

February 10, 1966

- I. Opening of meeting, roll call, introductions, guests
- II. Minutes of January 8, 1966
- III. Additions to agenda
 - Local Govt. Agency Application fee
 - Resolution commending Marvin B. Durning on award as U. S. Conservationist of the year
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
 - a) Local agency project application fee
 - b) Report on Statewide Plan
 - c) Report on Marine Fuel Tax Refund Study
.83 accrued to Outdoor Recreation Fund
 - d) Local Agency Project Applications
 - 1) Proposed point-rating system using committee adopted criteria.

Project Rating System made a part of the minutes
BOR Part 640 - Grands-in-Aid Manual made part of minutes
(page 9)
 - 2) Project descriptions
 - e) State agency projects
 - 1) Approval of projects by BOR
 - 2) Retroactive project survey in relationship to BOR and unanticipated receipts

Parks and Rec. Comm. - Dash Point; Ocean City; Twin Harbors
 - f) Schedule for forthcoming meetings
- V. OTHER REPORTS
 - a) From other agencies
 - b) Members reports - none
 - c) Staff
 - 1) Recreation permits - distribution
 - 2) Rule for marking projects
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - a) Arrangements for Seattle meeting

b) Request from Whatcom County

c) Correspondence

VII. ADJOURNMENT

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Morck Hotel, Aberdeen, Washington
Thursday, February 10, 1966 - 3:30 p.m.

Marvin Durning, Chairman

MINUTES

Committee met with Governor earlier in the day.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Durning; John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Keith M. Campbell; Charles G. Prahl, Director, Department of Highways; Daniel B. Ward, Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Thomas O. Wimmer; Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator. ADDITIONAL MEMBERS PRESENT AT BRIEFING SESSION WITH GOVERNOR: Lewis A. Bell; Warren Bishop; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission; Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Department of Commerce and Economic Development
Judson Wonderly, Assistant Director
Paul Benson, Chief, State Planning Section
Department of Fisheries
Don Erickson, Biologist
Department of Game
Stan Scott, Acting Outdoor Recreation Coordinator
Department of Highways
Willa Mylroie
Department of Natural Resources
A. R. O'Donnell, Technical Assistant
Parks and Recreation Commission
John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development
Interagency Committee Staff
Amy Bell, Secretary
Marvin Vialle, Consultant

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Attorney General
Lloyd Peterson, Assistant Attorney General
Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Glenn Tiedt
Housing and Urban Development
Gordon McKay
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Howard Schaub

OTHER AGENCIES REPRESENTED AT GOVERNOR'S BRIEFING:

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Maurice Lundy
Central Budget Agency
Ray Berlin

I. Opening of meeting, roll call, introductions, guests: The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Chairman Marvin B. Durning. Mr. Durning stated the meeting started late due to the length of the meeting with Governor Daniel J. Evans and members earlier in the day.

II. Minutes of January 8, 1966.

MR. WARD MOVED, MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED THAT THE MINUTES BE APPROVED AS MAILED TO THE MEMBERS. MOTION CARRIED.

III. Additions to Agenda.

(a) At the request of Governor Daniel J. Evans, an agenda item titled, "Local Agency Application Fee" which was postponed from the January agenda, was added to the agenda as Item IV(a).

(b) Mr. Wimmer asked recognition by the Chairman to read the following resolution: "BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation hereby officially recognizes with pride the recent national acclaim bestowed upon our Chairman, Marvin B. Durning, in Washington, D. C.

"The selection of Mr. Durning as U. S. Conservationist of the year was, we believe, richly deserved, and was partly a result of his efforts in the campaign to provide an outdoor recreation program for the people of the State of Washington and his service as citizen chairman of this Committee.

"We understand that the runners-up for this award were Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York and U. S. Senator Church of Idaho.

"Congratulations, Chairman Durning for overcoming such competition and bringing the award to the State of Washington."

The RESOLUTION was endorsed by applause of the audience and by the Committee. The Chairman thanked those present for their thoughtfulness.

IV. Old Business.

(a) Local agency project application fee.

This item, which had been removed from the January agenda, had been an item of discussion in the Natural Resources sub-cabinet meeting during the intervening month and was also a topic of discussion in the forenoon briefing session to which the Committee had been invited at the Governor's offices earlier in the day. Based upon mutual concern for obligations and responsibilities imposed by federal-local duties not thoroughly foreseen when Initiative 215 and biennium budgets were drafted and passed, further authorization seemed necessary to handle the work load.

Because of the plight of the Committee regarding evaluation and assignment of priorities among 134 projects from local agencies, and whereas the state agencies were providing assistance by funds or services in compliance with Section 13 of Initiative 215 commensurate with project benefits received, MR. WIMMER MOVED, MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED that (1) the ADMINISTRATOR BE AUTHORIZED AND INSTRUCTED TO PROVIDE COMPLETE EVALUATION AND INSPECTION OF ALL LOCAL PROJECT APPLICATIONS, (2) IN ORDER TO PERFORM THIS NECESSARY FUNCTION, THE ADMINISTRATOR BE AUTHORIZED TO CONTRACT FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES AS NEEDED, AND (3) THAT IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS THOROUGH EVALUATION AND INSPECTION OF THE LOCAL PROJECTS, THERE SHOULD BE COLLECTED FROM EACH LOCAL RECIPIENT PRIOR TO AN ALLOCATION DURING THIS BIENNIUM A SMALL PERCENTAGE FEE ASSESSED ON AN EQUITABLE BASIS WITH THE TOTAL OF ALL SUCH FEES COLLECTED NOT TO EXCEED \$30,000 PER ANNUM.
MOTION CARRIED.

Based upon the Governor's request for the Committee's concurrence to extend the project application fee concept to successful local projects, the Chairman requested the Attorney General's opinion about an appropriate manner to initiate such a billing consistent with the intent found in the Initiative, legislative, budgetary and/or executive powers available. The Committee concurred in this request. Assistant Attorney General Lloyd Peterson offered to research the matter for the Committee.

The Administrator was directed to suitably notify local agencies sponsoring applications that an advance billing could be anticipated.

(b) Report on Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan

A written report had been delivered to the Committee at the Governor's briefing session about which Paul Benson made a few remarks in summary and presented copies to the audience (copies on file). This report identified problem areas, cooperation underway, and progress being made to revise the preliminary plan submitted in December.

A communication was also acknowledged from the U. S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation describing limitations in the methodology used and the requirements for an in-state sampling which the Federal agency considered necessary to provide an acceptable technique in plan refinement (copy on file).

A revised grant for the purpose was advocated by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in response to suggestions from the Governor that private consulting sources be considered. No action was required, although comments were raised about securing monthly reports on the status of plan reconciliation from the Department of Commerce until a suitable document is available to the Committee and staff.

Mr. Hendrickson pointed out that William Bush was available full time to Mr. Benson henceforth in order to maximize the opportunity for the Department of Commerce and Economic Development to provide a plan which might satisfy Bureau of Outdoor Recreation standards in the near future.

The Administrator requested authority to submit a budget amendment to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation agreement 46-65-00001, dated September 9, 1965, so as to re-allocate portions of the \$34,780.00 grant in keeping with expenditure experience and employment needs until July 1, 1966, subject to approval by appropriate authorities and submission by the liaison officer, Marvin Durning. MR. WIMMER MOVED AND MR. WARD SECONDED THAT THE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZE THE ADMINISTRATOR TO REQUEST A BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FROM BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN THE COMMITTEE'S WORK IN REFINEMENT OF THE PLAN AND PREPARATION OF THE ACTION PROGRAM. MOTION CARRIED.

(c) Report on Marine Fuel Tax Refund Study.

It was reported that the study completed by the Department of Motor Vehicles had been released which indicated that .83 of fuel tax collections had accrued to the Outdoor Recreation Account from unreclaimed motor boat fuel tax which would amount to \$446,360.96 to the end of 1965. Mr. Durning reported that the hearings had been held January 24 and there was correspondence, for example, from Parks and Recreation Commission questioning the difference between what had been originally forecast and the study estimate. He said he had asked the Departments to give interested groups a chance to read the report and to make their views known, and that a careful review should be made.

This study was made by a survey based on observation of sales of gas for other than highway consumption, rather than the consumer approach used by all previous studies. At the hearings on unreclaimed fuel tax to be transferred to the Land and Water Conservation Fund held in Washington, D. C. in the House Ways and Means Congress Committee, the Outdoor Boating Club of America testified that on the basis of their study by a nationwide marketing consultant, who had done both a national and state-by-state study, by the consumer sampling method, by asking consumers about their habits in buying gas, it was estimated that the State of Washington was among the leading states in amount of fuel sold for marine purposes. It was estimated in Washington State at 3%. This study was more than triple the study-estimate made in this State of funds accruing to the Recreation Account. Study estimates made by oil companies and latest results in California have generally confirmed the Boating Club findings. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads, which used national highway consultants (who used the consumer method) have released the amount of \$27,665,500 from the Federal highway funds to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for 1965. Rounding the figure to \$28 million and taking only 1/50 of that amount for Washington, not allowing for the fact that Washington is among the highest users of marine gas, would result in \$560,000. Correcting this figure for 7 1/2¢ instead of the Federal 4¢, the figure for the State of Washington should be closer to \$1,050,000 than the \$446,360 estimated by the Department of Motor Vehicles' report.

The Department of Motor Vehicles should investigate the two methods and make further analysis of the results of this survey. It was felt further evidence might be presented that would change the picture, there ought to be an opportunity to cross check and see what these other possibilities are, and there should be a summary of all states summarizing their findings on marine fuel uses. Mr. WIMMER MOVED AND MR. WARD SECONDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES FURTHER STUDY PROCEDURES IN DETERMINING THE FUEL TAX RETURN. It was emphasized that a fair and equitable study was desired by all but that it was felt the conclusions of this report differed considerably from results obtained by other methods of sampling. MOTION CARRIED.

(d) Local Agency Project Applications.

(1) Proposed point rating system using Committee adopted criteria.

In furtherance of the action program agreement with the BOR, major work emphasis of Messrs. Marvin Vialle and J. Haslett Bell during January and February had been devoted to work with the Technical Coordinating Committee in developing the rating system based on BOR criteria adopted by the IAC in September.

Because of the delay in receiving the listing of all agencies having submitted plans, instructions to applicants were delayed and many of the applications were partially incomplete. The previous month had been spent in completing applications, working with the coordinating committee on a rating system which would eliminate flaws and inconsistencies, and applying a scaling system using this criteria based on field investigations, consideration of requests in light of available funds and consideration of statewide distribution. In the absence of state funds for development, it was decided to defer consideration of development projects until (1) applicants had put up 50% local matching to 50% federal and (2) revealed whether "retro-active credits" might be utilized for the 50% local share.

The proposed rating system would rate as Priority A all projects for which action was needed immediately; Priority B, those projects on which action must be taken in the near future or an opportunity to preserve a valuable resource would be lost or the needs of a broad segment of the public would not be met, Priority C, those projects on which action must be taken in the future to meet needs that exist now and Priority D, those projects for which although immediate action would be desirable, financing could be deferred for a period.

Following is the Project Rating System that was recommended for adoption:

PROJECT RATING SYSTEM

Local project proposals require objective rating on a point system as part of the screening process and assignment of priorities in addition to being in compliance with the statewide plan and meeting Initiative 215 requirements. Such an evaluation method has been devised to assure fairness and uniformity in the ranking of proposals. The BOR criteria ^{1/} adopted by the IAC as a statement of policy in September, 1965 provide the framework upon which this rating system has been developed. The topical headings below are derived from elements set out in the BOR criteria.^{2/}

The ideal project would score 100 points. Points should be distributed as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| A. BENEFIT CRITERIA | 25 |
| 1. General Population served | 15 |
| 2. Segment of Public (specific) | 10 |
| B. SITE CHARACTERISTICS | 30 |
| 3. Environmental Qualities | 10 |
| 4. Demand/supply | 20 |
| C. USE RELATIONSHIPS | 35 |
| 5. Diversity of Functions | 10 |
| 6. Extent of Participation | 15 |
| 7. Per Capita Development Costs | 10 |
| D. BONUS FACTORS | 10 |
| 8. Planning | 5 |
| 9. Cooperation | 5 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

^{1/} Attached as appendix.

^{2/} General criteria from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Grants-in-aid Manual (640.1.2) adopted by the Interagency Committee have been included in this rating system, except for items "B" and "F" because it was felt these items could not be evaluated on a point system and should be either restated and adopted as specific policy or considered by the Committee and the Administrator on a project-by-project basis as questions arise. Items "B" and "F" follow:

"B. Acquisition and development projects which can be financed only through public funds appropriated specifically for outdoor recreation purposes should be given particular consideration. High priorities would not ordinarily be assigned to projects that would, or could, in the absence of this program, be financed with funds appropriated for other purposes, or with private funds.

F. Where sports activities are concerned, developments for active participation are generally preferable to construction of spectator type facilities."

A11

A. BENEFIT CRITERIA 25

(1) Population Service (General - 15 points)

Priority is given to meeting the needs of the greatest number of people. To determine the extent to which a project will meet these needs, it is necessary to delineate the service area. The service area is determined by applicable recreation area standards, information furnished by applicants, our field inspection and the type and location of each project.

Access to the project from the service area will be evaluated by considering location of the project within the area in relationship to access facilities.

(2) Segment of Public (Specific - 10 points)

Proposals to benefit the general public will receive priority over those intended for a segment of the public. In the evaluation, special consideration will be given to the needs of the handicapped, aged and underprivileged.

If the facility is designed to serve a broad spectrum of age groups, including the aged, higher rating will be given.

The degree of physical capabilities (vigor or fitness) necessary for participation will be evaluated to weight more heavily those activities which will serve the broadest public spectrum and allow the handicapped to participate.

Activities requiring relatively little expenditure per person thus allowing the economically underprivileged to benefit will generally receive the highest rating.

Evaluation will be given and points given to provide consideration to those facilities requiring less skill.

B. SITE CHARACTERISTICS 30

(3) Environmental Qualities -(10 points)

Projects which would enhance, preserve or restore areas of natural beauty or areas with open space, archeologic, geologic, historic, biotic, etc., values will receive higher consideration. A rating will be assigned dependent upon how well the project is designed to accomplish such goals. Additional points will be assigned dependent upon the urgency to take action on projects to preserve site quality.

ALL

(4) Demand/supply Ratio -(20 points)

High priority will be given to acquisition projects dependent upon the scarcity of outdoor recreation acreage within the area. The demand/supply/need relationship for recreation land will be analyzed using current NRA area standards. The number of points awarded will be dependent upon the percent that an area is deficient in the type of facility. The percentage of supply added to an existing recreation inventory will receive credit.

C. USE RELATIONSHIPS 35

(5) Diversity of Functions - (10 points)

Priority will be given to projects that will ultimately provide for a broad range of activities, thus providing a wide spectrum of usage. Priority will also be given to projects being brought into full public utilization most rapidly as indicated by a six year capital improvement program.

(6) Extent of participation - (15 points)

This rating will be developed with analysis and evaluation of standards applied to various types of facilities to measure capacity.

(7) Per Capita Development Costs - (10 points)

Projects which result in a low per capita cost over an extended period of time will receive higher priority. Immediate evaluations will be based on an estimated annual attendance figure furnished by the applicant divided into the total 6 year development cost also furnished by the applicant. A rating scale inverse to per capita cost applies in this evaluation system.

D. BONUS FACTORS 10

(8) Planning: Projects within jurisdictions benefiting from comprehensive planning will receive extra points.

(9) Agency Cooperation. Extra points will be assigned to the projects which indicate cooperation with other jurisdictions or citizen groups.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Manual

Grants-in-Aid Series

Part 640 Acquisition and Development

Chapter 1 General Criteria

640.1.1

1. Purpose. This gives general criteria respecting acquisition and development projects. (See Part 635 for other criteria relating to planning projects.)
2. Priorities relating to project proposals for fund assistance for acquisition and development projects. The framework of priorities established in the State Plan may relate to all efforts and to all types of assistance to be sought to finance those efforts. The priorities established for project proposals submitted for acquisition and development assistance from the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be guided by the criteria shown below, which are based on the Act and its legislative history.
- A. ***Priority shall be given to meeting the needs of urban populations.
- B. Acquisition and development projects which can be financed only through public funds appropriated specifically for outdoor recreation purposes should be given particular consideration. High priorities would not ordinarily be assigned to projects that would, or could, in the absence of this program, be financed with funds appropriated for other purposes, or with private funds.
- C. Proposals to benefit the general public are preferable to those intended for a segment of the public. However, consideration should be given to the needs of handicapped, aged, and underprivileged groups to assure that they are adequately provided for.
- D. Development of basic facilities is preferable to that of more elaborate construction.
- E. The Bureau encourages projects which would enhance, preserve or restore natural beauty. Thus, those proposals which are solely intended to beautify may be considered. Also, among other considerations, each proposal should be evaluated on how well it would improve the quality of the environment in which the project would be located.
- F. Where sports activities are concerned, developments for active participation are generally preferable to construction of spectator type facilities.
- G. In those areas where there is a scarcity of recreation lands and immediate action is imperative to preserve such lands for public use, such acquisitions may be preferable to development projects.

MR. WIMMER MOVED AND MR. PRAHL SECONDED THAT THE RECOMMENDED RATING CRITERIA SYSTEM BE USED AS A TEMPORARY GUIDE TO ASSIST IN EVALUATION OF PROJECTS. It was felt that "temporary" should be included in the motion in order to permit changes that might be required and to answer objections if it were found the system did not meet the needs of the State of Washington. MOTION CARRIED.

(2) Project descriptions. Members were provided with a list of descriptions of local projects and a tabulation of funds requested. Those listed were:

| | <u>Acquisition</u> | <u>Development</u> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Clallam County, Salt Creek | | 25,000 |
| Voice of America | | 2,000 |
| Hood Canal School Dist. | | |
| Mason County Outdoor Recreation | 20,000 | 102,200 |
| McCleary, City Park | 12,000 | 100,000 |
| Port Angeles, Hollywood Beach | 55,000 | 45,000 |
| Cowlitz County, Riverside Park | 80,350 | |
| Olympia, Capitol Lake | | 37,000 |
| Vancouver, Franklin Park | 15,000 | 10,000 |
| Wahkiakum County, Covered Bridge | 40,000 | 60,000 |
| Anacortes, Causland Park | 52,000 | |
| Heart Lake | 132,000 | |
| Ship Harbor, Shannon Point | 130,000 | |
| 32nd St. Playfield | 20,000 | |
| Bellingham, Civic Field | | 166,048 |
| Forest & Cedar Playground | | 17,500 |
| Laurel and Indian Park | 55,000 | |
| Whatcom County, Agate Bay | 40,000 | 10,000 |
| Buchan Property | 500,000 | 250,000 |
| Buchan Alternate 1 | 100,000 | 65,000 |
| Buchan Alternate 2 | 190,000 | 160,000 |
| Deepwater Bay | 100,000 | 25,000 |
| Geneva-Euclid | 100,000 | 30,000 |
| Gooseberry Point | 50,000 | 20,000 |
| Hermosa Portage Stommish | 400,000 | 100,000 |
| Lake Samish | 500,000 | 100,000 |
| Lake Samish 2 | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Portage Island | 750,000 | 300,000 |
| Silver Lake | 85,000 | 10,000 |
| Teddy Bear Beach | 75,000 | 15,000 |
| Towanda | 80,000 | 20,000 |
| Arlington, Riverside Park | | 12,000 |
| Auburn, Les Gove | | 150,000 |
| Bellevue, Chism Beach Park | 461,000 | 100,000 |
| Hidden Valley Park | | 135,000 |

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, Feb. 10, 1966
Page 11

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Buckley, White River | | 11,190 |
| White River Recreation | 31,200 | |
| Everett, Walter E. Hall | 68,000 | |
| Des Moines, Small Boat Harbor | 335,000 | 2,820,000 |
| Fife, Park | 120,000 | 66,000 |
| Highline College, Outdoor Recreation | | 574,000 |
| Highline Public School, Waskowitz | 49,500 | |
| Ilahee Port, Recreation Dock | | 18,000 |
| King County, Bruhn Addition | 5,856 | |
| Pearce Property | 125,000 | |
| Lake Wilderness | 470,000 | |
| Luther Burbank | 1,000,000 | |
| Sammamish Valley Park | 400,000 | |
| Kingston, Port, Small Boat Harbor | 76,200 | |
| Kitsap County, Harper Waterfront | 9,500 | 5,500 |
| Silverdale | 3,500 | |
| Lake Forest Park, Nike Site | 25,000 | 75,000 |
| Manchester Port, Recreation Dock | | 4,800 |
| Milton, Town Park | 42,175 | 30,000 |
| Water Tower | | 3,000 |
| Mountlake Terrace, Cedar Way Park | 23,000 | |
| Central Valley | 95,000 | |
| Pierce County, Herron Point | 55,000 | |
| Spanaway Park | | 1,500,000 |
| Swan Creek Canyon | 50,000 | |
| Renton, Lake Washington | | 450,000 |
| Seattle, Armeni Boat Launching | 250,000 | |
| Downtown, Shorelands | 500,000 | |
| Schmitz Viewpoint | 250,000 | |
| Magnolia Park | 425,000 | |
| Tacoma, Swan Creek | 152,000 | |
| Coulee City, Town Park | | 64,000 |
| Coulee Dam, City Park | 4,000 | |
| Swimming Pool | | 7,000 |
| Grant County Port, Oasis Marina | 37,000 | 783,438 |
| Mattawa, Port | 38,000 | |
| Moses Lake, Cascade Park | | 133,820 |
| Okanogan, Alma Park | | 3,750 |
| American Legion Park | | 4,250 |
| Omak, East Omak Park | 34,122 | 145,237 |
| North Omak Park | | 3,000 |
| Benton County, Horn Rapids | 3,933 | |
| Columbia Park | | 58,747 |
| Two Rivers | | 5,475 |
| Horn Rapids | | 4,744 |
| Hover Park | | 6,107.50 |
| Lynnwood, Lynndale Park | 11,000 | |
| Asotin County, Park | | 15,125 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Ellensburg School Dist., Center | 15,000 | 189,500 |
| Ellensburg, Neighborhood Park | 19,005 | |
| Goldendale, City Park | 30,000 | 15,000 |
| Klickitat County, River Park | 4,000 | 16,000 |
| Mt. Viewpoint | 1,000 | 4,000 |
| Klickitat Port, Bingen Marina | | 95,323 |
| Prosser, Riverside Park | 18,000 | 60,000 |
| Selah, North City Park | 25,000 | 60,000 |
| Yakima County, Park | 85,000 | |
| Tieton Reservoir | | 52,000 |
| Yakima, Metropolitan Park | 75,000 | |
| Spokane, Havermale Island #1 | 435,600 | 124,400 |
| Havermale #2 | 254,000 | 82,000 |
| Spokane, Miller Ranch | 250,000 | |
| College Place, Lions City Park | | 62,226 |
| Pasco, Highland Park | 5,000 | 10,000 |

(e) State Agency Projects

(1) Approval of first projects by BOR.

It was reported that the first federal grants for projects had been authorized on January 20, 1966 by Dr. Crafts of the BOR, \$135,000 for the three game projects: \$72,500 for statewide water access, \$50,000 for Nisqually Delta Waterfowl Range Acquisition and \$125,000 for Scatter Creek Addition as the Land and Water Conservation Fund contribution. (10)

Relative to State proposals Mr. Overly's letter of February 7, 1966 was quoted which requested "each project proposal should be accompanied by a statement identifying the part or parts of the plan which show the need for the project and its priority in relation to other needs identified in the plan." It was requested that all "future submissions comply with this requirement."

Reference was made by the Administrator to progress made in compliance with the BOR deadline of March 1, 1966 for giving attention to the special outdoor recreation needs of the handicapped, as outlined in Dr. Crafts eligibility letter on the statewide plan dated December 3. A letter was to be provided to the BOR indicating that the rating system devised to implement the BOR criteria relative to the handicapped and retarded (based upon advice from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation) was in effect as part of the action program.

(2) Retroactive project survey in relationship to BOR and unanticipated receipts.

Mr. Hendrickson stressed the importance of gaining an overall comprehension of retroactively allowable costs as soon as possible in order

for the CBA and the Administrator to make trial ledgers of possible funding combinations in order to appraise the most favorable combinations of funding and to balance retroactive as against future projects. This information would be necessary to maximize HUD and BOR fundings for greatest gain to Washington's recreation program. It was stressed that both HUD and BOR had available funds and both should be utilized. It was noted that the briefing session with George Stastny, Director of the Central Budget Agency, relative to fund management concerns did not occur at the Governor's session for lack of time and no one appeared from the Agency at the Aberdeen business meeting. Forecast ledgers of funding combinations were needed with CBA assistance for the Action Program and C. I. P.

A letter of February 9 from George Stastny was received relating to the receipt of unanticipated receipts. It signified agreement with as suggested policy that all federal monies received by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation for retroactive projects should be deposited in the Outdoor Recreation Fund Account and should remain on deposit until such time as the funds were required for use as the State's matching share on new projects. Such funds should be made available for expenditure by the agencies originating the retroactive projects for current projects of those agencies. Funds were to be disbursed from the Outdoor Recreation Fund Account only for active projects approved by the full Committee. Retroactive projects would be so designated by the Committee at the time of their approval. This memorandum constituted assurance that retroactive and unanticipated receipts from the BOR credited to the Outdoor Recreation Account established by Section 6, Initiative 215, would be programmed for expenditure as recommended by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation and approved by the Governor.

Applications from the State Parks and Recreation Commission for retroactive credits for Dash Point in the amount of \$28,605.82 and Ocean City in the amount of \$30,739.00 were presented. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PRAHL AND SECONDED BY MR. WARD THAT THE COMMITTEE FIND THE AFOREMENTIONED PROJECTS OF THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATE WIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, CONSISTENT WITH THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR A SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES TO BE SUBMITTED BY EACH DEPARTMENT, AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OTHER CRITERIA ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND THEREFORE APPROVE AS PROJECTS THE ABOVE REQUESTS AND THE AMOUNTS REQUESTED ARE HEREBY ALLOCATED FROM FUNDS AVAILABLE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES AND THE FUNDS BE USED AS STATE PARKS MATCHING FUNDS FOR TWIN HARBORS. MOTION CARRIED.

(f) Schedule for forthcoming meetings.

MR. WARD MOVED, MR. PRAHL SECONDED THAT THE SCHEDULE THAT WAS PRESENTED AT THE SPOKANE MEETING BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: May 6-7 be changed to 13-14, August 5-6 be changed to 12-13 and that action on meetings scheduled for 1967 be postponed at this time. Dates and places for forthcoming meetings as revised appear below:

| | |
|----------------|--------------|
| March 11-12 | Seattle |
| April 8-9 | Yakima |
| May 13-14 | Everett |
| June 10-11 | Olympia |
| July 8-9 | Renton |
| August 12-13 | Port Angeles |
| September 9-10 | Pullman |
| October 7-8 | Longview |
| November 11-12 | Moses Lake |
| December 9-10 | Seattle |

Mr. Wimmer moved that the schedule be amended to read "if these meetings are found to be necessary inasmuch as a few might be cancelled". MOTION CARRIED WITH AMENDED WORDING.

V. Other reports:

- (a) From other agencies: Mr. Sydney Glover, Chairman, Grays Harbor Planning Commission; Mr. John Forbes, Manager of Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce; Mr. John Pearsall, Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Grays Harbor County; and Lauren Lucke, Public Health Officer, presented a summary of the health and sanitation problems facing the people of Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties in connection with the Pacific Coast beaches. The main hindrance to a solution of the problem has been the multiplicity of ownership and the difficulty of coordinating efforts among private, local and state agencies to solve the real hazards to health and recreation that exist in this area. It was the concensus of the Committee that the Administrator present the problem before the Governor's sub-cabinet on Natural Resources meeting on March 7 in an effort to coordinate efforts to solve the problem.

Mr. Don Bornstedt, Kelso, presented the application for the City of Kelso. Because of the fact that application forms had originally been lost the Committee accepted it for consideration with the proviso that if a large group of stragglers came in prior to the March meeting there might not be time to consider any but those which had arrived by the deadline. The need for additional land was due to widening of the freeway at Kelso. There had been a delay until such time as statistics had been gathered and the federal government could determine whether the highway should be 4 or 6 lanes at this area. The Department of Highways indicated they would look into the problem.

Mr. John Hall, Superintendent of Parks, Everett, presented the case for the City requesting help with purchase of land and indicated that they had money available in their budget for matching purposes.

Mr. Peter P. Denny, Chief Conservation Section, U. S. Army Engineers, District Seattle, discussed federal interests in beach erosion as related to recreation.

(b) Members. There were no reports from other members.

(c) Staff

(1) Recreation Permits - Distribution. Mr. Hendrickson commented on the memo of February 1 which requested a report from participating agencies as to whether sales of the recreation stickers could be handled by the departments this season. All responses had not been received and the Administrator requested an early reply.

(2) Rule for marking projects. Mr. Hendrickson reported that he had queried the BOR on whether a uniform method of marking projects receiving funds from the BOR had been adopted with a view toward adopting a marking policy for the IAC.

VI. New business.

(a) Arrangements for the Seattle meeting. Arrangements are being made for the Seattle meeting to be held in the Snoqualmie Room, North Court of the Coliseum, Seattle Center, on March 11-12.

(b) Request from Whatcom County. Mr. Hendrickson read a request from Whatcom County stating they were ready to finance a project under their bond issue which required that the Committee consider the situation similar to the policy exception made for Lake Forest Park. This would allow the purchase to be retroactively funded if the project later received a priority rating. Discussion brought out the following: (1) that should Whatcom County exercise its options it should not prejudice it from consideration by the Committee for allocation, but it should be clear it would not commit the Committee in any way, (2) that it would make the County ineligible for HUD funding, (3) that perhaps an IAC policy should be stated in more general terms rather than specifically acting on each project and (4) that BOR eligibility would not be affected. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WIMMER AND SECONDED BY MR. PRAHL THAT THE COMMITTEE ADVISE WHATCOM COUNTY THAT SHOULD IT EXERCISE OPTIONS IT COULD STILL BE CONSIDERED FOR STATE MATCHING GRANTS BUT THAT IT WOULD NOT BE GIVEN PREFERENCE AND THAT IT SHOULD BE ADVISED THAT IT WOULD RISK LOSING ELIGIBILITY FOR HUD FUNDS. MOTION CARRIED.

(c) Correspondence. The Committee was advised of a reply to College Place in correspondence of January 27, 1966 and February 8, 1966 which corrected assumptions about funding of projects. Note was also made of a meeting with Port of Vancouver officials to further consider a planning grant application to be held on February 15. The Chairman reported that an expected memorandum from Port of Kingston for land acquisition funding consideration did not arrive prior to departure for the meeting.

VII. Adjournment.

MR. PRAHL MOVED AND MR. WARD SECONDED THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED. MOTION CARRIED. 6:50 p.m.

APPROVED:

Marvin B. Durning

Marvin B. Durning
Chairman

Respectively submitted,

Einar H. Hendrickson
Einar H. Hendrickson
Administrator