

ORRRC LOOKS AT THE NATION'S OUTDOOR RECREATION FUTURE

By FRANCIS W. SARGENT, *Executive Director*
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission
Washington, D. C.

I am particularly happy to be here with you. As my accent would proclaim to all, this is a new part of the country for me. Without lapsing into the trite niceties of the usual visiting speaker, I would like to say that I have been most pleased and impressed with my first visit to the Gulf Coast.

As one who is engaged in a study of our national recreation resources, I am delighted to behold the resources that this section has to offer and I trust that I shall be privileged to come here and enjoy them again soon.

My purpose here today is to bring to your attention the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and to say something about how its work relates to that of your Association.

ORRRC was established by Congress in 1958 in response to suggestions from many individuals and organizations interested in the future of America's outdoors.

Congress directed the Commission essentially to do three jobs—first, to inventory the recreation resources of the nation, second to examine what effect such factors as increased population, income, leisure time and travel would have on the future of outdoor recreation—these are the building blocks to the third job—to recommend to the President and to Congress what policies and programs should be followed over the next forty years to insure accessibility to the outdoors for all Americans.

To do the job, a fifteen man Commission was established. Laurance S. Rockefeller is the Chairman. There are eight members of Congress—four Senators and four Members of the House, equally divided between the two parties. There are six Presidential appointees in addition to Mr. Rockefeller.

To help the Commission in its policy making process, Congress directed that an Advisory Council be established. This is composed of twenty-five citizens who represent not only conservation and recreation groups but also such potential competitor groups as mining, grazing, timber, petroleum and the like.

To work with the states in an effective way, the Commission asked the Governor of each of the fifty States to appoint a contact officer with whom it might work. John Camp, Executive Director of the Mississippi Game and Fish Commission, our host, is the contact officer for his State.

These state contact officers play a crucial role in our program. They are generously giving of their time to provide us with information, data and guidance. We have recently completed a series of meetings with all our contact officers across the country. And, I might say from my personal viewpoint, meeting with representatives from every state who are actually working in the field has been one of the most meaningful and productive projects we've undertaken. We learned a great deal.

The meetings were held to accomplish several purposes. First, they were designed to brief the state officials on the progress of the Commission. Second, to seek review of our plans for an inventory of state recreation areas, and third and most important of all, to educate ORRRC and its staff on the problems of every state.

We also invited the field people of the Federal agencies to attend as observers but we emphasized that these meetings were primarily focused on the states.

At each meeting we called upon the states to tell us about the problems they considered most urgent in outdoor recreation administration at the state level. While there were differences among the regions and among the states, we did see something of a pattern.

Perhaps the most striking aspect was the keen awareness and the growing concern among state officials of the critical need to do far more both to provide outdoor recreation facilities and to set aside unspoiled areas while they are still available.

Prefaced with this general impression, I would like to point out eight problems we found uppermost in the minds of the state leaders.

1—*Financing*

Almost all states cited *financing*—I suppose the man in charge of building the pyramids had the same complaint. We found that many state programs are hampered by a lack of funds for acquisition and development—but financing is also a growing problem for routine operation and maintenance of existing areas.

2—*Federal-State-Local Government Relations*

While these relationships were generally reported as friendly and cooperative, several states mentioned problems of coordination between various branches of government, both with the Federal government and local government. Some pointed out situations where there is overlapping responsibility and sometimes conflicting responsibility—and even gaps where no one has responsibility. The Federal policy in acquiring land around Federal water impoundments was cited as being inadequate and difficulties were reported by states in acquiring Federally-owned land for recreation purposes.

3—*User Fees*

This is, of course, closely related to the financing problem. We often heard of pressure upon state officials to make their programs self-supporting through user fees. Generally, however, the prevailing philosophy seems to be that states should provide basic recreation opportunities without charge. Charges, it was reported, should be made for special privileges such as marinas, cabins, fishing piers and bath houses.

4—*Relations With Private Enterprise*

Many administrators are under pressure not to develop any state-run facilities which would compete with private enterprise; hence, they attempt to attract private enterprise to provide lodges, eating facilities, etc.

5—*Conflicts With Other Uses and Among Recreation Activities*

Conflicts with other uses of land for houses, highways, factories, airports and conflicts among recreation activities were cited. The latter are becoming more significant particularly on water areas; swimmers, high-powered boats, skin divers and fishermen simply can't mix. Our limited water resources will have to be regulated carefully to allow these incompatible activities to live in harmony and safety.

6—*Legal*

An assorted group of problems which can be generally classified as "legal" were also mentioned. Some states do not have the power of eminent domain to acquire lands needed for recreation—this appears most critical when access to fishing waters is concerned. Others lack borrowing power or leasing authority.

7—*Out Of State Visitors*

Most states are anxious to lure tourists but many find difficulty in recouping their investment from these visitors without leaving a burden on their own taxpayers. A need was shown for interstate cooperation and regional planning where residents of large cities are primary users of recreational facilities in nearby states.

8—*Information and Education*

We found a need for information and education in the outdoor recreation field both as to the benefits and appropriate use of facilities. Many citizens do not know of the opportunities their state provides—others, through careless indifference or perhaps ignorance, abuse what is available.

These are only the highlights of the literally hundreds of problems we heard during our series of meetings. I'm sure they are familiar to you and that you could add your own to the list.

Now to turn from your problems to mine. Having found out what the problems are, what is ORRRC going to do about them?

I would be ridiculous and foolhardy if I said that we are going to solve all of them. We cannot.

But with the aid of our intensive nationwide study program—with all the advice we can get from interested and active organizations such as your own, and in the final analysis, with the judgment of our able and experienced Commissioners, we are going to recommend programs and policies for every level of government—and for private enterprise.

These recommendations will necessarily have to deal in broad problems, but it is hoped that by clarifying responsibilities, suggesting standards and evolving practical means much can be done to alleviate these problems I have mentioned. Particularly it is planned that the urgency of these problems can be brought to the attention of the President, the Congress, and the public.

I feel that the work of the Commission will be of real help to those of you on the firing line in the states. It will increase public awareness of the problems of providing outdoor recreation and of the need that these problems will be solved. It will offer some recommendations that, hopefully, will be of use to you. And it will provide a source of comparative data so that it will be easier for those in one state to know what is being done elsewhere.

In these regional meetings, in carrying out our inventory of state recreation resources, in practically all of our work, the states are an immense help to us. I hope that the ORRRC Report will repay that help by making the job of all of you a little easier and moving us toward that goal to which we are all dedicated—assuring that Americans will continue to have an opportunity to enjoy and benefit from outdoor recreation.

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRIAL FORESTS IN PROVIDING RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

*By J. E. McCaffrey, Vice-President
Southern Kraft Division, International Paper Co.
Mobile, Alabama*

Twenty years ago, the phrase "The role of industrial forests in providing recreational opportunities" would have sounded presumptuous to the industrial forester. In the first place, it connotes a duty or obligation to play a part—the show must go on, you know—and few forest industries felt so indebted.

In the second place, with millions of forested and nonforested acres throughout the land to take care of, the men in this relatively young profession were busy tackling resource problems vital to our nation. First came forest protection, then inventory, then reforestation and the business of assuring permanent productivity of forests on a crop-like basis.

As a group, foresters are dedicated to the highest practical use of forest lands, regardless of ownership. And industrial foresters know that in addition to helping keep the "woodbin filled", wise forest management contributes other important benefits to both man and wildlife. But these men adhered to "first things first". And we are fortunate that they did so.

Their efforts saw us through World War II. The timber they grew and protected went into thousands of products vital to the defense of our country and to the welfare of the people at home. It continues to do so in this era of exploding populations, high productivity and record consumer buying.

At the same time we are enjoying many benefits which are the direct result of good forest management. Some of these are: Watershed control, room and board for fish and game, and the protection of man and wildlife from fire and stream pollution. For the first time in many years, more wood is being grown than is being removed from the forests. Road systems built for the immediate purpose of harvesting timber are furnishing access to recreation areas, to streams and lakes, and to the hiker's trail. Careful timber harvesting is helping prepare recreational areas, clear ski areas, and provide room for picnic and camp grounds.

Growing continuous crops of trees was, and still is, the primary objective of the industrial forester. These other benefits are natural results of well man-