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Outdoor recreation has been synonymous with
Colorado since the first days that men could take time
out for leisure activities. The mule deer and elk in
your mountain fastness attract hunters from all over
the Nation and the world. Aspen and the Broadmoor
have almost a copyright claim on winter sports --
except for Sun Valley, of course.

With this kind of a heritage, it is even more
gratifying to know that you are devoting the time and
effort represented by this conference to the future
recreational needs of this State and this region.
Certainly this emphasis is well placed, for America
is changing at an accelerating rate and the need for
healthful recreation facilities is escalating even
more rapidly than population growth.

In large part your past interest in parks and recreation has been oriented toward the economic factor of tourism. It is your third largest industry and produces over half a billion dollars in annual income. In this you can give lessons to those areas of the Nation which are only now becoming aware of that potential. This is so because of the natural grandeur that existed here long before the white settlers arrived. Now you must look to the balance in recreation opportunity for your own citizens, to see that city dwellers and the people of the east slope have the same or equal opportunities as their fellow citizens to the west. We have the same problem of achieving balance in our national recreation effort, and that is really what all the current emphasis is all about.
Before examining some facets of that effort, however, let me tell you that I feel very comfortable talking about the national program in this State because we have an outstanding record here. It is better, I think, than we have done in any other State except California -- and almost on a par with that very large area. The National Park System in Colorado consists of two national parks, six national monuments, one historic site and one recreation area. They total 526,412 acres and served 3,707,000 visitors in 1965, despite some disruption by storms and floods.

It is also significant that four of these units (Mesa Verde, Rocky Mountain, Colorado Monument and Dinosaur) were established prior to creation of the National Park Service itself. This is a great tribute to the natural and historic wonders that you have inherited with Colorado citizenship.
And the record is not yet complete, for the Park Service is actively considering the creation of two additional units. One is already under development under an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation to make maximum recreational use of the Curecanti Project reservoirs. The other, a proposed Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, is in the advanced study stage and would preserve for scientific and educational purposes the insect and leaf fossils of that unparalleled area.

In 1958, when Senator Clinton Anderson's bill to create the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was passed, the national program for outdoor recreation was a conglomerate. The National parks were a keystone; so were the national forests, with campgrounds, the beginnings of a wilderness administration, and a concern about the
recreation use of forest access roads. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers were aware of the burgeoning interest in water-based recreation, but they were still entering into contracts which required most development work to be undertaken by local units of government. The National Wildlife Refuges were well established, but they were not widely thought of as recreation resources. Recreation was an activity on public lands, but was largely ignored as a program objective except by some visionaries. And so it went. Under the Chairmanship of Laurance Rockefeller and with the active participation of both congressional and public members, the monumental report, *Outdoor Recreation for America*, was issued in 1962, and a truly national approach to recreation began.

Its recommendations carried great weight.
They were practical and realistic. One of them called for a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, to coordinate the efforts of 20 Federal agencies concerned with outdoor recreation, and it is a source of great pride in our Department that Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, responded immediately to that recommendation, creating such a bureau by Secretarial order.

But we were dealing with a movement. Fast as we worked, we could not stay ahead. By the time another recommendation was carried out, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund concept was accepted in order to provide substantial financing for outdoor recreation, both at the national and the local level, the march of events almost obscured it.

In 1960, the multiple use act for the Forest Service had specified recreation as one of the objec-
tives of that great organization, and planning for recreation opportunities in the eastern United States forests had proceeded apace.

The Bureau of Land Management's charter was similarly changed, although not until 1964. Appropriations had been accelerated, and recreation potential of flood control and reclamation reservoirs was considered in the planning phases with the same care as the engineering aspects of the project.

Recreation had come to be recognized by the Department of Agriculture as an economic opportunity in the use of land retired from cropping, and loans were being made for these purposes.

The most striking development was the acceptance by the Congress of an affirmative obligation to furnish outdoor recreation opportunities in the crowded eastern parts of the United States. Cape
Cod National Seashore signaled this change, as for the first time a major unit of the National Park System was set up without either public lands or a contribution of private lands as the essential nucleus. Three more Atlantic Coast seashore facilities have since been created under that precedent -- at Fire Island, Assateague Island and Cape Lookout.

The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (Tocks Island) will furnish recreational opportunities of unmatched quality to millions of Americans in the crowded cities of the Eastern Seaboard.

Not just the Federal Government, but the States and local units of government and the private sector have been caught up in this movement. Highway departments in States like Colorado have always had a lead, and largely unappreciated, role in this -- it is now being recognized.
It is quite impossible for me to relate this
dynamic phenomenon of our time to Colorado in any
broad way. But I think we can examine the workings
of the land and water conservation fund idea in this
State as indicative of how this pattern of Federal-State
cooperation for meeting the recreation needs of America
will proceed.

The past year has been a busy one in the con-
servation field in your State. The record of your
legislature in passing seven major pieces of legis-
lation in such areas as water and air pollution,
junkyard and billboard control, roadside rest areas
and flood plain zoning represents a monumental
effort. Before that, in 1965, your lawmakers had
authorized participation in the Land and Water Con-
servation Fund program and the development of the
State Outdoor Recreation Plan which is prerequisite
thereto.

The resulting State plan was found adequate by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in January, and you thereby became eligible for apportionment of more than a million and a quarter dollars for the years 1965 and 1966. The first actual grant out of these funds, about 10 percent, was made in February to match planning funds advanced by the State. Two project proposals, one for development of the Cherry Creek Recreation Area and another for acquisition of lands to expand Golden Gate State Park are now before the Bureau for approval.

It is noteworthy that both of the projects presented to date are within a short driving distance of Metropolitan Denver. This is largely typical of the State plan that has been presented. It is responsive to the need for balance that I mentioned earlier.
The same trend is shown in the plan's commitment that not less than 25 percent of all allocations from the Fund shall go to local units of government to meet their park needs.

Thus an active and useful partnership between the Federal Government and the State, as envisioned by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, has now been launched in Colorado.

If the long-term national objective in recreation is to provide, maintain, and make as equally accessible as possible to most of the American people a well-balanced system of recreational resources of adequate quantity and good quality, we must grapple with several relationships.

One of these is the relative role of the public and the private sectors in the furnishing of recreation. The private sector now provides more than half
the total effort in outdoor recreation. Of the remain-
ing half, in the public sector, no good statistics are
available but it seems clear that the major fraction is
by State and local governments.

Yet there is great unevenness, and no one
is better able to appreciate this than Coloradans.
You probably have the greatest supply of recreation
opportunities of any State. From the private sectoral
standpoint, your customers come from the whole
United States and most of the economic benefit from
recreation is in the tourist-services business.

We need to know much more about the relation-
ship of the public and private sectors of the recreation
business. Some of the questions for which we need
answers are economic. For example, do we adequately
understand the impact which user fees at federally
operated or federally financed recreation areas have
on State or private recreation facilities that may be nearby or may be competitive alternatives? Does free camping at many national park areas prevent needed private expansion of camping areas? What is the case in other kinds of recreation areas and facilities? Are there some types of recreation better suited to development for profit than others? Some seem to be, but for the present we have very great difficulty being specific about it and designing our plans to recognize these relationships.

There are also other economic questions related to the private-public relationship. Can user charges be used as a management tool? When the recreational development of an area becomes saturated, should fees be considered as a means of rationing recreation opportunity? If so, how do we accommodate competing social objectives such as those to provide
opportunities across the board to all our citizens, especially those in and near major metropolitan areas for whom such charges may be a significant burden? And can these needs be met by the private sector?

Once having come to grips with the basic public-private issue, there is a second set of relationships that needs to be examined and rationalized. Among those things which will be done or handled by the public sector, how much is Federal, and how much is State or local? The State and local share presents a question as significant as the relationship between public and private. Can cities contribute to the outdoor recreational opportunities of its citizens when these opportunities lie outside the geographic boundaries of the city? Recreation opportunity will probably become an increasingly important concern to people choosing between continuing to live in the
central city and moving to the suburbs.

Traditionally, the role of the Federal Government has stemmed from its responsibilities as a major owner and manager of land. Public lands have typically been available to the public for recreation unless there was some specific reason to exclude public activity. The wildlife refuges were initially set up to preserve certain species from destruction or extinction.

It has not been until recent times that the Federal responsibility has been extended to an activist role, especially in the East. What does this say about the future role of the Federal Government? While national parks have been set aside to preserve and protect some unique historic or scenic treasure, large scale public recreation is new to these areas, too. I have already mentioned the new role of the
National Park Service as represented by Cape Cod.

Another of the relationships which bears heavily on policy and program considerations in this area is the apparent imbalance of recreational opportunity. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has recently made a rough approximation, which will be more fully developed for the Nationwide Plan to be completed in 1968, of relative recreational opportunity among the statistical measuring units set up by the Bureau of the Census. The analysis didn't produce any surprises, but it did provide some concrete evidence to support earlier feelings -- that on the average there is a deficit of recreational opportunity per capita in the Middle and South Atlantic areas and in some of the areas of the West, per capita opportunities are substantially above the national average.

We have not yet drawn very solid conclusions
from these analyses, but we do see the implications and issues which such information raises. Should investment criteria for Federal investment in recreation programs somehow specifically take account of regional imbalances? If so, to what extent and when?

There is yet another set of relationships that must be taken into account in this field -- how to balance supply and demand.

It is probably accurate to say that at no time in recent history has the aggregate supply of recreational opportunities equalled aggregate demand. We have been working against a supply deficit which built up during World War II and which during the late 40's and 50's built up a substantial national backlog.

Thus, while there have been imbalances in aggregate supply, the imbalance of the supply of
particular recreational opportunities -- such as camping and trailer camping sites -- has been increasing at rates substantially above our ability to meet it. There are other kinds of supply-demand relationships relating to questions of quality, which we do not adequately understand for which we are only now beginning to make adequate allowances in our planning process. For example, there are kinds of recreational experiences which can be obtained in a national park for which there is no trade-off opportunity in a highly developed intensive recreation area such as New York's Jones Beach. Yet, many of the kinds of pressures, including just the sheer weight of numbers on large national park areas, militate strongly in favor of handling more and more people and more and more automobiles in national park areas. Our national parks preserve values which
are for the most part irreplaceable and for which substitutes are not available at reasonable costs. This means Federal recreation policy must know enough about supply-demand relationships in relation to management objectives to permit sensible long-range planning and objectives.

These four basic sets of relationships must be understood if a well balanced recreation program for the American people is to exist. They are not totally independent; the question of recreational opportunity in the East versus those in the West is closely tied to the rationale for the development of federally owned lands and water resource projects.

Ever since the creation of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and very specifically in recent months these issues have been increasingly coming to the top of our discussions. We do not yet have very many
of the answers. But one truism of governmental policy is that half the battle is in knowing the right questions.

The role of the Federal Government in outdoor recreation programs is changing. In the last 10 years the change has been almost revolutionary. President Johnson and Secretary Udall have expressed strong intentions to make certain that the programs now under way and the changes being made are enduring assets on the American scene. In the President's insistence on a vigorous "creative federalism", he has placed great responsibility on the role of States and local governments and of the private sector. The opportunities for the exercise of creativity is nowhere greater than in meeting the outdoor recreation needs of this Nation. I can assure you of this Administration's intention to be creative to the limit of its
capacity and to welcome your suggestions and your initiative.