

December 16, 1968

- I. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, and Additions to Agenda
- II. Biggs' Plan Review Committee - Next Steps (stricken from agenda)
- III. Robert C. Meier, Assoc. Professor, School of Business, University of Washington -- "Explanation of Evaluation Model Technique"
- IV. Hal Wise Presentation of Phase III report
- V. Action Program Considerations
- VI. Audit and Extension of Planning Grant
- VII. Action on Renton's Lake Washington Beach Project
- VIII. Scheduling of meetings for 1969

Also at this meeting Doctor Slavin, Director, Planning and Community Affairs Agency gave a talk on his department.

ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

10:00 a.m. Monday, December 16, 1968

Flight Room, Hyatt House
Seattle, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Lewis A. Bell, Chairman; Mr. Omar Lofgren; Mrs. Frederick Lemere; Mr. Jack Rottler, Mr. Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries; Mr. Daniel B. Ward, Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Warren A. Bishop; Mr. John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Honorable Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; Mr. Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Mr. Charles G. Prah, Director, Department of Highways.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Department of Highways

Mrs. Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer

Department of Natural Resources

Mr. Lloyd Bell, Administrative Assistant- Recreation

Department of Fisheries

Mr. Elmer Quistorff, Assistant Chief, Contract Services

Department of Game

Mr. Stan Scott, Recreation Resource Specialist

State Parks and Recreation Commission

Mr. William Bush, Parks Planner

Planning and Community Affairs Agency

Dr. Richard Slavin, Director

Mr. Gerald Pelton, Recreation Planner

Legislative Budget Committee

Mr. Don Petersen, Fiscal Analyst

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

Mr. Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator

Mr. Ed V. Putnam, Assistant Administrator

Mr. R. Philip Clark, Recreation Resource Specialist

Mr. Kenn Cole, Accountant

Mrs. Marjorie M. Frazier, Administrative Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES PRESENT

Mr. Fred J. Overly, Regional Director

Mr. Michael S. Wright
Mr. R. I. Smith
Mr. Howard Chadwick
Mr. E. E. Allen

Housing and Urban Development
Mr. Edgar F. Neal, Open Space Operation Officer

Hal Wise and Associates, Inc.
Mr. Hal Wise
Mr. Terry Koepsell

1. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, and Additions to Agenda.

The meeting was opened by Chairman Bell. A quorum was declared, there being six members in attendance.

11. Biggs' Plan Review Committee: Next Steps

Members were advised that due to the absence of Mr. Biggs, this item would be stricken from the agenda.

111. Robert C. Meier, Associate Professor, School of Business, University of Washington -- "Explanation of Evaluation Model Technique"

Professor Robert C. Meier was introduced to those present by the Chairman and called upon to give an explanation of the Evaluation Model Technique. He explained how supply and demand data obtained from surveys performed and budgetary information, including restrictions, were fed into the model and pointed out that the purpose was to bring information about the aforementioned items and the recreational values of possible acquisition into a framework whereby all could view the total picture objectively.

Recreational demand was applied to the available inventory and the demand that could not be met by that inventory was placed into the model as acquisition needs. These unmet needs were taken from all thirteen regions. One of the important items placed in the model was area type value judgments. Doctor Meier stated they had attempted to maximize the recreational value within the budget restrictions. He noted the reason for complexity in the plan -- that all data is put into the model and arranged in terms of 21 area types, using thirteen regions. He then stressed the point that the computerized program would select the best benefit of supply to the number of people served. Doctor Meier stated that costs of land in each region were obtained from reviewing over 3,000 highway right-of-way purchases and relating each sale to a particular area type.

In response to a question of when the results would be available, Doctor Meier replied the final run had been made two or three weeks ago, but considerable re-checking is necessary; Mr. Pelton did the analysis in preparation.

Mr. Overly commented that the ORRRC report had been based on activities, not on area types, and he had innovatively recommended the proposal to the BOR for approval

as the area type approach shows high cost for high activity and low cost for low activity areas. Changes in the BOR Planning Manual now require that data collected and used in the statewide plan be based on activities. He further stated that the BOR feels that 21 area types are excessive and should be reduced to six or seven. Future updating of the plan should conform to the new planning requirements.

Upon completion of Doctor Meier's report and discussion, Chairman Bell asked for comments. There being none, he thanked Doctor Meier for the presentation, stating his feeling the report was very well presented and would certainly be of value to the Committee.

Planning and Community Affairs Agency Report

Doctor Richard Slavin asked the Chairman if he could make a presentation from the Planning and Community Affairs Agency to the Committee prior to the Hal Wise report since he had another engagement to keep and would not be available later on in the day. Permission was granted by the Chairman. His presentation consisted of a chart outline of the Planning and Community Affairs Agency program planning -- Local program; Program management (interaction of state government); and State Planning (as necessary function to the Governor). Eleven specific programs within these categories were then discussed by Doctor Slavin. Following this chart presentation, he outlined another chart entitled "Functional Planning Framework Chart", which showed the inter-relationship of planning within the state framework. There was some discussion on state planning within agencies and the need for coordination of efforts. Chairman Bell asked if the IAC budget made any provision for necessary planners, and Mr. Hendrickson replied that heretofore it had been the Committee's position that planners would not be introduced into the IAC program but that now the Governor had taken another look at this matter and the possibility exists. Chairman Bell thanked Doctor Slavin for his presentation.

IV. Hal Wise Presentation of Phase III report

The Chairman then called upon Hal Wise and Associates for an oral report on Phase III of their project. Advance copies were provided to all members on December 11, 1968. The report was included in material given each member to assist them in following Wise and Associates' verbal outline. The three parts of the report included (1) Intergovernmental responsibilities for meeting the outdoor recreation and open space needs of the State of Washington; (2) Optimal utilization of interagency committee resources, and (3) Tools for effective action program implementation.

Terry Koepsell spoke concerning Parts I and II, making specific reference to the recommendations therein. There was reference by Mr. Wise to the High Valley Project and the need for inter-departmental involvement in this area. Mr. Scott questioned page (12), Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, asking Mr. Koepsell whether he felt the IAC should be more involved in the federal level here as opposed to the Game Department. Mr. Koepsell stated that the report merely intended that IAC be consulted on these matters and work with the Game Department.

At this point, Mr. Overly noted an error on page (14) under the paragraph re U. S. Forest Service: Wording "National Park System" should be changed to "National Forest System."

Mr. Wise interjected the comment that the gist of the report concerned where planning responsibility vested and how to maintain the necessary channels of communication. The basic planning, he said, must lie within the agencies themselves. Some questions he noted were: How do you fit each project into the review plan -- how do you develop it and implement the action program to carry out an outdoor recreation plan. Wise then noted that the Phase III paper was merely a draft and he invited and encouraged any comments that might be made before this would be officially and finally released. Mr. Overly and Mr. Bell both remarked that the Wise report was to be considered advisory only and not subject to any release.

Mr. Lofgren asked if the presentation and proposals as made by Doctor Slavin would in any way affect the Information Clearing House as discussed on page (20) of the report. Mr. Wise said that it would.

The Committee recessed for luncheon at 12:15 p.m.

Reconvened at 1:20.

The Chairman called upon Mr. Wise to review Part III of the Phase III report, beginning on page (21). Mr. Wise maintained that the IAC and staff has to maintain a posture of evaluating projects and proposals of the state departments on exactly the same basis and on the same criteria as is used for the evaluation of local projects. Deadlines for local projects are required; whereas the same kind of discipline is not assigned to state agency projects. Mr. Wise pointed out that the state plan would have to be placed more in the hands of the IAC rather than in the hands of other agencies; that IAC needs to play a much bigger role than it is now playing -- in policy and program areas. Further, there is a need for much more consistent format, identification and use of language (page 27). Mr. Wise continued his report concluding with the main outline on page (37).

The Chairman expressed his appreciation to Wise and Associates and the manner in which they had been able to complete the request asked of them. It was his feeling that the Committee had never before been given an insight into these matters with such expertise and that the Wise report would be of valuable assistance in forthcoming planning.

Mr. Tollefson stated the Wise report had pointed out responsibilities and had also noted some failures. It was his feeling that one of the most significant items was that state agencies should treat state projects exactly the same way as other projects are treated. It would be a difficult step but a good one. There was some discussion again on interdepartmental cooperation and uniformity of language, and Mr. Wise felt there should be as much multiple-management of areas and projects as possible in order to accomplish the most for the people of the state as a whole. Mr. Bell stated that he felt the proposed BOR Technical Assistance Program could assist greatly in obtaining inter-government coordination. At this point Mr. Overly asked that the record show that the first time the High Valley Project came up for discussion was approximately three years ago and that the state plan was amended in the language to include its purchase.

Mr. Bell referred to the Scenic Highway Bill and suggested that committee members review it since it offers an opportunity for the Highway Department to partake of IAC funds and aid the committee in obtaining its goals.

In response to a query, Mr. Wise stated that additional staff people would be needed to handle project evaluation, new types of performances, etc. He suggested IAC should even now begin its task on the next plan preparation which would require additional staff.

Mr. Wise thanked the Committee for their attention and for the opportunity to present Phase III of his report. MOTION WAS THEN MADE BY MR. LOFGREN, SECONDED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, THAT MR. WISE BE REIMBURSED FOR THE BALANCE OF HIS CONTRACT UPON COMPLETION OF PHASE III. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V. Action Program Considerations.

Mr. Einar Hendrickson was then asked by the Chairman to report on "Program Considerations", as outlined in memorandum to the Committee members dated December 16, 1968. Mr. Hendrickson read portions of the report to the Committee members and there followed considerable discussion on various aspects of the report. Mr. Bell requested that the Action Program for general distribution be written in a simple, straightforward manner so that the general public will clearly understand the responsibility of the IAC in relation to coordination, program formulation, planning and project execution, and goals and objectives. Mr. Hendrickson noted that the Technical Committee would be meeting December 17 in Olympia on Action Program considerations. Key recommendations presented by Hendrickson were:

1. That more than an equal share, as now legislated, should be allocated to the local sector, perhaps a 65/35 split.
2. That a substantially larger state parks program, perhaps 70% of state share, should be considered at such time as parks improves its programming capability.
3. That a small allotment, say 5%, should be earmarked for joint expenditure for scenic highways, from within each respective basic allocation.
4. That a contingency reserve from each program allocation, in the order of an override of perhaps 40% be held back for multi-departmental programming.

Legislation

1. Local park and recreation district powers should be enlarged, or superceded, by a regional "recreation authority" enablement, that would permit, for example, a "Save-The-San Juans" investment by those jurisdictions that abutt Puget Sound (see draft provided for executive request of the Governor, August 1, 1968.)
2. A new source of park management "grant-in-aid" for local agencies, in the order of \$50 million for the next six years, should be embraced within any contemplated "block-grant" concept of state assistance for general municipal purposes.

3. The Initiative 215 source of earmarked unrefunded boater-paid fuel taxes should be bolstered by (1) a legislative determination that 2% be automatically allotted from total gas tax receipts, (2) the exemption privileges and authorization of refund for pleasure boats be removed, and (3) total 215 allocations be guaranteed for capital outlay.
4. Registration and licensing receipts and potentials of such affluent publics as the boaters, hunters, fishermen, golfers, and other publics with greater ability to pay, be re-examined with a view toward increasing receipts and thereby permit a more equitable distribution of Outdoor Recreation capital funds that come from general sources or revenue.
5. Wild river enabling legislation, with operational funding independent of existing IAC sources, be sought vigorously.
6. A separate financial grant-in-aid bond issue in the magnitude of \$100 million be sought for indoor recreational purposes to be shared in accord with a state plan of allocations between state agencies, municipalities, and school districts.

VII. Action on Renton's Lake Washington Beach Project

The Chairman deviated from the regular agenda and took up Item VII, the Renton project. Phil Clark explained the points noted in the memorandum to the members (dated December 13, 1968) and asked for their approval of the funding involved. MR. TOLLEFSON MOVED, SECONDED BY LOFGREN THAT:

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS RENTON'S LAKE WASHINGTON BEACH #3, TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 4, 1967, AND.

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE APPLICANT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE: AND

WHEREAS, FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE IAC IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964 (INITIATIVE 215) CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1964, THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM NO. 11) CHAPTER 12, LAWS OF 1963, EXTRA SESSION, RCW CHAPTER 43.98 SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE IAC HEREBY ALLOCATES \$49,645 FROM INITIATIVE 215 AND \$99,291 FROM LWCF FOR RENTON'S LAKE WASHINGTON BEACH PHASE 3 PROVIDED THAT THE APPLICANT SHALL EXECUTE ALL CONTRACTED ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

VI. Audit and Extension of Planning Grant

Mr. Kenn Cole was then asked by the Chairman to report on the memo of December 13, 1968, "Audit and Extension of Planning Grant". Explanation was given as

presented in the memo and verbal comments made about the Balance Sheet attached to the memo indicating Phase I and Phase II of the Total Contract with PCA. Following discussion, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE PCA CONTRACT BE EXTENDED AS TO TIME WITHOUT INCREASE IN MONEY AT THIS TIME. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

VIII. Scheduling of meetings for 1969

Memorandum of Mr. Hendrickson, dated November 20, 1968, to IAC members, "Suggested Calendar for 1969", was then discussed by the Committee members. It was the consensus of the Committee that the Quarterly meetings be confirmed as indicated in the memo:

February 23-24	Olympia
May 25-26	Spokane
August 24-25	Vancouver
November 23-24	Seattle

...with special meetings being reserved dates only unless considered necessary by the Committee at a later date. Further, May 25-26 location was changed from Yakima to Spokane, with Yakima being placed in the possible special meeting date of July 27-28. The Chairman then declared the committee had adopted the schedule.

Mr. Hendrickson suggested members review the Audit Report from the Washington State Auditor's Office, entitled "Inter-Agency Committee for Outdoor Recreation Audit - July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967 - July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968," attached to their folders. He said this was a very favorable two year audit which included recommendations for Committee concern on page (3).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TOLLEFSON, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN THAT THE MEETING ADJOURN 3:50 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

EINAR H. HENDRICKSON
Administrator

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE / DATE

LEWIS A. BELL