REMARKS

By A. HEATON UNDERHILL
Assistant Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior

MULTIPLE USE—MAGIC CONCEPT!

When I was a starry-eyed student first being indoctrinated in resource management concepts, I had a professor, a forester, incidentally, who used to state categorically at the start of every lecture, "Conservation is always spelled with a capital 'C'!" Today, some thirty years later, a certain portion of my early idealism has yielded to the abrasive action of a rough world, but I wonder if that thought did not have much merit.

We were taught that conservation could be defined as "the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time." Just what this meant depended to a considerable extent on who you were and what you did. There are many areas where sincere men, all considering themselves conservationists, disagree violently. Management of surplus big game on National Parks, proper use of wilderness areas, use of fire in forestry and game management, and agricultural drainage are but a few that can be mentioned. In spite of these differences, most of us in the resource management field feel that we know what conservation means, and most of us still feel it is important enough to rate a capital "C".

At about this same time, the term "multiple use" began to be heard. Its meaning, like that of "conservation," depended pretty much on who you were. To the early foresters, multiple use meant—manage the area the best way you know how to produce a maximum number of board feet and let other people use it—if they don't interfere with that production.

The early game manager was just about as bad. Wooded land was a divine arrangement designed to provide a home for deer, turkeys, grouse and squirrels! I shudder to think of the hours spent on so-called game management areas releasing apples, birch or blue beech at the expense of crop trees! In general, though, the game managers of the Leopold or Whyte period were converted foresters or were taught by foresters Their demands were quite moderate—"How about one old beech per square mile as a den tree?" (Only foresters called them wolf trees.) Or "Isn't it possible to rotate harvest so we can have a little more edge?" Board feet or cords were still paying the way; thousands of acres had been ruthlessly harvested and were covered with transition species or worthless sprout growth. No game manager dared suggest any management methods drastic enough to interfere with basic timber production, even if he did feel those white cedar swamps were created primarily as deer browse.

When soil conservation emerged from the dustbowls of the thirties, we found much the same thing. Land was classified as to best use, and plans developed accordingly. Multiple use was a term freely used, but I never heard of land being classified as best for industry, urbanization, or airport use. It was classified for agriculture—row crops, pasture, hay, produce, etc. If it was too rocky to farm, reforestation was suggested. If it was wet and undrainable, or an impossible odd corner, it was labeled a wildlife area!

Flood control, reclamation, and potable water reservoirs followed much the same pattern. They were built by practical hydrological engineers who had a single purpose in mind. If others could use it for something else—fine—provided they didn't get in the way.

To a certain extent, I am being facetious. There have been a number of broad-thinking resource managers on the conservation stage over the years, but by and large we have all tended to think and operate in terms of our own specialty. Multiple use has been a catchy phrase rather than a reality. Please don't misunderstand me! I am well aware that there are many situations and many areas where one use must dominate and other uses are tolrated if they don't interfere, but I do think we should re-examine areas we manage—especially if they are publicly owned—and see if we are applying a true multiple use concept to the greatest extent possible.

Outdoor recreation ties very closely into this picture. In fact, I believe it may well be the ingredient, the catalyst if you will, that can spark a true multi-

ple use concept. Most of you know something about the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. If you have followed the speeches of Director Edward C. Crafts since last spring, you are familiar with our beginnings, the tasks that have been set before us, our philosophy, and our plans. To refresh your memories, let me review this very briefly.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reported to the President and Congress last January. Among their recommendations was one for the creation of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior. This was reiterated by President Kennedy in his conservation message last March. On April 2nd, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall established the Bureau and named Edward C. Crafts, former Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, as Director. The Bureau was given responsibility for:

—coordinating the programs of various Federal agencies as they affect outdoor recreation. (Incidentally, there are more than 20 involved.);

—developing a nationwide plan for outdoor recreation, incorporating the plans and requirements of Federal, State, local and private agencies;

—rendering assistance to the States and their subdivisions in the field of outdoor recreation;

—sponsoring and/or conducting research designed to keep abreast of the Nation's recreation needs and developing ways of meeting these needs;

—and providing information and educational material to assist public and private agencies.

Assisting Director Crafts we have Associate Director Lawrence Stevens, a geographer and long-time Department of the Interior employee who served for two years as ORRRC's Deputy Director for Studies, and two Assistant Directors: John Shanklin, a forester, career conservationist and, for many years, a staff advisor to the Secretary of the Interior, and myself. As most of you know, I am a biologist and have served in various fish and game capacities. We are a small Bureau and to a considerable degree our functions and responsibilities overlap, but in general, John is responsible for Federal coordination, education, research, and staffing the President's cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Committee and I have planning, special studies, and assistance to States and local units.

It should be stressed that ours is not a land managing bureau. We are planners and coordinators. We seek to build no empires; we are not jealous of other agencies—Federal, State, local, or private. We want to see a job done with a minimum of duplication or wasted effort. Our principal yardstick in planning and making recommendations is, "Does this solution best meet the outdoor recreation needs of the American people now and for the foreseeable future?" We are basically oriented to people, not resources. We recognize, of course, that resources must be managed to meet various human needs, but we do not feel that recreation is automatically a secondary consideration.

This carryover from our Puritan forebears must be dispelled. Hard work and frugality are admirable virtues, but the race of modern life, the tremendously complex civilization our brains have wrought, and the magnitude of our control over basic resources all make it imperative that we provide all members of our society with ample time and opportunity to re-create. Since World War II, the American people have been demonstrating that they subscribe to this philosophy at an ever-increasing pace. They have swarmed over our outdoors in a wild scramble to find places and ways to draw strength and inspiration from mountains, woods, fields, and waters. They are forcing a real multiple use concept upon our land and water managers.

Here is a potable water reservoir. It is wonderful to be able to supply water so pure that it need not be treated with unpalatable chemicals and yet exposes no one to early death by waterborne disease. But if those same longer-living citizens are ending up in mental institutions because they have no place to relax from our mad pace, then perhaps, it is better to let them fish or picnic at the reservoir and treat the water, making the recreationists pay for the treatment.

If it is more important for a particular area to produce deer or quail or turkey rather than pulpwood, then by all means let us manage it that way even

if we have to bulldoze away half the pulp production of an area known as a State or national forest.

Again, let me hasten to point out that I am not advocating that we always cater to the whims of the largest number. Administrators must carefully weigh various conflicting recreation uses—hunting and birdwatching, fishing and water skiing, hiking and horseback riding, etc. They must also weigh man's other requirements. Few would advocate exposing a valley to serious flooding by using flood storage capacity of a reservoir to provide better fishing. Timber production, hydro-electric power, irrigation water, cattle forage, flood prevention, and potable water are all legitimate end products of various types of resource management. Often one or more will be most important and other possible uses or products must suffer. But let us not compartmentalize our thinking. Because we call a tract a forest and it is administered by foresters does not necessarily mean that board feet of wood is the most important crop. A wildlife refuge or a public hunting ground may possess something more precious than ducks or deer; it may even be best suited to pulp production. Recreation opportunity can well be the most important contribution of a Corps of Engineer reservoir that was originally built for some other purpose.

Outdoor Recreation deals with people and their needs—only indirectly with the resources that provide this recreation. For this reason it can cut across many of the fetishes and mores that have grown up around resource management. It can encourage a broader and more honest multiple use approach.

The key which can accomplish this is planning, followed by fast action before it is too late. We are attempting to do just that. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has a small, but, we at least believe, a highly qualified staff. We are reviewing the outdoor legislation submitted to Congress this past session, which for various reasons was not passed.

In the light of last session's testimony and the ORRRC recommendations, we are particularly studying Federal land acquisition requirements, planning funds for the States, and, as emphasized by ORRRC, State and local requirements for acquisition and development grants with matching Federal funds. This naturally entails a study of sources of revenue.

Director Crafts wants this legislative Program to incorporate the best thinking of all conservation agencies. He has asked a representative group of State Conservation Administrators, including some here today, to meet with him and go over the needs and methods of meeting them. We must have the broad viewpoint which you as a group can furnish as well as the grassroots feelings with which you are also familiar.

Outdoor Recreation in all its ramifications and the new Bureau of the same name should and will be a rallying point for natural resources managers in shaping a program for the future and in implementing that program. Working together we can put the capital "C" back into conservation; we can make multiple use truly a magic concept!

REMARKS BY D. H. JANZEN

I owe the Southeastern Association an apology in that this is my first attendance at one of your annual meetings. I have had a problem with conflicting dates in the past. I'm looking forward to getting some first-hand information on your problems and accomplishments during the next several days. Your Association has quite a number of unique accomplishments to brag about—such as the initiation of the cooperative wildlife disease project and the major dove research and management study program, but it is not my assignment to talk about happenings in the Southeast about which each of you are better acquainted than I.

When your President, Jim Webb, told me last spring that you were going to meet in Charleston this year and that he expected me to be present and appear on the program, I asked him what I should talk about. He said: "Pick your own subject," so this morning I'm going to take about 20 minutes of