

November 6, 1965

- I. Opening of meeting
- II. Minutes of previous meeting
- III. Additions to agenda
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
  - a) Correspondence regarding submission of Plan to Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) at last meeting.
  - b) Outdoor Recreation Plan Refinement
    1. Status Reports from Comm. and Econ. Development
    2. Accommodation of local and regional plans as part of Statewide Plan - Parks and Recreation Commission
    3. Briefing on State Highway program as related to Outdoor Recreation
  - c) Action Program - Project application procedures
    1. Proposed workshop/seminar on project refinement
    2. Information program to advise local agency applicants
  - d) Report on Sub-cabinet meeting of October 18 and subsequent progress re staffing
- V. Status of Project applications
  - a) State agencies
    - Parks - Fort Worden and Ebey - GSA purchased from.
    - Game - Projects - stream banks; Nisqually; Scatter Creek; Hole-in-the-ground
    - Fisheries - no report - had yet to start federal application
    - Natl. Resources - 14 projects recommended for funding
  - b) Local agencies -
    1. Recommendation on application form - authority granted to use.
    2. Policy determinations required by pending correspondence  
Remainder of questions held for later meeting - December
    3. Status of pending letters of intent, Vielle's project work.
    4. Puget Sound Governmental Conf - Project Open Space report submitted
- VII. Other reports or briefings
  - a) Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Marvin Meisner - procedures in submission of actual projects
  - b) Housing and Urban Development Dept. Open Space letters attention called to same.

"Lake Forest Park  
Rule" pg. 11

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- a) Clarification on reimbursement of expenses of members
- b) Schedule of meetings - changed.
- c) Report on availability of surplus property at McNary Dam and Lock Project

ADJOURNMENT

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
PUD Auditorium - Kennewick, Washington

Saturday, November 6, 1965 - 9:15 a.m.

Marvin Durning, Chairman

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Durning; Keith H. Campbell; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; Jack Hilson; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission; Charles G. Prah, Director, Department of Highways, Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries; Judson Wonderly, Acting Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator.

MEMBERS ABSENT

John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Warren A. Bishop; Thomas O. Wimmer.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Parks and Recreation Commission

John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development

James Webster, Recreation Consultant

Department of Natural Resources

A. R. O'Donnell, Technical Assistant

Department of Fisheries

Elmer Quistorff, Assistant Chief, Contract Services

Department of Game

Stanley Scott, Acting Outdoor Recreation Coordinator

Department of Highways

Mrs. Willa Myrole, Research Engineer

Interagency Committee Staff

Marvin Vialle, Consultant

Amy Bell, Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission

Ted McTighe, Chairman, Spokane

Attorney General

Lloyd Peterson, Assistant Attorney General

Legislative Subcommittee on Parks, Outdoor Recreation and Tourism

Avery Garrett, Chairman

James W. Guenther, Staff

Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Glenn Tiedt, Recreation Resource Specialist

Marvin Meisner, Recreation Resource Specialist

- I. Meeting called to order at 9:15 by Chairman Marvin Durning. Members and special guests were introduced as identified above.
- II. Minutes of previous meeting. IT WAS MOVED by Mr. Cole and SECONDED by Mr. Tollefson that the reading of the minutes of the October meeting be dispensed with. MOTION CARRIED. Since there were no corrections, changes or additions, the Chairman declared the Minutes approved as mailed to the members.
- III. Additions to the Agenda. John Porter, Director of the Puget Sound Governmental Conference, provided a letter which offered the assistance of his group in establishing priority for allocation of funds in the Puget Sound area. This was added as Agenda Item V(b)(4).
- IV. Old Business
  - (a) Correspondence regarding submission of Plan to Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) at last meeting. Letters regarding the statewide plan from Mr. Fred Overly, October 20, and Dr. Edward Crafts, October 25, expressing pleasure at receipt of the plan and intention to expedite BOR consideration of the document were read into the record.
  - (b) Outdoor Recreation Plan Refinement. The Administrator reported that this item was on the agenda in compliance with the I. A. C. staffing assistance agreement with the BOR so as to obviate possible duplication of efforts on the action program; particular emphasis was given to the importance of communicating information about the relative sufficiency of outdoor recreation facilities by activity or use on a comparative basis between regions inasmuch as previous requests had been made for a clearer description of the standards, criteria and participation rates by which needs are determined to serve as a basis for project consideration. (Note Minutes of October 9, page 4.)

Mr. Hendrickson distributed copies of the "Summary Report" on the Outdoor Recreation Plan approved at the September meeting, signed and delivered by Liaison Officer and Chairman Durning to the BOR at the October meeting, and subsequently reproduced in abbreviated form as part of the BOR agreement on project #46-65-00001. A limited distribution of 150 copies of the "Summary" and 50 copies of the fully documented Plan (looseleaf binder) had been authorized.

Questions had been raised about Committee and local agency involvement in the planning process so that the demand/supply/need analysis would be meaningful in priority selections. A concern for the relationship between statistical tabulations and financial realities evidenced in earlier meetings was voiced by the Administrator.

(1) Status Reports from the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. Mr. Wonderly indicated how the plan was being readied for a two hour presentation at the forthcoming December meeting. The plan was being assembled in draft form as a single document comprising the elements which are statewide and regional in scope plus the participating state and local agency plans. The plan coordinator on the State Parks Commission staff was scheduled to deliver a total document to the Director of Parks on November 19, which document will be reviewed with the State Parks and Recreation Commission on November 22, and delivered to the Department of Commerce and Economic Development (CED) no later than December 3, in accordance with the "701" contract between the two departments.

(2) Accommodation of local and regional plans as part of Statewide Plan-Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Odegaard described the time extension until November 19 during which local plans would be accepted for attachment to the Statewide plan. He said 5 State agencies, 22 counties, 89 municipalities and 10 other governmental units will be represented in the state document. To overcome deficiencies in the preliminary plans received prior to August 1, a sample six-year plan format was provided local units on October 28 to improve the quality and comparability of action data. All plans should include a statement of local authority, reference of analysis, methodology, demand, supply and need and a 6-year summary. It was assumed that the quality of the projects would be satisfactory since it has been impossible to inspect. The local agencies need not be concerned if they used the National Recreation Association (NRA) standards although the Parks Commission used the BOR user-criteria rather than an acreage standard; the acreage basis will be accepted, by State Parks until conversion to a uniform basis is possible. All plans or changes made before November 19 should be provided to Parks; thereafter to the CED. All inquiries regarding funding should be directed to the IAC.

Mr. Hendrickson discussed the IAC's contract agreement with the BOR by which BOR granted funds to the Committee for work on the action program of the statewide outdoor recreation plan. Mr. Odegaard stated that the plan being coordinated by the Parks Commission for delivery to the CED on December 3, 1965 ~~could include~~ <sup>would</sup> include an action program but limited in terms of the financial aspects properly the responsibility of the IAC. He said the plan would be submitted to the Parks and Recreation Commission and if approved, would be submitted to the Department of Commerce and Economic Development in fulfillment of the Housing and Urban Development 701 planning grant contract. Mr. Odegaard said that if accepted by Commerce it would become the official state outdoor recreation plan. In answer to a question by the Chairman, Mr. Wonderly clarified that if accepted by Commerce it would fulfill the HUD (HHFA) contract, but it would then be submitted by Commerce in draft form to the IAC for its consideration.

*Amended  
12-11-65  
minutes*

Mr. Odegaard said that so long as a local or state agency has met the requirements set out by the Parks Department it will be incorporated into the State plan regardless of the way in which the plan was presented; all plans received will be summarized in the State plan. In answer to Mr. Tollefson, he clarified that the Parks Department would no longer be the coordinator after December 3. However, it will be necessary to have a continuing refinement of the Plan. Mr. Wonderly clarified that there would be an opportunity for additional agencies to present plans. The Chairman stated that it had been voted several times that as soon as possible the Interagency Committee should assume its responsibilities for refinement of the Plan and become the outdoor recreation plan coordinating agency, but that staff and money would be required to accomplish this task. Mr. Wonderly presented a letter which discussed this aspect in relationship to Item (d) below.

(3) Briefing on State Highway program as related to Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. Prah! briefed the Committee on the meeting in Washington D. C. which dealt with the Federal Highway Beautification Act signed by the President October 22. The U. S. Department of Commerce has to issue regulations regarding the administration of the Bill. There are three sections of the bill which relate to the purposes of this Committee: (1) control of advertising, (2) screening of junkyards and other unsightly areas listed in the Act and (3) beautification of the highways. Bill board control will require resolution of legal problems as provisions of the Federal Act may be in contravention of the State Law. The Federal Act would allow bill boards along interstate and primary highways in areas zoned for commerce and industry or actually so used. There is provision for paying property owners and sign owners for worth of signs lawfully in existence along the Interstate system or the Federal-aid primary system on September 1, 1965 which does not conform to the Federal law out of the general Federal funds to the extent of 75% with 25% from State funds. The law makes penalties of 10% of Federal highway apportionment if billboard provisions are not complied with by January 1, 1968 and an additional 10% penalty for failure to screen junkyards by the same date which would amount to \$14 to \$15,000,000 annually. The Highway Department must administer this Act which adds 3,000 miles to bill board control in the State.

The second aspect of the bill was the control of junkyards on primary and interstate highways. Federal participation will cover 75% of cost in the removal or screening of unsightly areas. Washington State share can be paid out of the motor vehicle fund only on the right-of-way. \$20,000,000 throughout the nation has been authorized for this purpose.

Third, three per cent of funds apportioned to the State shall be used for landscaping, acquisition and enhancement, rest areas and beautification

on or adjacent to the Highway. This is available without matching by the State. This does not come out of the Federal highway trust funds. Mr. Tollefson asked if it were illegal to have a billboard on one's own property. Mr. Prah! stated it was legal if it were advertising that property for sale or advertising activities conducted on the property on which it was located. Mr. Prah! answered Mr. Tollefson that there was a legal question involving eminent domain for this purpose. At present purchase of strips of land along right-of-way must be made out of general funds; if on the right-of-way may still be purchased out of the trust fund.

- (c) Action Program- Project application procedures. Mr. Hendrickson reported that in compliance with the BOR agreement #46-65-00001 dated September 9, 1965 as a refinement of the action program, consultant work was progressing satisfactorily in estimating local project requirements and financial needs. A Memorandum entitled "Local Agencies who have submitted proposal letters," dated November 1 (copies supplied to members) with a cover letter were sent local agencies who had provided letters of intent asking them to refine their project proposals on BOR forms 8-90 and 8-91. Information gathered provided a basis for refining and harmonizing the capital improvement data established by Committee action at Chelan (see allocations policy item (2) page 9 of September minutes) in compliance with Initiative 215, Section 12, into a suitable state application. He further reported the collaboration with other State agencies, notably the State Auditor, Central Budget Agency and Attorney General's office, in streamlining procedures.
- (1) Proposed workshop/seminar on project refinement. The Administrator reported that a Statewide meeting was being scheduled to orient local applicants about the information desired on State and Federal project forms. Such an orientation session could be followed by applicant appointments to prepare the forms with sufficient completeness to evaluate the relative priority of projects between regions.
- (2) Information program to advise local agency applicants. The staff reported that a supplement to the State Parks and Recreation Commission newsletter was being provided as a method of advising local agency applicants about policy decisions of the Committee. Mr. Hendrickson reported that the five-page draft submitted in August was abbreviated to provide current information about the action program phase of the Comprehensive Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan (re: BOR project 46-65-00001) with particular reference to financing methods and allocations, recommended allocations for public agencies, and plan maintenance. Future issues will provide questions and answers about policy decisions the Committee makes in furtherance of the action program and approving projects. The newsletter would be available next week, courtesy of the State Parks and Recreation Commission, with a limited mailing from the Committee itself. Mr. Hendrickson said that the original draft

material was provided so that each Department could use it as it saw fit.

- Jac Staffing*
- (d) Report on Sub-cabinet meeting of October 18 and subsequent progress re staffing. Administrator Hendrickson reviewed action at Governor Evans' subcabinet meeting regarding Interagency Committee staffing requirements. Messrs. Biggs and Tollefson had participated in this presentation. The Department of Game had also collaborated in preparing a description for a position classification. At the subcabinet meeting of October 18 the Governor had assigned Mr. Charles Dunn, his Special Assistant, to assist the Committee on funding and position classification. Subsequently Budget Director George Stastny had by letter of October 25 requested a long range table of organization to suitably staff the office. This plan would serve as a basis for assigning such assistance as proper charge against the appropriations to some of the agencies represented on the Committee.

It was reported that Mr. Dunn requested a recommendation from the Committee for division of the cost of additional assistance. The Administrator had given Mr. Dunn an estimate of costs by letter of October 29, some recommended job descriptions and a plan of organization for staffing. Mr. Hendrickson reported that a project application fee of 1% of estimated project costs seemed most equitable from the alternatives discussed before the Committee members earlier; he recommended that a ceiling figure from State sources of \$30,000 per annum appeared sufficient for the remainder of this biennium, provided that two-to-one Federal matching were obtained from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD, formerly HHFA - 701 funds). Mr. Wonderly delivered a letter to the members dated November 4 which proposed a similar 1% processing fee for projects but modified the level of federal funding. His proposal called for the addition of eight new personnel in the next fiscal year. It was pointed out that 701 grants for plan administration and implementation might not cover costs of equipment, office space, legal-personnel-fiscal overhead, and other incidental requirements outside of the planning sector.

Mr. Hendrickson had advocated to Mr. Dunn that three divisions be created; fiscal, project review and plan maintenance. He backed this proposal by recommending action by the Interagency Committee to (1) create these three divisions, (2) place a supplemental funding ceiling for agencies in the current year (and fiscal 1967) at \$30,000 per annum and (3) apportion such additional funds between the benefited agencies by a 1% project application fee, (4) request Governor's assistance in expediting the creation of positions, (5) maximize federal assistance on matching basis, (6) allow administrator discretion in creating positions and (7) find additional financial aid to cover non-matchable expenses of the office. It was emphasized that the heavy obligations would come in the fiscal and project analysis divisions immediately, whereas possible jobs within the plan maintenance division could not be clearly determined until the plan forthcoming from

State Parks and CED was analyzed by the Committee and the BOR.

MR. COLE MOVED THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR BE ACCEPTED AND THAT HE BE GIVEN AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH POSITIONS AND WORK OUT FINANCING OF THIS PROGRAM IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS RECOMMENDATIONS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HILSON.

In discussion which followed, questions were raised and answered to the effect that (1) assistance was needed for budget analysis, auditing accounts, project inspection, reconciliation of conflicting projects and plan refinement, (2) equal sharing of costs by departments or loaning personnel seemed inappropriate, (3) subcontracting through Commerce for Federal aid seemed most appropriate, provided two-to-one matching were possible, (4) project fees would only be levied against total costs of State projects at this time, (5) CED letter proposal did not cover incidental overhead costs ineligible under HHFA policy, (6) the Attorney General's office considered an extension of the fee to local agency projects legally permissible but the staff requested deferral of such action at this time, (7) only \$12,030 of the BOR grant was available for staffing of which \$2350 had been committed for contract services to date, (7) staffing was needed now to handle immediate projects and next biennial budget work before July 1, (9) position classification and pay plan determination should be left for Administrator's negotiation.

Members made the following observations relative to the recommendation and motion: (1) Mr. Prah said authority should be given the Administrator to set up necessary positions, (2) Mr. Cole said a one percent project fee seemed equitable on a benefit basis, (3) Mr. Odegaard requested a detailed and written proposal to refer to the State Parks and Recreation Commission for action, (4) Mr. Wonderly observed that a supplemental \$5,340 should be sufficient until June 30 for plan maintenance purposes in addition to the BOR grant, (5) Mr. Tollefson said the Committee should not fail in its responsibility to provide an adequate staff and (6) Chairman Durning reiterated that the biennium appropriation of \$79,740 was proving woefully inadequate, and the BOR grant of \$34,780 was for a limited purpose, (7) Mr. Hilson suggested that a position classification plan be ratified at the next meeting and (8) Mr. Campbell urged that final determinations be a first order of business at the December executive sessions, and (9) Chairman Durning emphasized that the recommendation and action sought was merely an authorization to proceed with staffing within the limits of a 1% surcharge and a ceiling of \$30,000 which might be charged against the Departments of Fisheries, Game, Natural Resources and Parks.

A SUBSTITUTE MOTION by Mr. Tollefson, SECONDED by Mr. Campbell, was offered that would authorize the Administrator to bring back to the December meeting a position classification (and a Central Budget Agency ratification for merely \$5,340 funding as proposed by Mr. Wonderly's letter.

Mr. Odegaard proposed another substitute motion that the Administrator be directed to present a written recommendation for all positions one week in advance of the next meeting and was ruled out of order by the Chairman. Mr. Odegaard questioned whether hasty action would be (1) a circumvention of the intent of the Legislature, (2) abrogation of independent Commission authorities and (3) inequitable, inasmuch as neither the Departments of Highways nor Commerce were included in costs. QUESTION CALLED ON SUBSTITUTE MOTION. FOR: Campbell, Tollefson, Wonderly; AGAINST: Cole, Odegaard, Prahl (Durning - to break tie); ABSTAINING, Mr. Hilson. MOTION FAILED.

Mr. Odegaard MOVED AS A SUBSTITUTE MOTION and Mr. Campbell SECONDED that Mr. Hendrickson be allowed to establish positions and a table of organization but that as far as financing goes direct that a plan be presented in writing to the Committee at least one week before the next meeting for consideration at that time and that this be made the first order of business at the Friday, December 10, meeting. The Chairman and the Administrator agreed that such progress on staffing as may ensue with the Governor's office and related agencies would, of course, be submitted for ratification by the Committee. SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED with three votes in favor (Campbell, Hilson, Odegaard) and four against (Cole, Prahl, Tollefson, Wonderly). Substitute motion failed.

THE VOTE WAS THEN CALLED UPON THE ORIGINAL MOTION BY COLE, SECOND BY MR. HILSON SUPPORTING THE ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION. IT PASSED BY VOICE VOTE WITH MR. ODEGAARD DISSENTING AND ASKING THAT THE RECORD REFLECT HIS POSITION. (Note: Three questions raised above.)

Mr. Campbell MOVED that we have a progress report as a first order of business Friday, December 10, and the staffing situation surveyed. Mr. Mr. Tollefson SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED. Mr. Scott wanted it recorded that there was no vote from the Department of Game only because Mr. Biggs was not present.

V. Status of Project applications

(a) State Agencies.

(1) Parks and Recreation Commission.

The Chairman requested that the records reflect ceremonies held on Friday, November 5, when two checks in the amounts of \$107,250 and \$57,500 were delivered to Mr. V. L. Barnes of the General Services Administration for the purchase of Forts Worden and Ebey.

(2) Department of Game.

Mr. Hendrickson reported that the following projects authorized by Committee action last month had been prepared on BOR application forms, reviewed by his office and BOR representatives in Seattle and were ready for the Chairman's signature on the agreements:

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, November 6, 1965  
Page 9

<u>Project #</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Federal Amount</u>
46-00002	<u>Stream banks</u>	5 miles/8 sites	\$ 72,500
46-00006	<u>Nisqually</u>	150 acres	50,000
46-00007	<u>Scatter Creek</u>	150 acres	12,500
46-00008	<u>Hole-in-the-Ground</u>	1000 acres	25,000

(3) Department of Fisheries

Mr. Tollefson reported that the Fisheries Department had yet to start the Federal application.

(4) Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Cole asked Mr. O'Donnell of his staff to describe the 14 projects being recommended for funding. He reported that informal clearance for eligibility under BOR criteria had been obtained. Access areas listed apply only to access for recreational purposes. The question of whether these lands could be bought on a long range basis had been resolved with BOR.

The 14 projects presented for action by Natural Resources are:

Lyre River Camp & Picnic Area, Clallam County	\$ 8,796.75
Larch Mountain Scenic Picnic Area, Clark County	9,744.25
Caterpillar Island Picnic Area, Clark County	5,375.25
Capitol Forest Group Camp & Horse Trail Area, Grays Harbor	11,741.00
Minnie Peterson Camp & Picnic Area, Jefferson County	6,022.75
Osborne Park Picnic Area, King County	9,858.25
Chopaka Lake Camp & Picnic Area, Okanogan County	14,646.00
Whiteman's Cove Camp Picnic and Boat Landing area, Pierce	53,272.25
Smith Island Boat Launch Area, Snohomish County	14,733.25
Dragoon Creek Camp & Picnic Area, Spokane County	11,813.00
Rocky Lake Camp & Picnic Area, Stevens County	10,804.25
McKenny Park Camp & Picnic Area, Thurston County	13,186.15
Ahtanum Camp & Picnic Area, Yakima County	5,628.50
Lake Merrill, Cowlitz County, Camp, Picnic & Boat Launch Area	15,672.50

Mr. Odegaard said there was a question whether Chopaka should be included as the Parks Commission has been working to obtain this land and there is some conflict over whether this should be a Park or a primitive area.

Mr. Cole said that some of these areas can be developed further in the future. This is a base to be built upon. The Department of Natural Resources would do the original preliminary development which could be expanded upon later. With the understanding that Natural Resources would withdraw later if Parks wished to further develop the area, Mr. Odegaard stated he would support the request of the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Prahl MOVED that the Interagency Committee find the aforementioned projects of the Department of Natural Resources to be consistent with the Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan adopted by the Committee, consistent with the statutory requirements for a six-year capital budget for outdoor recreation facilities submitted by the department, and in accordance with

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, November 6, 1965  
Page 10

the other criteria adopted by the Committee, and therefore approve as projects the above listed ones and in 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. Mr. Campbell SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(b) Local Agencies

(1) Recommendation on application form. In furtherance of Initiative 215 requirements and Committee policy for financial planning (apropos BOR project 46-65-00001 on refinement of the action program), the Committee was presented a suggested project application form designed to augment BOR forms 8-90 and 8-91. The Administrator recommended approval of the form prepared under contract with Mr. Vialle. He explained that the recommendation was an outgrowth of conference with, and proposals submitted by representatives from the Central Budget Agency, the State Auditor's office, Association of Washington Cities, Washington Assn. of County Commissioners, University of Washington Bureau of Community Development, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and others having competence on the subject.

The form requested information to supplement the BOR procedure in compliance with the fiscal six-year plan requirements of Section 12 of Initiative 215. Information to be secured on the form would be necessary for priority evaluation of projects submitted by local agencies. It was pointed out that this phase of action program refinement would aid the Committee in screening the most worthy projects out of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Cole MOVED and Mr. Pahl SECONDED that the Committee grant authority to use this form. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(2) Policy determinations required by pending correspondence. The staff presented a mimeographed list of 21 questions dated November 4, 1965 resulting from refinement of the action program in accordance with BOR project 46-65-00001 and asked for policy discussion. Supplementing these questions was the Chairman's letter dated November 1, entitled "Timing of action on local projects for this fiscal year" and the Administrator's recommendations on "local government project proposals" dated November 1, each of which had been provided by mail to the members. The Memorandum from the Administrator asked for discussion and a resolution on the questions of what local governments were eligible to apply to the Committee for grants and whether a "shelf" of priority projects should be qualified beyond the immediate funding capacity of the Committee. The Chairman's memorandum asked "(1) Should the Committee "qualify" projects in excess of immediate ability to fund? (2) What will our definition of a "project" be and (3) How shall we handle credits for State and local expenditures since September 4, 1964."

A most pressing question was raised by Lake Forest Park. Mayor Francis E. Holman inquired whether funds to be expended for a NIKE site might be retroactively reimbursible if the purchase later qualified as an IAC priority. Mr. Campbell MOVED and Mr. Tollefson SECONDED that Lake Forest Park might be retroactively reimbursed for their purchase of the Nike site if the purchase is approved as a priority for funding by the IAC. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

LAKE FOREST PARK RULE:

AUTHORITY GIVEN TO PROCEED WITH ACQUISITION WITHOUT DISQUALIFYING PROJECT FROM CONSIDERATION FROM RECEIVING STATE VOTED FUNDS IF PROJECT IS LATER RATED AS PRIORITY UPON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS WOULD NOT GIVE THEM PREFERENCE BUT RATHER REQUIRE COMPLIANCE BY THE USUAL RATING SYSTEM.

Mr. Campbell MOVED and Mr. Cole SECONDED that the remainder of the policy questions be made a special order of business at the December meeting. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Odegaard MOVED that as a practical matter no matter of policy be considered by the Committee unless it had been submitted in writing at least one week in advance of a meeting and re-submitted for approval in advance of the next meeting. Mr. Odegaard asked that we mail such material one week in advance to all members. Mr. Campbell SECONDED the motion. Chairman Durning stated that if there were no change there should be no necessity of presenting it in writing prior to the second meeting. Mr. Tollefson said that since the Committee was new there would be many emergencies and that a restriction in this manner appeared questionable; he MOVED TO TABLE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING. Mr. Prahl SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Prahl asked that the Committee have the recommendations of the Staff on policy questions and their reasons therefor. It was suggested that the Committee review Mrs. Horwood's work on similar questions. Mr. Campbell asked that the Departments which had recommendations should submit such in advance so that comments might be consolidated in the written report mailed to members.

(3) Status of pending letters of intent. Mr. Vielle's project work related to the BOR agreement #46-65-00001 also included an updating of the summary of "letters of intent" to sponsor projects. A mimeographed synopsis dated November 4, 1965 was provided each member.

(4) Puget Sound Governmental Conference. The Conference did not make an oral report but submitted a letter and summary of Project Open Space for which 34 technical reports had been received earlier. The letter stated that "Should the Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation elect to disburse State open space funds on a regional basis, the Puget Sound Governmental Conference recommends that allocations be based on such factors as existing and projected population and their related demand implications; and, should this become fact, " they could "assume the responsibility of preparing a priority system for allocations of State open space funds for the Central Puget Sound region." No

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, November 6, 1966  
Page 12

action was taken pending action on the policy questions deferred until the next meeting.

VI. Other Reports or Briefings

- (a) Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Marvin Meisner from the Regional Office of the BOR in Seattle reported on procedures in submission of actual projects: (1) submission of proposal to State agency (2) review and assignment of priority by State (3) recommendation and submission to BOR (4) review by BOR for compliance with Statewide plan, technical adequacy, administrative and financial criteria (5) negotiation between State and BOR on assignment of priority, special terms required and financing and (6) notification by the State to the local agency that the proposal had been qualified. The State may then enter into agreement with the BOR to obligate funds. The State deals directly with the applicant. Mr. Meisner said it was recommended that the applicant use the BOR forms which are also acceptable by HUD. Both the BOR and the State agency would follow up in project implementation. Mr. Meisner listed some of the criteria that would be given high priority: (1) needs of urban areas, (2) needs of general public (3) development of basic facilities, (4) preservation of natural beauty and (5) active over spectator type facilities. Mr. Meisner listed expenditures that are allowable: (1) present services of employees on project (2) fringe benefits, (3) consultation services (4) supplies and materials (5) travel and (6) informational costs. Not allowable are expenditures for: (1) ceremonial (2) incidental costs of acquisition (3) cost of maintenance and operation, and (4) value of personal property. In answer to a question it was indicated that the BOR would match only allowable expenditures.

The Committee discussed the possibility of qualifying plans in order to build up a backlog of plans ready for funding. It was felt that no rigid system should be set up that could not be changed if necessary. In answer to concern that plans might become obsolete before action would be taken Mr. Meisner clarified the meaning of a project as like developments in different geographical areas or all capital activities within a park boundary; it was stated that a plan could be broad or narrow, extending over a long or a short period of time.

- (b) Housing and Urban Development Department. Mr. Hendrickson called the attention of the members to the Open Space letters included in the books and asked that they be retained for reference by placement in ring binders. OS#7 provided additional information about the Executive Order as requested at the August meeting.

VIII. New Business

- (a) Clarification on reimbursement of expenses of members. Mr. Lloyd Peterson, of the Attorney General's office provided an opinion for legal guidance

with regard to reimbursement of members. Section 11 of Initiative 215 states that "Members employed by the state shall serve without additional pay and participation in the work of the committee shall be deemed performance of their employment. Members from the public at large shall serve without pay, but shall be entitled to reimbursement individually for necessary travel and other expenses incurred in performance of their duties as members of the committee on the same basis as is provided by law for state officials and employees generally." As RCW 43.03.050 provides that "The heads of all state departments may prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding fifteen dollars in lieu of subsistence and lodging to elective and appointive officials and state employees while engaged on official business away from their designated posts of duty, but within the state of Washington, and not exceeding twenty-five dollars per day while engaged on official business elsewhere," the Central Budget Agency in their Budget and Accounting Manual, Section C, provides that the "department head" may authorize reimbursement either on the basis of actual expenditures or on a per diem basis in lieu of subsistence and lodging." (See CL.02A(1)).

Mr. Peterson concludes: "Insofar as citizen members' expense reimbursement is concerned, the "department head" of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation is clearly the chairman of the committee. Accordingly, it is my view that the Chairman of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation may, as a policy matter, determine whether reimbursement to citizen members for subsistence and lodging shall be based upon actual expenses, or on a per diem basis. Either method can be used so long as the amount received as reimbursement does not exceed the maximum allowed by RCW 43.03.050. It is also my view that the statute and the Central Budget Agency regulations contemplate that an established policy shall be determined and that it would be prudent to consistently and uniformly apply the alternative selected."

The Chairman stated he would make the necessary determination and advise the citizen members.

- (b) Mr. Campbell MOVED that the schedule be changed so that the January meeting would be held in Spokane and the February meeting in Aberdeen. Mr. Sidney Glover, Planning Director of Grays Harbor County wished to have the Committee come to Aberdeen to hear their petitions as a decision was to be made in February. It was stressed that an applicant would still be considered though he did not present an oral presentation - that they needed only to meet the criteria. The Administrator was requested to notify all interested parties of the change of schedule and notify them within a short time so that all local applications which may be considered be reviewed by the Committee prior to action at the Aberdeen meeting in February. MOTION PASSED.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, November 6, 1965  
Page 14

(c) Report on availability of surplus property at McNary Dam and Lock Project.

In reference to a letter from Fred J. Overly of the BOR dated October 14, 1965, asking for evaluation of McNary Lock and Dam Project, Benton County, D-Wash-496U for possible acquisition in accordance with Section 13(h) of the Surplus Properties Act of 1944 Mr. Thomas Slater of the Corps of Engineers stated that the Corps had examined the area and found it non-essential to the McNary needs. The land would then be available through the General Services Administration.

VIII. Adjournment. Mr. PrahI MOVED and Mr. Odegaard SECONDED that the meeting of the Interagency Committee be adjourned. CARRIED. 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Einar H. Hendrickson  
Administrator

APPROVED:



Marvin B. Durning  
Chairman