

The Museum project, of course, never would have materialized if State technical staff had not researched the site. In fact, the State expended time and money by funding an archeological study. The report written, as a result of the actual findings on the site, was and is "glowing," and recommends a Museum.

I feel that there is more to this than meets the eye. I have a suspicion that the decision to scrap the project arises from the results of the Outdoor Recreation Master Plan, and if I am correct, Arch Creek is an early victim for South Florida. That Plan is deficient in several very fundamental ways. The Survey used for collection of data is poorly constructed. In its construction it imposes a skew on the data collected. This skew is further aggravated by the mathematical techniques used to predict Recreation Demand and Needs, and State responsibility in dollars to meet those needs. For example: Table 8.4, Bicycle Riding, indicates a surplus for our region in Bike Trails; Recreational Vehicle/ Trailer Camping indicates a surplus in our Region; Table 8.17 Archeological and Historic Sites indicates a surplus in our Region; Tables 8.20 and 8.21 Freshwater and Saltwater Boat Ramps indicates a surplus in our Region. As a result of these Tables other Tables are generated to indicate the Responsibility of the Division to meet the "needs". Table 10.2 on page 123, establishes that the Division of Recreation and Parks has no "Need" responsibility for the following: Bicycle Trails, Boat Ramps, fresh and salt water, camping sites, and Archeologic and Historic sites. In table 10.4 on page 124, the same projections carry forth into 1980. In dollar value, Table 10.3, for 1976, Recreation and Parks allocates 0 dollars in those categories; and for 1980, the same 0 dollars again.

I know the Division will be getting more money to do this survey on a county basis rather than multi-county regions. However, if the same unsophisticated and plain wrong survey and analysis techniques are continued to be used, all of us working on good community projects might as well move up to Region 1, which includes Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Okaloosa Counties. They have a need for 5 Archeological and Historical sites!

The one interesting fact that Mr. Landrum imparted to me was that money is NOT the issue at Arch Creek. He assured me that the Division had the money but chooses not to spend it. He further stated that April 1 deadline that was reported in the Herald for the expiration of the Trust was not significant. He stated that April 1 does not affect the money at all. (This is in conflict with statements from others within his department have made.

This sure turned into a complicated situation. We all thank you so much for the time and interest you and John have shown in this matter. Sorry if this caused you a hassle.

Be well.
Warmest regards,

Maureen B. Harwitz