Mr. HENDRICKSON. I also come here wearing a hat as national chairman, division of planning and practice, for the American Institute of Planners, although we do not offer a statement at this time.

The State of Washington wishes to enter this testimony on behalf of Senate bill 1401 with amendments. We favor its passage, for only by provision of additional revenues will it be possible to meet the critical outdoor recreation needs that exist now.

We have evidence of serious land escalation problems in the State of Washington, as is exemplified in the Seattle-King County area. While our State may be thought of as a frontier, where we have something like one-third of the land area in the public domain, we still have the escalation problem and we have a need for acquiring additional lands in our State for recreation purposes.

One example we cite in this letter is in a downtown area of Seattle, where the escalation of price in a project before us has been something like 50 percent in a period of 2 years.

The State of Washington has had an emphasis on acquisition that parallels the activities of the land and water conservation fund. Our letter bears this out to the extent that we have earmarked about $13 million for capital outlay purposes in a 6-year period. During this time we can only expect about $5 million from the land and water formula under existing conditions.

It is true, I think, by our example that your program has certainly stimulated activity in our sector. In fact, last year the legislature put on the ballot what is now known as referendum 18 for an additional $40 million outdoor recreation bond issue. I will skip through the comments, which I will leave for the committee, on how the legislature responded to this. To be brief, I might say that by parlaying funds from local, State, and Federal sources, we have, we think, a somewhat enviable record.

The first project commitments were made in late 1965. Since that time we have made 297 starts, at last count, to acquire and improve about 30,000 acres for a gross cost of $14½ million.

This is most marked by the current action in the Seattle area. I would like to give credit to the so-called forward thrust, which has an election a week from today for a $118 million issue for King County area's loan for recreational purposes. It is to the credit of one particular man, who formerly served your committee, that this was put on the ballot here.

But at this pace, the pace that we are all committed to now, we are not meeting the needs. In fact, the needs for our State show something like $600 million—needs that should be satisfied in the immediate years. At this pace it would take upward of a century to accommodate the needs that exist now.

Our program does dovetail with the administration recommendations for a 5-year program of acceleration here before you in Congress. We think through planning that we do have some answers to the questions just raised about how do you handle options.

Perhaps the plan should go to the point where you have some type of official map procedure, so that actually your sites are committed. And we will obviate the problems of the escalation of price. I think your contractual provisions in the current bill go part of the way insofar as Federal acquisitions are concerned.