

December 11, 1965

- I. Meeting called to order
- II. Minutes of Previous meeting
- III. Additions to the agenda
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
 - a) Delivery of Statewide Comprehensive Plan Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan - Judson Wonderly Paul Benson Mr. Bush etc.
 - b) Progress report on staffing
 - c) Policy questions and recommendations
 - d) Report on status of state agency project applications
 - e) Report on local agency project applications
- V. Other reports or briefings
 - a) U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, Open Space Representative
Oliver Everett
 - b) Small Business Administration K. O. Finnila Loan Specialist
 - c) U. S. Dept. of Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Representative
 - d) Economic Development Administration
 - e) Members - No reports
 - f) Staff
 1. Retroactive Credits Memo of November 16
 2. Implementation of Executive Order #11237 - President
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - a) Arrangements for Spokane meeting
 - b) Consideration of Peace Arch
 - c) Game Dept. - certain projects modifications
 - d) Concern re schedule of meetings
 - e) Thanks for arrangements
 - f) Wonderly - thanks to him for his work, etc.
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION
Leopold Hotel, - Bellingham, Washington

Saturday, December 17, 1965 - 9:10 a.m.

Marvin Dunning, Chairman

MEMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Dunning; ~~John A. Bliss, Director, Department of Game~~; Keith M. Campbell; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; Charles H. Odgaard, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission; Thomas O. Wimmer, Jackson Wenzelky, Acting Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Elmer H. Hendrickson, Administrator.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Warren A. Bishop; Jack Hillson; Charles G. Prah, Director, Department of Highways; Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries; *John A. Briggs, Director, Dept. of Game.*

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Parks and Recreation Commission

John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development

Bill Bush, Coordinator, Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan

Department of Natural Resources

A. R. O'Donnell, Technical Assistant

Department of Fisheries

Elmer Quistorff, Asst. Chief, Contract Services

Department of Game

Stanley Scott, Acting Outdoor Recreation Coordinator

Department of Highways

Mrs. Villa Mylroie, Research Engineer

Department of Commerce and Economic Development

Paul Bonson, Chief - State Planning Section

Rosemary Horwood, State Planner

Ann Williams

Interagency Committee Staff

Marvin L. Vialle, Consultant

J. Haslett Bell, Consultant

Amy Bell, Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Attorney General

Lloyd Peterson, Assistant Attorney General

Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Fred Overly, Regional Director

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Oliver Everett, Asst. Regional Director for Special Programs

Small Business Administration

K. O. Finnila, 502 Loan Specialist

Economic Development Administration

Val Cameron, Field Coordinator

- I. Meeting called to order at 9:07 by Chairman Marvin Durning. Members and special guests were introduced as identified above.
- II. Minutes of Previous meeting. Mr. Odegaard asked that the word "could" on page 3, last paragraph, line 5 be changed to read "would", and the minutes were so amended by unanimous consent. MR. CAMPBELL MOVED, MR. WIMMER SECONDED that the reading of the minutes be dispensed with and that they be approved as AMENDED.
- III. Additions to the Agenda. Mr. Odegaard asked to discuss the question of "options" as relevant to the policy questions. He also requested that the consideration of approval for an addition to Peace Arch Park be placed under "new business." Requests granted.
- IV. Old Business.
 - (a) Delivery of Statewide Comprehensive Plan Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan - Judson Wonderly. Mr. Wonderly provided a background statement about the preparation of the Plan. He stressed the need for further review and refinement before the Plan would be ready for presentation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with their contractual relations with HUD which would expire June 30.

Paul Benson of the staff of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development (CED) was introduced; he acknowledged the work contributed by William Bush and John Clark of the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Norman Knott and Stan Scott of Game Department, Al O'Dannell of Natural Resources Department, Elmer Quistorff of the Department of Fisheries, Willa Mylroie of the Highways Department and Ann Williams and Rosemary Horwood of CED. He discussed the intended distribution of plans for review by local and other agencies. A request had been made that copies be strategically located in each region, and with agencies contributing to the formulation of the document; it was also suggested that copies be made available in certain libraries. Mr. Benson read the transmittal letter and stressed the importance of incorporating additional comments into the final plan before their contractual deadline of June 30. Initiation of constructive comments was invited within one month. He cautioned that the figures in the front of the book and those in the end were not comparable, inasmuch as the front figures were the long term statistics estimated for long term needs of the State, including localities therein, based in part on ORRCC figures, whereas the figures at the end were a compilation of estimates by state and local agencies of land and facilities needed to provide the programs for which each was responsible. He also stressed that the two sets of figures were not comparable as far as time periods were concerned. By reference to the document delivered, he summarized purpose and scope of the report, findings, overview of Washington's Opportunities and Problems, the Demand, Supply, and Needs, facilities in the private sector, the role of Open Space and material contained in the appendix. He concluded by introducing Charles Odegaard and William Bush of the State Parks Department.

Mr. Bush stressed that the study had been begun prior to the passage of funding programs now in existence. Mr. Bush read the foreword and emphasized that the work was not intended to be confining, nor a ceiling on what might be accomplished. Reference was made to the basis on which the Report was organized: an activity analysis, region by region.

Mr. Durning expressed thanks on behalf of the Committee for the work presented. Members commented on the need for further cooperation to (1) provide an action program, (2) the need to include additional activities to satisfy BOR requirements, (3) the desire for a statement reviewing the history of the Washington outdoor recreation program and planning efforts, (4) the need for inclusion of open space areas, (5) desirability of participation by school districts, (6) need for inclusion of special needs of the handicapped as suggested in Dr. Crafts' letter of December 7, and (7) the problem of updating the plan and evaluating additional plans that would be coming in for approval and addition.

In answer to a question regarding a time limit on submitting suggestions for revision, Mr. Durning said that review should begin immediately and that comments received within 30 days would have most opportunity of being incorporated, but that to commit the IAC or Commerce to a 30-day time limit might be an impossible goal to meet.

Mr. Overly was called upon to explain the eligibility established by the prior interim plan submitted in October. Reference was made to his letter of December 7 and that of Dr. Crafts' dated December 3 in which the State was granted eligibility for projects until January 10, 1967 but expected to (1) sustain a sound, comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation planning effort, (2) strengthen the plan, identify all project proposals as to need and priority in relation to other needs identified in the plan, (3) share benefits with local units of government, (4) consider needs of mentally and physically handicapped, (5) increase the net outdoor recreation investment, (6) prevent substantial impairment of outdoor recreation resources, (7) protect, enhance and restore natural beauty and other qualitative aspects of the State's total outdoor environment - both urban and rural, (9) serve needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and (10) further the objectives of the Congress and Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, (11) be consistent with pending wild rivers legislation (particularly the Skagit River area), (12) be consistent with the use study of North Cascade Mountains area, (13) be not inconsistent with objectives of the San Juan Island National Historical Park, (14) recognize recreational value of scenic roads, and (15) submit a revised and updated plan and planning program meeting Bureau requirements, adequate for purposes of the Act prior to the expiration of the eligibility of the interim plan January 10, 1967. Mr. Overly stressed the record that the region had made, saying he was proud of the fact that it was the first region to have all state plans submitted, first to have all states receive some type of planning grants, and first in submitting acquisition, construction and development projects for approval. He said that the new document being presented could be presented to his office for informal review.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CAMPBELL, SECONDED BY MR. WIMMER THAT WE RECEIVE THIS PLAN FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND REFER IT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION AT THE NEXT MEETING. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (b) Progress Report on Staffing. Mr. Hendrickson reported on the Staffing progress calling the attention of the Committee to the memo of December 9 which summarized the efforts of the past month, illustrated by the attachment of a number of separate memoranda provided to carry out the directive of the last meeting. He stated that unless the IAC were to remain a rubber stamp organization, which he did not feel was the intent of the Initiative, additional staff was required. Mr. Durning discussed a brief telephone conversation with Mr. Dooliver of Governor Evans' office

regarding staffing for the Committee and said further discussion with the members of the Committee and the Governor's office would be helpful.

MR. CAMPBELL MOVED THAT MR. DURNING AND MR. HENDRICKSON BE URGED TO MEET WITH THE GOVERNOR, CENTRAL BUDGET AGENCY AND THE PERSONNEL BOARD, IF NECESSARY, REGARDING PROVISION OF STAFF, SALARIES AND POSITION CLASSIFICATIONS SO AS TO OBTAIN SUITABLE ASSISTANCE BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

Mr. Wimmer suggested that the Committee members discuss the question of staffing at lunch following the business meeting. With the understanding that this further discussion would take place, the question was called and the MOTION CARRIED.

(c) Policy Questions and Recommendations. Mr. Hendrickson referred to the memo of November 30, setting out 7 policy questions for decision of the Committee. These questions had been given Committee review in writing by members during the month, and informally discussed in the interim to polish up the recommendations.

(1) SHOULD THE COMMITTEE "QUALIFY" PROJECTS IN EXCESS OF IMMEDIATE ABILITY TO FUND?

RECOMMENDATION: It was recommended that the Committee "qualify" projects in excess of its ability to fund in any given year. At the same time, the meaning and limitations of the Committee's "qualifying" action should be explained to any applicant so there will be no misunderstanding about the conclusiveness of that action.

MR. CAMPBELL MOVED, MR. COLE SECONDED, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. MOTION CARRIED.

(2) WHAT WILL BE THE DEFINITION OF A "PROJECT"?

RECOMMENDATION: It was recommended that the definition of a project for the Interagency Committee be as set out in the BOR Manual, or by comparable definitions in the "Open Space" Guidelines.

"The BOR manual 600.2.1 defines a project as follows:

"PROJECT: A planned undertaking in which

A. All actions or activities have a discrete, well-defined, common objective, and

B. There are fixed beginning and ending dates.

A project should be limited to those actions and activities which are definitely planned on for a specific planning undertaking, recreational area, or activity. The term embraces like developments in different geographical areas, all capital activities within a park boundary, the purchase of a small plot of land, and the construction of a few picnic tables."

Section 610.1.8, states further:

"The "Project" definition is sufficiently flexible to permit a broad or narrow "packaging." The Bureau encourages the broad interpretation, to save paper work and money. However, the interpretation cannot be so broad as to make the project unmanageable. The inclusion of all of the State's acquisitions or developments in a single proposal would not ordinarily be a reasonable package because of the lack of a common specific purpose and the impossibility of effective control.

"In general, then, a project ought to be limited to those actions and activities which are definitely planned on for a specific planning undertaking, recreational area, or activity. The definition is broad enough to cover efforts related to development or maintenance of the State Park, similar developments in different geographical areas, or all capital activities within a park boundary. It can be narrow enough to permit the purchase or development of small recreational plots contiguous to a school or to a conservation impoundment.

"Generally, a project proposal should embrace only those efforts that can be accomplished within a five-year period. Proposals for longer periods must be carefully justified, as to why such efforts cannot be broken into two or more project proposals."

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, MR. WIMMER SECONDED, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. Mr. Odegaard asked if approval of the terminology of "project" which can extend to 5 years would then enable an agency to go into a time payment method of carrying out a project. Mr. Peterson thought this might very well be included, but that each proposal would have to be investigated further. It was the consensus that this would be considered as part of the policy determination, subject to legal interpretation on a specific project. MOTION CARRIED.

(3) HOW SHALL CREDITS BE HANDLED FOR STATE AND LOCAL EXPENDITURES SINCE SEPTEMBER 4, 1964? (a) TOWARD FEDERAL BOR OR HUD FUNDS? (b) TOWARD STATE INITIATIVE 215 AND STATE REFERENDUM 11 FUNDS?

RECOMMENDATION: It was recommended that consistent with PL 88 - 578 the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, expenditures made by state agencies or local governments on or after September 4, 1964 which are found eligible, may be applied as credit toward federal aid from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the extent allowable by BOR: that such credit be applied at 50% of the total project cost without any matching from the voted state funds; that such credit be used only toward approved projects for additional outdoor recreation land or development, not merely for reimbursement of a treasury for projects already accomplished; and, provided, that the committee find with respect to the credited state or local expenditure that they be on a project which the committee may approve under BOR criteria as applicable to such a new project.

AND IT WAS FURTHER RECOMMENDED, That there be no retroactive credit for obtaining Initiative 215 or Referendum 11 funds except in the case of an applicant specifically requesting from the committee authority to proceed with an expenditure under some emergency condition without foreclosing that agency's eligibility to credit such expenditure as a matching share in the event the committee later granted the project priority.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, MR. COLE SECONDED, THAT the recommendation be adopted, with amendment suggested by Mr. Durning that in the last sentence "grants the project a priority" be changed to read "allocates funds to the project."
MOTION CARRIED.

(4) WHAT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR GRANTS FROM STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES?

RECOMMENDATION: Grants for projects to all legally eligible public agencies as defined by Initiative 215 and in BOR Manual section 600.2.1 should be charged by the committee, provided that planning and project criteria are satisfied on a priority basis.

MR. CAMPBELL MOVED, MR. ODEGAARD SECONDED THAT the recommendation be adopted, with the amendment that a period be placed after "satisfied" in the last line and that "on a priority basis" be excluded. CARRIED.

(5) CAN INITIATIVE 215, REFERENDUM 11, OR FEDERAL FUNDS BE APPLIED BY A LOCAL PUBLIC BODY TOWARD THE PURCHASE OF PROPERTY WHICH IS OWNED BY ANOTHER PUBLIC BODY, OR (2) ANOTHER DIVISION OF THAT SAME PUBLIC BODY?

RECOMMENDATION: That the committee should establish as a matter of policy that, outdoor recreation account funds may only be applied by a local public agency toward the purchase of property owned by another public body, or another division within the public agency if there are legal barriers or public necessity that makes it imperative to purchase in lieu of achieving a transfer. However, each case must be carefully investigated on its own merits.

Mr. Kurth of the Grant County Port District mentioned a problem their district had with transfer of lands. It was pointed out that the phrase "if there are legal barriers or public necessity that makes it imperative to purchase in lieu of achieving a transfer", should take care of this type of problem. MR. COLE MOVED AND MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. MOTION CARRIED.

(6) UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES AND IN WHAT MANNER WILL PLANNING APPLICATIONS FROM LOCAL AGENCIES WHO ARE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR 701 PLANNING ASSISTANCE BE ACCEPTED?

RECOMMENDATION: Application for comprehensive recreation planning should not be entertained by the committee at this time, except if, (1) incidental to and part of a development project, or (2) a type of general study that is ineligible as a 701 grant through aegis of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development, but qualified under BOR planning grant standards.

MR. WIMMER MOVED, AND MR. COLE SECONDED, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. MOTION CARRIED.

A comment was raised from the floor that Whatcom County, not having time to qualify for 701 funds, went ahead and did the planning anyway in order to be included in the State plan. Could they be reimbursed? Mr. Overly said that at the present time only funds available are Land and Water Conservation Funds and since Commerce was receiving HUD funds for this comprehensive plan, the BOR probably could not grant planning money to a local agency for planning which would be appended to the 701 product,

although consideration might be given to an amendment to the IAC contract for refinement of the action program.

(7) WHAT LIMITATIONS WILL BE PLACED ON PROJECT APPLICATIONS THAT PROPOSE TO USE A FEDERAL PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN AS THE LOCAL MATCHING FUND? SHALL STATE AND FEDERAL OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDS BE USED AS GRANTS TO AUGMENT SUCH CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AS MARINA DEVELOPMENT, GOLF COURSES, SWIMMING POOLS, OR OTHER COSTLY CONSTRUCTION WHICH TRADITIONALLY MAY BE FINANCED BY USER FEES AND REVENUE BONDS?

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Committee's participation with state and BOR funds in projects which could be financed by user fees or similar revenues (particularly for which other sources of private or governmental financing are available), be limited to assistance for, or equivalent to, the land acquisition phase of the project. In such case the committee should require that the local matching share be an "equity" investment and a local commitment against the general tax base of that local community, rather than borrowed money for which the project itself, or its revenues, serve as security.

MR. WIMMER MOVED AND KEITH CAMPBELL SECONDED THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. Mr. Odegaard felt that there was an implication that this could make all state agencies ineligible for development funds whenever fees might be charged. He made a substitute motion to postpone this question until wording could be changed, and that it be specifically a part of the Agenda for January. The Chairman directed that the question be re-studied for discussion at the January meeting. *(Not adopted?)*

- (d) Report on Status of State Agency Project Applications- Mr. Hendrickson submitted a December 9 memo entitled "Report on Status Agency Project Applications" which listed Fisheries as having made no applications to date; Game nearing completion of its last application for Colockum Game Range Addition; Natural Resources' 14 projects as presently under review by BOR; Parks and Recreation's (1) Twin Harbors, Lake Chelan Breakwater and Ft. Canby as being reviewed by BOR, (2) Walter Daniels proposal having been submitted for staff review and, (3) a Peace Arch proposal received too late for comment, and suggestions for Highway Beautification projects that might be considered for funding out of the contingency reserve.

Mr. Wimmer questioned whether we should use our funds for maintenance or rehabilitation of projects already owned by a State agency, that should not projects such as Chelan breakwater come out of their operation funds? It was decided that this should be discussed at the next meeting, with consideration to this and retroactive projects requiring further attention relative to the funding imbalances that might occur.

- (e) Report on Local Agency Project Applications. The December 9 memo from the Administrator entitled "Local Agency Project applications," was presented dealing with the action program refinement of the plan; it summarized a pre-qualification schedule, three memos to local agencies, the agenda for the project orientation meeting, project application appointments for December 14-16, and, a status report of local agency projects reflecting office work up to December 9, 1965. This memo announced a deadline for receiving applications from local agencies for December 31. It was emphasized that this date applied only to those applications which might be acted upon at the February meeting. The

*amended
1-8-66
minutes*

December 9 memo entitled "Status of Local Agency Projects", summarized activities regarding a workshop where Des Moines, Bellevue, Highline Public School, Lynnwood, Port Angeles, Tacoma, Ellensburg Public Schools, Benton County, Whatcom County and Selah applications were reviewed. It also discussed the Orientation Workshop in Olympia on December 1 at which procedures for making application for matching funds were publicized to help applying agencies finalize their applications. A schedule for further meetings with local agencies to work out special problems was also included as follows:

Tuesday, December 14, Olympia, IAC office: Auburn, Olympia, Fife, Kitsap County, McCleary

Wednesday, December 15, Seattle, U. S. Courthouse: Lake Forest Park, King County, Highline College, Poulsbo, Renton, Mountlake Terrace, Edmonds, Bellingham, Whatcom County

Thursday, December 16, Moses Lake, City Council Chambers: Klickitat Port District #1, Spokane County, Yakima County, Okanogan, Omak, Grant County Port District #7, Benton County, Moses Lake

State agency members asked that there be some method devised for circularizing summaries of projects for their review and recommendation. Mr. Hendrickson stated that a summary circulation to departments could be arranged as soon as sufficient assistance became available. In the meantime, extra agency assistance was welcomed and requested.

V. Other Reports or Briefings:

(a) U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, Open Space Representative:

Mr. Oliver Everett, San Francisco regional office of HUD, had appeared the prior afternoon before the Committee to emphasize the application procedures for local agencies. These were summarized in Open Space Letter No. 5. distributed in the members' folders at the Kennewick meeting. Particular attention was directed to the checklist procedure and supporting statements required, which might serve a parallel basis for the IAC in screening priority projects.

(b) Small Business Administration

Mr. K. O. Finnila, 502 Loan Specialist with the Small Business Administration discussed the possibilities of coordinated efforts by various public agencies in the utilization of the 502 lending authority. Loans under this program are made to a local development company (IDC) to assist a specific small business concern (SEC).

He stressed that there being no two cases alike it would be difficult to describe what needs to be done by the SEC and what can be expected from IDC participation but that basically, the 502 authority would lend up to \$350,000 or 80% of the fixed asset cost of land, buildings, and equipment for any eligible business. Maximum maturity is 25 years and the SEC must be able to amortize the obligation within that period. In addition, SBA can lend directly (in combination with an IDC 502 application) to the SEC up to \$350,000 for operating capital (term - not more than 10 years) provided 40 to 60% equity remains for this purpose. Under

the condominium laws of the State of Washington, it is conceivable one LDC application could assist multiple SEC's under one roof to develop a major recreational complex.

(c) U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Representative

Mr. Fred J. Overly of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in his report Friday afternoon stressed the fact that the \$94,000,000 grant to the States from the Land and Water Conservation fund was not adequate to meet the needs of the States but it was hoped that the availability of this money would act as an incentive for the States to accomplish the job themselves.

(d) Economic Development Administration

Mr. Val Cameron of the Economic Development Administration discussed at the Friday afternoon session, the possibility of using the facilities of the EDA in redevelopment areas. The Administration was created to provide opportunities for new long term employment and can offer assistance in areas where there is high unemployment or low income. They are equipped to provide loans or grants of up to 50% for acquisition and development of lands or improvement of facilities, and up to 75% for comprehensive planning projects.

(e) There Were No Reports From Members

(f) Staff:

(1) Retroactive Credits Memo of November 16. Mr. Hendrickson called the attention of the members to the Memo asking member agencies to provide information to determine allowable costs for retroactive project reimbursement. It was stressed that this summary was desired as soon as possible, inasmuch as project action should be delayed on some projects already submitted until a rather complete overview of the scale of "credits" might be reviewed. To date only the Game Department had submitted a complete list. (Attached.)

(2) Implementation of Executive Order #11237. A memo dated December 2, 1965 contained excerpts from interpretations of the Executive Order of July 27, 1965 which would harmonize activities of HUD and BOR until replaced by joint instructions now being developed. Interagency staff work on this matter was announced for December 21. The Commerce and Economic Development Department indicated its intent to facilitate such reviews.

VI. NEW BUSINESS.

(a) Arrangements for Spokane meeting. Mr. Campbell said that arrangements had been made for the January meeting in Spokane and that headquarters would be the Davenport Hotel. He asked if the Committee would like a tour of the Falls, Havermale Island and another site on the highway.

It was decided to wait until members knew more about their own schedules for the weekend of January 7-8 before making a decision, so that the usual "poll" card could be returned. The local proposals for January 7-8 in Spokane were found otherwise satisfactory.

Mr. Campbell suggested a change in agenda for the Friday afternoon and Saturday morning meetings so that Friday might include (1) introduction of dignitaries, (2) short historical review of the Committee, (3) distribution of Saturday business agenda, (4) attention to local agency presentations, (5) an opportunity for other people to raise questions or comments, and that (6) the Saturday meeting be devoted to business only meeting. No action was taken, although the discussion appeared to favor a continuation and sharpening of this format.

- (b) Consideration of Peace Arch: Mr. Odegaard asked that the Committee consider approving a project addition to Peace Arch Park. This proposal was listed within their 6-year program, considered to have high priority, was consistent with the statewide plan, and the required funds of \$19,900 was within cash ceiling allocation established by the Committee October 9. He said the 5 acres were necessary for parking to accommodate the 400,000 visitors at Peace Arch Park, and would contribute to the restoration of the natural beauty of the Park as necessitated by highway relocation in the vicinity. HE MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE FIND THE AFOREMENTIONED PROJECT OF THE 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 SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT, AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OTHER CRITERIA ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, AND THEREFORE APPROVE AS A PROJECT as an addition to Peace Arch Park by allocation of \$19,900 from funds available to the Interagency Committee, subject to securing an allotment for the expenditure of funds from other authorities. MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED. Since the proposal had not been submitted with sufficient time to study the proposal, it was the concensus to receive the proposal, direct Mr. Hendrickson to confer with Parks, and present a recommendation at the January meeting so it could be publicly considered at that time with more complete analysis; however, if the option would expire before the January meeting, and efforts to extend it proved inappropriate, the members might be polled so a special meeting could be called by Mr. Durning. Such action should be previewed upon the Administrator ascertaining it to be a BOR qualifying project.
- (c) Mr. Scott stated that the Game Department wished to present certain proposals regarding modification of certain of their projects at the January meeting. He volunteered that members could be provided with information prior to that time for analysis. This was accepted for the January agenda.
- (d) Mr. Campbell asked for a schedule for meetings beyond February. He expressed concern that the areas with the densest population had not had adequate meetings with the Committee. The Chairman agreed to provide suggestions for Committee study for the January meeting.
- (e) Mr. Cole expressed thanks on behalf of the Committee to the people of Bellingham and Whatcom County for the excellent arrangements for the meeting.
- (f) Mr. Durning noted that December was the first anniversary of the Committee. Mr. Odegaard called the attention of the Committee that this might be the final meeting for Mr. Wonderly in his voting capacity; Mr. Durning gave sincere thanks for the assistance that Mr. Wonderly had

provided and said he would welcome Mr. Wonderly's continuing aid for the program after the change in his voting status. It was also mentioned that Mr. Jack Hilson's term would expire January 1, 1965 and appreciation was due for his service; with suitable recognition of his service to be provided.

VIII. Adjournment. MR. COLE MOVED, MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED, THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED. MOTION CARRIED. 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Einar H. Hendrickson
Administrator

APPROVED: *as amended.*

Marvin B. Durning
Marvin B. Durning
Chairman