

June 25, 1965

- I. Introduction of Einar H. Hendrickson - formal ratification of his employment as Administrator
- II. Minutes of previous meeting - corrections
- III. Chairman's report -
 1. White House Conf. on Natural Beauty
 2. Marine Gas Tax
 3. LWCF Funds
- IV. Administrator's report - BOR Regional Conf., San Francisco, June 14-15, 1965
 1. Grants-in-aid Manuals presented to all members
- V. Proposed revision of Operating Procedure Manual
- VI. Proposed funding formula and criteria:
 1. Parks Department
 2. Alternative - Horwood/Mylroie
- VII. Loss of Quorum at 3:30
- VIII. Audience response to funding considerations
- IX. Surplus Lands available from GSA
- X. Next meeting - Vancouver

ADJOURNMENT

APPENDAGES:

1. Excerpt from Funding/Priority/Response Manual
2. Criteria
3. Guest List of those at the meeting

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Commissioner's Chambers - King County Court House - Seattle, Washington

Friday, June 25, 1965 - 1:30 p.m.

Marvin B. Durning, Chairman

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Durning; Keith H. Campbell; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources; John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Judson Wonderly, Acting Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Thomas O. Wimmer; Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Warren A. Bishop; Jack Hilson; Charles G. Prah, Director, Department of Highways; Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries.

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES

Parks and Recreation Commission
William A. Bush, Coordinator, Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan
John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development
Department of Commerce and Economic Development
Mrs. Rosemary Horwood, State Planner
Jack W. Sousie, Fiscal Officer
Department of Natural Resources
A. R. O'Donnell, Technician
Department of Game
Norman P. Knott, Chief, Land Management Division
Department of Fisheries
Elmer Quistorff, Assistant Chief, Contract Services
Department of Highways
Mrs. Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Attorney General's Office
Lloyd W. Peterson, Assistant Attorney General
Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Fred J. Overly, Northwest Regional Director

Introduction and Ratification of Einar H. Hendrickson as Administrator. The meeting was opened at 1:40 p.m. by the Chairman who introduced the members of the Committee, other representatives of state agencies present, and Mr. Lloyd W. Peterson, the Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Interagency Committee.

The Chairman formally introduced Mr. Einar H. Hendrickson, newly selected Administrator of the Interagency Committee, whose employment had been authorized by previous action of the Committee. Mr. John Biggs moved that Mr. Hendrickson's appointment as Administrator of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, commencing June 23, 1965, at a beginning salary of \$12,000 per year, be ratified. The motion was seconded by Thomas O. Wimmer and unanimously carried.

Minutes of Previous Meeting. The Chairman called for a reading of the minutes of the previous meeting held on May 15, 1965. IT WAS MOVED BY Mr. Keith Campbell, seconded by Mr. Wimmer, and passed, that the reading of the minutes be dispensed with. Mr. Durning asked for any amendments, additions or corrections. There being none from the Committee, he pointed out the following errors in language on Page 3, in the paragraph entitled "Progress report on gas tax study.": On line 13, strike ~~taxed marine gas~~, and insert: taxed marina gas. And, beginning on line 14, through line 16, strike out the following: ~~upon the boating associations on the amount of gas expended for boating purposes; so that by January 1 they would have their complete findings;~~ and insert the following: on the sampling of roadside filling stations on the amount of gas expended for boating purposes; and that by about October 15, they should have the tentative findings on these figures, and the complete report by January 1. Mr. Biggs MOVED the acceptance of the minutes, with the additions and corrections outlined by the Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wimmer and carried.

Chairman's report. Mr. Durning gave a brief report on the recent White House Conference on Natural Beauty which he attended in Washington D. C. Other Committee members attending were Bert L. Cole, Charles G. Pahl and Thomas O. Wimmer. The Chairman described the Conference as an inspiring and important event, and forecast that many matters under discussion might become federal legislation and could affect the work of the Committee. He reported that the President stated that he would incorporate much of his program on Natural Beauty into his State of the Union message to Congress at the opening of its next session in January, 1966. President Johnson also sent four bills to Congress the day after his Conference: (1) Regarding control of outdoor advertising on the federal interstate and primary highway system; (2) Regarding control of junk yards on the federal interstate and primary highway system; (3) Requiring that 3% of federal aid highway funds to each state be used to acquire interest in and improve strips of land for scenic beauty adjacent to highways; and (4) Requiring that 1/3 of federal aid secondary highway funds in each state be spent for scenic roads or recreational access roads.

Regarding the progress of the marine gas tax study, Mr. Durning stated that Virgil Harder, one of the consultants conducting the research for the Department of Licenses, reported that the study is proceeding on schedule. The sampling was begun on Memorial Day weekend as a trial run; full scale sampling was begun on June 14 and will continue through September 14, including 10 roadside stations per week. In

Mr. Harder's opinion, there were no insurmountable problems to date.

Chairman Durning reported that efforts had been made to carry out the Committee's decision of the previous meeting that \$150,000 of Washington's Land and Water Conservation Fund monies be set aside for outdoor recreation planning assistance. The method and criteria for such requests just recently became clear and a model application for this purpose had been delivered to Mr. Durning just prior to the meeting. Mr. Hendrickson was asked to pursue the preparation of an application in the proper form, consistent with pending contract relationships between HHFA, State Department of Commerce and Economic Development and the State Parks and Recreation Commission.

Charles H. Odegaard referred to Page 5 of the minutes of the previous meeting and asked if the \$150,000 requested from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, stated as "for the planning needs of this body" was literally for "planning" only, and not for acquisition or development. Mr. Overly explained that his office sent a telegram to the Committee in view of the Congressional supplemental appropriations having become available. Mr. Maurice H. Lundy, Supervisory Recreation Resource Specialist for the BOR, had elaborated on this message. The Committee was requested to take action in May to utilize this money in order to safeguard the interests of the local government bodies. "Generally, there may be only one Land and Water Conservation Fund-assisted statewide planning project within a State at any one time. However, there may be, concurrently, both an HHFA-assisted project and a supplemental Land and Water Conservation Fund-assisted project in a State, provided: one does not overlap the other, the two projects are correlated, and there is no duplication of Federal financial assistance for the same work." Mr. Overly added, under subsequent clarification from BOR, such a request by the Committee may be made over an extended time, inasmuch as the monies will be available for the next two years. No federal project funds for acquisition or improvement can be allocated until the state plan is completed, priorities determined thereby, and funds accumulated for matching.

Regarding outdoor recreation planning assistance to local governments, Mr. Biggs said that he had been visited by representatives of the Vancouver area, including Mr. Don Tilson of the Port of Vancouver, who asked whether money will be available for planning, acquisition and development of boating facilities and other water-use activities. Judson Wonderly said that Mr. Tilson had called at his office, and the staff of his department was working with Mr. Tilson on the matter regarding possible HHFA planning assistance. The Chairman asked Mr. Hendrickson to contact Mr. Tilson to insure that he is advised of the Committee's interest in being of assistance.

Chairman Durning said that in his capacity as liaison officer with the BOR for the Land and Water Conservation Fund program, he had received a letter from Mr. Overly's office pointing out the need for a legal review of authorities, to be submitted to the federal government to qualify the Committee to receive federal funds. Mr. Durning reported that he had requested such a review and had sent a copy of his letter to the members of the Committee; he said that since the review would concern the legal

authority of several member agencies and might require help from their legal counsel, it would seem appropriate that the Committee as a whole, now make a motion or resolution asking for this legal review. Mr. Wonderly's MOTION to that effect was seconded by Mr. Campbell and passed.

Administrator's report. Mr. Hendrickson said that he had met with Mr. Roy A. Pitt, Jr., Secretary of the State Finance Committee, on June 24th. Mr. Pitt was awaiting approval of the issuance of \$2 million of Outdoor Recreation Bonds by the Teachers' Retirement System. If the approval is obtained by July 15, the \$2 million bond sale should proceed as reported earlier; if not, it could be included in a supplemental bond sale in about October of this year. Mr. Wimmer MOVED that a letter be written to the State Finance Committee describing the concern and urgency for action by the Teachers' Retirement System. There being no objection, the Chairman asked the Administrator to provide a suitable letter.

The Administrator provided copies of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants-in-Aid Manual to all members present. He commented on the importance of the June 14-15 Regional Conference with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in San Francisco during which representatives from the western states were acquainted with federal policy. He distributed material from the Conference summarizing topics, speakers and discussions through the two days. He asked that subsequent meetings devote a portion of time on each Agenda to gain acquaintance with these procedures.

Mr. Hendrickson reported that the Newsletter, under discussion at previous meetings, would receive priority attention and that ideas and means were invited in an effort to begin the publication at an early date. Departmental participation had been offered by some members.

Progress was reported on arrangements for the next meeting of the Committee in Vancouver, through contact with the Honorable Robert M. Schaefer, Speaker of the House of Representatives, with a commitment secured for August 13 or 14. A workshop meeting was being considered for Friday morning August 13 with officials and interested persons of the Vancouver area, a tour of regional facilities and proposed recreation development in the afternoon. The Committee's business meeting would be held on the morning of the 14th. Senator Frank W. Foley and the Speaker have expressed concern that first-hand knowledge of projects that may be eligible for allocations by the Interagency Committee might be useful for later determinations.

Proposed Revision of Operating Procedure Manual (Red Book). Mrs. Rosemary Horwood opened discussion about a number of revised forms, beginning with draft Form No. IAC-1 entitled "Application for Financial Assistance for Planning, Acquisition, or Development of Outdoor Recreation Lands", presented at the May 15 meeting. Adoption of these revised drafts to replace the earlier forms in the Operating Procedure Manual distributed at the April 1 meeting, was requested. Because sufficient copies of the material were not available, the matter was deferred to the next meeting.

Proposed funding formula and criteria. The Chairman called the next item on the Agenda -- consideration of the two alternative proposals for funding formula for the

Committee's grants. The Administrator asked that proponents of the two alternatives make a three-minute synopsis of each proposal. Mr. Odegaard stated that the funding distribution formula listed on the Agenda as "Parks Department Proposal (Blue Book)" was extracted from the 1964 report of the Governor's Inter-Agency Committee On Outdoor Recreation. It contained the composite work of the six participating Agencies and reflected consideration that agencies have interlocking sets of needs. Mr. Odegaard reviewed and explained briefly this proposal, a copy of which is attached to these minutes and marked Appendage A.

The alternative plan was presented and explained by Mrs. Rosemary Horwood of the Local Affairs Division of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. She stated that the material was offered as an alternative to open discussion and recommended further study of both alternatives before a final decision on adoption of a funding formula by the Committee. A copy of this proposal is attached hereto as Appendage B.

Mr. Wonderly said Mrs. Horwood's proposal was a departmental effort to bring out for discussion those considerations which may not have been thoroughly analyzed during the pressures of finalizing the 1964 report.

Mr. Biggs commented that he favored the basic idea of the second alternative as opposed to the formula discussed by Mr. Odegaard because its philosophy would allow the Committee to allocate money to those projects of highest priority on the basis of need and readiness, as opposed to the automatic percentage division envisioned in the first proposal. Mr. Odegaard added that the proposal of the 50% State - 50% local government formula, which had been advocated for the passage of Initiative 215 and Referendum 11, should not be substantially modified, and the adoption of definite percentages for local governments would encourage their own efforts. Mr. Biggs stated his agreement with the 50/50 State and Local division, but said that actual "expressed" need by some counties might be competing with a "latent" need in other counties, so that a rigid formula based on area might apply in a detrimental manner. For example, some counties might proceed with plans on the basis of "They've given it to us, where can we use it?". Mr. Campbell added that he believed that the \$10 million (authorized by Referendum 11) is small compared with need, and that another bond issue may be required later; therefore, the action of the Committee will have a very important effect on future bond issues.

Mr. Cole observed that the stimulus of fixed amounts, while removing the fear of "grabs" by larger jurisdictions or the "other" side of the Cascades, is an arbitrary criterion rather than foundation upon the need or a plan. It would invite political pressures rather than rest upon sound evaluation. He advocated the allowance of a couple weeks to obtain response and proposals from agencies outside of the state agencies represented on the Interagency Committee.

Mrs. Mylroie, in support of the alternative formula, stated that if need is great enough, local governments will find a way to ask for it. She referred to Mr. Prah's letter of concern about the first proposal. It was observed that everyone would be asked to apply, based on their need, but would not be eligible for consideration if they were not a part of the statewide plan and a priority system.

Loss of Quorum. Mr. Wonderly, due at another meeting, asked to be excused at 3:00. Mr. Cole also had to leave shortly after 3:00 and requested that the Committee not vote on the funding formula at this meeting. He further asked if the opinions expressed by the interested attendants at the meeting could be given to the Committee in writing. Mr. Biggs asked to be excused at 3:30, leaving the Committee without a voting quorum. A letter was read from Warren A. Bishop stating, in part: "I am hopeful final action will not be taken regarding the funding formula until the July meeting. This is one of the most important actions the Committee will take in the early phase of its existence, and I know that everyone agrees that a great deal of deliberation is required on this important matter." Mr. Campbell added that he would like to review the policies and criteria of other states facing these same problems.

The Chairman, addressing the audience, asked that any interested group or public agency direct its opinions or suggestions to the Administrator, to be compiled into a report to be brought before the whole Committee at its next meeting. Three weeks time was considered sufficient for constructive and documented responses from concern groups.

The Chairman then asked for audience response to funding considerations before the Committee. A summary of questions and answers that (1) provided stimulus to further examination of both proposals, and (2) provided consideration for uncovering many underlying aspects is provided herewith:

Francis Rutherford
Kitsap County Park Board
Port Orchard

Kitsap County needs financial aid in planning. Will it be available through the Interagency Committee?

ANSWER: The application through the HHFA with 2 to 1 matching funds is the preferred method, for which proposals are handled by the state Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Bureau of Outdoor Recreation funds are available through action of this Committee whenever it is determined that the other route is not appropriate.

Nancy L. Rising
Bellevue Park Board
Bellevue

On Page 7 of the "Suggested Procedure for Allocation of Matching Funds" prepared jointly by the Department of Commerce (Planning Section) and the Department of Highways regarding the funding method, 1960 census figures were used in the illustrative calculations for the proposed distribution formula. Were these 1960 figures used just for comparison or would this be the basis?

ANSWER: Mrs. Horwood: The 1960 figures were used only as an illustration, and the distribution would more likely be based on up-to-date population estimates, otherwise a growing area could be penalized.

Directed to Mr. Odegaard: Who would appoint the County review boards? The alternate proposal says that priorities are to be established by the Interagency Committee; whereas, the Funding-

Priority-Response Manual method says that priorities are to be established by the County Commissioners.

ANSWER: Mr. Odegaard: There are alternative possibilities up for consideration by this Interagency Committee from which, and other methods, a method may be selected.

Chester Blesen, Executive Secretary
Association of Washington Cities
Seattle

Twenty percent to cities is a pretty small amount; acquisition costs in urban areas are much higher to cities than they are in outlying areas of Counties. Sixty percent of the people of the state reside within incorporated areas. Do you consider these formulas reasonable allocations based on need?

ANSWER: Mr. Durning: We want to consider constructive, alternative proposals if concerned groups will be good enough to document and justify what they consider equitable methods for allocation. Can you provide some recommendations?

Edward J. Johnson, Superintendent
Seattle Park Department
Seattle

Regarding Mr. Odegaard's figures, can these state agencies expend funds in municipal areas?

ANSWER: Mr. Odegaard: Yes, if their responsibilities are appropriate to the kind of area (facilities) being proposed.

Mrs. Madeline LeMere, Member
Seattle Park Board
Seattle

Are you proposing a 50-50 split of funds?

ANSWER: 1 local - 1 state is set out in Initiative 215 for the marine funds; the bond money distribution is to be determined.

David D. Rowlands, City Manager
City of Tacoma

The problems are greatest in cities and the solutions are most costly. In many areas, people want facilities close at hand. The average age of our population is increasing and older folks should be considered in your planning for their leisure time. Please take these needs into careful consideration in determining your formula.

Mr. Durning, addressing the audience: People should not become impatient with the problems faced in adoption of formulas by this Committee. You can see that this is not a decision that can be made lightly. We invite associations, public bodies and private citizens to provide our Administrator, Mr. Hendrickson, with constructive recommendations, in writing. Justification of your position will be valuable.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES - June 25, 1965
Page 8

Richard D. Ford, Executive Secretary
Washington Public Ports Association
Olympia

Requested that when formulas, criteria, etc, are finally formulated, adopted and made ready to be put to use, that we minimize the complexity of forms, material, procedures, etc. "Keep it simple. The Red Book may be fine -- but hide it!"

John L. Chambers, Executive Secretary
Washington State Association of County Commissioners
Olympia

There may be areas in the state where need and opportunity is available, but local people have neither the resources nor stimulus for planning and development. These areas may be of benefit to many people in the state as well as tourists. If these are omitted from local plans, will they just be lost?

ANSWER: Mr. Durning: This may be a role for state agencies; it might be included in the statewide plan.

The Chairman said this subject would be held over to be continued at the next meeting of the Committee.

Surplus lands available from General Services Administration (federal). The Chairman called on Mr. Odegaard to discuss a matter that was not on the Agenda but that Mr. Odegaard had asked time for preceeding the opening of the meeting. Mr. Odegaard said that several months ago, his Commission adopted a resolution to obtain federal surplus land without fee from General Services Administration. At the present time, these lands are available to schools on that basis, but not for state agencies for recreational purposes. Pursuant to vote of the State Parks and Recreation Commission, all members of Congress from this state and the President were written a request suggesting that state agencies be allowed to apply for the lands as recreation sites. He cited several in the state that now come under the classification of surplus federal lands. A MOTION WAS MADE by Mr. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Campbell and passed that Mr. Odegaard, along with the Administrator, develop a resolution to present at the next meeting.

Next meeting. The Chairman said he had talked with Senator Foley and Speaker Schaefer regarding their request that the Committee's next meeting be in Vancouver. After discussion, the date of the next meeting was set as August 13-14, Vancouver, Washington. Final arrangements were to be made by the Administrator to fit a program being formulated by Tom McClelland, Vancouver, Clark County Regional Planner.

Mr. Odegaard moved to adjourn at 4:20 p.m.; and, there being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

EINAR H. HENDRICKSON
Administrator

EHH:blg
Attachments

APPROVED:

Marvin B. Durning
Marvin B. Durning, Chairman

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES - June 25, 1965
APPENDAGE B.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Department of Commerce
and Economic Development
State Planning Section
and
State Department of Highways
June 15, 1965

Suggested Procedure for Allocation of Matching Funds

Introduction: Criteria for a choice of method

The subcommittee working on the method of procedure for priorities and funding concluded that the funding procedure chosen by the Interagency Committee should meet the following criteria:

- a. The method chosen should be such as to best serve the basic objectives of the funding measures.
- b. There must be justification and a definite rationale for the method chosen, for the percentages and guides used for decision, consistent with the purposes of the funding measures.
- c. Fund monies should be allocated and used as rapidly as possible consistent with review and audit procedures required by the funding agencies. Long delays occasioned by holding funds for local use when no certainty exists that there will be a desire to use them are incompatible with the purposes of the measures.
- d. The relationship between the probable amount of available funds and the possible demand for them, coupled with the costs of land acquisition, make it evident that funds should be flexible and not tied down to very small shares which would return relatively limited recreation values to the recipients and the public generally.

Note: Attachment A shows illustrative shares available under a system of percentage allocations to cities and counties. Considering that the acquisition cost for some individual sites would be likely to be more than \$1,000,000, a possible maximum allocation of \$72,000 (not including a possible contingency fund allocation for the largest city in the state) does not seem to offer much incentive toward achieving the objectives of the funding measures.

The proposed alternative method of funding is designed to meet the above criteria, and to provide a method of decision based on sound planning practice and the stated requirements and objectives of the funding measures.

1. General Procedure

- a. Two cutoff dates per year, November 15 and May 15, would be established to fit fiscal or annual budget processing, and the possibility that the availability of the agency share of funds might rest on the results of an election.
- b. Counties, municipalities and other eligible agencies would be requested to indicate once a year, or at a reasonable interval, whether they intended to apply for matching funds during the following year or years and in what amount.
- c. Interagency Committee funds would be divided into two shares, one for each of the first two cutoff dates. Thereafter marine gas tax monies could be accrued biennially and divided into four parts, one for each period until the succeeding biennium, and the bond monies could be allocated between periods at a rate determined by the selling dates of the bond issues.
- d. Six weeks would be allowed for Interagency Committee review and decision, and the decisions would be announced approximately on January 1 and July 1.
- e. Allocated funds would be available to the applicant until one month prior to the next period, or five months from date of notification. If funds are not used, or if substantial evidence

as to why they have not been committed is not presented, funds would revert to the Interagency Committee for re-allocation at the next cutoff date.

- f. Interagency Committee review of progress reports would be made once a year; if substantial progress has not been made, the Interagency Committee would consider withdrawing funds for noncompliance. If progress is satisfactory, time for availability of funds may be extended.
- g. Accrued funds, reverted funds and bond monies would be audited and the amount available for allocation would be reported to the Interagency Committee on December 1 and June 1 of each year.

2. Method of Analysis

- a. All proposed projects must be a part of or consistent with the statewide plan for outdoor recreation and open space as provided by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Marine Recreation Land Act; this constitutes agency review and priority rating, as well as acceptance at state and federal levels.
- b. Proposed projects must fit the provisions of the various funding measures; this also constitutes a review procedure.
- c. Proposed projects for any one period would be considered as a group and ranked according to agreed criteria (see 4. Suggested Criteria); priority would be assigned according to rank.

d. The proposed projects with the best scores could be handled in any of several ways:

- 1) Monies could be allocated as far as they would go;
- 2) Priority projects not funded could be put over for reconsideration at the next date.
- 3) If a specific group of priority projects are to be funded and funds will not be adequate for all priority projects, monies could be prorated between them, or
- 4) A portion of each could be funded and the remainder funded later.

The Interagency Committee might wish to use each of these methods, according to the circumstances of the particular funding period and the applications under consideration.

3. Guidelines on Allocations

- a. Not more than 20% of the funds available for local agencies in any one period would be allocated to any one county, municipality or other eligible local public body.
- b. Not more than 50% of the funds available for state agencies would be allocated to any one state agency in any one period.
- c. Not more than 75% of the state funds available during any one period for either state agencies or local agencies would be allocated on one side of the Cascade crest.
- d. An agency receiving a major allocation would not be eligible to apply for an additional such major allocation for at least one year from the date of the original allocation.

- e. Not more than three such major allocations would be approved in any one calendar year.
- f. Allocations to political subdivisions would not exceed \$2.00 per capita of the population in the jurisdiction or the estimated project interest area.

4. Suggested Criteria for Ranking Proposed Projects

- (a) number of people served by proposed project
 - 1) residents in nearest urban area within driving time of proposed project
 - 2) visitors
- (b) unique quality of site, location, activity or project in terms of geography, view, activity or other characteristics of statewide significance.
- (c) historical interest, state or national
- (d) variety of activities to be provided
- (e) age groups to be served
- (f) educational or cultural values added
- (g) driving time from population center *, not more than
 - 30 minutes from an urban area up to 5,000 population
 - 45 minutes from an urban area up to 20,000 population
 - 60 minutes from an urban area up to 20,000 population to 50,000 population
 - 120 minutes from an urban area over 50,000 and SMSAs.
- (h) total recreation and open space area in the jurisdiction of the applicant agency is below 10 acres per thousand population for the urban area, and an additional 10 acres per thousand for the county in which the proposed project is located.

* Based on studies in California and Michigan

- (i) proposed project is part of a metropolitan or multi-jurisdictional park and open space system for which a metropolitan or regional park and open space plan has been adopted and of which the proposed project is a part.
- (j) cooperative action by two or more agencies is proposed for planning, acquisition or development of a proposed park and open space system or project.
- (k) Interagency Committee finds that substantial emergency in respect to the acquisition of a site or sites required to fill plan requirements.
- (l) seasonal availability; year round multiple use.
- (m) usability for handicapped persons.

Illustrative calculations for proposed distribution formula for outdoor recreation funds in Washington State (based on \$1,000,000 available for first biennium).

1. Assume \$1,000,000

30% equal share

20% county population as percent of total state population

20% cities as percent of total urban population

10% others in county on basis of county percent of total

20% contingency

2. 1960 county population as percent of state for selected counties

			<u>Minimum Share</u>	<u>Maximum Share</u>
1. Garfield	2,976	.1%	\$ 200.00	\$ 7,892.00 +
2. Pacific	14,890	.5%	1,000.00	8,692.00
3. Chelan	40,744	1.4%	2,800.00	10,492.00
4. Whatcom	70,317	2.5%	5,000.00	12,692.00
5. Yakima	145,112	5.1%	10,200.00	17,892.00
6. Spokane	278,333	9.8%	19,600.00	27,292.00
7. King	935,014	32.7%	\$65,400.00	\$73,092.00
State Total:	2,853,214	100.0%		

3. 1960 city population for selected cities as percent of total population of cities in Washington (interpret as incorporated cities)

1. Hatton	95	0.006%	12.00	7,704.00 +
2. Cheney	3,173	0.184%	368.00	8,060.00
3. Hoquiam	10,762	0.626%	1,252.00	8,944.00
4. Olympia	18,273	1.062%	2,124.00	9,817.00
5. Bremerton	28,922	1.682%	3,364.00	11,056.00
6. Everett	40,304	2.343%	4,686.00	12,378.00
7. Spokane	181,608	10.559%	21,118.00	28,810.00
8. Seattle	557,087	32.391%	\$64,782.00	\$72,474.00

Total Incorporated
Population

1,719,891=100.00 %

This is an excellent procedural step, to which we would like to add, on a trial basis at least, notification of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development for the following additional items:

Item 1. Open Space and Outdoor Recreation Study

Inasmuch as the Department of Commerce and Economic Development is responsible for the outdoor recreation and open space study being conducted by the State Parks and Recreation Commission, it would be essential to receive the same information, even though comment or response would be made by State Parks as a general rule.

Item 4. Planning: Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

Due to the fact that the Department of Commerce and Economic Development is the statutory planning body for the state, transmittal on the same basis as for Item 1 would facilitate the coordination of state planning studies.

Suggested Procedure

When any of us receives a communication dealing with any of the above, we should see that the proper material is forwarded to the proper agency. It would be presumptuous of me to suggest a specific procedure since each of us has a different internal organization.

However, though each of us will handle these communications differently, there are two aspects which I believe all of us should keep in mind and use as a basic consideration.

1. Route to the appropriate agency as previously identified.
2. Do not in any way offer any response concerning some other agency's responsibility, except to relate it is being forwarded.

which I will put in the form of a motion if and when the above two comments are approved.

1. Public agencies.

- a. That no applications be accepted from public agencies until the County Outdoor Recreation Committee has provided a priority recommendation for consideration by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.
- b. That the applications from public agencies be approved as received when they are for funding within the 20 percent available to county government or 20 percent for city government.
- c. That the applications from public agencies be approved on set three-month intervals, starting October 1, 1965 when they are for funding within the 30 percent to counties as a geographical unit, 10 percent to other public agencies, and 20 percent contingency.

2. State agencies.

That the applications from state agencies be approved on set three-month intervals starting September 1, 1965.

...

To simplify our routing and responses it seems to me that we need only to keep in mind what agency is responsible for what particular type of need. It seems to me that these are:

1. Open Space and Outdoor Recreation Study - Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.
2. Funding via three outdoor recreation measures - Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.
3. Funding by way of HHFA and ARA - Commerce and Economic Development.
4. Planning:
 - a. 701 - Commerce and Economic Development.
 - b. Land and Water Conservation Fund Act - Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation.

- b. Twenty percent of these funds be made available to the governmental units of the collective thirty-nine counties on the basis of each county's population in proportion to the population of the state.
 - c. Twenty percent of these funds be made available to the collective cities of the state on the basis of each city's population in proportion to the total population of the cities within the state.
 - d. Ten percent of these funds be made available to other public agencies in the collective thirty-nine counties, excluding the cities and county government per se on the basis of each county's population in proportion to the total population of the state.
 - e. Twenty percent of these funds be made available to the public agency in the state for contingency.
5. That the funds made available to any grouping of "other public agencies" through the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act be held for acceptable application from any agency within that grouping for one year and then, if not successfully applied for, be placed into the contingency fund for a period of six months at which time they shall be available to state agencies if not successfully applied for by public agencies.
6. That the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation require each county, as a geographical unit, as a condition of eligibility, to establish or designate a county (or two or more counties) Outdoor Recreation Committee.
7. All applications for funding from any public agency first go before the County Outdoor Recreation Committee which committee shall check for accuracy and technical completion.
8. That the monies made available through the equal basis share (thirty percent) and the other public body share (ten percent) be authorized on the basis of the recommendations of the county Outdoor Recreation Committee.

...

C. Recommendation.

Since this recommendation is under the assumption of approval of the County Outdoor Recreation Committee and funding percent distribution, I will not put this in the form of a motion. Rather, it is a recommendation,

EXCERPTS FROM
FUNDING - PRIORITY - RESPONSE MANUAL
prepared by
Charles H. Odegaard, Director
Parks and Recreation Commission
and Member of
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

STATE OF WASHINGTON
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

June 15, 1965

E. Recommendation.

As a member of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, I hereby move the adoption in principle of the following funding formula and direct that the Administrator meet with the office of the Attorney General to enact this into its proper legal wording. I move that:

1. Within the framework of the various laws, 50 percent of the monies made available to the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation from the Marine Recreation Land Act and the Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue of the State of Washington and the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act be made available to Washington State agencies and that 50 percent of these monies be made available to other public agencies;
2. Of the fifty percent funds made available to state agencies that those made available through the Washington State funding measures be at a no-matching basis, and that those made available through the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act be made on the basis as prescribed by the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation;
3. Of the fifty percent of the funds made available to public agencies, those made available through the Marine Recreation Land Act and the Outdoor Recreation Bond Issue be made on a forty-percent-sixty percent public basis, and that those made available through the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act be on the basis as prescribed by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation;
4. Of all monies made available to public agencies, they be on the following basis:
 - a. Thirty percent of these funds be made available to the thirty-nine collective counties on an equal basis with $1/39$ th of the thirty percent being available to each county as a geographical area, not a governmental unit.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES - June 25, 1965
APPENDAGE C.

GUESTS

Mrs. Mortimer H. Thomas, League of Women Voters, Seattle
Einar M. Syvertsen, Dept. of Commerce & Economic Develop., Seattle
Wayne Kite, Skagit County, Mount Vernon
Lanche Crow, Skagit County, Mount Vernon
Ting-Li Cho, Port of Seattle, Seattle
Ruth Ittner, Bureau of Governmental Research & Service, Seattle
Chester Biesen, Executive Secretary, Association of Wash. Cities, Seattle
Marion E. Langstaff, King County Planning Department, Seattle
Richard D. Ford, Executive Secretary, Wash. Public Ports Ass'n., Olympia
Richard Burrows, Parks and Recreation Dept., City of Mercer Island
Siegfrid K. Semrau, Park and Recreation Department, Bellevue
Nancy L. Rising, Bellevue Park Board, Bellevue
Virginia Gunley, League of Women Voters, Seattle
Floyd M. Jennings, Association of Washington Cities, Seattle
Georgette Valle, State Representative, 30th District, Seattle
Ron Nelson, City Planning Department, Tacoma
Doug McArthur, Metropolitan Park District, Tacoma
Erling Mork, City Planning Department, Tacoma
Bill Glundberg, Metropolitan Park District, Tacoma
David D. Rowlands, City Manager, City of Tacoma, Tacoma
James W. Wright, City of Tacoma, Tacoma
J. Garth Anderson, Board of Public Works, Tacoma
Bob Eveleigh, Pierce County Planning Department, Tacoma
Rod Gilchrist, S. W. Snohomish County Joint Planning Council, Edmonds
Mrs. James D. Hogan, Kent Park Board, Kent
John N. Porter, Director, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
Don McArthur, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
Jerry Schlatter, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
R. N. Joshi, Puget Sound Regional Transportation Study
John L. Chambers, Executive Secretary, Wash. State Assoc. of County
Commissioners, Olympia
David W. Stevens, Bureau of Governmental Research and Service,
University of Washington, Seattle
Tom McClelland, Clark County Regional Planning, Vancouver
Merwin W. Parker, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
Lal R. Kemoe, Ballard Fish and Game Club, Ballard
Carl B. Berg, King County Park and Recreation Department, Seattle
Ev G. Henry, Puget Sound Interclub Association, Seattle
H. A. Harvey, Puget Sound Interclub Association, Seattle
also President Princess Louise Society and Northwest
Marine Industries
Stan Olson, U. S. Forest Service, Snoqualmie N. F.
John W. Hall, Everett Park Department, Everett
Frank Bennett, Everett Planning Department, Everett
James A. Murphy, City Attorney, City of Edmonds
Ron Taylor, Recreation Division, City of Edmonds
Dennis Pisila, Planning and Parks Department, Snohomish County, Everett

GUESTS (Continued)

Floyd Rowley, Ellensburg Public Schools, Ellensburg
Francis Rutherford, Kitsap County Park Board, Port Orchard
Frank Duester, Northwest Marine Industries, Seattle
Edw. J. Johnson, Seattle Park Department, Seattle
Waldo J. Dahl, Seattle Park Department, Seattle
Madeline LeMere, Seattle Park Department, Seattle
Don Sherwood, Seattle Park Department, Seattle
Bruce G. Finke, Seattle City Planning Commission, Seattle
Robert F. Hultz, Seattle City Planning Commission, Seattle
Sydney W. Glover, Planning Director, Grays Harbor County Planning
Commission, Aberdeen
Jack Harbeston, Consulting Services Corporation, Seattle
Ann Williams, Editor, Department of Commerce and Economic Development,
Seattle