

September 10, 1965

- I. Opening of meeting, roll call, guests
- II. Minutes of Previous meeting
- III. Additions to agenda
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
 - a) Sale of bonds - report of sale
 - b) Marine Fuel Tax Study - Status Report
 - c) Planning Assistance - Grant Applications
 1. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
 2. Housing and Home Finance Agency
 - d) Interim Plan for Submission to BOR - accepted
 - e) Policy on Division of Funds and Criteria for Judging Projects
 - Unobligated balances; matching requirements; the plan; six-year capital budgets
 - f) Project requests - consideration on handling
 1. State Parks - GSA - Fort Worden, Fort Ebey and others
 2. Game Department
 3. Dept. of Natural Resources - 23 sites
 4. Local public bodies
 - g) Out-of-state Visitor Index - report
- V. New Business - reports
 - a) Ten Regional hearings - State Parks
 - b) BOR - Maurice Lundy
 - c) HUD - Kenneth James
 - d) Future meetings
 - e) ACP Commendation - Biggs/Garton
- VI. Chairman's Report
 - a) Meeting of Subcommittee on Parks, Outdoor Rec. and Tourism of Legislative Council - Seattle September 18, 1965
 - b) Legislative Interim Budget Committee -- Appt. of Senator Atwood as Liaison to this Committee
 - c) Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty

d) Possible Regional White House Conference on Natural Beauty

VII. Members' Reports - None

VIII. Administrator's Report - including correspondence

IX. ADJOURNMENT

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Masonic Lodge - Chelan, Washington

Friday, September 10, 1965 - 2:00 P. M.

Marvin B. Durning, Chairman

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Durning; Keith H. Campbell; Thomas O. Wimmer; Jack Hilson; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission; Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries; Judson Wonderly, Acting Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Warren A. Bishop; Charles G. Prah, Director, Department of Highways.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Parks and Recreation Commission
William A. Bush, Coordinator, Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan
John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development
Department of Natural Resources
A. R. O'Donnell, Technical Assistant
Department of Fisheries
Donald Erickson, Biologist
Department of Game
Norman Knott, Chief, Land Management Division
Department of Highways
Mrs. Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer
Dept. Comm. & Econ - Paul Benson

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Attorney General
Lloyd W. Peterson, Assistant Attorney General
Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Maurice Lundy, Assistant Director, Regional Office, Seattle
Dale Haskins, Supervisory Recreation Resources Planner
Legislative Budget Committee
Dean Clabaugh, Auditor
Senator H. B. Hanna

*amended
10-9-65
minutes*

- I. Opening of Meeting, Roll Call, Guests. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Durning at 2:03 p.m. Members and special guests were introduced as identified above. Chairman Durning thanked Senator Hanna and the local arrangements committee for organizing the effective presentations held that morning for the benefit of the Committee.
- II. Minutes of Previous Meeting. IT WAS MOVED by Mr. Cole, SECONDED by Mr. Biggs, that (1) reading of minutes of the August 14 meeting be dispensed with, (2) the word "not" be removed on Page 10 of these minutes as it refers to saving Land and Water Conservation Funds for acquisition and development, and (3) the minutes be accepted as so amended. PASSED.
- III. Additions to Agenda. MOVED by Mr. Cole, and accepted by consent of the Committee, that, as an addition as a first item of new business, consideration be given to the regional meetings scheduled by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. The chairman so ordered.
- IV. Old Business
 - (a) Report of Sale of Outdoor Recreation Bonds. The administrator presented each member a copy of the September 3 letter from the State Finance Committee which requested reimbursement of expenses in the anticipated amount of \$3050 for costs on the sale of Referendum 11 bonds. The letter cited the legislative authority for this transfer and gave an itemized breakdown of projected expenditures. IT WAS MOVED by Mr. Campbell, SECONDED by Mr. Hilson, to approve payment of necessary actual expenditure of the State Finance Committee in the ceiling amount of \$3050 as requested by the letter. MOTION CARRIED.
 - (b) Status Report on Marine Fuel Tax Study. Mr. Hendrickson provided each member a copy of minutes of a meeting sponsored by the Department of Motor Vehicles on July 28. It gave a progress report and explanation about (1) selection of stations sampled, (2) rationale of the procedure, (3) competency of the staff, and (4) validity of the method. Chairman Durning added that (1) the field work has been extended to the end of September and (2) the marina analysis had been forwarded to Director Douglas Toms, Department of Motor Vehicles. In answer to questions raised by Dr. F. A. Harvey of Seattle Yacht Club, and Tom Wimmer, the Chairman reported that the Committee must await the findings and action of the Department of Motor Vehicles on allocation of the Initiative funds as based upon their survey, inasmuch as the Interagency Committee has no jurisdiction over this work.

65-00035
#46-00035

- (c) Planning Grant Assistance. A copy of the preliminary draft as authorized by the August meeting entitled, "Project Proposal for Financial Assistance for Comprehensive Statewide Outdoor Recreation Planning," dated 30 August, 1965, was presented to each member. It provided for refinement of the action program element of the plan to complement, but not duplicate the 701 efforts already underway by the Department of Commerce and Economic Development and the State Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Durning presented a September 9 letter from Dr. Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in Washington, D. C., asking for the Chairman's initialing of amendments to concur with their recommendations to make the project grant a total of \$34,780. Attention was also called to Senator Henry M. Jackson's news release relative to the approval of this grant. The Committee expressed unanimous appreciation to the federal officials for their cooperation in processing this grant in just ten day's time.

The Administrator was instructed to take appropriate steps for receipt and expenditure of these funds through the normal channels of State government so as to add staff people forthwith.

Mr. Hendrickson reported that the companion proposal for a budget adjustment in the on-going 701 project had not been finalized so as to provide additional manpower for the office. Referring to the second part of Mr. Bishop's motion of August 14 on this subject, it had not yet become possible to obtain some agencies' financial participation as authorized by Section 13 of the Initiative. Further negotiation was expected to provide sufficient matching assistance to meet the need for adding a planner to the staff and resources to meet office needs. The Chairman advised the Committee of an appointment with James Dolliver, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, to advise of progress toward this end.

- (d) Acceptance of Interim Plan. Mr. Odegaard traced the happenings relative to his request at the August meeting for consideration of an initial plan, the subsequent motion to table this matter, the concurrence about securing a B. O. R. evaluation thereof, as well as the history of the program from the State Parks' vantage point.

Reference was made to Mr. Durning's memorandum of September 3 which summarized the accelerated effort to provide a suitable framework plan with emphasis on the existing outdoor recreation supply, the demand, and evaluation of need, and an action program. Based thereon, Mr. Odegaard's office presented a new

blue covered booklet entitled "Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan," with cover letters from his office and Judson Wonderly, Acting Director, Washington Department of Commerce and Economic Development, dated September 8, 1965, indicating that in their judgment, this substitute proposal (based upon a partial evaluation of the B. O. R. inventory data and partial fulfillment of the 701 contract) would qualify the Committee for Federal Land and Conservation funds. It included information on demand, supply and need for swimming, nature walks, picnicking, camping, horseback riding, boating, hunting, fishing and ~~other~~ other resource acquisitions.

The plan provided an immediate needs summary of \$35.4 million, analyzed for eight regions of the State, and gave emphasis to development of existing public properties. Further analysis was indicated for a number of other activities for which the 701 Housing and Home Finance Agency subcontracts provide and on which completion was estimated for December.

IT WAS MOVED by Mr. Odegaard that the plan be adopted. It was SECONDED by Mr. Wonderly with a statement that he was prepared to make the certification required of his office to meet Sec. 5 (d) of the LWCF Act. The Chairman called for discussion.

Members questioned whether the action program should be premised on exact findings when, in fact, this represented only a partial analysis and one in which emphasis might tend to favor state park activities. Question was raised whether this document would meet the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on an interim basis. The Technical Coordinating Committee was reported to have recommended adoption on this basis even though it did not include measurements on activities or uses for which an evaluation of certain information remained unavailable.

Committee members asked for (1) clarification on why certain activities were selected, others omitted; (2) reasoning why other resource functions were not analyzed; (3) explanation about the lack of urban emphasis; (4) justification about the validity of action percentages from partial information and a 1959 consumer survey and (5) assurance that being tied to a partial analysis of information would not prejudice project clearance on activities not covered. Mr. Odegaard emphasized that he had attempted to explain the Plan at the orientation session for this purpose the prior evening, but could only guess on possibilities

until more complete data could be provided. Mr. Maurice Lundy, representing the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, asked that a methodology statement be added to identify the manner in which judgment factors had been applied to demand and supply data. He indicated that his office could supply the Administrator generalized, supplementary statements as an addendum to help qualify projects for those activities not sufficiently covered in the proposed interim plan.

Thomas Wimmer offered the following AMENDMENT to the motion for discussion purposes. It was SECONDED by Jack Hilson:

The Interagency Committee (1) accepts the Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan, dated September 8, 1965, as an interim plan for use in administration of its program and obligation, SUBJECT TO adding information on methodology and on other parts of the comprehensive plan still under way, (2) Refers it to the Chairman and Administrator for consultation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and committee members as necessary, (3) empowers the Chairman and Administrator to make such changes and additions as necessary to meet the requirements of the B. O. R., AND ALSO SUBJECT TO amending Sec. IV, P. 14, the "Action Program" element of the plan, to conform to the position the Interagency Committee takes on division of the funds.

The Chairman assured the Committee that the substantive data contained in the blue book would not be altered without agreed upon basis in fact, as might be cleared with Messrs. Odegaard, Wonderly, or their staffs, if the amendment motion was to be entertained; however, available data on other activities might be added, such as O. R. R. C. findings, or other studies to qualify activities otherwise omitted.

Mr. Odegaard spoke against the Wimmer amendment because he felt (1) his contract and B. O. R. requirements called for a substantiated need, (2) it was unacceptable to divorce the "action" phase, and (3) his offer to provide subsequent data from files or by letter was sufficient. He asked that his original motion be accepted or rejected. Mr. Biggs felt the second motion more adequately provided for adding "scope" to the plan; he re-emphasized the danger of one "line" agency presuming to plan for functions of other agencies and called for redirection of planning under control of the I. A. C. Mr. Cole expressed the urgency of accepting the alternate motion so that the product be a Committee solution rather than the plan of one department. Messrs. Wonderly and Odegaard called attention to certification and contract

requirements which they believed bound their hands.

Mr. Tollefson suggested that the plan be adopted first, then a second motion provide an amendment to substitute an action phase as proposed by Mr. Wimmer. Mr. Wimmer said he wanted to avoid an outright rejection of the plan as submitted and therefore offered the compromise amendment. Mr. Cole felt that technical interpretation should not hinder the will of the Committee nor the will of the electorate in implementing the funding measures. The Chairman after inquiry by Mr. Campbell said that he would send out the revised interim plan for review by the members prior to final submission to the BOR, but the pressure of time might allow only 48 hours for review by members. Question was called on the amendment.

The Amendment PASSED by a six to two vote; Mr. Odegaard asked that the minutes reflect his three reasons for opposition (cited above). Question was called by Mr. Biggs to vote on the amended motion. It CARRIED with Mr. Odegaard's dissent and request that his vote be reflected as related to the amendment only. Mr. Tollefson also voted negative because of the fear of legal problems in the procedure. The Chairman declared the interim plan adopted, as amended.

- (e) Division of Funds. Matching requirements, and criteria for judging project applications for acquisition and development proposals.

Chairman Durning reviewed his memorandum on the subject, dated 7 September, 1965, as provided the members by mail. He stated its purpose to accomodate all funds on an interim basis until experience may prove the need for refinement. The proposed policy would serve as a guideline with uniformity as well as maximum simplicity and be based upon the same criteria and principles embodied in the B. O. R. manual. The period of this biennium was deemed sufficient for the trial application. The two page background statement was placed on file. The Chairman asked that pages 3 through 7 of the proposal be entered into these minutes:

A Division of Funds

- (1) All three sources of funds, Initiative 215 (unreclaimed Boat gas taxes), Referendum II (Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue), and Land and Water Conservation Fund available in any year should be divided into equal shares for state agencies and for local public bodies

(2) If by the end of the third quarter (March 31) of any year there remains unobligated any sum of monies in either the state agency or local government shares for that year, the Committee should consider the entire unobligated balances as available for approved projects by either state agencies or local governments, e. g., if state agencies have not submitted approved projects to obligate the entire state agency share, the unobligated balance may be used for local matching projects, and vice versa. In using the word "unobligated," it is understood that a project may be "qualified" and sums "obligated" without the money actually being yet "expended." It is expected that the Committee will want to have a shelf of applications for projects beyond the capacity of a current year's fund, projects which are "on the shelf" awaiting possible funding in the next year or years. In succeeding bienniums, the state agencies will have received their appropriations from Initiative 215 and Referendum 11 funds directly from the Legislature, but may still have to apply to the Committee for federal matching funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The proposed process will, it is hoped, make it possible to develop a long-range capital budget approach to allocating our funds, recognizing, of course, that not all future year funds should be tied up in advance since new opportunities and needs will come to the attention of the Committee each year.

B. Matching Requirements

(1) Grants to state agencies will not require matching by those agencies; grants to local public agencies will be on a matching basis.

(2) All matching grants to local agencies will require equal contributions from local and state (Initiative 215 or Referendum 11) sources, and these together would make up the non-federal half. Thus, for example, on a \$100,000 project eligible for state and federal assistance, the shares would be as follows:

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| <u>Land and Water Conservation Fund -</u> | <u>50% or \$50,000</u> |
| <u>State funds</u> | <u>25% or \$25,000</u> |
| <u>Local funds</u> | <u>25% or \$25,000</u> |

Such a local contribution seems low enough to be within the range of possibility for local governments but not so low as to remove a need on their part for careful evaluation and screening of proposals to us. If the local share were even lower, there might be danger of less than first-rate projects being proposed. Furthermore, this division is fifty-fifty between state and local funds; lacking any factual evidence for a different sharing, it seems the fairest division. In projects for which there may be no federal financial contribution, the principle of equal shares from state funds and local contributions would be the same. Thus, for instance, in an application by a local body to buy surplus federal

land at 50% of appraised value, there is no federal financial contribution (because 50% has already been taken off the price). The state's share would be one-half of the remaining price payable, and the local share, half of this price payable.

(3) In projects in which federal funds from the Housing and Home Finance Agency (soon, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development), open space land grants may be available, the same shares would apply for the reason that the Housing Act of 1965 has increased the open space land grants to 50% of total project cost. This brings it parallel with the Land and Water Conservation Fund in this respect.

C. Criteria for Judging Projects

All criteria for judging allocations are, in essence, guidelines by which the Committee seeks to evaluate the contribution the proposed project would make to meeting the needs of the citizens and visitors of the State of Washington for outdoor recreation facilities and to assess the urgency of the particular project in comparison with others before the Committee. It is impossible to reduce the entire process to a mathematical formula, but the Committee should have general guidelines to assure that we accomplish our goals and are consistent and fair. We need, therefore, a defined set of goals, thorough information about proposed projects and how they relate to the goals, thorough exposure to and discussion of alternatives from the many points of view represented by members of the Committee, and a group judgment as to the allocation of funds. Two key provisions of Initiative 215 provide important tools -- (1) the requirement that we find all approved projects to be consistent with a long range state-wide plan and (2) the requirement that applicants submit a six-year capital budget. In addition to the plan and the capital budget, we will need at least general criteria as to kinds of eligible projects and priorities among them. The plan, the capital budget and other criteria are discussed below.

(1) The Plan

It is in the ^wcomprehensive statewide Outdoor Recreation plan that we shall find the inventory of existing facilities and projections of future demand by area and by type of outdoor activity. The overall content and structure of the plan is set out in Part 630 of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation manual entitled "Chapter 3, General Requirements." I am attaching a copy of that chapter to this memorandum and call your attention particularly to Part 630.3.2. You will find considerably more detail about each part of the plan set forth in Chapter 4 of Part 630. There will be presented for the Committee's consideration at our September 10 meeting an initial interim plan which I assume will follow the overall organization set out in the BOR manual. The more complete plan now being prepared under the coordination of the State Parks Department is scheduled to be completed by December 3, and the effort of plan maintenance, refinement, and revision thereafter will continue to provide additional information

and detail to guide our efforts. I am confident that the initial plan will provide sufficient information to allow us to begin implementation of our program and that the further planning efforts will allow us to refine our procedures as additional information becomes available.

(2) Six-Year Capital Budget

In addition to the requirement that a project be found by the Committee to be consistent with the plan, Section 12 of Initiative 215 also requires that the applying state agency or local public body submit to the Committee a six-year plan for developing outdoor recreation facilities within its authority. This requirement was written into the Initiative in order to bring an orderly, long-range point of view to the buying and improving of land. It was designed to be coincident with the capital budgeting requirements for state agencies, then proposed by the Central Budget Agency, and coincident with the six-year capital budgeting practices in many local government bodies. By requiring this six-year plan, the Committee will be able to learn from the applying agency or local public body how the proposed project fits into its overall planned expenditures to meet its outdoor recreation needs, how soon the applicant intends to develop and bring a project into public use and gain some insight as to whether the proposed project can realistically be accomplished by the applicant. Initial six-year capital budgets may well not have the sophistication and detail we may require in the future, but they should help us get off an emergency footing and onto an orderly program to meet state and local needs.

(3) Other Criteria

Criteria such as population, accessibility and the like are really all encompassed within the definition of existing facilities and demand, which is part of the plan. In addition, however, we need a general philosophy and policies as to the kinds of eligible projects and priorities within them. Such a set of general criteria are provided in Parts 640 and 650 of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation manual. I propose that the Committee adopt as its general criteria those set forth in the above-mentioned parts of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation manual. Each of the members of the Committee has been given a copy of the BOR manual, and I hope you will find an opportunity to review these parts prior to our September 10 meeting. By copy of this memorandum, I am requesting Mr. Hendrickson to obtain sufficient copies of the relevant pages of the manual so that they will be available at the meeting. I understand that Mr. Lundy of the BOR staff will be at our meeting, and he can undoubtedly answer questions about these criteria.

Since the state comprehensive plan must be statewide in nature and embrace both state and local programs, I do not think it necessary to place limits on the amount of funds which may be spent in any year in any particular

part of the State. I am confident that resources and needs exist in all parts of our state and that the program will be administered in a way fair to all sections. I am concerned, however, that a limitation on funds in any year in any area may prevent the Committee's action upon major opportunities of outstanding value which may bunch themselves in any year without regard to arbitrary limits we may set on uses of the money. As a general guide, I think it appropriate that we adopt a policy of seeking to help all areas of the State prepare themselves to participate in our program.

This proposal is submitted in hopes of allowing the Committee a sound way to begin implementing our program. It is not meant as an attempt to answer all problems for all time nor with any expectation that it will meet unanimous approval. I have discussed its contents with Mr. Hendrickson and have undertaken to present it myself because it does represent my own thinking and because the rush of time does not permit my sending it to him for evaluation and distribution in advance. His own thoughts and comments are solicited as well as your own.

This proposal concerns only acquisition and development projects. Neither Initiative 215 nor Referendum 11 funds may be used for planning purposes; therefore, the making of grants for planning outdoor recreation facilities involves only the Land and Water Conservation Fund monies. Because it involves different considerations and matters closely tied up with the responsibilities of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development in state planning and in administration of planning grant assistance to local governments from the House and Home Finance Agency, I have left policy on that subject for later consideration. I do intend, however, this proposal to mean that if planning assistance is given to either state or local agencies from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it should come from the state agency or local government share as appropriate."

It was moved by Mr. Wimmer, SECONDED by Mr. Biggs, that the Committee adopt the Chairman's recommendation for division of funds, matching requirements, and criteria for judging projects. The Chairman called for discussion.

In answer to questions, it was debated that (1) proposals must initiate with a public agency before coming to the Committee for funding, (2) flexibility was essential and embodied in the plan or BOR criteria for priorities, (3) it was questionable if non-profit corporations would be eligible, however, charitable donations to public agencies might be an answer, (4) adoption would amount to substitution of an "action program" in the plan (page 14, financing & 2-3), (5) the proposal was in accord with the amended motion on plan adoption so as to be legally consistent with subsection (e) of Section 5 of the LWCF Act, (6) under Initiative 215, Sections 7 and 12 in particular, the fund

allocation responsibilities of the IAC could not be abrogated as an element of another agency's plan, (7) mathematical formula were a means to an end in aiding the judgment process and not an element of the plan as such to bind the Committee's policy or violate the legislative intent in the Initiative, (8) flexibility from the 25% local matching might invite submission of less worthy projects, and ability to match is a reflection of demand, (9) the capital budget concept rests upon policy the Committee may establish under Section 12 of the Initiative, (10) There is a cost of land factor that tends to offset the "poverty" kind of need which may be evident in some communities.

Mr. Wonderly asked that the record contain attention that subsection (e) of Section 5 of the LWCF Act which reads "in addition to assistance for planning projects, the Secretary may provide financial assistance to any state with the following types of projects or combinations thereof that are in accordance with the state comprehensive plan" so that the adoption of this formula would have to be found consistent with the comprehensive plan. The Chairman so ruled.

Mr. Biggs elaborated that his intention in seconding the motion was premised upon timely review and amendment if experience shows the desirability for a shift in policy. Mr. Tollefson professed the view that plan and policy amendments could accommodate hardship areas.

On call for the question, the MOTION CARRIED. In a dissent vote, Mr. Odegaard asked that the record reflect a concern that the action be based on the plan analysis of need.

(f) Project Requests: Considerations on handling ((1)) Fort Worden and Fort Ebey. A motion by Mr. Biggs, seconded by Mr. Campbell, was made that the application submitted in August be approved as consistent with provisions of the plan and the Initiative. The Chairman reviewed his communications with the General Services Administration, and others, granting an extension of time to November 30 in order to meet statutory requirements for consideration of the purchase of this surplus federal land. He stressed the need for orderly process so as not to be stampeded by hasty proposals. Thereupon the motion was restated as follows: The Interagency Committee based upon (1) the report and information provided at the last meeting regarding Fort Worden and Fort Ebey, and (2) the passage of the interim outdoor recreation plan at this meeting, as amended, signifies its intention to allocate the sum requested by the State Parks Commission for its purchase of the property subject to compliance with the requirement for submission of a six-year

capital plan and a finding by the Committee that the project is consistent with the interim plan so that the Committee might expect to confirm this arrangement at the October 9 meeting.
MOTION CARRIED.

((11)) Other projects: Mr. Hendrickson announced that the time was at hand for entertaining project applications consistent with the plan adopted during the course of the meeting and in compliance with the funding policy provided. The two forms for this purpose from the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, for these purposes (pink form 8-90: acquisition, and green form 8-91: development) were made available and discussed. The chairman said that all eligible public agencies who have provided an acceptable plan which is included in the statewide interim plan just adopted, should by correspondence, be notified that they may initiate project applications.

Mr. Cole was at this point requested to distribute the Department of Natural Resources' 47-page booklet entitled, Multiple Uses of Public Lands: Recreation, describing 23 top priority sites in 21 counties for which his cover letter of September 9, 1965, and his oral explanation, sought consideration sufficient to obtain approval of projects at the October meeting. The capital outlay summary identified a possible allocation of \$344,196.00 for these projects. The proposals were referred to the regional office of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the administrator for recommendation prior to the next meeting and placed on the October agenda therefor.

Messrs. Biggs and Odegaard reviewed their request to have project applications on the agenda for the October meeting, and were invited to do so in harmony with the policies adopted.

Milton Martin, Superintendent of Parks, Benton County, inquired on behalf of local public agencies, about submitting projects. The chairman explained that whenever (a) the requirements for inclusion in the statewide plan and (b) meeting the criteria of the Initiative and policy adopted hereafter were satisfied, projects could be entertained; however, a group of projects will be considered simultaneously from many communities so that particular favor will not be given on a first come - first served basis. Moreover, it is likely that both state and federal funds will be dispersed, perhaps, in quarterly allotments consistent with receipt into the treasuries.

Mr. Claude Wilson, County Commissioner from Sedro Woolley (Skagit County) inquired whether moneys could be granted for payment of options or easements, and to what extent retroactivity was appropriate. The chairman asked that a letter request for an

opinion, or a test application be provided, inasmuch as a curb-stone view on such an important question might be insufficient.

- (g) Out of State Visitor Index. The Administrator reported that exploratory meetings had been held respectively with B.O.R. and the Technical Coordinating Committee. Inasmuch as fourteen other matters referred at the same meeting have competed for time, he had not been able in the absence of staff to complete this matter. No committee action, however, would be required so long as the agencies represented could agree on times to make the systematic counts of visitors in order to obtain a fair share of the federal funds thereby committed.

V. New Business

- (a) Regional hearings on initial plan. Mr. Cole requested of Mr. Odegaard that the ten local meetings scheduled between September 20 and October 1, by the State Park and Recreation staff reflect the policies adopted by the Interagency Committee. Mr. Odegaard gave assurance that the process was one of informing properly and obtaining the local input so that refinements for the December comprehensive plan version would be appropriate ones. The meetings are a contract stipulation under the 701 agreements.
- (b) Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Mr. Maurice Lundy discussed the Federal Census Bureau work on a national survey of recreational needs, content of plans and projects received from Oregon and Montana, his office's appreciation of working with Mr. Odegaard on the interim plan, the Wild River Study (including the Skagit River), and the National Trail Study, as they affect the State of Washington.
- (c) Housing and Home Finance Agency Report. Mr. Kenneth James, Seattle Area office, reported on the Open Space program in effect since 1961. The 1965 amendments (August 10) widen it to development and beautification (including scenic areas, historic areas, street planting, upgrading of malls and squares, relocation). Both state and local public bodies are eligible with grants up to 50% being possible. Projects heretofore assisted with either 20 or 30% grants for acquisition may reapply for the difference up to 50% for subsequently qualifying improvements. Criteria relative to comprehensiveness of the plan remain. The authorization act is for \$310 million, of which up to 12 1/2 % can be awarded in any one state. There is a limitation of \$64 million for acquisition in built up areas; \$36 million for urban beautification. The requested appropriation is \$40 million for fiscal 1966 which is expected in a supplemental

appropriation bill, so that Washington might expect about one million dollars from these sources. Reference was made to the Presidential executive order on which agency interpretations are awaited. New procedural guides will be in print before November.

Mr. Wimmer brought out prospects that the Bridgeport and golf-course proposals mentioned earlier might be eligible for HHFA open space funding. Mr. James invited specific inquiries on projects. Art Garton asked about population criteria.

- (d) Future meetings. IT WAS MOVED by Mr. Campbell, SECONDED by Mr. Biggs, and PASSED that the schedule of meetings adopted in August be amended to follow the following time format: (a) Friday mornings be reserved for tours (if any), (b) Friday afternoons be reserved for local explanations and presentations, (c) Friday evening be reserved for possible discussion sessions, and (d) Saturday forenoon be the official business meeting.
- (e) ACP Commendation. Mr. Biggs introduced for recognition the new ACP (a conservation partnership) program of the Ferry County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, Clyde R. Massie, Chairman. By letter and booklet, he explained how improvement of a stand of forest trees on farmland adjacent to public roads can be assisted up to 70% of cost to make roadsides attractive within 200 feet. IT WAS MOVED, SECONDED, AND PASSED that Mr. M. J. Hanley, office manager (P. O. Box 323, Republic) and Ferry County organizations be commended for initiating this program having national significance. Mr. Art Garton, State Director of the Farm Home Administration, offered to provide additional information on the program.

VI. Chairman's Report

- (a) Announcement of the meeting of the Legislative Council Subcommittee on Parks, Outdoor Recreation, and Tourism in Seattle on September 18 (Saturday forenoon). The Chairman called for suggestions from the members and asked that the informal dinner at Hugh's Steakhouse be devoted to pooling legislative ideas.
- (b) Announcement was made of the appointment of Senator Atwood (Bellingham) as Liaison to the Interagency Committee from the Legislative Budget Committee. As his representative, Mr. Dean Clabaugh, Legislative Auditor for the Budget Committee, was present and recognized.
- (c) Natural Beauty Conferences. It was announced that Governor Evans' "Conference on Design" will be held December 3-4 at the Pacific Science Center (Seattle) with Langdon Simons as chairman. Senator Magnuson has announced a northwest states regional conference on Natural Beauty in April. Mr. Odegaard requested suggestions inasmuch

as his office would provide staff service to the Governor's office.

VII. Other Reports. At the late hour, members deferred making any reports. The Administrator reminded of his unfilled obligations in the absence of staff help, which included: (a) items related to securing legal opinion, (b) information brochure, (c) preparation of project forms and criteria, (d) refinement of agency manual, (e) information on executive order, (f) instructions on BOR sticker sales, (g) plan maintenance proposals, (h) Central Budget Agency cooperation on calendar of priorities, (i) establishment of position classifications, (j) preparation of fiscal allotment schedule (k) HHFA - 701 assistance (l) attention to backlogged correspondence (m) attention to initiation of projects, (n) plan evaluation of local proposals, (o) public relations to explain the program. At the late hour, it appeared inappropriate to consider these matters further, except to encourage agency collaboration so that matching financial aid will be available to staff the office in due course. If not in this fiscal year, certainly by the summer of 1966 a pooling of assistance as a charge against appropriations to the several agencies (Initiative Section 13) appears imminent together with federal planning grants to properly staff the Committee functions. Mr. Durning mentioned that a meeting with Mr. James Dolliver, Administrative Assistant to Governor Evans, and with Mr. George Stastny, Budget Director, was contemplated to coordinate policy direction toward these ends.

VIII. Adjournment. Close of the meeting was MOVED, SECONDED and PASSED at 5:57 p.m., the next meeting having been set for the Tacoma area on October 9.

Respectfully Submitted,

Einar Hendrickson

EINAR H. HENDRICKSON
Administrator

APPROVED: *as amended*

Marvin B. Durning
Marvin B. Durning
Chairman