

our thriving tourist industry, a preserve for the outdoor sportsman, a principal resource of family recreation and a substantial contributor to both our peace of mind and the pleasure of life in Washington. It is in good measure, the equal and opposite of our Urban Society.

As in the case of urban affairs, time is the uncompromising taskmaster. Where in the past we have considered our natural heritage to be one of perpetual abundance, today we must view it as a vanishing asset, subject to the predictable and inevitable population growth which we must expect for the balance of this century. When you consider that Washington will add 500,000 people in the next four years, and perhaps a million more in the ten years after that, the factor of time becomes the foundation of urgency.

To assure that we have the capacity to acquire and preserve a portion of these areas, this administration will ask that a \$50,000,000 bond issue be referred by the Legislature to the people for approval on the 1968 election ballot. The bill will propose that half of the money requested be designated for use by State agencies and half by local agencies in a cooperative and coordinated effort to set aside and secure for the future some of our great natural heritage.

By parlaying funds from local, state, and various Federal sources, the Inter-agency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, the State focal point for obligation of funds, has made an enviable record. First project commitments were made in late 1965. Since that time, 297 starts have been authorized to acquire or improve more than 30,000 acres of land for a gross cost of \$14,486,929.15.

We have a substantial backlog of proposals initiated from within the \$600 million needs identified in the Statewide plan accepted by the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as the basis for judging priorities. Only a small fraction of the critically needed projects can be satisfied by currently foreseeable resources. Although our record thus far is enviable, we are fearful that the one percent per annum gross input (local/state/Federal) for outdoor recreation capital outlay is seriously below the State's growth trend. At this pace it will take 100 years to catch up with needs expressed in the plan and identified as today's priorities.

One of our demonstration show pieces is the recently completed Arboretum Trail project in the heart of Seattle. The city, the University of Washington, and money from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act contingency fund permitted its construction. A photo is attached.

The State's six-year program dovetails with the Administration's recommended five-year program of accelerated land acquisition. With passage of Referendum 18 this fall, however, the State will continue to outstrip its rightful share of Federal funds even if S. 1401 provides an additional source of revenue from Outer Continental Shelf Land receipts, as recommended by the Administration. Federal resources will still be inadequate.

In our opinion the Administration proposal to set the level of financing at \$200 million a year for the next five years is insufficient to meet the overall need. It not only falls short of what is needed for land acquisitions by Federal agencies, but it is unrealistic in terms of matching fund support for State and local projects also faced with skyrocketing costs. For the most part, these are close at home projects where most of the people live. The need is urgent, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund matching grant program enables State and local governments to stretch their dollars twice as far.

Instead of stabilizing the Fund at \$200 million, we would like to see the Congress set the level at \$400 million annually for the next five years. If the proposed 50-50 distribution is adopted, States, and through them, local governments, would have a \$200 million annual appropriation with which they could work. This would enable them to meet their outdoor recreation needs more realistically before prime areas disappear or prices become prohibitive.

If sufficient revenue is not forthcoming from the Outer Continental Land receipts, serious consideration should be given to the additional sources of funding listed in S. 1401 and H.R. 8578 as introduced. These included miscellaneous receipts under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and earmarked receipts from national forests. We suspect that the Washington State situation is typical of that in other states as a result of long-deferred assumption of responsibility in providing more and better outdoor recreation areas now and for future generations. We believe that the time for action is now.

Sincerely,

LEWIS A. BELL,
Chairman, State BOR Liaison Officer.