

January 8, 1966

- I. Meeting called to order
  - II. Minutes of previous meeting - corrections
  - III. Additions to agenda
  - IV. OLD BUSINESS
    - a) Rule of committee procedure regarding projects and allocation of funds
    - b) Statewide Plan - pending status - review
    - c) Report on staffing
    - d) Policy questions and recommendations
    - e) Report on status of state agency project applications
      - Peace Arch - Parks Commission
      - Game Dept - Colockum Game Range Addition
      - Nisqually Delta Waterfowl Range
      - Water Access - various rivers
      - Hold-in-the-ground - future funding carry-over
    - f) Local agency project applications
    - g) Local agency project application fee - further study - discuss with Governor
  - V. a) Report on Friday Briefings
    - 1) Corps of Engrs. Cost sharing for recreational navigation projects.
    - 2) HUD Robert Boldt, Washington, D.C. report
  - b) Reports of Members
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
  - a) Rule regarding marking of all projects receiving funds by committee vote.  
DELETED from agenda.
  - b) Schedule for forthcoming meetings
  - c) Proposed low-budget communications and public relations program
  - d) Arrangements for February meeting
- VII. ADJOURNMENT

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Davenport Hotel, - Spokane, Washington

Saturday, January 8, 1966 - 9:10 a.m.

Marvin Durning, Chairman

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Durning; John A. Biggs, Director, Department of Game; Warren A. Bishop; Keith M. Campbell; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission; Charles G. Prahl, Director, Department of Highways; Thomas O. Wimmer; Daniel B. Ward, Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development; Einar H. Hendrickson, Administrator.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Department of Commerce and Economic Development

Judson Wonderly, Assistant Director

Paul Benson, Chief, State Planning Section

Department of Fisheries

Don Erickson, Biologist

Department of Game

Stan Scott, Acting Outdoor Recreation Coordinator

Norman P. Knott, Chief, Land Management Division

Department of Highways

Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer

Department of Natural Resources

A. R. O'Donnell, Technical Assistant

Parks and Recreation Commission

John A. Clark, Supervisor of Planning and Development

James Webster, Recreation Consultant

Interagency Committee Staff

Amy Bell, Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER AGENCIES

Attorney General

Lloyd Peterson, Assistant Attorney General

Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Fred Overly, Regional Director

Maurice Lundy, Assistant Regional Director

Dale Haskins, Supervisory Recreation Resources Planner

Corps of Engineers

Al Gullidge

Housing and Urban Development

Robert Boldt, Open Space Land Division Specialist

Earl Singer, Urban Design Specialist

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dick H. Bower, Supervisor of History, Geography and Civics

Harold Smith, Supervisor of Secondary Education

Parks and Recreation Commission; Ted McTighe, Chairman

MEMBERS: LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM

The Honorable Avery Garrett, Chairman

The Honorable Don Talley

The Honorable Mrs. Kathryn Epton

The Honorable Ted Peterson

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:10 by Chairman Marvin B. Durning. Members and special guests were introduced as identified above.
- II. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING. The Chairman asked for acceptance of the minutes as provided by mail. Mr. Prah! stated that inasmuch as the Department of Highways would receive other federal funds it would not be submitting a program nor asking for money from the contingency fund so that the item on page 7, under item (d) reading "and suggestions for Highway Beautification projects that might be considered for funding out of the contingency reserve." be properly construed from the Minutes; it was also mentioned that the name of Mr. Biggs should not appear as having been present at the previous meeting. MR. COLE MOVED AND MR. PRAHL SECONDED THAT THE MINUTES BE APPROVED WITH SUCH CORRECTIONS. CARRIED.
- III. Additions to Agenda. It was recommended by the Administrator that Items IV(d) Policy questions and IV(g) Local Agency Project Application fee be removed from the Agenda. Recommendation accepted.
- IV. Old Business.
- (a) Rule of Committee Procedure Regarding Projects and Allocation of Funds. Mr. Hendrickson presented the following recommendation: That (1) all applications by state or local agencies to qualify or allocate funds for a project, and all requests for amendments to projects, be provided to the Administrator in the form and number established by the Committee no less than ten days prior to a forthcoming meeting, (2) each application or amendment received be placed on the agenda of the next meeting to be "received" by the Committee and referred to the Administrator for staff review, evaluation and recommendation, (3) the Administrator (a) seek comments of interested agencies, (b) provide staff analysis, and (c) bring his report and recommendation to the Committee at a subsequent meeting, and (4) the Administrator or a member may bring an emergency matter before the Committee by majority vote of those present in a regularly convened meeting.

The Committee felt that local agencies should be afforded an equal opportunity to bring emergency matters before the Committee either through the Administrator or a member, and that any state agency could also present its case individually. MR. ODEGAARD MOVED AND MR. BIGGS SECONDED THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED. MOTION CARRIED.

(b) Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. Reference was made to the staff memo on this subject which recommended that (1) the plan not be adopted in its preliminary form, but be subject to extensive revision, (2) the Committee staffing complement be filled to accommodate the necessary work, (3) agency funding, 701 budget amendments, and/or an extension of BOR contracts to staff the office be authorized, and (4) overload work requirements be employed to private consultants, if the Department of Commerce and Economic Development finds subcontracting to an outside firm necessary.

Mr. Benson reported on behalf of the State Department of Commerce that review was well underway, that 9 letters of critique had been received from local agencies and other sources; that 27 letters had been received through Mr. Hendrickson requesting that time be allowed for sufficient review; that meetings had been held with several state agencies to incorporate suggestions about the plan; and that additional meetings with BOR would begin on January 12 to consider the type of changes needed. He quoted from the December 7 and the December 3 letters from the

BOR regarding the interim plan that had been accepted and the need for additional information to be included in the more comprehensive outdoor recreation plan. He made a recommendation for the Department of Commerce that the document be continued in review and that no official action be taken until the Department could recommend action at a future meeting as to the type of changes to make the plan acceptable.

Mr. Biggs stressed the need (1) for accommodation of public reactions and (2) to bring the plan into conformity with BOR standards, and (3) the fact that an interim plan had been accepted by which allocations could be made until next January thereby permitting time for review.

Mr. Hendrickson presented letters from (1) Association of Washington Cities, (2) Mr. J. R. Vibber, President, Washington State Association of County Park and Recreation Boards, (3) Mr. Saagvold, Chairman, Benton County Park and Recreation Boards, and (4) Mr. George Plescher, Secretary Benton Regional Planning Commission with their criticisms.

MR. BIGGS MOVED THAT THE PROPOSED PLAN BE KEPT ON A PENDING STATUS SO THAT THE WORK OUTLINED AND ACCOMMODATION OF REACTIONS FROM PUBLIC AGENCIES CONTINUE TO BE CONSIDERED WITH A STATUS REPORT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING TO BE PROVIDED TO INDICATE HOW THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BOR AND THE PUBLIC MIGHT BE MET PRIOR TO ADOPTION. MR. COLE SECONDED. It was suggested that the Department of Commerce and Economic Development be primarily concerned with the refinement of the plan and extend the technical work required within limits of their federal agreement. MOTION CARRIED.

- (c) Report on Staffing. Mr. Hendrickson submitted to the Committee two memos of January 5. One entitled Report on Staff, indicated the short range work program for 1966, which served as a basis for a two hour conference between Governor Evans, Chairman Durning and the Administrator. It supplemented prior memoranda and the Committee directive of the last meeting. Mr. Durning's letter of December 20 summarized the Committee's need as agreed upon at the December meeting; since that time the Committee had been provided clerical services of Mrs. Janet Romine through the Department of Game and services of William Bush from Mr. Charles Odegaard. In addition, the services of J. Haslett Bell, who will provide consultant work in plan refinement was obtained under the BOR contractual funding. It was also the understanding that the Central Budget Agency would provide reimbursible bookkeeping assistance beginning in March. The other report, entitled Report on Staffing - Work Program, included a schedule which illustrated peaking points of activity and staff effort for the next sixty days, secondly in May-June, September-October, and again in December - January. These times coincided with project allocations, federal grant deadlines, Governor's budget submission, and expiration of plan BOR eligibility. While there appeared to be dominant periods of work load, it was indicated that adequate staffing would permit phasing the necessary jobs so as to obtain a smooth, orderly flow of work to and through the Committee. It was explained that this would permit Committee thought and discussion about work programming although it was reported as a crude start to describe specific chores which were not thoroughly jelled to date. Reference was also made to the Governor's concern about staffing.

- (d) Policy Questions and Recommendations. The Administrator related how recommendation on the policy question deferred at the last meeting were not ready, but had been referred to the Assistant Attorney General Lloyd Peterson for study. Persons in the audience were recognized to be heard on this question.

Mr. Robert W. Graham, President of the Interclub Association and representing 60 to 70 boating organizations across the State asked to address the Committee. He suggested that (1) boaters were not concerned with development of facilities at the point of boat origin, (2) they favor use of funds for development of transient destination facilities for short time purposes, (3) it should not be the function of the Committee to provide for 12 month moorage of vessels, (4) the need was for facilities that could be used on a temporary basis so that funds would be earmarked for the future acquisition of sites that might otherwise be lost forever; (5) funds originating in a particular county should not necessarily be utilized in that county and (6) underlying guide lines as a basis for development of the Statewide plan be disseminated to the whole public.

Mr. Rottler, Vice President of the Interclub Association and President of Northwest Marine Industries, representing 170 marine dealers and moorage operators, stated that there were 220,000 boats in the State of Washington. He stressed that the industry felt that land acquisitions was most important. It was suggested that if private capital could provide development of rental facilities, this would be preferable to the use of public funds so as to deploy public funds for the purposes recommended by Mr. Graham. He also asked that the public reaction to the Plan be considered.

- (e) Report on Status of State Agency Project Applications. Mr. Hendrickson quoted from the Memo of December 22, "Fund Allocations - Outdoor Recreation Act" which summarized the "ceiling" allocation to State Agencies in October which could come out of the Bond sale. He summarized concern that there had been no Committee action regarding retroactive credits.

Mr. Hendrickson called attention of the Committee to the January 4 memo about State Agency Project Applications:

(1) The Chairman reported that forwarding certain projects to the BOR had been delayed pending Committee amendment of its October action to authorize the use of retroactive credit or appropriations as part of an application inasmuch as the earlier vote only contemplated the use of IAC administered funds.

(2) If supplemental resources (agency appropriations or credits for improvements made since passage of the LMCFA - September, 1964) were to be applied for BOR matching funds, Committee Action to this effect would be needed on each specific project.

(3) For the immediate two years (i.e., prior to December 31, 1967), all retroactively creditable projects must be utilized. Inasmuch as there will be limited state funds available the urgency in calling for qualifying eligible retroactive projects is clear. Maximizing these possibilities will lead to more funds sources other than the BOR.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, January 8, 1966  
Page 5

- (4) Use of credits is desirable, however to date no overall picture of how much is available or eligible for each agency has been provided as requested by a November memo. Mr. Hendrickson asked that a credits listing be submitted as soon as possible in order to analyze benefits during this year.
- (5) The only funds definitely available for expenditure at this time are the \$500,000 Referendum 11 Bond proceeds voted by the Committee i.e., the state agency share for this fiscal year. The rate of expenditures from the outdoor recreation account must be tailored to this situation until either Initiative or Federal funds become available.
- (6) No Federal funds (i.e. BOR) became available until approval had been granted on projects by the Washington, D. C. office of BOR and a "project agreement" has been signed by the State Liaison Officer and the Director of the BOR. None of the projects had been so approved. Thereafter, reimbursement bills must be submitted.
- (7) There are no Initiative 215 funds available yet; the marine gas tax study report was due by January 1, 1966 to the Director of Motor Vehicles. He was scheduled to hold one or more hearings, make findings, before funds may be transferred to the outdoor recreation account. It was estimated that \$500,000 unreclaimed marine gas tax (before subtracting costs of IAC administration, bond sale costs, and costs of the gas tax study) might be available; the study result may be less than \$500,000 and a law suit could hold up transfer of funds until settled. The only prudent course seemed to be to delay spending. The Committee meanwhile could only "qualify" projects.
- (8) The Department of Natural Resources in its development project proposed \$3,225 from State funds in the outdoor recreation account as part of the State share. These could only be Initiative funds, since bond funds were for acquisition only. The project could be "qualified", but probably could not be funded at this time on this assumption.
- (9) Both the Parks Department and the Department of Natural Resources had written up projects using "credits" for past work done, whereas there was no mention of credits or their use in the Committee actions at the October meeting. This procedure increased the matching requirements from BOR funds in the projects where the credits were used so as to deplete BOR sources.
- (10) No specific action had been taken to authorize use of any of the contingency fund of \$140,000 to date; therefore, it was considered as earmarked with equal importance with other projects approved.
- (11) The Analysis took the conservative position that until initiative funds were definitely available in the outdoor recreation account, expenditures of State funds for projects from this account could only be bond funds, and these were limited to \$500,000 in fiscal 1966 for State projects.

Mr. Hendrickson recommended that allocations be amended to permit proper filing with BOR for processing without going into contingency fund. It was contemplated (1) that Twin Harbors project would use \$59,100 in retroactive credits, (2) that non recreation account funds would be used for Fort Canby and (3) that Lake Chelan State Park would utilize credits in amount of \$26,100 as the matching funds. The Department of Natural resources asked for development credits of \$51,300 and \$3,225 additional. Mr. Biggs felt that this was an accounting procedure problem; that if there was an immediate deficiency in certain accounts which had no relationship to the overall allocation (provided that it did not exceed 1/2 of the total allocated, nor constitute a borrowing against the future) such exchange and approval would make possible the orderly working out of authority already given. The Game Department could use their own funds in expectation of a reimbursement of funds when money became available.

MR BISHOP MOVED THAT THE ALLOCATIONS BE MODIFIED TO THE EXTENT THAT WAS NECESSARY TO RATIFY AND APPROVE USE OF RETROACTIVE CREDITS AND NON RECREATION ACCOUNT FUNDS AND TO ALLOW ORDERLY PURCHASE IF REQUIRED FROM THE CONTINGENCY FUND TO FINANCE THOSE PROJECTS ALREADY APPROVED AND THAT EACH AGENCY STILL BE LIMITED TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT SET IN TACOMA, AS FUNDS BECAME AVAILABLE. MR. CAMPBELL SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hendrickson referred to the Memo of December 29 in which Mr. Durning had summarized the mail poll of the Committee favoring allocation of funds on an emergency basis to the Parks Commission for the Peace Arch Project. Mr. Hendrickson also referred to the Memo of January 5 which requested ratification of this action premised on a rearrangement of project rankings in scale with the percentage of bond funds allocated to Parks.

MR. BISHOP MOVED, AND MR. COLE SECONDED, THAT THE ACTION TAKEN IN THE INTERIM BY POLL ON THE PEACE ARCH PROPOSAL OF THE PARKS BE RATIFIED. MOTION CARRIED.

Upon introduction by Mr. Biggs, Stanley Scott of the Department of Game gave a brief resume of the 30-page folio that had been mailed to the membership. Request was made for project amendments as follows:

|  | <u>Original Request</u> | <u>Revised Amount</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| (a) <u>Colockum Game Range Addition</u>    | \$100,000.00            | \$121,198.23          |
| (b) <u>Nisqually Delta Waterfowl Range</u> | 100,000.00              | 120,000.00            |

(Mr. Biggs commented that the Department of Game recognized the existence of other interests in the Nisqually Delta.) It was contemplated that the Scatter Creek Addition would remain as originally proposed; \$25,000.00.

Mr. Scott presented options on water access areas in the amount of \$30,144.50 which would fall within the amount for water access approved by the Committee in October. They were: Elochoman river, \$462.00; Columbia River, \$250.00; Columbia River, \$15,000.00; Skagit River, \$10,000.00; Stillaguamish River, 2 @ \$1,000.00; Grays River, \$866.25 and Grays River, \$1,566.25.

He further requested that the Game Department be allowed to carry their project of Hole-in-the-Ground into a future funding period, if necessary, and that it be given an appropriate priority. In answer to a question from Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Fred Overly, the Regional Director of BOR, said this would entail a budget amendment in the project application. MR. BIGGS MOVED AND MR. PRAHL SECONDED THAT WE AMEND THE PARTICULAR PROJECTS OUTLINED BY MR. SCOTT.

Mr. Wonderly asked for further study of the Nisqually Area as related to a total economic land use plan in the area and that the record reflect the interest on the part of the Ports and other industries for consideration in any economic planning. Mr. Bishop suggested that such plans were not available. In view of the lack of such comprehensive economic plan and the unique characteristics of the area as a recreational resource the question was called and MOTION CARRIED.

- (f) Local Agency Project Applications. A January 5 memo provided a tabulation of all local projects received: 132 local proposals from 56 local agencies, including 35 cities, 11 counties and 10 other public bodies. Of these projects 63 were for development; 69 were for acquisition. \$5 million of local funds were available to match \$20 million of projects that local agencies considered important enough to be placed before the Committee. During December the staff had conducted seven day-long meetings to help develop these proposals. In addition, it was reported that there had been two meetings of the technical committee to develop rating criteria based in part on BOR criteria adopted by the Committee in September; these covered 10 objectives in which rating might be attempted. It was recommended that project selection not be attempted at the February meeting, inasmuch as further work on evaluation criteria, application refinements, and adequate review could be necessary to select the best type of projects. It was explained that it appeared desirable to prequalify projects in excess of immediate ability to fund so that projects not receiving a top priority for this funding period might be ranked for attention at a subsequent allocation period to be consistent with plan requirements of the initiative. In answer to Mr. Austin Morgan's College Place question regarding the possibility of partially funding a project, Mr. Hendrickson answered that it seemed possible but that a decision on such question had to be considered in reviewing all local projects so as to gain an overall picture of needs.

- (g) Local Agency Project Application Fee. This had been removed from the Agenda for further study and to gain insight on the matter with the Governor.

## V. Other Reports

### (a) Report on Friday Briefings

- (1) Corps of Engineers. Cost sharing for recreational navigation projects, Al Gullidge. Mr. Gullidge discussed the role of the Corps of Engineers in construction of small boat facilities in the U. S. The Corps has completed 11 small boat basin projects in the State of Washington at a cost of \$7,000,000 from Federal funds and \$4,000,000 from private and local funds. Large projects require action by Congress and take approximately 5 years to process but the Congress has delegated to the Corps the responsibility for construction of facilities under \$500,000. By this method the sponsoring agency (1) requests a feasi-

bility study, (2) the Corps prepares a detailed engineering and economic study, (3) the report is reviewed and if feasible, (4) authority is given to make a detailed study review and authorization of funds.

The local sponsor must (1) provide easements and rights of way without cost to the U. S., (2) hold U. S. free from damages and maintenance, (3) provide adequate landing, berthing, provisions of fuel, water, etc. for all on equal basis, (4) provide cash contribution, (5) assume all project costs in excess of \$500,000, (6) pay for relocation of sewers and other public utilities and (7) provide and maintain cost of break-water, sharing on a 50% basis if used by pleasure boats. If for commercial use, the federal government pays 100%.

Mr. Gullidge also discussed the need for a study of boating patterns and the problem of pollution from marinas.

(2) Housing and Urban Development, Open space land division, Robert Boldt, Washington, D. C. Mr. Boldt reported on the creation of the Housing Act in 1961 for the purpose of acquiring local areas which might soon not be available. In 1965 the Act was changed to allow (1) acquisition of developed land where vacant land was not available, (2) development of land which had been acquired with the assistance of HUD, and (3) increased matching funds to 50%. These funds are available to any public body who can acquire land for recreation and conservation purposes and who can contract with the Federal Government. The Department can assist (1) only in urban areas, (2) in acquisition of undeveloped land or developed land where it is grown up and there is a finding that there is a need for this open land, (3) in acquisition of park and recreation land and special types of land, (4) combined school and park site, (5) acquisition in water oriented areas for recreation or conservation purposes, (6) funding of sanitary land fills when it is established it will become park within 10 years, (7) acquisition of underground parking facilities where city agrees to put park above it and, (8) historical sites located in urban areas or historical buildings located on such land. Certain kinds of acquisition costs and administration costs are also eligible for matching grants. Aid in acquiring developed lands extends to relocation of persons and businesses. For development of lands acquired through the aid of the Department, it is required that a site development plan be provided and that the community contribute 50% either in cash or kind (labor, materials, etc.). Mr. Boldt stressed that the Seattle office would help in answering questions and in filling out forms for funds.

(b) Members

Mr. Campbell asked that a letter be sent Mr. Hilson and Mr. Wonderly from Mr. Durning expressing thanks from the whole Committee for their services of the past year. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Cole asked that Mr. Campbell be thanked for the arrangements for the Spokane meeting. Mr. Campbell said that Mr. Roy Gunderson, Superintendent of the Department of Parks and Recreation, deserved their thanks.

VI. New Business.

- (a) Rule regarding marking of all projects receiving funds by Committee vote. Since this was not ready, permission was asked to delete from the agenda. The Committee consented and was requested to provide ideas for this policy.
- (b) Schedule for forthcoming meetings. A suggested schedule was presented taking into consideration that (1) the need for hearings on project applications would diminish, (2) the need for the Committee's region by region acquaintance with recreation programs had been magnified, (3) Committee inspection of existing resources, projects in execution, and future projects would be desirable, (4) the process of informing the public and accommodating the interests of legislators would grow, and (5) agency tours should be hosted in district areas to educate the Committee regarding natural beauty and recreation potentials.

Dates and places recommended for future meetings were listed as follows:

|                |                   |                       |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| March 11-12    | Seattle           |                       |
| April 8-9      | Yakima            |                       |
| May 6-7        | Everett           |                       |
| June 10-11     | Olympia           |                       |
| July 8-9       | Renton            |                       |
| August 5-6     | Port Angeles      |                       |
| September 9-10 | Pullman           |                       |
| October 7-8    | Longview          |                       |
| November 11-12 | Moses Lake        |                       |
| December 9-10  | Seattle           |                       |
| January 6-7    | Olympia vicinity) |                       |
| February 10-11 | " "               | ) Legislative session |
| March 10-11    | " "               | )                     |

Written comments for consideration of amendments to this recommendation were solicited by January 20.

Discussion followed regarding a need for continuation of two-day meetings, expense of attending a two-day meeting at distant points, the need for work centering in the western area, the problems of tying the Committee to a long term schedule. MR. CAMPBELL MOVED, AND MR. WIMMER SECONDED, THAT THE QUESTION OF FUTURE MEETINGS BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA AT THE FEBRUARY MEETING. MOTION CARRIED.

- (c) Proposed Low-budget communications and public relations program. The Administrator distributed copies of A Proposed Low-budget Communications and Public Relations Program produced in November as part of Phil Parker's contract under the BOR action program agreement.
- (d) Arrangements for February meeting. Mr. Durringsaid that the Committee had been invited to meet with the Governor February 10 which would be one day before the scheduled meeting in Aberdeen. It was asked if the work of the Committee might be accomplished on the same day. MR. BIGGS MOVED THAT THE MEETING BE ON THE DATE SUGGESTED BY THE GOVERNOR AND AN

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

MINUTES, January 8, 1966  
Page 10

EFFORT BE MADE TO CONSOLIDATE THE ABERDEEN MEETING TO THAT TIME.  
MR. ODEGAARD SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED. The Chairman directed  
Mr. Hendrickson to discuss this shift with people in Aberdeen.

VII. Adjournment. IT WAS MOVED, SECONDED AND PASSED THAT MEETING BE ADJOURNED.  
11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Einar H. Hendrickson*  
Einar H. Hendrickson  
Administrator

APPROVED:

*Marvin B. Durning*

Marvin B. Durning  
Chairman