lovelady noted staff was recommending funding of this project for a two-year period; whereas, ORVAC recommended it at one year. There is a significant cost involved for those sponsors who must prepare budgets and documentation on an annual basis. Secondly, the State Parks Commission requested support for two full-time equivalents and also a small amount of capital construction (picnic shelter).

84-14P - Yakima County ORV Program, Nacras 4 X 4 Trail Rehabilitation Plan:

Mr. Lovelady reported in investigating this project with past projects, it was found this one duplicated funding approved in 1982 sponsored by the U. S. Forest Service. The contract with the Forest Service included the Naches Trail over the mountains and into Kittitas and Yakima counties. In response to Mr. Mackey's question, Mr. Lovelady said there had been staff turnover in Yakima County and the project had been presented at the request of the user group that may not have been aware that the project was already underway.

84-31P - Spokane County Parks, Deer Park ORV Park: This project was withdrawn.

COMMENTS FROM PROJECT SPONSORS:

Jerry Shuart, Deputy Sheriff, ORV Education/Enforcement, Kittitas County Sheriff's Department and Fred Slyfield, assistant: (84-24E - ORV Education-Enforcement 7)

1. Slide presentation on Kittitas County's ORV Education-Enforcement program, and explained why continuation was necessary.
2. Increased use in the ORV facilities in the county requires three FTE's to provide educational programs in schools and to patrol the entire area.
3. In 1984 two deputies managed this area - reduced complaints and conflicts by 50%.
4. Speaking for Sheriff Young, pointed out that a lot of people who ride motorcycles don't necessarily use the trails but do use the park areas provided for them.
5. Two FTE's recommended by staff and ORVAC, but third deputy is urgently needed to make a viable program in Kittitas County.

Committee members questioned Deputy Shuart. It was brought out that the Committee had funded last year 2.5 FTE. This year staff recommendation was for two deputies plus 5% which would enable the County to continue its programs satisfactorily. There followed discussion on the amount of monies needed to fund the positions, the fact that deputies are needed to patrol various areas full-time, that they must meet with land agencies, work with the Transportation Department, do field work, as well as educational work in the schools. Deputy Shuart stated there was not enough time to do all these tasks with just two deputies.

Mr. Mackey noted if the projects were funded as presented there would still be a balance. Mr. Lovelady stated this balance is carried over to meet cost increases or other matters.

Mr. Tveten suggested the County generate revenue through fees for camping. He was informed this was not possible. Private facilities do not advertise their land for use and state lands don't have fees. Plus this, the liability aspect is not good.

John Dazell, ORV Coordinator, Grant County Sheriff's Department (84-23E, Grant County ORV Education/Enforcement 2): Mr. Dazell spoke regarding the overtime aspect for the deputies. Staff feels this should be deleted; County feels it is most important to include this in the project.

1. It is 110 miles from one end of the county to the other. There are 10,000 people in a 5,000 acre area.
2. Two deputies cannot patrol this extensively in the time allowed (8 hours). In 1984 approximately \$1,100 has been spent for overtime. Many deputies have put in a lot more time than they record.
3. Without the extra help, the County will be unable to have a good ORV education/enforcement program.
4. Winter usage has also increased, thus increasing the need to patrol.

Chris Christensen, U. S. Forest Service, stated a study had been completed of northern resource managers in the Federal Government which stated the need was not more enforcement but for more education to take care of the problems being generated by ORV users.

Mr. Mackey felt the Sheriff's Departments should cover overtime for the deputies, leaving the ORV money to be spent on ORV matters. Also, the same could be done by Chelan County.

At this point, Mr. Dovel stated the Committee has the ultimate power to approve or disapprove recommendations of staff and/or ORVAC. Staff has reviewed these projects asking sponsors to make every possible effort to do what they can in every creative way to live within the recommendations.

Larry Boyd, Chief Deputy, Grant County Sheriff's Office, mentioned that most ORV users coming into Grant County are from other counties and localities. He supported Thurston County in its desire to have education programs because he felt it was most necessary. The whole state should participate in this type of program first to make sure everybody has an idea of the laws, the rules, and the impact on the environment of ORV's. He felt a few dollars is really not going to help much in the overtime, but he appreciated the Committee's interest.

Tommy Thomson, ORVAC Chairman: Mr. Thomson spoke regarding two items - (1) education and enforcement - (2) Wenatchee National Forest:

(1) Education and Enforcement: ORV users are very concerned over the amount of money being expended in the administrative area. If every county decided to apply for these funds to use administratively there would not be sufficient funds left for getting projects "on the ground". Education/enforcement is important, but should not be to the detriment of ORV facilities.

(2) Wenatchee National Forest: ORV users appreciate accomplishments by the Wenatchee National Forest officials in the planning and layouts of areas and in the hearings process. They have listened to ORV users and have developed trails where they were needed. Expressed his appreciation and that of ORVAC to the Wenatchee National Forest officials.

Mrs. Warden agreed the Committee should keep in mind that ORV facilities are very important and that other types of programs should be carefully reviewed.

Richard "Pete" Peterson, Chelan/Douglas ORV Coordinator (84-25E - Coop. ORV Education/Enforcement 6):

1. Could be able to "live" with the \$61,500 for next year as recommended by staff.

2. The ORV program in these counties is not merely four or five months, but entire year.
3. ORV use has increased; there is a need to continue school contacts.
4. Are beginning to see some positive changes - less complaints received, etc.
5. Chelan County also provides a coordinator, but does not receive funding for that position.

Mike Dolfay, Forest Trail Coordinator, U. S. Forest Service, Wenatchee: Felt the state needs to look at a program where all ORV users would need to obtain a certificate to ride their machine. This could be a certificate of education given at the age level of the rider proving he had completed certain training in how to operate the vehicle and was knowledgeable of the rules.

Mr. Wilder stated the staff was basically following the guidelines emanating from the last funding session. Staff had been directed to be frugal with the funds and to ensure that the best projects were presented - not just spend the money because it is available. He felt that ORVAC was concerned with the same issue - what happens if there is a cutback? The IAC has developed an extensive police force and now will be looking at the maintenance and operation programs. He expressed his appreciation for staff's efforts and stated he was proud of staff actions.

Off-Road Vehicle Impact Assessment Funding Requests: Mr. Wilder then referred to a letter received by the Game Department from Gene Tillett, Regional Habitat Program Manager, on November 6, 1984, expressing concern about seven of the ORV projects. Mr. Lockard, Director Department of Game, had asked that the Committee be advised of Game's concerns:

- 1) 84-08D Klone Peak, N. Tommy
- 2) 84-04D McDonald Ridge
- 3) 84-3D Manastash/Blowout/Blaze
- 4) 84-14D Naches 4X4 Trail Rehabilitation
- 5) 84-09D Chumstick Area 4X 4 Environmental Analysis
- 6) 84-5D Mt. Clifty/Quartz/Pyramid
- 7) 84-7M & 84-60 Sawtooth Trailhead and Maintenance

Mr. George Volker, TAC Member, Department of Game, outlined the request. The Department of Game requested it be permitted to do an assessment on each of these projects to determine their impact on wildlife and whether or not mitigation measures are needed. A summary of Game's funding requests was included in the letter for the funding assessments, totaling \$26,157.00.

84-08D	Klone Peak, N. Tommy	\$ 5,726
84-04D	McDonald Ridge	5,926
84-3D	Manastash/Blowout/Blaze	5,926
84-14D	Naches 4X4 Trail Rehabilitation	1,715
84-09P	Chumstick Area 4X4 Development	3,023
84-5D	Mt. Clifty/Quartz/Pyramid	3,485
84-7M & 84-6D	Sawtooth Projects - Trailhead and Maintenance	686
		<u>\$ 26,157</u>

Goals, Objectives and Needs analysis for each project was included with the letter.

Mr. Jessup asked why this information was not given to the staff prior to this

IAC meeting. Mr. Volker replied some of the information had been presented some time ago in advance of the ORVAC meeting; some had been prepared as a result of the request of IAC staff for specific projects. However, time had run out for discussion. Mr. Boyle asked if there was, then, an official position on the requests. Mr. Volker replied the Game Department did have an official opinion but he was unable to speak to it at this time. Mr. Boyle then recommended that the matter not be reviewed by the Committee at this meeting. Mrs. Warden suggested that when the trails are designed, they could be submitted to the Department of Game for review. It was brought out by Mr. Tveten that any project before the Committee for review is subject to SEPA evaluation, and the Game Department could review that as well. No action was taken by the Committee on this matter, it being understood that IAC staff and the Department of Game would review these projects to encourage protection of wildlife and habitats. Mr. Jessup specifically asked that staff work with the Department of Game and, if necessary, the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. WARDEN, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT

THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING OF THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS (DEVELOPMENTS; EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT; MANAGEMENT; AND PLANS AND STUDIES) BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AS LISTED ON PAGE 33 OF THESE MINUTES; AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Department of Fisheries, Hood Canal Bridge Public Fishing Access Project IAC (83-800D) and Tacoma Fishing Pier Project (81-801D): Mr. Wilder referred to a letter received by the Chairman the morning of the IAC meeting (11-13-84) from William R. Wilkerson, Director, Department of Fisheries, requesting action. The Chairman called upon Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries, for explanation.

- (1) The Department of Fisheries requested that the IAC approve a cost increase in the amount of \$63,200 for the Hood Canal Bridge Public Fishing Access project, bringing the total project cost to \$443,200.
- (2) Project had been held up for over four years as a result of the bridge damage/replacement and subsequent Kitsap County permit delays.
- (3) Fisheries proposed to use the unexpended balance remaining in the state portion of the Tacoma Fishing Pier Project (81-801D).
- (4) This request subject to approval of the Office of Financial Management.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MRS. WHITFIELD, THAT

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES' PROJECTS

ORV PROJECTS AS FUNDED NOVEMBER 13, 1984

DEVELOPMENT				
84-003D	USFS Wenatchee NF	CleElum RD	Manastash Blowout-Blazed Trail	\$ 59,250
84-004D	" "	Lk. Wen. RD	McDonald Ridge Trail	185,100
84-005D	" "	Naches RD	Mt. Clifty-Quartz Mt. Loop	57,000
84-006D	" "	Chelan RD	Sawtooth Area Trailhead, Signs	7,500
84-008D	" "	Entiat RD	Klone Peak-No. Tommy Trl. Redevelop.	87,750
84-010D	" Colville NF	Colville RD	Little Pend Oreille ORV Trail Seg. 1	65,200
84-012D	" "	Newport RD	Batey-Bould Trail - Phase 2	76,100
84-016D	Yakima County ORV Program		Yakima County ORV Pk. Develop.	38,200
84-019D	Thurston County Parks		ORV Sports Park Development	17,750
84-021D	Richland, City of		Horn Rapids ORV Sports Pk. Dev. #4	93,000
TOTAL				\$ 686,850
EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT				
84-013E	Yakima County ORV Program		ORV Education/Enforcement 7	\$ 38,000
84-017E	Thurston County Parks		ORV Safety/Education Program 6	35,000
84-022E	Richland		Benton/Franklin ORV Educ/Enforc 3	32,650
84-023E	Grant County Sheriff		ORV Education/Enforcement 2	73,300
84-024E	Kittitas County Sheriff		ORV Education/Enforcement 7	75,600
84-025E	Chelan & Douglas Counties		Coop. ORV Educ/Enforcement 6	61,500
TOTAL				\$ 316,050
MANAGEMENT				
84-007M	USFS Wenatchee NF	Chelan RD	Sawtooth Area Trail Maintenance	\$ 4,800
84-015M	Yakima County ORV Program		Suntargets ORV Park M&O - 1985	60,000
84-018M	Thurston County Parks		ORV Sports Park M&O - 1985	140,700
84-020M	Richland, City of		Horn Rapids ORV Sports Pk. M&O	100,150
84-030M	State Parks & Rec. Commission		Riverside State Park ORV M&O 85-87	160,900
84-027C	Yakima County ORV Program		ORV Program Coordinator	26,600
TOTAL				\$ 493,150
PLANS AND STUDIES				
84-001P	USFS Mt. Baker-Snoq. North	Bend RD	Tinkham Trials Planning Area	\$ 8,350
84-002P	USFS Gifford-Pinchot NF	Superv. Office	Comprehensive Forest ORV Plan	13,000
84-009P	USFS Wenatchee NF	Entiat RD	Chumstick Area 4X4 Environ. Analysis	7,300
84-026P	Othello, Town of		ORV Mini-Park Study	9,000
84-032P	USFS Colville NF	Kettle Falls	Scalawag ORV Road-Proposed	26,550
TOTAL				\$ 64,200

TOTAL ORV FUNDING . . . . . \$ 1,560,250

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$63,200 FOR ITS HOOD CANAL BRIDGE PUBLIC FISHING ACCESS PROJECT (83-800D), WHICH WILL INCREASE THE TOTAL COST OF THE PROJECT FROM \$380,000 TO \$443,200, EXCEEDING THE TEN PERCENT ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY OF THE IAC DIRECTOR, AND

WHEREAS, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT HAS BEEN HELD UP FOR OVER FOUR YEARS AS A RESULT OF THE BRIDGE DAMAGE/REPLACEMENT AND SUBSEQUENT KITSAP COUNTY PERMIT DELAYS; AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES WILL USE ITS UNEXPENDED BALANCE OF FUNDS REMAINING IN THE TACOMA FISHING PIER PROJECT (81-801D) TO FUND THE COST INCREASE; AND

WHEREAS, THERE IS NO SCOPE MODIFICATION TO EITHER PROJECT INVOLVED;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$63,200 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES' HOOD CANAL BRIDGE PUBLIC FISHING ACCESS PROJECT (83-800D), WITH THE PROVISIO THAT ADDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT WILL BE OBTAINED SINCE THE APPROPRIATION WOULD BE EXCEEDED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE INCREASE; AND

FURTHER, THAT THE AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL FUNDS WITHIN THE PROJECT BE CONFIRMED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV C. NEW BUSINESS. IAC 1985 PROPOSED MEETING DATES: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated November 13, 1984, "1985 IAC Meetings - Proposal". Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MRS. WARDEN, THAT THE FOLLOWING 1985 IAC MEETINGS BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR INSERTION IN THE WASHINGTON STATE REGISTER, JANUARY ISSUE:

MARCH 28 - 29 THURS-FRI	OLYMPIA	REGULAR MEETING
JULY 25-26 THURS-FRI	YAKIMA	REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 7-8 THURS-FRI	OLYMPIA	GRANT-IN-AID FUNDING SESSION - REGULAR MEETING (LOCAL AGENCIES/OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS)

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Chairman Jessup thanked the Committee, audience and staff for an excellent meeting. He expressed his pleasure at having the opportunity to serve the Committee and the citizens of Washington the past three years. Mr. Wilder complimented the Interagency Committee members on their deliberations at the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE:

John H. Lemps Jr.  
CHAIRMAN

3-28-85  
DATE

Hand-out at this meeting received by the Committee:

"ORV Monitor - Off-Road Safety Education Newsletter"  
Volume 2, No. 1 - Winter 1984  
Thurston/Grays-Harbor County Off-Road Vehicle Sports Park

ORV letters distributed to Committee members: (In addition to APPENDIX B)

Ltr. from Thomas F. Durham, Rainier, Washington to  
Carol Jensen, Western Washington ORVAC Representative  
dated October 29, 1984 - requesting close monitoring of  
education/enforcement projects and possible on-site in-  
spections.

Ltr. Town of South Cle Elum, Honorable George A. Schoen, Mayor,  
to Kittitas County Sheriff, Tom Young, supporting ORV  
program in Kittitas County. Dated: 9-25-84

Ltr. City of Roslyn, Honorable Jack Derring, Mayor, supporting  
Kittitas County ORV project. Dated: 9-13-84.

Board of County Commissioners, Resolution 84-34, June 8, 1984,  
supporting Kittitas County ORV project.