

GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 2315, S. 2331, and S. 2197

BILLS TO RESTORE THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM TO
THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

JULY 17 AND 18, 1969



Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1969

32-373

GOVERNMENT

Storage



461600 701334

Y 4
.In 8/13
G 56/7

21144
In 8/13
G 56/7

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

FRANK E. MOSS, Utah

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin

LEE METCALF, Montana

MIKE GRAVEL, Alaska

GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado

LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho

PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming

MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon

TED STEVENS, Alaska

HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

JERRY T. VERKLER, *Staff Director*

STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel*

ROY WHITACRE, *Professional Staff Member*

PORTER WARD, *Professional Staff Member*

CHARLES COOK, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

FRANK E. MOSS, Utah

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming

PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon

HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

(II)

CONTENTS

S. 2315.....	Page 1
Departmental reports:.....	
Agriculture.....	1
Budget.....	3
Interior.....	2
Amendment intended to be proposed by Senator Moss.....	11
S. 2197.....	3
S. 2331.....	4

STATEMENTS

Baring, Hon. Walter S., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada.....	24
Bennett, Hon. Wallace F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah.....	13
Cannon, Hon. Howard W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada.....	23
Church, Hon. Frank, a U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho.....	18
Crafts, Edward C., former Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	26
Greeley, Arthur W., Associate Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.....	41
Hansen, Hon. Clifford P., a U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming.....	18
Hatfield, Hon. Mark, a U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon.....	12
Johnson, Hon. Harold T. (Bizz), a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	25
Johnson, Lemuel, president, Mid-Atlantic unit, International Avion Travelcade Club.....	71
Kimball, Thomas L., on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation.....	70
Koisch, Brig. Gen. F. P., Director of Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, accompanied by Mark Gurnee, staff member.....	46
Loesch, Harrison, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, accompanied by Lawrence N. Stevens, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; and Harry W. Rice, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior.....	26, 57
McGee, Hon. Gale, a U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming.....	19
Moss, Hon. Frank E., a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah.....	10
Nelson, Hon. Gaylord, a U.S. Senator from the State of Wisconsin.....	21
Penfold, Joseph W., conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America.....	68
Pettis, Hon. Jerry L., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	15
Smith, Dr. Spencer M., Jr., secretary, Citizens Committee on National Resources.....	61
Stevens, Hon. Ted, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska.....	22

COMMUNICATIONS

Amos, Mr. and Mrs. Clark, Emmett, Idaho: Letter to Hon. Frank Church, U.S. Senate, dated May 12, 1969.....	7
Brooks, Donald R., Salt Lake City, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate.....	8
Brown, Mr. and Mrs. E. L., Salt Lake City, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senate.....	10
Clarke, F. J., major general, U.S. Army, Deputy Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated July 15, 1969.....	49
Cocking, Peggy, Casper, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate.....	21

IV

Cranston, Hon. Alan, a U.S. Senator from the State of California: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 17, 1969-----	Page 24
de Lorenzi, John, American Automobile Association: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 17, 1969-----	72
Eighty Utahans: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	9
Erickson, Mrs. Harriet J., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho: Letter to Hon. Frank Church, U.S. Senate, dated March 25, 1969-----	6
Frederick, Robert M., legislative representative, National Grange: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 18, 1969-----	74
Gagner, A. E., North Ogden, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	7
Ingram, B. H., Laramie, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate-----	19
Jacquot, Raymond G., Casper, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate-----	20
Johnson, Velma and Earl, Salt Lake City, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	8
Kostum, Joseph C. and Abbie C., Pocatello, Idaho: Letter to Hon. Frank Church, U.S. Senate-----	6
Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Denman, Afton, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate-----	20
Moore, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley H., Clearfield, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	10
Pomeroy, Kenneth B., chief forester, American Forestry Association: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated July 15, 1969-----	74
Ross, Leonard L., Ogden, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	9
Rouse, Art, editor and publisher, Trailer Life: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 10, 1969-----	75
Smith, Dr. Spencer M., Jr., secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 21, 1969-----	67
Stevens, Lawrence N., acting director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Letter to Hon. Alan Bible, chairman, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, dated July 25, 1969-----	31
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated July 10, 1969-----	24
Weckwerth, Delmer S., Casper, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate-----	19
White, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd; Hall, Mr. and Mrs. E. Dale; O'Neal, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard; Dyer, Mr. and Mrs. Gary; Voelker, Mr. and Mrs. Joe L., Casper, Wyo.: Letter to Hon. Gale McGee, U.S. Senate-----	20
Woodworth, Howard and Fern, Hyattsville, Md.: Letter to the chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated July 11, 1969-----	76
Yates, Floyd, Magna, Utah: Letter to Hon. Frank Moss, U.S. Senate-----	9

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

"Congress Reconsiders—The Golden Eagle Gains Official Help," from Trailer Life, August 1969-----	75
Golden Eagle passport fact sheet-----	73
Golden Eagle resolution of the Izaak Walton League of America-----	68
Statement by Senators Jackson, Church, and Moss on introduction of S. 2315-----	5

GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1969

**U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.**

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, Senator Alan Bible (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Alan Bible (Nevada), Frank E. Moss (Utah), Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin), and Mark O. Hatfield (Oregon).

Also present: Jerry T. Verkler, staff director; Stewart French, chief counsel; Roy Whitacre, professional staff member; and Charles Cook, minority counsel.

Senator BIBLE. The hearing will come to order.

This is the time that we have set to take testimony on S. 2315, S. 2331, and S. 2197, bills to amend the Land and Water Conservation Act by restoring the golden eagle program that will terminate next year unless this or similar legislation is adopted by the Congress.

We will make those bills and any available reports a part of the record at this point.

(The data referred to follow:)

[S. 2315, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is hereby repealed.

(b) Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-5), as added by section 2 of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is redesignated as subsection (d).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, July 17, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,

Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request of June 19, 1969, this is our report on S. 2315, a bill "To restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act."

We recommend that S. 2315 be enacted.

The purpose of the bill is to reestablish the recreation entrance and user fee system under the program established by the Land Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

Five years of experience with the original provisions of the Act makes it clear that this phase of the program is a desirable one. It has led to significant improvement in the administration of the use of National Forest recreation developments, facilities and services provided at public expense. Those taking advantage of these opportunities pay a reasonable fee for the privilege of doing so and the program has been well accepted.

Under the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354), Public Law 90-401, the entrance and user fee phase of the program will be repealed as of March 31, 1970. We therefore recognize the urgency of action if it is to continue without repeal.

There are some aspects which we believe on the basis of our experience might be improved. As time goes on we will review these and make appropriate recommendations if it is determined that changes in the basic legislation are needed. In the meantime, we believe that the entrance and user fee part of the program should continue. In this connection, we understand that Interior is recommending that the date of expiration of the government-wide fee system be extended one year to allow for further study. We will have no objection to that approach if the Committee believes it advisable.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL, *Under Secretary.*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your request of June 19, 1969, for the views of this Department on S. 2315, a bill "To restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act." While we have received no request, we note that S. 2331, which is identical to S. 2315, except for the title, is pending before your Committee. A similar bill, S. 2197, is also pending.

S. 2315 would repeal section 1 of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354), which in turn repealed, effective March 31, 1970, the provisions in section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) concerning admission and user fees at Federal outdoor recreation areas. Under such provisions a uniform Government-wide recreation fee (Golden Eagle) program was established. The program involves the sale of an annual automobile permit of \$7 which entitles a purchaser thereof and anyone accompanying him in his automobile to enter most Federal recreation areas without paying any additional entrance fee. The purpose of S. 2315 is to continue such program indefinitely after March 31, 1970.

S. 2197 would provide for a Federal recreation fee program limited to areas administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture. The annual automobile fee would be raised to \$10. Section 2 of the bill would authorize the respective Secretaries to prescribe rules and regulations for the collection of the \$10 fee. Under section 3 of the bill all fees collected would be covered into the fund established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897).

This Department has had 4 years experience with the uniform Government-wide fee program. We believe that there are a number of factors to be considered, such as whether each individual seeking admission to an area should be required to obtain an entrance permit rather than pay a single charge covering all occupants of the purchaser's automobile. An additional factor is whether the fee should be based on the use a visitor makes of specific facilities rather than a flat-rate entrance fee. There are other factors to be considered.

We believe that the present Government-wide recreation fee program, including the Golden Eagle program, should be fully re-evaluated before action is taken on bills of this nature. When such reassessment has been completed, we will be in a much better position to make recommendations to the Congress on the kind of legislation that should be enacted. We recommend that Congress extend the existing program only for one additional year (through March 31, 1971) at the present price of \$7 for each Golden Eagle Passport.

We also recommend that the extension apply to recreation areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. We recommend an amendment to section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731, 746) which precludes entrance or admission charges after March 31, 1970.

We have prepared the enclosed draft bill to carry out our recommendations and recommend its enactment as a substitute for S. 2315 and related bills.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

A BILL To amend certain provisions in Acts concerning fees for entrance to and use of areas administered by Federal agencies for outdoor recreation and related purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(d) of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354, 355), is amended by deleting "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

SEC. 2. Section 210 of the Act of August 13, 1968 (82 Stat., 731, 746) is hereby amended by deleting "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your June 19, 1969, request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 2315, a bill "To restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act."

In the report which the Department of the Interior has submitted to your Committee it recommends enactment of a draft bill in lieu of S. 2315. The draft bill differs from S. 2315 in the following two ways:

First, it would authorize an extension of the program only from March 31, 1970, to March 31, 1971, instead of for an indefinite period. We would prefer a one-year extension during which time the Administration plans to evaluate fully the government-wide recreation fee program and to recommend any changes necessary to have an administratively and economically practical as well as a uniformly equitable fee system to become effective by April 1, 1971.

Second, the draft bill would amend Section 210 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746) by changing the date in the first sentence of that section from March 31, 1970, to March 31, 1971. We are not clear what, if any, effect changing the date in Section 210 might have, as a practical matter, given the current legal interpretation of that section by the Department of the Army. However, since the date in that section coincided with the date on which the Golden Eagle Program otherwise would expire, it seems logical to conform the date in Section 210 to the recommended expiration date for the extension period for the Golden Eagle Program.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of the Interior draft bill in lieu of S. 2315.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

[S. 2197, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To establish fee programs for entrance to and use of areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to provide for the designation of land or water areas administered by the Secretary of the

Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture primarily for recreational, scenic, scientific, historical, or cultural purposes at which fees are to be charged, and to provide for the establishment of such fees as follows:

(a) A fee of not more than \$10 for an annual motor vehicle permit which will entitle the purchaser thereof and anyone accompanying him in a private non-commercial motor vehicle to enter areas so designated in such vehicle and to use sites, facilities, equipment, or services provided by the United States in such areas: *Provided*, That the purchase of said permit shall not authorize any such use that the appropriate Secretary determines not to be made within the coverage of the permit.

(b) Fees for a single visit or series of visits during a specified period of less than a year for entrance to, and such use of, areas so designated by persons who choose not to purchase the annual permit under subsection (a) of this section or who enter such areas by any means other than by private noncommercial motor vehicle.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the collection of the fees established pursuant to this Act for areas administered by them. No free permits shall be issued to any Member of Congress or other Government official. The collection of fees for the annual motor vehicle permit may be made by the said Secretaries directly or by contract with any private or public agency. Any such contract may provide that the contractor will receive not more than 5 per centum of the total fees he collects for any one calendar year, and may be subject to such other terms and conditions as the appropriate secretary deems proper.

(b) Notice that a fee has been established under this Act shall be posted at each area to which it is applicable. Any violation of any rules or regulations issued under this Act shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$100.

SEC. 3. All fees collected under authority of this Act shall be covered into the land and water conservation fund established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-5).

[S. 2331, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To continue in effect the unified system of annual and user fees for Federal recreation areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is hereby repealed.

(b) Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-5), as added by section 2 of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is redesignated as subsection (d).

Senator BIBLE. In 1968 Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide that the original sources of revenue to the fund could be augmented to provide a fund of \$200 million annually for the period 1969 through 1973. The additional income to the fund would come from general fund receipts or Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing receipts.

At the same time the Congress repealed authority for the annual Federal recreation permit, known as the Golden Eagle passport, and for other recreation and user fees collected under the Golden Eagle program.

The Federal agencies still have authority to collect recreation fees at their areas, but after March 31, 1970, there will be no annual permit which may be used at all Federal recreation fee areas.

It would appear proper that the statement of our distinguished chairman, Senator Jackson, in connection with the introduction of

S. 2315 should be made a part of the record at this point. Senators Church and Moss also spoke at that time.
(The document referred to follows:)

S. 2315—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RESTORE THE "GOLDEN EAGLE" PROGRAM TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to restore the popular "Golden Eagle" program for admission to Federal outdoor recreation areas.

The Members of the Senate will recall that in the 90th Congress I sponsored S. 1401, which provided new sources of revenue to assist the States in their outdoor recreation programs and for the acquisition of additional Federal areas. The measure also granted the Secretary of the Interior administrative powers with which to meet land escalation costs which threatened growth of State and Federal activity with respect to outdoor recreation.

The 1964 act established a uniform system of entrance and user fees for all Federal outdoor recreation areas as one of the sources of revenue for the fund. An annual fee of not more than \$7 was authorized which would admit the payer to all Federal recreation areas during the year. Such areas now number more than 3,000.

This provision for payment of a single annual fee for general admission was designated the Golden Eagle program.

During the course of consideration of S. 1401, the committee had before it proposals to abolish the entrance and user fee system entirely. One such proposal was embodied in S. 2828, 90th Congress, which was sponsored by Senators Harris, McClellan, and Monroney. It would have prohibited the collection or receipt of any entrance or user fees at any of the many Corps of Engineers projects.

However, the committee, after weighing the pros and cons at some length, reached the following decision, as set forth in our unanimous report on S. 1401:

"In view of the disagreements as to the facts and the controversy as to the policy, the committee believes the entire fee system under the act should be the subject of comprehensive legislative review. This bill, which is in the nature of emergency legislation to provide aid to the States and Federal agencies to save their outdoor recreation programs, is not the proper legislative vehicle for such consideration, the committee believes.

"Therefore, the fee system will be given the full and careful study required in separate legislation."

The present bill is an outgrowth of this commitment.

The Senate in the 90th Congress concurred with the committee, and as we passed S. 1401, the entrance and user fee system, with the Golden Eagle, was left intact. The House, however, abolished the program forthwith. In conference, we were able to get a year's extension for the program, or until March 31, 1970. This is the form in which the 1968 amendment to the Fund Act was enacted. The bill I am introducing today would repeal the provision by which the Golden Eagle program goes out of existence next year. It is, as I have stated, based on the independent study to which the Interior Committee committed itself last year.

Admittedly, the Golden Eagle program did get off to a slow start, because, in part at least, of a prohibition in the law against the use of any of the funds for publicity or public education purposes. Certainly, in the first years of the operation, revenues did not come up to expectations, and at some facilities there may have been some basis for the charge that the costs of collection exceeded the revenues.

However, with more than 3,000 Federal outdoor recreation facilities now available in 47 States in all parts of the country, and with more and more Americans finding physical and spiritual refreshment in them, the popularity and use of the Golden Eagle pass has grown by leaps and bounds. Revenues from it increased from \$633,600 in 1965 to \$4,846,200 in 1968. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation estimates that at least \$5,200,000 will come into the fund from the program during this year.

The Golden Eagle is particularly popular with retired and elderly persons, and others who have the opportunity to visit extensively a number of the outdoor recreation areas to which the pass provides admission. Clearly the program furthers the use of our magnificent outdoor recreation areas for the benefit of our citizens.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the repeal of the Golden Eagle program was a mistake and I urge prompt, favorable consideration of this measure to restore it to the American people. The cost to the individual is small indeed and the funds aid both State and Federal activities. I hope the Senate will agree with me and with the very large number of concerned citizens who have urged the retention of this worthwhile program.

Mr. President, joining me as cosponsors of this measure are Senators Church, Moss, Magnuson, and Bible. The Senator from Idaho is necessarily absent from the Senate today, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by Senator Church on this bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2315) to restore the "Golden Eagle" program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) and others in support of this bill to extend the life of the Golden Eagle passport.

I have received scores of letters from my constituents urging the extension, Mr. President, and I believe it has been solidly demonstrated that the passport has performed an essential service. In addition, although revenue from the passport in its first year was little more than half a million dollars, its sale has since steadily increased, and last year alone returned almost \$5 million to the land and water conservation fund.

Even if the revenue were not significant, Mr. President, it is obvious from the mail received—not only by himself—but by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and other Senators, that the Golden Eagle program has been a success. It has been of major benefit, as an example, to thousands of our senior citizens, who in their retired years have found great pleasure in traveling to our many fine national parks and recreation areas. In short, this is a public service which should be continued, a purpose which this bill would accomplish.

This is in line, Mr. President, with the legislative history of Public Law 90-401, which indicates that by extending the life of the Golden Eagle passport until March 31 of next year, there would be time for the Congress to consider the public attitudes and advantages and disadvantages regarding the Government's outdoor recreation fee system. It is quite apparent that the passport has wide acceptance and support.

I would also like to comment that much of the mail which I received linked the projected termination of the Golden passport with the consideration being given by the National Park Service to turning over the operation of major campgrounds to private concessionnaires. Most of the passport users vigorously oppose such a changeover, fearing that greatly increased fees will result.

To illustrate this, and the need for continuation of the Golden Eagle passport, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three of the typical letters which I have received on this matter appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO,
March 25, 1969.

DEAR SIR: I just want to ask you to help save our Golden Eagle pass.

We bought it every year. It is the only pleasure a lot of poor people can afford with a load of kids, gas & food—Please don't let them take this away too. Money's at the bottom of this. So stop the small camp owners from killing a cheap vacation for Poor People. Thank you.

Sincerely,

IRS. HARRIET J. ERICKSON.

POCATELLO, IDAHO,
May 21, 1969.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Through the news media we are informed it is the intention of the Forest Service to do away with the Golden Eagle pass and contract the care and operation of our National Forests and Parks camping grounds, and recreational facilities, and they in turn charge the users \$2.50 and up per day for these accommodations.

We urgently request you do all you can to discourage and prevent this being done and to encourage the continuance of the Golden Eagle pass, as to contract the management of these facilities can only lead to ultimate down grading of the facilities and profiteering on the part of the lessee to the detriment of the facility and the prohibition of use and enjoyment of them by that mass of the public who may not be able to afford the increased charges.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. KORTUM.
ABBIE C. KORTUM.

EMMETT, IDAHO,
May 12, 1969.

HON. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator,
Boise, Idaho.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: It has come to our attention that the Golden Eagle passport is to be cancelled after this year, and the facilities at the National Parks to be turned over to concessionaires.

We feel that this will soon run into so much extra cost that the lower income families and retired people will not be able to visit the Parks.

When the Golden Eagle was imposed, most people here greatly resented having to pay to get into what they felt was their own tax-maintained, God-given right. Many families have purchased their own picnic tables and chairs to carry along so that they won't have to pay the Camp fee. Now you know what this means: Every car-turn-off place and stream in the entire West will be littered and polluted until it will be impossible to clean up.

Perhaps the Government feels it cannot afford to build and maintain more Parks and camp sites . . . but, can it afford not to, when in these times it is so important for city-stressed people to be able to get out and away for a weekend, or even a Sunday picnic? Does the Government REALLY want its citizens to vacation in their own country?

If those who actually use the Parks must be the ones to help pay for their upkeep, then, surely, the Golden Eagle passport should be enough payment. Let those who demand more expensive facilities seek privately owned camps.

Let's build more and better camp and picnic areas for the increasing population, and PLEASE, not impose concessionaires, or more costly fees.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CLARK AMOS.

Mr. Moss. Mr. President, I announced some weeks ago that I would introduce a bill to extend the Golden Eagle passport. Since that time I have been working closely with the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church) and other members of the Senate Interior Committee in the preparation of such a bill. We have decided that the best approach is legislation which will provide for the continuation of the Golden Eagle passport beyond the date now set for its expiration—March 31, 1970. This is the measure I take pleasure in sponsoring today.

I realize that others have rushed in with Golden Eagle passport bills which make some changes in the program, but it is my opinion that a direct extension of the program as it now exists is the more realistic and comprehensive approach.

There is no doubt in my mind that the American people want to see this particular American Eagle kept alive. Since 1965, the passport has allowed the bearer and everyone riding with him in his private vehicle to enter any federally operated recreation area without paying the fees charged at any of these areas.

Although the passport idea was resisted to some extent when it was first inaugurated, it has more than proved itself in the past 5 years, and its popularity, in my part of the country at least, is substantial. It has been an "open sesame" to wider admittance and greater use of our Federal recreation areas for many American families, and I predict its use will soar as more and more people become aware of its low cost and convenience.

The first year the passport was in operation—fiscal year 1965—it brought in only \$663,000 in revenue to be deposited in the land and water conservation fund, and apportioned among the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries to acquire national outdoor recreation lands and waters, and for matching grants to the States to acquire and develop recreational areas and facilities.

In fiscal 1966, sale of Golden Eagle passports brought \$2,819,000; in fiscal 1967, \$3,795,000; in fiscal 1968, \$4,846,000 and in fiscal 1969, through April 30, \$3,294,000, with the heaviest use months yet to come.

It is impossible to know how many people were admitted to our recreation areas under these passports, or how many used the camping grounds or other facilities, because the Golden Eagle is a family-type permit, and a car with one of them could contain as many as six or even more persons when it passed through the entrance gates and often does. We do know that the number of permits issued grew from only 90,000 in the first full year in which the permit was in effect to 692,000 in the last full year, fiscal 1968. In the first half of fiscal 1969, over 400,000 were issued.

I understand there has been some disappointment in the Department of the Interior because the amount of revenue generated from the passport has not lived up to projections. I suggest first that perhaps the projections were too ambitious, and second, that the figures I have just quoted indicate that the use of the passport, and the revenues from it will continue to grow—and grow substantially—if it is not terminated. Also, there are many people who would be more than willing to pay more—even \$10 or \$15 a year—for the privilege of buying one passport which would admit them to about 3,000 Federal recreational areas.

I have received many letters from people in Utah who explain far better than I am able to do so what the Golden Eagle passport means to them and their families. I ask unanimous consent to place excerpts from several typical letters in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I have had the pleasure of using the Golden Eagle passport since it came into existence. In fact I purchase three each year. One for each of our two children and their families and one for ourselves.

It has just come to my attention that Congress has silently, with very little notice and with lack of sufficient information to the majority of people affected, voted the pass discontinued as of April 1, 1970.

It is hard to understand when the program was expanding so rapidly in the direction in which it was originally intended, for the purchase of additional recreational land, having increased from 90,000 in 1965 to 692,000 in 1968, why the Golden Pass was made a scapegoat in such a manner and eliminated. * * * I remember the years before the Golden Pass when one could not even find a place to stop to eat a picnic lunch without being exploited by individuals who had been given concessions or the right to charge a fee just to stop for a short while. I feel there should have been more public notice of the final impending action against the Golden Eagle pass so that residents who favor it could have brought favorable pressure to bear. * * *

A. E. GAGNER.

NORTH OGDEN, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I have purchased the Golden Eagle passport each year since its inception and I'm sure that millions of others have done likewise. I think that this in itself indicates that the American people are concerned about their National Park Service and are willing to support its growth and improvement. I believe that the abolishment of this passport is a rebuttal of the faith of the American people.

Let's keep our Forest Service Rangers and other essential personnel in these parks and if we need more, let's get more. I'm sure that most citizens that use the parks would be more than glad to pay an additional one or two dollars for their passports if the increase is justified.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BROOKS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: In regard to the Golden Eagle program, we feel at this time we would like to express our interest in keeping the Golden Eagle Passport in force, and would appreciate anything you could do. * * * We are a couple of travelling people. We have supported the Golden Eagle from the beginning.

We, and all our friends, would be willing to pay more than \$7. In fact, we have heard that it will probably be impossible to go camping, because the costs will be prohibitive if the Government allows private enterprise to take over.

Sincerely yours,

VELMA and EARL JOHNSON.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: It has come to my attention that the Golden Eagle pass will go out of existence next year, according to a law passed by our present Congress * * *

We have been a trailering family for six years now and belong to a small trailer club. We use these Federal parks at least once a month during the summer months, and really enjoy them. We also spend a two-week vacation this way each year. And really, I think the Golden Eagle pass is the thing for this type of vacation. Where otherwise we could not afford two weeks away from home * * *

We wish to thank you for any help you may give us toward the repeal of this recent law passed by Congress which would eliminate the Golden Eagle pass. Even a raise in price to \$10 would not be out of line at this time.

Yours truly,

LEONARD L. ROSS.

OGDEN, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Much to my disappointment and surprise I find that "The Golden Eagle passport" has been silently shot down while our backs were turned. The article that I read indicated that it may be too late to submit a protest, but I am surely going to appeal to you personally to use your influence to discourage this action if at all possible.

This has done more for outdoor people like myself than anything that has ever happened in the past in the way of encouraging people to spend more time in the great outdoors.

The facilities that have been provided for us through this program have been absolutely fabulous. We need more of them and I think that the Golden Eagle passport will get them for us.

Please don't let them discontinue this program.

Sincerely,

FLOYD YATES.

MAGNA, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: This letter is written in protest of the manner in which the Golden Eagle passport was voted out of existence as of 1 April 1970. I am an ardent recreational vehicle enthusiast and outdoorsman and subscribe to numerous hunting and fishing periodicals, trailer and camper magazines and it was not until recently that I became aware that the Golden Eagle Passport was no more. Apparently no one can offer a reasonable explanation except that certain groups silently and "sneakily" pressured their Congressman to vote the passport out. * * *

The Golden Eagle passport was probably the greatest single piece of assistance the Federal Government ever gave to vacationing families, hunters, fishermen and all those who love the outdoors. No recreational boom in history compares with the current interest in camping. It is estimated that 50 million Americans will indulge during 1969. * * *

It is absolutely essential that a national camping program provide more education to our urban population in the care and use of our wonderful natural environment.

This plan should provide for the enlargement of regional vacation areas, with more surrounding state parks, private campgrounds and resorts to serve the ever rising tide of recreational travelers. Certainly local communities have a great responsibility to relieve the intolerable pressure on national and state parks. * * *

May we respectfully ask that you indicate to us what your feelings are in this regard and advise what you intend to do now and in the future.

Very truly yours,

(Signed by some 80 Utahans).

Mr. Moss. Among those who would be most seriously hurt if the Golden Eagle passport is not continued are older people who have retired. Many of them have saved for years to buy trailers and camping equipment so they might see as many of America's national parks and monuments and forests and other recreational areas as possible, and if they have to pay separate entrance fees to each one of them, they simply cannot afford to go.

I also ask unanimous consent to place excerpts from several letters in the Record which explain how people already retired—or soon to retire—feel.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: We want to add our voices to the thousands of others who are protesting the cancellation of the Golden Eagle passport to our National Parks and Recreation Areas. * * *

It makes one lose what little faith there was left in the fairness of our government.

We have paid taxes all of our lives and we think the Golden Eagle is the fairest thing ever, especially for retired people and others of moderate means. We have purchased one every year and with its help we have managed to see a little bit of 45 of the 50 states. By the time of retirement from U.S. Forest Service work, we had managed to acquire a comfortable camper outfit, and hoped to be able to see all we could of our beautiful outdoors. Now with the elimination of the Passport it looks doubtful.

Even if we have to pay more for the Golden Eagle, at least we would know what to expect. * * *

Please, Senator Moss, use whatever influence you have to either renew or replace with a pass equally fair, before the Golden Eagle passport expires.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. E. L. BROWN.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Again I am writing you concerning the Golden Eagle pass. It has come to my attention that the present Congress has voted the pass out of existence and I want to strongly protest this unfair action. * * *

My husband and I plan to retire in three years and have long looked forward to the time when we could travel and see this beloved country of ours, with the convenience of our travel trailer. Being able to spend some time in our National Forests is a cherished dream which we certainly cannot afford on retirement pay if we have to pay unreasonable prices to park our trailer. * * *

Thank you very much.

Mr. and Mrs. WESLEY H. MOORE.

CLEARFIELD, UTAH.

Mr. Moss. Mr. President, an excellent case can be made for continuing the Golden Eagle passport beyond the expiration date of May 31, 1970, and we are taking the first step here today in the introduction of the bill which is sponsored by the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Idaho, and myself. The next step will be hearings in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I am confident they will be scheduled at an early date.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Moss is with us today. I am happy to recognize him.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK E. MOSS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a very brief statement.

I was happy to be a cosponsor with the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee of S. 2315, which would extend the Golden Eagle program or restore the program so that this could be used as a means of admission to all Federal recreation areas, with one exception.

As early as April of this year, I made a full public statement on this matter because of the concern of our people about the possible expiration of the Golden Eagle program in 1970, and indicated that I would introduce legislation.

Then over a period of time we consulted with the Park Service and worked out some of the problems that existed in this program, and then I joined with the chairman in introducing the bill. The bill that is before us, however, in my opinion is deficient, and I intend to propose an amendment. I have those amendments prepared and perhaps should state them right at the beginning.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, the amendment will be made part of the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

[S. 2315, 91st Cong., first sess.]

AMENDMENT Intended to be proposed by Mr. Moss to S. 2315, a bill to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, viz: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a)(i) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), is amended by deleting "\$7" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10".

(b) Section 7 of such Act (78 Stat. 903) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior determines necessary in order to advertise and promote any entrance or user fee program established pursuant to section 2(a) of this Act".

SEC. 3. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746) is repealed.

Senator Moss. I will explain the amendment very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

The present cost of the Golden Eagle admission sticker is \$7, and I think one of the problems we have encountered is the disappointment there is with the amount of revenue coming in. Therefore, my first amendment would increase the annual fee to \$10. I think this could be done without impairing the usefulness of the sticker. The people who buy it, and get a bargain for a full year's time, could pay \$10 very readily.

Second, I think that one additional problem that we have is that in the legislation as it presently exists the Department of the Interior is forbidden to advertise or promote or otherwise publicize the Golden Eagle program. I think that should be removed. I think that the Secretary, to the extent he determines necessary, can advertise or promote the use of the Golden Eagle program stamp. If our people understood it better, we probably could increase the number that could be sold. I think that is a legitimate thing to do, explain the program.

The third amendment has to do with the reservoirs on areas created under the Flood Control Act of 1968. This has constituted a very glaring exception to the Federal areas utilized under the general admission program of the Golden Eagle stamp. As we all know, the flood control program is administered by the Corps of Engineers. It caters to more people seeking waterborne recreation than all the other recreation areas that we have, and yet, for reasons that I do not think are valid, they have been excluded from the operation of the program. I think this ought to be absolutely uniform among all Federal recreation areas.

This constitutes an admission charge to any person who intends to use an area. On the other hand, I don't think some should be free and some should have a sticker. That is the third amendment that I propose to introduce.

I think with those changes the bill that we have before us constitutes a very necessary and desirable means of financing our land and water conservation fund along with other sources of revenue that this committee has provided.

I would point out that the first year, fiscal 1965, when we started this program, we took in only \$663,000; by fiscal 1968 the income was up to \$4,846,000. Unfortunately, I do not have the figures up to date, but at the end of April, when I was compiling this information, already it was \$3,294,000 for the current or fiscal year that has just expired, and the number of visitations had greatly increased.

I think the program is on its way. It is beginning to succeed. Maybe it hasn't grown as rapidly as we had hoped, but certainly is growing, and I can testify that the people in my State, and I think all throughout the West, have high acceptance of the program.

I have a sheaf of letters from people who wrote to me urging that we continue the Golden Eagle program. I believe this committee ought to report a bill and get it on the floor during this session of the Congress and it should be acted upon so that the program will not expire next year.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. I appreciate the statement from the distinguished Senator from Utah, a member of the subcommittee.

Senator Hatfield.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK HATFIELD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my support of this legislation with the statement that I hope that someday no admission fee will be charged in our national parks and recreation areas. In Oregon, a vast majority of our State parks do not charge admission fees, and, they are recognized by many vacationers as among the finest in the country.

At a time when our society is becoming more urbanized, we should encourage visits to our parks. People who have visited our recreation and park areas know the rejuvenating effect such trips bring.

In addition, free admission to Federal parks and recreation areas would remind the taxpayer that it is his tax money that is providing the facilities. Too many times a taxpayer pays his Federal taxes and sees few tangible returns. Free use of our Federal parks would remind him of the Federal Government's role in our total recreation picture.

Until such time when free admission is possible, however, the Golden Eagle passport represents an acceptable alternative. To many Oregonians, the Golden Eagle represents the best investment they can make in their weekend and vacation enjoyment, for each time they visit an area, the cost drops.

I wish to highlight two groups of people who profit greatly from the Golden Eagle program. They are senior citizens and large families.

Many older Oregonians have written me to tell of their great pleasure in using our parks. The Golden Eagle offers them an opportunity to visit our parks as often as they can with no increase in cost. Because so many elderly people have fixed incomes, the Golden Eagle helps hold down the cost of vacation plans. Large families are not penalized by a "per person" charge, and therefore are encouraged to take family vacations. I think this committee should encourage such family endeavors and this passport is a step in that direction.

The immediate success of the Golden Eagle pass is well known by this committee. The number issued has doubled in 4 years. In 1968, I think it important to note that of the \$11.8 million received by the Interior Department and Forest Service from all users of parks and vacation areas, \$5.1 million—or 45 percent—came from the sale of Golden Eagle passports.

The success of this is even more dramatic when we remember that no funds were earmarked to publicize the Golden Eagle pass. I would hope that if we continue the program, we provide modest funding to allow for publicity for the passport.

In conclusion, I repeat that I hope eventually we can eliminate entrance fees in our Federal parks, and our scenic wonders and campsites can be enjoyed free of charge. Until we achieve that, however, I was glad to join as a cosponsor of the bill to continue the program. I hope that the Golden Eagle passport bill is endorsed by this committee and that it will be viewed favorably by the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present my views on this subject.

Senator BIBLE. I now recognize the senior Senator from Utah, Senator Bennett.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Senator BENNETT. I appreciate this, Mr. Chairman. I have to go to another meeting. I appreciate this opportunity to appear in full support of legislation to extend the Golden Eagle passport.

Because of action in the 90th Congress, the Golden Eagle passport is due to expire on March 31, 1970. To illustrate my complete support of Golden Eagle, on May 16 I introduced a bill to establish fee programs for entrance to and use of areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which would extend the Golden Eagle passport indefinitely.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear at the outset that I have no pride of authorship and will be happy to support my bill or any of the others which were later introduced and which you are considering today.

I introduced my own bill to give Congress a chance to look again at this program, and I am sure that these hearings will bring out both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

My bill was prompted by the wishes of many of my constituents who have been using the passport at national parks, forests, and reservoirs. Many of them are retired and enjoy the opportunity to travel and visit our natural wonders. The annual fee permit has allowed them to visit our national parks and forests at a great reduction in cost.

In Utah, where more than 70 percent of our land is federally owned, many of our citizens are ardent outdoorsmen, whose main recreation is obtained in federally operated recreation areas. Many of my constituents have told me that even if the price had to be increased, it would still be a bargain, and I agree.

Therefore, my bill calls for an annual fee of not more than \$10. I feel this charge is reasonable and the fund would be used for a good purpose.

The Land and Water Conservation Act approved by Congress in 1965 recognized the growing need to raise money so that the States and, to a lesser degree, the Federal agencies, could acquire and develop projects for use by the general public furnishing a broad range of outdoor recreation uses and experiences.

When the passport plan was first introduced, I received complaints about the imposition of fees at some previously free recreation areas. However, once the users became aware of the benefits that accrued from the yearly permit the opposition ceased. I might add that my mail has been overwhelmingly in favor of the extension of the Golden Eagle passport.

As you know, since 1965, the passport has also allowed the bearer and everyone with him in a private vehicle to enter more than 3,000 national parks, forests and refuges, as well as other federally-operated recreation areas, without paying fees charged at any of the areas. The program expanded from 90,400 Golden Eagle passports issued in 1965 to 692,300 in 1968. During the first half of fiscal year 1969 alone, 403,100 had been sold.

Although revenues were not as great as anticipated because the program got off to a slow start, the fees collected grew to \$4,846,000 in 1968 from a low of \$633,600 in 1965. For 1969, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has estimated a total of \$5,200,000. These figures would seem to prove the program is booming and should be expanded, not buried.

The land and water conservation fund derives revenue from admission and user fees at Federal recreation areas, net proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real estate and related property, and existing Federal taxes on motorboat fuels. About 60 percent of annual appropriations from the fund are normally available to the States.

In its first 3 years, \$160.5 million was allocated to match State funds to help finance such diverse projects as multipurpose metropolitan parks, snow ski areas, campgrounds, urban playgrounds, golf courses, swimming pools and bicycling paths. The program extends to the 50 States, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Money from the fund also supports Federal acquisition of authorized areas within the national parks, national forest and wildlife refuge systems.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee and the Senate as a whole will act favorably on this legislation to extend this worthwhile program.

I am happy that the chairman of the committee has introduced a bill sponsored by other members of the committee and I assume that this is the bill that will come out of the committee.

Senator BIBLE. We have three bills.

Senator BENNETT. Yes; including mine.

Senator BIBLE. Your bill is before us.

Senator BENNETT. I am happy at the suggested amendment to raise the fee to \$10 because this was probably the chief feature of the bill I introduced which is before you, and which was the first bill on the subject actually before the Senate. I am happy to carry on the figures that my colleague from Utah has given to you.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has estimated a total of \$5,200,-000 in receipts for the fiscal year which has just closed.

I think it is important that this bill be passed.

I am not sure I share my colleague's feeling that the stamp should be applied to those lakes to which admission is now free, but if, in the wisdom of the committee, it feels that that should be done, certainly I will support it when the bill gets to the floor and I hope the committee will approve the bill today and work for its rapid action so that there will be no loss of time and there will be no interruption of the use of the Golden Eagle passport.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Congressman Jerry L. Pettis. Mr. Congressman, we are happy to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF HON. JERRY L. PETTIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. PETTIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First off, let me say that I am delighted to find, at least so far, that I am among friends.

My testimony this morning bears out what has already been said but I would like to add a few words in support of the program.

I would like to thank the members of this committee for giving me an opportunity to discuss a matter which I consider to be of grave urgency for all of our constituents, whether they be East or West, and I speak of the desire and future ability of our citizens, particularly our senior citizens, to visit and enjoy our national parks. Personally, I look forward to the day when admission to all national parks and recreational facilities will be free of charge. Americans should be able to enjoy our beautiful resources as a matter of right and heritage without price.

Up to now, the pressure for money for new parklands and maintenance of current facilities has been so great that free admission seems to be a long way away. The next best thing, however, is the Golden Eagle passport.

Since 1965, our citizens have been able to visit our Federal recreational facilities during the year for only \$7 by purchasing the Golden Eagle. I would hope that this program would be continued, and I am cosponsoring a bill on the House side to that effect. To meet the problem of increased costs, we are proposing raising the season price to \$10.

It is an unfortunate fact that individual cash payments at every park could be prohibitive for many of our citizens. It is important to remember that it is our elderly who have the most time to visit our parks, but it is these same senior citizens who can least afford to pay continually at every park from their fixed incomes.

One of my constituents wrote me recently saying, "I am 73 years old, on a small pension." He described his activities in our national parks and said that they were his "only pleasure left."

Another wrote me saying, "We do hope and pray that you put through the bill for the park season tickets. I think we older people are entitled to that much. Being on a fixed income, we must have some places to go. We are not like horses and can be shot because we are old or older. We were young once and helped to bring things in this world up to date."

Let's be sure that users of public facilities pay a fair share of the cost—the Golden Eagle is completely consistent with this policy. At the same time, however, we must not rob these people of the opportunity to feel a cool breeze and to see a mountain by charging so much that they are prohibited from entering one of our national parks.

The Golden Eagle is consistent with our public policy of asking those who use and enjoy our public lands to contribute reasonably to the cost. The U.S. Department of the Interior reports that additional charges are made for such services as bathhouses, lockers, boat launching ramps, cabins, overnight shelters, electricity, fuel, winter sports facilities, and camping.

Under my bill in the House, if the appropriate Secretary under the program feels that extra charges should be made for user activity, the Golden Eagle passport system would not interfere with that ability.

The Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, recently commissioned the Arthur D. Little Corp. to do a study of the entire Federal recreation area permit and fee system. The company's findings, in a 225-page report, recommended a new system that would be built around a multiarea permit much like the Golden Eagle. The added factor would be a penalty assessed against those who did not purchase permits in advance; one-day permits purchased at the park would be considerably more expensive than the present system and would be enforced through a new spot-check system.

If we were to abolish the Golden Eagle, what would the results be like? Certainly not an increase in revenue, for it is quite evident that many of our elderly would find the increased costs prohibitive. My own mail overwhelmingly supports this position. Instead of increasing total revenue, we might well decrease it, and I might note that in fiscal 1968 the Golden Eagle brought it over 43 percent of the total revenue in entrance fees for national parks.

Further, while current projections estimate \$12 million in revenue for fiscal 1969 under the present system, the Little Corp. predicts that the adoption of its proposal, substantially a universalization of the Golden Eagle, would bring in \$33 million during the same period.

Let's look into the financial picture a little deeper. In the private sphere, the public customarily receives a discount in the purchase of products or services in quantity because fixed costs make it less expensive this way for the dealer. As in the private sphere, however, our national parks find the brunt of their expenses tied up in fixed or semi-fixed costs.

Specifically, much of the money now goes to purchasing new land and the further development of facilities. As for operational expenses, the parks can charge for additional services, as already noted. Thus, from a financial standpoint, it is reasonable to assume that citizens who want to visit a number of our parks should not have to pay the full cash allotment at each facility.

The Little Corp. study showed that 15 percent of the Golden Eagle purchasers do not even break even. If the price were raised to \$10, this figure could jump substantially higher.

The Golden Eagle passport is only a substitute, in my mind, for free national parks. In the absence of any hope for early attainment of that idea, however, this season ticket system will allow our elderly to enjoy their heritage. America's mountains, streams, and great areas of natural beauty, while still bringing in the necessary public funds.

The system has been shown to be a reasonable and workable one financially, and many of our citizens could not afford any other. Let's not take this last possible pleasure away from them.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. That was a very fine statement, Mr. Congressman. I commend you for it and I think we are in fairly close agreement on most of the things that you have stated.

What is the status of your bill in the House?

Mr. PETTIS. We have not had hearings yet.

Senator BIBLE. I was hoping you would press for some early hearings on that.

Mr. PETTIS. I might add that the members of the committee, however, are very friendly to this concept on the House side.

Senator BIBLE. Who is chairman of the park committee on the House side?

Mr. PETTIS. Congressman Taylor.

Senator BIBLE. Well, I would urge you to see him and ask him to give you an early hearing.

Mr. PETTIS. This I have done, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Senator MOSS. I want to congratulate the Congressman on a very fine statement.

I agree the ultimate goal is to have free national parks. But until some happy day in the future when we can fund it, we have to build up this fund that we use for acquisition and other costs, as you so well know. I was glad to have your statement that you would favor even the raised price if that were necessary, so that we could do two things:

One, there are elderly people—and I have heard from them by the hundreds and thousands, I guess—but, second, it is a sort of a blanket invitation, an encouragement to our people who buy their pass at the beginning of the season to go again and again to Federal recreation areas. We ought to encourage outdoor recreation for our people, it seems to me, and once they have bought the sticker, just the way we all seek a bargain, they can say, "Well, we can jump in the bus now and run out to the lake." Nobody thinks whether they have to pay \$1.50 to get in. Just go out and use it. I think building this psychology into our people of using all these outdoor recreation areas is a great thing.

Mr. PETTIS. I might add that this would certainly give promotion of this concept of seeing America first which is very important in our society.

Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Congressman.

Without objection the statements of Senators Church, Hansen, McGee, Nelson, Stevens, Cannon, Cranston, and Tydings, and Representatives Baring and Bizz Johnson, will be included at this point.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CHURCH, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, I would like to urge its approval of an extension of the Golden Eagle passport. I think this is essential as a public service to thousands of American citizens.

Scores of people in my State of Idaho have either written, wired to me or told me personally what the permit has meant to them. I have been particularly impressed with its enthusiastic use by our senior citizens, on restricted incomes, who with it have been enabled to visit and camp in the national parks and other Government recreation areas. The pleasure of this activity, in their declining years, has been eloquently expressed in letter after letter which I have received.

They have indicated they would be happy to pay even more for the passport if it were continued.

The bill which I have cosponsored with Senator Jackson and others is designed to simply extend the passport as it now exists, at a cost of \$7. Many of my constituents have suggested a charge of \$10 for the passport. If there is to be an increase, I believe this is to be adequate.

Receipts from the sale of the Golden Eagle passport have greatly increased, showing the growing popularity and use of this permit, and that it adds considerably to the moneys needed in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Chairman, I hope our subcommittee and the full committee will act promptly to approve legislation to extend the Golden Eagle passport.

STATEMENT BY HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. Chairman, the Golden Eagle passport plan, initiated by Congress in 1965 as a part of the Land and Water Conservation Act, has proved to be a most popular program among the citizens of the United States. Although the program was originally planned as a means of raising money for the purchase of more recreation land through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Golden Eagle passport also insures access to more than 3,000 national parks, forests, refuges, and other federally operated recreation areas at a reasonable cost on a fixed annual fee basis.

The Golden Eagle passport problem has proved to be of special benefit to the Nation's senior citizens. Following retirement, most people find themselves free to travel extensively for the first time. They have the opportunity to take full advantage of the Nation's scenic pleasures. In most cases, finances are the principal item which determines the amount of travel which can be undertaken by a retired citizen.

The Golden Eagle passport permits these individuals to travel throughout the Federal recreational system during the entire year at one fixed fee. Recreational areas are especially well-suited for inexpensive travel by use of trailers, campers, etc. Without the Golden Eagle permit, a retired person might find his travel plans severely hampered because of the inability to meet, on his fixed income, the entrance fees at various Federal recreation areas.

It is easy to overlook the senior citizen in the bustle of the everyday business of the Nation. The senior citizen living on a fixed income is particularly burdened by the inflationary cycle the Nation is experiencing. The Golden Eagle passport program is one means by which senior citizens can be given a break and an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the Nation's recreation areas.

Although the original fund-raising purpose of the Golden Eagle passport must not be overlooked, it is important that we recognize the great benefits which are derived from this program by this Nation's senior citizens living on a fixed income as well as others who enjoy spending much time in the Nation's outdoor recreational areas. I strongly support the legislation to continue the Golden Eagle passport program after the present expiration date of March 31, 1970. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. GALE MCGEE, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my statement on S. 2315. I strongly support this legislation to restore to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 the provision for annual fee permits to our national parks and forests. I am convinced that the "Golden Eagle passports," as the permits are commonly known, are extremely popular with the citizens of this country, especially among the senior citizens who have retired and derive a great deal of pleasure and recreation from visiting the national parks and forests. This is evidenced by the phenomenal growth in the number of Golden Eagle permits issued between fiscal years 1965 and 1968 from 90,000 to almost 700,000.

I have received many letters from people in Wyoming and other States supporting the continuation of the Golden Eagle passport program. Some of these letters also express concern that if the Golden Eagle program is terminated, the parks and campgrounds will be turned over to private concessionaires resulting in greatly increased user costs and lower standards of operation.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that several typical letters which I have received recently be made a part of the record at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that prompt, favorable consideration be given to S. 2315 so that the popular Golden Eagle program can be retained for the benefit of our citizens.

CASPER, WYO., April 9, 1969.

Senator GALE MCGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: I note in the April issue of Trailer Life Magazine that Congress has taken action to do away with the Golden Eagle Stamp in 1970. In my estimation the Golden Eagle Stamp is one of the greatest benefits that our government has ever given the people of this great land.

I have bought the stamp ever since it has been in existence, whether I made use of it or not. I would certainly like to see every effort made to continue the Golden Eagle.

Yours truly,

DELMER S. WECKWERTH.

LARAMIE, WYO., March 30, 1969.

Senator GALE MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: To my complete consternation, I have just learned that the bodies which represent us out there have put the axe to the Golden Eagle, as of April 1, 1970. It is also my understanding that none of us were asked whether or not we liked the arrangement, but that the action was taken as the result of some letters from folk who never like to pay for anything.

I want to assure you that I have wholeheartedly supported the Golden Eagle fee and the program for the years it has been in existence. And that I AM JUST AS WHOLEHEARTEDLY AGAINST ANY MOVE TO PUT THESE AREAS INTO THE HANDS OF CONTRACT CONCESSIONAIRES, OR ANY OTHER PRIVATE OPERATORS. Further, I see no connection between the move which has been made, and the need to broaden facilities.

I sincerely hope you will initiate, or strongly support, if otherwise initiated, a move to reestablish the Golden Eagle program as it was. Or a change in the designated use of the fees, for the purpose of broadening facilities in existing areas, would be acceptable.

I am a retiree, as of last year, age 66. Our family loves the outdoors, and has especially enjoyed it in Wyoming for the past 15 years; so much so that we moved

to Laramie from Nebraska on my retirement in February of 1968. We have particularly enjoyed the facilities made available to us by the Golden Eagle program since its inception, and looked forward to greater use of it in the years to come.

I am sure you will hear from many others of us, and I'm also certain that you will come through for us.

Thank you for this and for all the services you perform for us.

Sincerely, from one ex-Nebraskan to another, and with best wishes,

B. H. INGRAM.

CASPER, WYO., April 23, 1969.

Senator GALE McGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: We are writing to you with the hope that you will see fit to take a stand against the abolishment of the "Golden Eagle Permit." We've read, with much concern, the action that is taking place in Washington and feel that, without the Golden Eagle, our State will be deprived of a goodly income which is sorely needed to maintain our parks and recreational areas.

Individual enterprise, in our opinion, has no place in the management of these parks and, if it comes to this, certainly Wyoming tourism is going to feel the impact. An individual, such as you and I, cannot enter into the management of a recreational area on a seasonal basis without charging a sufficient amount to guarantee a living on a yearly basis. It takes very little imagination to realize that the general vacationing public and tourists are not going to pay these prices and individual management will lead the trailering and camping public to seek camping sites wherever available outside the recreational borders with the ultimate result being a "cluttered and unsanitary, unsightly countryside." These people will be camping where the necessary facilities, such as garbage and toilets, are not available. Also, the fire hazard in our precious forests will be greatly increased.

We, who are proud to be residents of the State of Wyoming and who wish to see it remain a vacation wonderland, ask your support in keeping the "Golden Eagle Permit" as the passport to all parks and recreational areas.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. LLOYD WHITE.
Mr. and Mrs. E. DALE HALL.
Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD O'NEAL.
Mr. and Mrs. GARY L. DYER.
Mr. and Mrs. JOE L. VOELKER.

AFTON, WYO.

Senator McGee or To Whom It May Concern:

We were told to write to our congressman about the following problem,

We were told that this is our last year for the Golden Eagle and that all our camp grounds were to be turned over to concessions.

Mr. McGee, the laws of the land retire people at age 65 and rather than spend the rest of their lives in a rocking chair, they try to get what pleasure they can from moving about in a camper or trailer. And they can't afford to pay \$60 to \$75 a month for parking on their small retirement. It isn't the rich people who travel or live this way.

If the government must do something, raise the price of our Golden Eagle \$25 or such. I'm sure all the senior citizens who enjoy outdoor life, especially going south in the winter, will be more than glad to pay that much rather than have to pay from \$1-\$2.50 for camp grounds per day.

Please don't put the Senior Citizen who can enjoy this kind of living in a Rocking Chair before their time.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DENMAN MILLER.

CASPER, WYO., April 25, 1969.

Senator GALE McGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: As a citizen of the fair state of Wyoming I would like to lend my support to your Washakie Wilderness Bill. I feel that if we are to protect our wonderful natural heritage we must set aside as much of this primi-

tive territory as possible. I think your bill does a very good job of doing this as it will give maximum protection to the wildlife, especially the elk.

I am also writing concerning the repeal of the "Golden Eagle" admission pass which admits one to Forest Service and National Park Service recreation areas. I feel that this pass is a good investment and should be continued even if it is necessary to raise the price.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND G. JACQUOT.

CASPER, WYO., May 5, 1969.

HON. GALE MCGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just returned from purchasing my Golden Eagle stamp and the clerk informed me that this is the last year—it is being discontinued. I asked her if there were anything we could do to keep it as we think it is just great. The campgrounds are always so well kept up and we like the idea of being covered for the season at any camp we choose to visit. We would appreciate anything you can do to re-instate it. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

PEGGY COCKING.

Mr. and Mrs. T. H. Cocking.

STATEMENT OF HON. GAYLORD NELSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF
WISCONSIN

I cosponsored S. 2315 which would indefinitely extend the Golden Eagle passport program for two reasons. First, I believe that the collections of those monies is in complete accord with the American tradition of full and fair payment for value received. For more than 15 years the Government has had a policy that where the use of Federal resources convey special benefits to identifiable recipients above and beyond those which accrue to the general public, such recipients should pay a reasonable charge for the service or product received or for the resource used.

Second, I think that the revenues collected under the Golden Eagle program during the last three years do not bear a true reflection of the future funds which can be generated under this program. I do not feel that the users of our great National recreation areas object to the seven dollar charges made for this passport. Rather, I view the passport's apparent lack of acceptance until recently by recreationists to incomplete knowledge stemming from restrictions imposed on the advertising of the passport program. This is evidenced by the fact that in 1965 only 303,000 passports were sold. By 1968, however, the number had increased to nearly 800,000. I believe that as the benefits to be derived from the passport are better understood that participation in this program will greatly expand, thus substantially adding to the revenue source of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Having been instrumental in passing the original Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, I naturally feel compelled to follow its progress. During the first three years of its existence, the Fund received nearly \$300 million in revenue which was used for land acquisition, development and planning. Without a doubt, the investiture of these funds was successful in providing additional recreational outlets for millions of Americans. However, I felt that the monies generated by the Fund were not adequate to fulfill the objectives of the law, and unless new revenues were provided, State and Federal outdoor recreation property acquisitions would be jeopardized.

Because of this deficiency in funds, and the tremendous increase both in the recreation demand and land price escalation, I co-sponsored an amendment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to authorize a minimum annual expenditure of \$200 million for five fiscal years beginning in FY 1969. I recognized that even this increase in funds would not fully meet the future recreational requirements of the states and Federal agencies. However, I also am aware of the multiplicity of other demands on our National budget. Therefore we had to be realistic regarding priorities and the apportionment limitations which would have to be imposed on our recreation program. Therefore we limited the authority to \$200 million.

Since passage of last year's amendment to the Act which assured an income of \$200 million per year into the Fund for each fiscal year beginning in 1969 and extending until 1973, I have been concerned that the level of requested and appropriated monies to the Fund have not sufficiently increased over previous fiscal years. In Fiscal Years 1966 through 1968, the Fund received an annual average of nearly \$120 million per year. Yet, after passage of the amendment last year, the request and the appropriations for 1969 actually decreased to a level of only \$111,500,000. The outlook for Fiscal Year 1970 also looks bleak, with only \$124,000,000 requested, following the last review by the President.

I believe I speak for other members of the Committee when I say that it was our intent that the Fund be appropriated at the level of \$200 million annually until 1973 to meet the tremendous outdoor recreation demands of our Nation. It was not our intent that the difference between the \$200 million authorized and the amount actually appropriated would merely be credited to the Fund for future use over a long period of years. We intended that the \$200 million be spent within the five year period, or at most by the end of six years. Who misunderstood our intent?

Further delays in acquiring and developing lands, resulting from budgetary restrictions, will only mean that less and less land will be acquired in the future for outdoor recreation purposes. Recent statistics indicate that land values are increasing annually on the average of 5-10 per cent. The rate has been significantly higher for recreation lands, especially for water-oriented lands. The demand for outdoor recreation use has accelerated at a rate greater than the population increase, and the suitable lands for recreation are more scarce relative to land use generally causing a greater acceleration in recreation land prices.

The fact remains inescapable that if future recreation needs are to be met, the land base must be acquired within 5 to 10 years. After such time either the cost of recreation lands will be prohibitive, or the lands will become committed to other competitive uses. We already know, through a report on land price escalation prepared last year by the Department of the Interior, that total Federal and State needs under the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the next 10 years is about \$3.6 billion. On a 5-year projection, the need is estimated at \$1.5 billion. Even with the authorized \$200 million to the Fund between now and 1973, there will still be a large deficit in meeting recreational demands. It is easy to predict the effect these statistics will have on new areas needing authorization.

What is even more important is that a recent tabulation by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation early this year reveals that the estimated cost of Federal recreation land acquisitions *already authorized* and eligible for funding under this Act nearly equal the 500 million authorized as the Federal government's share of the Fund during the next 5 years. The total estimated needs after Fiscal Year 1969 in all Federal recreation areas financed with appropriations from the Fund equal \$498 million. Further delays in the appropriation process can only serve to bankrupt the fund because of land price increases. Further delays will also adversely affect the chances of new recreation land acquisition legislation being enacted.

I feel that recreation is a highly legitimate use of the taxpayers dollar, and this fact must be fully recognized by the administration if we are to meet future recreation demands. Continuation of the Golden Eagle passport program will assist in providing funds to meet these needs, as well more complete appropriations to the Fund through Outer Continental Shelf revenues.

STATEMENT OF HON. TED STEVENS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to have this opportunity to testify on behalf of S. 2315.

Tourism is one of the mainstays of Alaska's economy. Despite increased development in other areas, this will be true for all time to come. Our magnificent scenic wonders are truly unique, and an increasing number of Americans are flocking to Alaska every year to take advantage of the naked grandeur of my state. Any measure which will help stimulate Americans to get out and see this beautiful country is a good one.

The Golden Eagle passport, since its inception, has enjoyed the increasing interest and support of Americans. The revenue producing aspects of the passport should not be ignored, as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has estimated that over \$5,000,000 in income will be received this year if the program is continued.

This would greatly benefit state and federal efforts in expanding our national system of parks and recreation areas.

But even above the monetary considerations, the Golden Eagle passport provides an easy and inexpensive method by which many of our citizens can see America. A good many Americans, especially our senior citizens, can see many parts of our country at a reduced cost through the Golden Eagle program. I feel that this is the main reason why S. 2315 should be enacted. It encourages and aids many citizens to see and enjoy this beautiful land of ours. I request that this committee report this bill favorably.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. CANNON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE
STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased that the committee has seen fit to consider my bill, S. 2331, and others which call for extending the very popular Golden Eagle passport.

This legislation is of great interest to my state of Nevada and other western states, many of whose citizens are outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

At a minimal cost of \$7 per year, the Golden Eagle passport enables the bearer and his family to enter any national park or forest without paying an individual unit entrance fee each time.

The Land and Water Conservation Act approved by Congress in 1965 provided for fees at recreation areas and the Golden Eagle passport as means of raising money for purchase of more recreation lands. Unfortunately, under provisions of PL 90-401, the Passport program will be discontinued March 31, 1970.

Among the reasons given for discontinuing the permit approach is that in some cases the costs of administering the program exceeded revenues generated.

It is my understanding that studies are now being carried out to determine whether this is indeed the case, and if so, just how serious a problem it has been.

Mr. Chairman, I have received letters from literally hundreds of Nevadans asking Congress to keep the Passport. Many of these letters came from the elderly citizens who are on a limited income but who have an abundance of free time. Camping is one of the few pleasures in which senior citizens can engage within their limited income.

A report which appeared about a year ago said:

"According to the best expenditure data available older people, who have about half the income of the younger, also spend about half as much as do younger people. Older consumers followed a pattern more closely related to low-income groups in general . . .

"Smaller expenditures by older consumers in many categories probably reflects their low-income position rather than lack of need for the goods and services."

I am aware that admissions fees to Federal recreational areas do not constitute the greatest expense of recreational travel. The point is, however, that these elderly people were so concerned over withdrawal of the Passport and the subsequent individual fees they would have to pay, that they took the time, energy and money to write to me and many other members of Congress to have the program retained.

Many said they would be willing to pay a higher passport fee if the Interior Department felt it needed more money, but elimination of the program would result in fees out of the reach of many of our citizens.

The purpose of our system of national parks and forests as well as the remainder of our federal recreational estate is to provide pleasure and an understanding of the natural world. I say that if we have a method which provides an efficient, relatively inexpensive means for the American public to enter and enjoy our recreational lands—and we do have such a method in the Golden Eagle passport—then we should insure that this is maintained.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALAN: I am happy to join with many of my colleagues in support of Senator Jackson's bill, S. 2315, to extend the life of the Golden Eagle passport.

The farsighted California pioneer of nature and conservation, John Muir once wrote: "Thousands of nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life."

This same necessity takes thousands of visitors to our national parks and forests each year. The Golden Eagle passport program provides for a single annual fee for general admission to all federal recreation areas.

This legislation is of great interest to many California outdoor enthusiasts. Many of these enthusiasts are elderly citizens with limited incomes. Camping is one of the few pleasures that provides an efficient, relatively inexpensive means for recreation.

California offers an unlimited variety of parks and forests. By failing to re-establish the Golden Eagle passport, Congress would stop many would-be travelers from experiencing the pleasure that the wilderness offers. In these times when men fly to the moon and when people cross the globe in a matter of hours, we must preserve our country's "fountains of life" and allow all Americans an inexpensive means to enjoy nature's beauty and simplicity. We have those means in the Golden Eagle passport. I urge the retention of this worthwhile program.

Sincerely,

ALAN CRANSTON.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building.*

DEAR SCOOP: In anticipation of the Committee's hearings next week on extending the Interior Department's authorization to issue Golden Eagle passports, may I state for the record that I have heard within the last year from a great many of my constituents who favor such an extension.

The Golden Eagle passport is a great convenience for people who frequently use our national parks and recreation areas. I strongly support an extension and hope the Committee will conclude, as I have, that these passes have proved to be a very commendable success.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. TYDINGS.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER S. BARING, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. Chairman, I wish my statement, supporting the continuation of the Golden Eagle passport program to our nation's parks and recreation areas, be inserted in the proceedings today before your Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

My western State of Nevada is very keen on having this passport program continued, as are all western states. This popular program is for the benefit of all our citizens who love the great outdoors and wish their children to see the wonders of this country, whether it be in the East, West, North or South.

Our retired citizens must receive the consideration of the fact that they make up a large number of travellers today to our parks, and the Golden Eagle permits afford them easy access to the parks in their "golden" years.

The convenience afforded our vacation-bound people to the parks and recreation sites with the advance purchase of such passports is obvious, and the cost is minimal. Without the Golden Eagle passport program our travellers not only would be inconvenienced by buying admission passes at each park, but very likely they would be paying higher admission fees at each park. And, a family on vacation usually takes in more than one park when travelling. Advance planning by the head of the family is a must during these times of higher costs.

The Golden Eagle program is not only an added incentive for Americans to "Discover America First"; it is also a revenue builder for our park system and a justified service for the taxpaying general public.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, as a co-author of H.R. 11381, a bill to re-establish the Golden Eagle passport, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your fine Committee in support of the companion legislation, S. 2315, introduced in the United States Senate by the distinguished Chairman of the Full Committee, Senator Jackson, and others including yourself, Mr. Chairman. The support given this legislation from so many senior members of the Senate Interior Committee certainly demonstrates that it is most deserving of enactment.

The House bill was introduced by twenty-five California representatives in Congress who agree that the annual fee for admission to all federal recreation installations should not be permitted to expire next March as will occur unless affirmative action is taken by this Congress.

As you all know, the bill would provide an annual motor vehicle permit which would entitle the purchaser, and anyone accompanying him in his private car, to enter some 3,000 designated National Parks, National Forests, or National Wildlife Refuges which are administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. Should the Golden Eagle passport be allowed to die, it would impose a severe hardship on many people who now make regular visits to the fine parks and recreation areas which have been developed through the wisdom of the Congress of the United States by providing authorization and appropriations for these facilities. The only alternative is individual entrance fees which can add up to prohibitive amounts especially when you consider the young father taking his family out for a day in the woods or the retired couple seeking the peace of the outdoors.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the revenue from the Golden Eagle passport did not live up to its expectations. However, I do not believe that this fact alone should cause the death of the entire program. I believe that the record will show that in 1965 the first year of operation, some 90,000 Golden Eagle passports were issued. The following year, this increased by more than 400 per cent. Then in 1967, the sales increased to 542,000. Last year, this increased another 150,000 to a total of 692,000 sales. I would imagine that a similar increase will be reflected in the 1969 sales.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that the pressure is greatest in areas where multiple-purpose water resource, development has created federal reservoirs with strong recreation attractions. Here, I believe, we face a unique problem which I hope can also be solved through this legislation. This relates to fees charged for boat launching. There is no uniformity in the user fees charged by the various agencies at boat-launching ramps. In some cases, I find that one agency will assess a daily boat-launching fee of \$1 whereas another agency operating a similar facility nearby will make no charge. I have found that even at the same reservoir, charges are made at some boat-launching ramps and not at others. First of all, I think that there should be uniformity in the fees charged and secondly, I feel that the fee must be reasonable. This can best be achieved through the establishment of an annual boat-launching permit.

The lack of such annual fee, I believe, constitutes a failure of the federal government to recognize a very serious problem and does impose a severe limitation upon the public's ability to enjoy, to the fullest possible extent, the recreation potential of these reservoirs constructed with public funds and maintained with public funds.

The daily fee which is imposed in many of the areas is excessive for people living in the immediate vicinity of these reservoirs. These people, as you can well imagine, use these reservoir facilities many times during the year. If a pensioner were to go fishing with his rowboat or his small motorboat once or twice a week, as many used to do before launching fees were charged, you can well imagine what the cost in boat-launching fees would amount to in just a year, even if the daily fee were only \$1 as many of them are. For many of these pensioners and other low income families, a day of fishing on the nearby lake is the most healthy and, up until fees were imposed, the least expensive family recreational opportunity available to them. Since the establishment of these daily boat-launching fees, these people simply have been unable to do this because the limited family budget will not permit repeated payments of the launching fee.

Mr. Chairman, since this proposal had not been considered previously, I discussed this with the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service. I have received assurance that my proposal will receive "the full consideration it deserves" in the development of the fee structure should the Golden Eagle passport not be extended.

However, I gained the distinct impression that the executive agencies believe that if the Golden Eagle passport is extended, such an annual launching fee would have to be provided as part of the basic legislation.

This I urge you to do today.

Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Edward C. Crafts, the former director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, is unable to be here today. He has sent a statement for the record which will be included at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF EDWARD C. CRAFTS, FORMER DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

As former Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, I was intimately involved with the original Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, with the amendment last year to include a portion of the mineral receipts from the Outer Continental Shelf lands, and with the administration of the Act.

I strongly favor S. 2315 and believe it would be desirable to continue the Golden Eagle program as long as there is a Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is true that sales of the Golden Eagle permit did not come up to expectations during the first few years of the program. It takes time, however, for a new concept such as this to catch hold and this year the Golden Eagle sales are substantially higher than any previous year. There has also been considerable adverse reaction throughout the country as the public learns the Golden Eagle program will terminate next spring.

The continuation of the Golden Eagle will not enlarge the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program because the ceiling is set at \$200 million a year. If Golden Eagle sales are continued, the income from such sales will go into the fund and the amount of mineral receipts entering the fund will be reduced accordingly. Therefore, the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury will benefit to the extent of the Golden Eagle income.

I recommend the following amendments:

1. The maximum sale price of the Golden Eagle permit should be raised from \$7 to \$10. This permit is a tremendous bargain, especially to families, retired persons and others who use it extensively and there is no reason why the price should not be increased. No one should complain about paying \$10 for a family to visit a series of National parks, forests, and monuments for a total price of \$10 per year.

2. Section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which prohibits the use of moneys from the Fund for publicity purposes should either be repealed or modified to allow a reasonable expenditure of funds to advertise and promote the Golden Eagle program. This inability to advertise the Golden Eagle is one of the reasons why it has taken as long as it has for people to catch on and learn about it.

3. Section 210 of Public Law 90483 that prohibits the Corps of Engineers from charging fees for the recreation areas administered by the Corps should be repealed. There is no reason whatsoever why the Corps should not charge fees for use of its recreation areas when other Federal agencies do charge. The Golden Eagle should apply to Corps projects just as it applies to the Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and other Federal recreation agencies.

Senator BIBLE. The next witness is the Honorable Harrison Loesch, Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Land Management.

STATEMENT OF HARRISON LOESCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT; ACCOMPANIED BY LAWRENCE N. STEVENS, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION; AND HARRY W. RICE, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. LOESCH. I do apologize very sincerely, Mr. Chairman, for the bureaucratic process which resulted in our not having our report before you.

Senator BIBLE. You get that bureaucratic process stirred up, because we are not going to wait very long for it.

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, sir. I thought it would be here by now.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, it will be incorporated in the record and we would like to have it by the end of this week, which is tomorrow.

Mr. LOESCH. With the permission of the chairman, I would ask that my statement be included in the record, and we will highlight it a bit for the committee.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, that will be so ordered.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARRISON LOESCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LAND
MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: We are pleased to be here today to testify on S. 2315, a bill "To restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act", on S. 2331 which is identical to S. 2315 except for the title of the bill, and on S. 2197 which would establish a fee program only for recreation areas administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture.

As you are aware Public Law 90-401 repealed, effective March 31, 1970, the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act under which the Government-wide \$7 Golden Eagle passport program was established. This passport presently enables the purchaser thereof and anyone accompanying the purchaser in his automobile to be admitted at most Federal recreation areas for a one-year period without paying any other admission fee. S. 2315 and S. 2331 would continue this program indefinitely after March 31, 1970, whereas S. 2197 would provide for a \$10 annual permit program applicable only to recreation areas administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

The existing \$7 Golden Eagle Passport program has been in existence for 4 years. The following table shows the approximate cumulative sales of the passport by all Federal agencies:

Calendar year	Passports sold	Funds collected
1965	303,600	\$2,125,100
1966	468,700	3,280,400
1967	629,700	4,408,200
1968	729,200	5,104,300
Total	2,131,200	14,918,000

About 60 percent of the total Golden Eagle passport sales for the past four years has been made by the Department of the Interior and 35 percent by the Department of Agriculture. The remaining 5 percent has been made by the other Federal agencies participating in the program—the Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico).

The Department of the Interior has acquired considerable experience with the Golden Eagle passport program over the past four years. On the basis of that experience it is clear the program has fallen far short of the goals expected when it was first established in 1965.

We believe there are a number of factors to be considered before any action is taken to extend the existing program indefinitely. Such factors include (1) the degree of support for a Government-wide recreation fee program by all of the Federal agencies referred to in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act; (2) the feasibility of each agency developing its own recreation fee system as contemplated by Public Law 90-401; (3) whether the emphasis should be placed on Federal recreation area user fees rather than admission fees; (4) whether permits should be issued to each user of Federal recreation areas rather than on a carload basis; and (5) whether non-Federal public and private agencies should be given additional opportunities and incentives for sale of Federal recreation area permits.

We therefore recommend that the present Administration be given sufficient time to reevaluate the existing Federal recreation fee system and to develop recommendations with respect to it for submission to the Congress. In order to enable the Administration to do so, we recommend that the existing Golden Eagle passport program be extended for one additional year, i.e., through March 31, 1971.

During the one-year extension we recommend that the Golden Eagle passport program apply to public recreation areas administered by the Corps of Engineers. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which was fully debated before the Congress, included the Corps among the eight agencies authorized to collect recreation fees. If this program is to be evaluated for one additional year, then we believe all original participators should be included in the program.

Moreover, we are not aware of any considerations of public equity or any problems of administrative feasibility of fee collection which would justify exemption of the Corps from the fee program during the remainder of the trial period which we have recommended.

We therefore recommend the amendment of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 which precludes entrance or admission fees after March 31, 1970, at public recreation areas administered by the Corps of Engineers.

The Department has received over 1500 letters so far this calendar year supporting the continuation of some type of annual Federal recreation permit, and a large number of them have expressed the view that the existing \$7 permit could be increased. From our experience, we find that the \$7 permit has been purchased principally by persons spending weeks or months in Federal recreation areas and is a bargain. We believe these persons should pay a small fraction of the cost of supplying Federal outdoor recreation facilities.

The draft bill submitted with the Department's report on S. 2315 and related bills will carry out our recommendations. We recommend the enactment of our draft bill in lieu of the above bills.

This concludes my formal statement.

Mr. LOESCH. The Department recommends that the Golden Eagle passport program be continued on an interim basis for 1 year instead of indefinite continuation as proposed by S. 2315 and the other bills before the committee for the reason that there are three or four items which we feel the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should make some study and recommendations on during the coming year.

In consequence, we have proposed that the bill before you be amended to simply continue the program until March of 1971 instead of March 1970 as it is now set to expire. The factors we desire to study include first, the degree of support there may be for a Government-wide recreation fee program by all Federal agencies which are referred to in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act; second, the feasibility of each agency developing its own recreation fee system as contemplated by Public Law 90-401; third, whether the emphasis should be placed on Federal recreation area user fees rather than admission fees; fourth, whether permits should be issued to each user of Federal recreation areas rather than on a carload basis; and, fifth, and last, whether non-Federal public and private agencies should be given additional opportunities and incentives for sale of Federal recreation area permits. This, of course, would contemplate the same system as fishing and hunting licenses are now purveyed to the users of such licenses.

We think this administration ought to be given sufficient time to reevaluate the existing Federal recreation fees system and to develop recommendations with respect to it for submission to Congress, and a portion of this study with respect to the level at which the permit fee should be set.

I, personally, have no particular hangup on whether the fee should be \$7, \$10, or even \$15. But I think perhaps a little more work needs to

be done to determine that. We certainly recommend that the Golden Eagle passport program apply to all public recreation areas administered by the Corps of Engineers. It certainly seems inequitable, and I see no justification at all, for having such areas exempted when our parks or forests and other Federal recreation areas, the program is applied to them, specially with regard to our proposal that the program be continued at this time simply for one year. We believe that all original participators should be included in the program.

It is my understanding that the corps has already ceased to charge fees under the Golden Eagle program. The reason for this I do not know. We would recommend the amendment of section 210 of the Flood Control Act which precludes entrance or admission fees after March 31, 1970, at public recreation areas administered by the Corps of Engineers so that the statutes will be consistent.

We have received in the Department—I, personally, have received a number, as also has the Secretary, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and other agencies of the Department—a large number of letters this year supporting the continuation of some type of annual Federal recreation permit, and if I may be permitted to say so, I believe that perhaps disappointment over the initial level of return from the Golden Eagle passport program caused the proposed cessation of it just at the time that it was gaining widespread public acceptance. Of course, I do believe it ought to be continued.

With that, Mr. Chairman, if you have questions, I will be glad to answer them if I can.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate your statement.

I have, as a matter of fact, since you have started testifying, received the official report of the Department of Interior dated July 16, suggesting the amendments that you have just made in your written statement, so you are not derelict. You are only 30 minutes late. This does have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, so this will be made a part of the record at the proper place.

First, how much does it cost in total—Larry Stevens may be the correct witness for this—how much does it cost in total to administer the Golden Eagle program, on an annual basis?

Mr. STEVENS. During the last fiscal year 1968, which was prior to the passage of Public Law 90-401, the—

Senator BIBLE. What is that law?

Mr. STEVENS. That is the amendment of last summer.

Senator BIBLE. That is the amendment to the Rivers and Harbors Act?

Mr. STEVENS. No. The amendment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which repealed the Golden Eagle. In other words, in 1968, we were proceeding on a full-stamp basis and we spent approximately \$90,000 for the administration of the Golden Eagle permit. In fiscal 1969 just closed, because of the repeal of last summer, we cut down on the material we were putting out and we estimated \$50,000, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. Well, now what does that embrace? It certainly must cost you more than that to monitor and take care of your various recreation areas and your campgrounds and all of your park systems and make your collections.

Doesn't it cost you more than \$90,000?

Mr. STEVENS. I thought you were referring to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation cost of—

Senator BIBLE. Maybe it is a Park Service question.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, no. I know now what you mean.

Senator BIBLE. I want to know what is the total cost of administering the Golden Eagle.

Mr. STEVENS. It is approximately 10 percent of collections among the managing agencies.

Senator BIBLE. You collected \$5 million in 1968. That means it cost you \$500,000 to administer?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir; roughly.

Senator BIBLE. What do you count into your administration?

Mr. STEVENS. The cost of collection at the gate, the cost of spot checking, the cost of distributing the various types of permits, and the personnel involved in the fee collection and enforcement.

Senator BIBLE. If you are collecting \$5 million and it costs you \$500,000 to collect it, it is a pretty good income item, isn't it?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Now, that \$4.5 million surplus goes into the Land and Water Conservation Fund?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Does it revert in the fiscal year?

Mr. STEVENS. It stays there for the year it came in, plus 2 additional years.

Senator BIBLE. So it is plowed back into the very objective for which it was collected.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct, Mr. Chairman, and the administrative costs that I mentioned do not come out of the fund.

Senator BIBLE. The problem that has been called to my attention in the various parks and recreation areas that I visited is the difficulty of actually administering this act, of making the collections and of seeing that the permittee, whether or not under the Golden Eagle passport, stays there just the allotted time or whether you have to move him along at the end of 14 days.

What is the overall policy? How long can you stay in a campground, generally?

Mr. STEVENS. It varies, Mr. Chairman, between individual national parks, depending on the size and on the number of people trying to get into this particular national park. Likewise, there is some variation in the Forest Service regulations.

Senator BIBLE. How about Yellowstone? How long can I stay there?

Mr. STEVENS. I believe it is 14 days.

Senator BIBLE. Yellowstone? Fourteen days in Yellowstone? Fourteen days in Yosemite?

Mr. STEVENS. At the big ones, in the peak season, it is 14 days.

Senator BIBLE. How about the Lake Meade recreation areas?

Mr. STEVENS. I am not sure about Lake Meade, but I can provide that.

Senator BIBLE. Provide it for the record because it has been called to my attention.

(The information is as follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1969.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks, and Recreation, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: We are pleased to provide information for the record of the hearings of July 17 and 18 on S. 2315, S. 2331, and S. 2197. You had requested information on (1) the length of stay permitted at Lake Meade National Recreation Area, (2) the unappropriated and unrequested balance in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and (3) the costs of collecting recreation fees. The requested information follows:

1. The length of stay permitted in a single visit to Lake Meade National Recreation Area varies among the several sites in the area. There are 17 trailer villages and/or campgrounds at Lake Meade; 3 are posted for 15 days, 11 are posted for 30 days, and 3 have no limit on length of stay.

2. The unappropriated balance for fiscal year 1969 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund is \$88.5 million. As you know, \$200 million will accrue to the Fund in fiscal year 1970. That amount plus the 1969 balance will make a total of \$288.5 million available to the Fund.

Funds requested for fiscal year 1970 amount to \$124 million plus \$30 million for Advance Contract Authority. If we deduct these amounts from the \$288.5 million, we have a remaining uncommitted and unappropriated balance of \$134.5 million left in the Fund.

3. We have carefully reviewed all available information relating to the costs of collecting recreation fees. None of the agencies involved has a cost accounting system that would reflect actual costs of collecting such fees. The estimate of 10 percent used by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation includes the same cost items as the other agencies use. One reason for the difference is that each agency figures its costs in relation to the funds it collects. Many permits are sold by mail orders addressed to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. While the cost of checking Passports at areas, answering questions and processing visitors falls on the managing agencies, the revenues from the mail order sales cannot be credited to specific agencies. Thus, their costs may run 15 to 20 percent. Overall, we believe that total costs will not exceed 12 to 15 percent of total collections.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE N. STEVENS,
Acting Director.

Senator BIBLE. As I say, the difficulty is to see to it that the permittee who was there for 14 days at Yellowstone, or wherever, moves on at the end of said days. Now, does your \$500,000 go to see that he does move on at the end of the allotted time?

Mr. STEVENS. That would be included in that amount; yes, sir. But I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that that problem which you mentioned would exist whether or not you have the Golden Eagle.

Senator BIBLE. Yes. It is inherent in the very nature of the park system.

What has been your experience, based on the many millions of people who visit our parks and recreation areas? Do we have many abuses by those who stay longer than they are supposed to stay?

Mr. STEVENS. I think it is a problem; yes.

Senator BIBLE. Is it widely abused?

Mr. LOESCH. May I say, Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that this problem is a particular one on the lower Colorado River in the winter time.

Senator BIBLE. I don't blame them.

Mr. LOESCH. Yes; and the Bureau of Land Management has quite a lot of difficulty down there in the winter.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have any suggested solution for it? Does that require more administration, more police?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. What are your suggestions?

Mr. LOESCH. We are addressing ourselves to that problem a little bit right now and expect to do so with some vigor in the later summer and fall. We are going to have to have more administration down there by the Bureau of Land Management; no question about it.

More people visit the lower Colorado River than both Yellowstone and Grand Canyon combined, which is a rather surprising statistic. And we have very, very few and very primitive facilities for this number of visitors and our manpower is almost nonexistent. I think we have one full-time man and two part-time presently running the whole thing from Parker Dam down to Yuma.

Senator BIBLE. Why don't you put more help on?

Mr. LOESCH. Well, Mr. Chairman—

Senator BIBLE. Was that a cutback?

Mr. LOESCH. That is part of it. We are making it a priority for this coming season, however.

Senator BIBLE. How many people are you asking for in the fiscal year 1970 bill?

Mr. LOESCH. No more. We are going to transfer a couple of others from somewhere else so that the overall amount won't be increased, but I am afraid we will leave somebody else short handed when we do it.

Senator BIBLE. It seems to me if you need additional manpower that you can find support in the Appropriations Committee for the dollars to put the men there because this should be a means of producing better revenue.

Mr. LOESCH. I think there is no question about it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. Do you feel, Mr. Stevens—and I guess you started right out with the Bureau of Recreation, didn't you, so you have a fine background there?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Do you feel if this had not been repealed effective March 31st next year that you would have collected a total of \$5 million in this calendar year?

Mr. STEVENS. I think we would have collected a little more. I think, as Senator Moss pointed out, the program got off to a slow start and this was not too surprising in view of the newness of many features of it, but the experience over the last 3 years would permit me to say that it was getting into high gear; it was definitely bringing in substantial increases each year.

Senator BIBLE. Well, it appears to me even if it brought in \$5 million, it was still a good program because that sure pays it's own way and I think it is true it gives people, and particularly the elderly in the country, added interest in their parks and recreation areas.

Whether it is \$7 or \$10—I am inclined to be in favor of \$10; that seems to be a good figure and it is justified—I think it gives them a greater interest in their country and in their parks and in this great land of ours. If people want to visit a park, I think they ought to pay something for it. I think it will work out very well.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, certainly the correspondence received would indicate a very broad acceptance of the concept. After the first

year, when we got letters objecting in local situations, these have dropped off to almost zero. The mail which has been coming in this year is just 100 percent in favor of continuing the Golden Eagle and many of them indicate a willingness to pay a higher price.

Senator BIBLE. The only objection I have ever had personally has been from those who go into the reservoirs and spend just a short time there and feel it is a little unfair that they have to pay, and maybe they are right. But we are going to hear the Corps of Engineers on this, and let them develop their own points, as well as the Forest Service.

Mr. STEVENS. May I add one more point, Mr. Chairman? We are aware that there were bugs in the program and this is one reason we commissioned the Arthur D. Little report in 1967.

Senator BIBLE. Yes. Has that report been made available to this committee?

Mr. STEVENS. I believe it has, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. Yes; I understand it has, and I know it is a very, very voluminous report, but we might have the inclusion of a few pages well worth directing our attention to.

The Senator from Utah.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Was there a noted change of attitude about the Golden Eagle when the corps was given its exemption in the flood control bill, Mr. Stevens?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, there was a complete cancellation of fees.

Senator Moss. As far as the corps was concerned, but I wondered if you felt the impact over in the recreation areas in any way?

Mr. STEVENS. No. We didn't feel it in the sense I think you mean.

Senator Moss. I wondered if you had any notable resistance growing because some of the areas had been left out by the congressional act. But you said you didn't detect it?

Mr. STEVENS. No.

Senator Moss. Secretary Loesch, the funds that come from the Golden Eagle passport go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund; is that correct?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, Senator.

Senator Moss. And last year Congress passed a bill providing that we would make sure that for 5 years there would be \$200 million in the Land and Water Conservation Fund by taking the additional moneys we need from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues. What has the action of the Department been? Have you utilized the full \$200 million?

Mr. LOESCH. No, sir. Senator Moss, in fiscal year 1969 the actual use was \$154 million, I believe, and for fiscal year 1970 it is \$124 million.

Senator Moss. What is the reason for that?

Mr. LOESCH. Sir, as far as I know, this is caused by the general constraints of the budget and the Land and Water Conservation Fund took its share of the cut like the rest of our departmental funds.

Senator Moss. Well, at the time we were having hearings on the fund on augmenting it, we were told that there was a backlog of \$700 million, I think, needed for acquisition of recreational facilities, and that we were in this problem of the constantly escalating costs because there was no assurance that the money was going to be there and the Secretary couldn't move on acquisition so I am sure on that rationale we were able to get the matter through the Congress.

So, we knew there would be \$200 million there. The Secretary knew there would be \$200 million there and could avoid some of these escalations in the costs that we have been subjected to. Now, by reducing it significantly below the \$200 million, we don't seem to have accomplished anything by putting that money in the fund.

Mr. LOESCH. Not only that; we are complicating the problem. This escalation in land cost, of course, as you are well aware, is increasing and continuing and I think we could profitably spend for recreation uses many times the \$200 million a year.

As you are aware, Senator Moss, I am not the most skilled man in the world on budgets and how these administration things go and so on, but I certainly am highly in favor of using the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the fullest.

Senator Moss. Didn't the visitation to our parks and recreation areas go up again this year?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, sir; and it will continue to do so by leaps and bounds. I think the projections for visitor use by 1990 are fantastic.

Senator Moss. I know the ones that I am personally acquainted with have grown to the point that they are miserably overcrowded.

Mr. LOESCH. This is absolutely correct.

Senator Moss. So we need these extra recreation areas that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is supposed to finance, and your opinion is the same as mine, that the escalation in land prices will continue to jump. It seems to me the longer we procrastinate, the more we feed the inflation, as it were, in an area where we know we are going to have to spend money because people will demand more and more outdoor recreation areas all the time.

I want to ask one other question. This has to do with the value of having some kind of an entrance charge which ordinarily is accompanied at least by the presence of supervisory personnel whether they are acting in a police manner or not. I have been told that the experience of the Park Service is that vandalism and destruction decreases wherever you have an entrance charge and where there is somebody around; is that correct?

Mr. LOESCH. The statistics certainly show that this is the case, Senator, and I think it is not an uncommon phenomenon that when you have to pay for something you are a little more careful of that something than if you get it for nothing. I assume that this is a human reaction that applies in this field as it does in others.

Senator Moss. And this, in my opinion, would be a good argument for having the entrance fee applicable universally in Government-owned recreation areas rather than having it not apply in certain areas. Would you reach that same conclusion?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes; I certainly would. I think it would be well to have a recreation fee of this kind even if it weren't netting any money.

Senator Moss. Because not only is there the expenditure the individual has to make, but there is somebody there who watches him go in and out, which has the added factor that it is somewhat of a deterrent on vandalism and destruction.

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, sir.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, I appreciate it.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Secretary, concerning this last point you raised about charging a fee, I ask who paid for these parks in the first place?

Mr. LOESCH. Senator Hatfield, of course it is the taxpayer.

Senator HATFIELD. Is that the same person who now is using them, by and large?

Mr. LOESCH. Well, yes and no. Some of the same people. For instance, if I pay a tax, income or otherwise, I may or may not use the park. It is like anything else. If I am a citizen in a town, I may or may not use the fire department myself personally, depending on my good or ill luck. If I am a citizen and pay a tax, I may or may not use the park system, depending on my situation and good luck.

Senator HATFIELD. That is where in your testimony you draw the distinction then between a user's fee and admission fee.

What is the distinction on page 3 that you make? And also subsection 3 of your factors in which you say, "whether the emphasis should be placed on Federal recreation area user fees rather than admission fees"? Would you articulate the distinction you make between these two?

Mr. LOESCH. Of course, as the Golden Eagle is now set up, if I have one, I can take anybody with me in my car to an area where the admission fee is required. The alternative might be a fee which would be paid by each person who used a specific facility within a recreation area. As the matter presently is, I might take a five-man group to a park today, and an entirely different, except for myself, group tomorrow and continue that all year on the basis of one \$7 fee, and that is just a straight admission fee.

The user fee would be if each of the members of my party had to pay a fee individually for use of specific facilities or services, just simply like a fishing license or hunting license.

Senator HATFIELD. Are you familiar with the State and park programs of Oregon, my State?

Mr. LOESCH. No, Senator; I am sorry to say I am not.

Senator HATFIELD. With all due respect to the other 49 States, I think you will find by general consensus, most users feel that, if not the finest, it is at least one of the finest State park programs in the entire country.

Mr. LOESCH. So I have heard from the Bureau of Recreation.

Senator HATFIELD. You also probably are aware that the vast majority of these parks are free. They are free. You probably will find them cleaner, you probably will find more care given to them by the user, as well as others, than I think even some of our national parks. And I, therefore, don't believe that paying a fee, in itself, whether it be a user's fee or admission fee or any other kind of fee, is necessary to maintain an appreciation for the park facility on the part of the user.

I think our experience indicates that there can be an appreciation expressed by the care given to a park other than through the paying of a fee. Personally, I hope that we can eliminate all fees one of these days from all of our national parks. I believe the taxpayer has paid for them. Generally, we should be moving in that direction. That happens to be a philosophical as well as what I think is a practical viewpoint, although it may not be pertinent at this point.

I would like to ask you, I believe a while ago Mr. Stevens said that the moneys that have been acquired from the Golden Eagle are held for the year for which they were collected and then for an additional 2 years. Is my understanding correct?

Senator BIBLE. I don't think he said distributed. I think he said held 2 years before reversion to the U.S. Treasury. I don't think you have ever had a reversion, have you?

Mr. STEVENS. No; unless they are appropriated.

Senator HATFIELD. Oh, actually there has never been any reversion?

Mr. STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. So that the approximately \$14 million is net after, as I understand, the 10-percent administrative costs. You then have had about \$14 million appropriated and utilized in this period from 1965 through 1968.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct; \$14.9 million.

Senator HATFIELD. This is almost \$15 million which then has been made available that otherwise would not have been possible to utilize; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator HATFIELD. Now, all this has happened without the benefit of promotion or publicity, because I believe the original law prohibited funds to be used for that purpose; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct, Senator.

Senator HATFIELD. Do you have any way to estimate the additional sales of passports if you had some moderate or modest form of promotion and publicity?

Mr. STEVENS. Based on the experience of the Bureau, and this would have to be purely judgment, I would say that if we were permitted to put on an effective promotional campaign, we could double the sales.

Senator HATFIELD. Double the sales. Already we have more than doubled sales in the 3-year period, 1965 through 1968, without promotion and publicity. How do you account for this? Just word of mouth?

Mr. STEVENS. The 1965 figure is just a partial year, Senator. You see, the act went into effect January 1, 1965, and it was therefore not strictly comparable to the other years.

Senator HATFIELD. I see. It would still be about double, though, wouldn't it? The 1968 figure is \$5.1 million?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. The 1965 figure—partial figure—then is \$2.1 million. Adjusting that year to conform to the same base upon which we measure the other years would still almost double it, wouldn't it?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I think that if in 1968 we had had that kind of authority, we could have sold twice as many.

Senator HATFIELD. Do you have any figures thus far? What is the figure this year?

Mr. STEVENS. It is running a little below 1968.

Senator HATFIELD. How do you account for that?

Mr. STEVENS. Two reasons: One, the word got around that the thing had been repealed and I think a lot of people did not realize that the repeal did not go into effect until March 1970 and therefore didn't know they could buy one.

Secondly, we have reduced what little we have been able to do in the way of informational material. We did this in the light of the repeal, so

I believe these two together would account for that drop, plus the fact that the Corps of Engineers stopped all collections as of last October. This would be an additional reason.

Senator HATFIELD. We would have to have an amendment to the act in order to provide you with authority to have promotional publicity?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Secretary, I have one further question that relates back to this matter of your first three factors on page 3.

Do you feel that by extending this act for a year or so, that there would be greater cooperation or that you could develop greater cooperation? I gather from this there is some lack of full cooperation that you think would be necessary to have a successful program.

Mr. LOESCH. Well, it would be necessary to have the optimum; yes, Senator Hatfield.

I am informed—well, I guess it is quite well known—that the Corps of Engineers opposes the use of the program in its area with some vigor, and I don't know as we could develop cooperation. That seems to be a pretty well established attitude on the part of the corps and I doubt if it is going to change its mind as to what it thinks is best for it.

I do believe that this is tied in with the fact that public acceptance of the program was just really starting to make itself felt when the repealer came in. I do believe that an effort to inform all agencies and the public could develop more support than has been evident in the past.

Senator HATFIELD. I gather, then, that there would have to be some type of mandatory action applied to the corps in order to get this attitude properly changed to insure cooperation?

Mr. LOESCH. Well, I would prefer that you ask the corps that, Senator.

Senator HATFIELD. But you have sufficient cooperation from all the other agencies?

Mr. LOESCH. I think so; yes.

Mr. STEVENS. I would like to say, Senator Hatfield, that the Park Service and the Forest Service, which are the two other big agencies, have, in my judgment, done a tremendous job in trying to carry out an effective coordinated fee program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. They have both cooperated 100 percent with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the rather substantial and complicated job of getting a coordinated program underway, and the other two bureaus primarily concerned, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Land Management, have a much smaller operation, but I would like to commend both the Park Service and Forest Service for, I think, a very outstanding job.

Senator HATFIELD. Thank you very much.

Since commendations are being passed out, I think the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation deserves a great deal of commendation.

I don't think that we need to belabor the point to you. Just as with the minister on Sunday, we are talking to the wrong congregation and wrong people, but I think the needs of this country, as urbanization becomes more acute and presents more problems, are quite apparent to all of us who are involved with the recreation. Your leadership there has been superb.

Senator Moss. May I volunteer, Mr. Chairman, one comment? I don't think that the Members of Congress have been totally without fault in encouraging the Corps of Engineers to take the attitude it has in some areas where they have vast numbers of these impoundments. Maybe the corps would be encouraged to change its attitude, in the terminology of the Senator from Oregon, if we in Congress might change it a bit.

Senator BIBLE. Of course, the corps really hasn't made its policy. They have been told in the 1968 law what they can do and what they can't do. I am sure that will develop in their testimony.

Mr. Stevens, probably you are the correct witness for this question: What is the total amount received by the National Park Service and the Forest Service, if you know their figures, from all users of park and recreation areas under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department and under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service?

Mr. STEVENS. Total amount received in fees?

Senator BIBLE. Yes. I mean from the campers, overnight stayers, 1 day, or whether it is Golden Eagle; what is the total?

Mr. STEVENS. For the years 1965 through 1968, it was \$5.9 million.

Senator BIBLE. Oh, it must be more than that, because it was \$5 million—

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry, Senator. I was reading the wrong figure; \$22,776,000.

Senator BIBLE. \$22 million.

Now, how much did you collect in total for all user fees from people who use the national parks, recreation areas, and the Forest Service areas and the Bureau of Land Management areas in 1968?

Mr. STEVENS. For 1968, the total fee figure, including Golden Eagle and other fees, was \$6,642,000.

Senator BIBLE. Can that be right? Because you have collected \$5 million from Golden Eagle alone.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry. I have \$11.8 million.

Senator BIBLE. \$11.8 million is the total amount that you collected from all users of the parks and recreation areas under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and that also includes the Forest Service, as well?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. That is, of that \$11.8 million you collected, \$5.1 million was from the Golden Eagle.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator BIBLE. That is about, I think you said, 45 percent or whatever.

What is wrong with the philosophy suggested by both Senator Moss in his earlier statement and Senator Hatfield a few moments ago? Why don't you make these available for free to everybody? They are taxpayers. Why not, if they showed you a certificate that they had paid taxes anywhere, let them come in for free, providing they don't stay over the 14 days?

Mr. STEVENS. My own feeling, Senator, is that the vast majority of people who take advantage of these facilities are perfectly willing to pay a fee for the additional privileges which they are enjoying, and the fact that these were originally purchased with taxpayers' dollars, to me is not a compelling reason for free admission.

Senator BIBLE. Why?

Mr. STEVENS. Because I think that the people who use them are deriving a special benefit which is not being received by the other members of our country, and to pursue such a usage analogy, the one that, I think, is very analogous is the municipal parking lot, which is bought by the city and paid for, and then they put meters in and the people who—

Senator BIBLE. You had an awful tough time getting those meters in, though, didn't you? That was the biggest crisis in my little hometown of Fallon, when they put meters in. My dad said, "It will be a sorry day when you put a meter in front of my store." I don't think he liked it, but they did it.

Mr. STEVENS. To me, it means the man who parks his car on public property is paying for that special benefit and that the dime he puts in the meter is a legitimate charge even though it is public property.

Senator BIBLE. I guess we can't beat the tax collector no matter what we call him. Admission fees, users' fees, or straight-up taxes. I thought maybe this might be one bonus that the poor bedraggled taxpayer might get. Maybe that is the philosophy they use in Oregon. That is undoubtedly why Senator Hatfield has been so very popular up there. It makes a lot of sense.

I think some time we should get something from the Government for free, just like getting a box of cereal and finding a prize in it. Well, I don't know. I just kind of wanted your thinking. We will have to go ahead and collect the \$10 a year and collect \$11 or \$12 million which we collect in total.

I would like to simplify it as much as we can and I do think it is important that, whatever we do, we do it with some little tenure in mind so that the people don't misunderstand what we are doing just as they have done in the past. I mean, it is on-again, off-again. First you are going to do it; then you are not. No wonder they get confused. We are confused enough as it is, and I am sure our constituents are more so.

Mr. STEVENS. I think it is quite right, Mr. Chairman, and I think there is one advantage of continuing a coordinated Government-wide program, and that is that under that system you can operate a simpler, less complicated system than if you have five or six different ones designed and operated by individual agencies.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Stevens, a while ago you mentioned a 10-percent administrative cost for Golden Eagle in collecting the Golden Eagle passport fees. What is the cost for the administration of these others fees?

You gave to our chairman just a moment ago a figure of \$11.8 million total for all fees collected. If you subtract \$5.1 million which you said was inclusive of the Golden Eagle amount, that leaves a remainder then of \$6.7 million.

Now, in that \$6.7 million, I am sure it varies there among agencies, but what is the average administration cost?

Mr. STEVENS. It is about the same, Senator Hatfield: 10 percent.

Senator HATFIELD. In other words, for the \$11.8 million, it would be then approximately \$1.18 million cost for administering?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Senator HATFIELD. And that means that you have collected a total then of about \$10 million net?

Mr. STEVENS. Net; yes, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. Now, a while ago you mentioned an analogy to the meters. What is the basic theory or the premise upon which you apply a fee—user's or admission—to the parks? What theory of taxation of which it is a form do you use? Why do you apply it? What is its origin.

Mr. STEVENS. The basic philosophy, as we would see it, Senator Hatfield, would be that that segment of the population who finds it possible and is desirous of using this particular recourse is, logically, it is equitable for him to pay a reasonable price for the use of that resource.

Mr. LOESCH. If you have to have the money in the first place.

Mr. STEVENS. And that this resource is providing a benefit to the users in the same way that the people who take minerals off the public lands pay for that commodity.

Senator HATFIELD. Then this \$10 million net that you collect is plowed back into the facility which the user has enjoyed; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Indirectly. It is not earmarked for that. It goes into the fund.

Senator HATFIELD. So, really, it is not a user's fee, then? A user's fee in theory is for that purpose of developing further the facility which the user enjoys, such as a gasoline tax earmarked for highway construction.

I don't think your analogy of parking meters is a good one because a parking meter was established not as a user's fee but established as a source of general revenues for that municipality, and that money goes into all services for that municipality—police protection, fire protection, and so forth. Generally speaking, among municipalities, the parking meter was developed and devised as a revenue raiser, and now is used as a revenue raiser. But what I gather here in your discussion is that this fee is not a general revenue raiser. It is a user's fee, but is the money plowed back into the development and further enhancement of that facility?

Mr. STEVENS. Not the one that that man used.

Senator HATFIELD. But, in general, the facilities of recreation?

Mr. STEVENS. It is earmarked for recreation and I think it is analogous to the gasoline tax—

Senator HATFIELD. It is analogous to the gasoline tax but not the parking meter.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I think we are discussing two separate basic questions. One is the earmarking of funds; the other is the question of whether you pay additional fees for use of public property.

Senator HATFIELD. Yes, but I think it is a much stronger case than you make by keeping it purely as a user's tax rather than trying to draw analogies to those which are general revenue raisers because I think it tends to cloud the purpose of the whole field in the first place.

In spite of the fact that you do base your rationale upon it being a user's fee. I must reiterate the point that for the amount of money that it costs to raise this amount—namely, 10 percent—and for the total

need that you would get from the \$10 million, this easily could be a bonus to the taxpayer.

I do hope that your Department can give a little review to this general thought that these three members at least raised this morning.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you gentlemen. I very much appreciate your appearance here this morning.

Our next witness is Arthur Greeley, Associate Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR W. GREELEY, ASSOCIATE CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. GREELEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Arthur W. Greeley. I am Associate Chief of the U.S. Forest Service and I am pleased to be here this morning to present a statement for the Department of Agriculture in support of S. 2315.

We understand you are also considering related bills S. 2331 and S. 2197. Our comments are also applicable to these bills.

S. 2315 and S. 2331 are identical and would reestablish the recreation entrance and user fee system under the program established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

S. 2197 would create a new fee system for lands administered by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior.

The recreation fee system presently applies to recreation developments in the National Forest System administered by the Forest Service, as well as to certain areas administered by the Departments of Army and the Interior. Under the act of July 15, 1968, the existing system will be repealed as of March 31, 1970.

Outdoor recreation is one of the principal values and purposes of the National Forest System. These 187 million acres comprise one of the largest groups of lands available to the public for outdoor recreation, including hunting and fishing. In 1968, there were approximately 157 million recreation visitor days to national forests and national grasslands—five and a half times the number of such visits in 1950. This was over 50 percent of the recreation use of all Federal lands in 1968. By the year 2000, we estimate that the number of visitor days recorded for these lands will exceed 600 million.

Senator BIBLE. You mean visitor days in each case?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir.

The Forest Service has worked vigorously to carry out the fee system which was begun under authority of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This year, recreation fees are being collected at more than 2,800 sites on national forests throughout the United States. Up through May of this year, we collected almost \$2 million in such fees.

I would like to insert here that we do not collect at all of the recreation sites within the national forests. We have about 7,600 developed recreation sites within the national forests so the difference between 7,600 and 2,800 are the ones at which fees are not collected.

Senator BIBLE. How do you determine which ones you collect it in and which ones you don't?

Mr. GREELEY. Guidelines are set up under the Executive order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. What are they?

Mr. GREELEY. Essentially, we collect at the better established places, the ones that have facilities for large—we avoid collections at the small places; we avoid collections at the places where the cost of administration seems to be excessively high in comparison with the returns. And we avoid collections or do not make collections at places where the established recreation facilities are either poor in character or old in time of construction.

Senator BIBLE. All right. You may proceed.

Mr. GREELEY. We have had what we think is good experience with the fee system over the past 5 years. It has led to significant improvement in administration of use of national forest recreational developments, facilities, and services provided at public expense.

Particularly, we believe recreation users have had greater interest in and respect for the areas they visit. In turn, the emphasis of the program has encouraged us to continue to provide high quality recreation opportunities.

We have found that overall, the fee systems have been well accepted. In addition to providing a return to the Government for major recreation development expenditures, the system has increased public knowledge, appreciation and support for the entire Federal outdoor recreation effort. It has also had the advantage of providing more contact with the public by Forest Service personnel and giving us increased feedback from the public on our policies and quality of our recreation developments.

There are some aspects of the fee system which might be improved. As time goes on, we will review these and make appropriate recommendations to Congress concerning needed improvements.

However, we believe that the general framework of the system is sound and we think it should be continued. The alternative would be to allow the several Federal agencies which provide outdoor recreation opportunities to go their separate ways after 1970, using different fee policies and different fee structures. This would cause confusion, inequities, and possibly resentment by recreation users.

On balance, S. 2315 and S. 2331 are desirable to achieve a coordinated national program of charges for public outdoor recreation on Federal lands. We urge enactment of this legislation.

Senator BIBLE. How much does it cost you to collect the amount of money, \$2 million, that you say you have collected through May of this year?

Mr. GREELEY. The studies that we have made about our cost of collection indicates that it varies between 15 and 25 percent of the amount collected.

Senator BIBLE. Why would your figure be so much greater than the Park Service? Do you police it better, or what?

Mr. GREELEY. I was wondering, too, because it seems to me that theirs is low. I will check with them.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that in policing this, we have been following systems which were intended to be low cost. We use the game warden type approach. We don't have gatekeepers situated at all of the places where people come in to use recreation facilities. We have made use of ticket vending machines and made use of envelope type—

Senator BIBLE. I have seen those. I think they work very well.

Mr. GREELEY. And we don't have somebody on duty 24 hours a day to make collections.

Senator BIBLE. It is an honor system.

Mr. GREELEY. We refer to it as a game warden system, as a game warden checks up on hunters and fishermen. You can go out hunting and fishing five or six times and not encounter a game warden, but the seventh time you probably will.

Senator BIBLE. I recently visited Flaming Gorge and you used that type of system there, and they tell me it worked out very satisfactorily and cut down the cost of administration. You may have different elements that go into your 15 or 20 percent, but I wish you would get with the Park Service and I wish Mr. Stevens and you would show us the elements that go into his 10-percent figure and what goes into your 15 to 25 percent.

(See paragraph 3 of letter of Department of the Interior on p. 31.)

Mr. GREELEY. There have been some discussions here about general administration costs. The Golden Eagle passport, as such, is the term that applies to the \$7 yearly permit, but the fee system which is authorized by the section of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which we are discussing here this morning, also authorizes daily fees, and fees for other uses.

So, part of the problem about determining what goes into administration costs is the cost of just selling the \$7 Golden Eagle sticker versus the total cost of administering also the daily fees or biweekly fees and the cost of the game warden type verification of existence of permits that I have been referring to here. So, there could very well be some differences in what costs have been included in these figures.

Senator BIBLE. What is the total amount that you collect in fees for the use of sites of the national forest? Two million dollars is the amount you say that you relate to Golden Eagle since its inception. What is the total amount?

Mr. GREELEY. For 1968, Mr. Chairman, our total collections from the passport, that is, the Golden Eagle passport and also other fees, was \$2,800,000, and this was about \$1,600,000 from the passport and the rest was from daily and biweekly fees. We had about, oh, say 60 percent from passport fees and 40 percent from the others.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have any suggestions as to how you can better improve the collection or administration part other than you have testified to so far?

Let me ask a preliminary question: If I stay on a site for which I paid a fee in the national forest, how long can I stay there?

Mr. GREELEY. Where we put in a limit, it is 2 weeks. We don't have limits at all places. We base this on the demand for the sites. The heavily used campground—heavily used facilities—where people will stay all summer if we don't do something about it, we do put in a 2-week limit. But I think the 2-week limit probably only applies at a quarter of our campgrounds.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have any great policing difficulties?

Mr. GREELEY. Not in enforcing the 2-week limit. Our policing difficulties go to vandalism.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Moss.

Senator Moss. Chief Greeley, when the Golden Eagle passport began, did you have much of a problem, resistance problem, in the Forest

Service? It was really a greater change of direction for the Forest Service in charging entrance fees, I think, than for the Park Service, and I wondered what sort of a resistance you might have received.

Mr. GREELEY. Well, Senator Moss, we did have resistance and we started off with resistance internally in the Forest Service, a great philosophical split over the question discussed this morning, about whether recreational use of public area areas should be free or on the basis of a charge.

We had another philosophical split within the organization about admission fees versus user fees because, as you know, with the boundaries of the national forests being as they are it is not feasible to charge people admission to these great national forests as such.

So, by and large, the fee system that we have developed is on the concept of a user fee for particular areas rather than an admission fee. The fees are charged on the basis of people going to areas to use facilities that represent development investments made by the Federal Government.

After we had worked out a system and convinced our own people that this was an equitable thing to do, we had vigorous resistance in some spots around the country. During the first year, particularly, we administered this new legislation with a very soft touch. It was a soft-sell approach. We did not issue citations. If people refused to purchase a daily sticker or \$7 Golden Eagle passport, we just asked them to move. We did not issue citations. In many cases, it was just a warning and we let it go at that.

By the end of that first summer, Senator, we were beginning to get criticisms, "I have come here, paid for my sticker. Why has my neighbor been permitted to not make the same expenditure for a fee that I have made?"

By the second summer, that was primarily the kind of complaint we were getting.

Generally speaking, by the end of the second summer, these hot spots were gone. Not only were people accepting the payment of a fee, but people have come to expect that this is something that they should be willing to pay for.

When we started out, we didn't expect to arrive at that point, so this came as something of a surprise to us.

Senator Moss. In other words, the acceptance took hold after the first year and, to some degree, it was self-enforcing by people who did pay the fee and demanded others do likewise.

Mr. GREELEY. That is correct.

Senator Moss. Do you have a serious problem on drawing the line that you describe between areas where you do charge what in effect is a user fee and those where you allow it to be used without any payment?

Mr. GREELEY. We thought at first we would have trouble with this, but it has pretty much boiled down to the main areas, the ones that are most popular; the ones that are the largest and the ones that have the best facilities are the ones that we charge for. The ones that are small, isolated, remote, or the ones that have less well developed facilities we have been not charging for.

When we do make investments and upgrade the equipment or the facilities in the campground, then we put it on a charge basis. So

far when we have done that, we have not had serious objection by the people using it.

Senator Moss. Is your dividing line rather generally where you have put in, say, fireplaces and have water and facilities like that? Are these the ones where you are expected to have a charge, that is, a passport, to get in there or pay a user fee?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir; and, of course, there are signs that indicate that it is a charge camp.

Senator Moss. But if I just went out in the forest some place and made my camp and got my water out of the stream, you wouldn't expect me to pay an entrance fee there?

Mr. GREELEY. That is correct. This is where we got into the problem of admission fee versus user fee concept. The act authorizes both user and admission fees, and our concept really boils down in practice to our thinking of it in terms of a user fee. This has not to do, Senator Hatfield, with what happens to the money after it is collected.

Senator Moss. I see from your testimony that the Forest Service strongly supports a uniform system among all Federal installations. Would it add to your problems very greatly if there were different types of admission or user fees among various departments?

Mr. GREELEY. In some places, Senator Moss, we have found that one of the important considerations is to be at least reasonably consistent with what is being done by administrative agencies in the general area.

We have had problems of getting on a reasonably close approach to the levels of fees being charged by some States. Now, there are a great many States that haven't learned what the State of Oregon has apparently learned, not to charge. And we have found in some places our fees were below the fees charged by the adjoining States. This has been particularly true in the Lake States. We got into some coordination difficulties with the State park administration people there because our fees were lower and they were getting objections to the levels of fees charged by the State. We have been able to work those out pretty well, I think.

Our main coordination problems, if there were to be differences in Federal systems, would be to coordinate between the Forest Service and the National Park Service because there are more national park services and national forest areas where this kind of coordination is necessary. We do have some problems involving coordination between Forest Service and Corps of Engineer projects. While this would be less extensive than the coordination between National Forest and National Parks, it still would be something that we would have to figure out how to handle.

Senator Moss. I was aware of the problems that arose on Flaming Gorge when it was administered by two departments before the legislation placed it all under the Forest Service, because you get angry letters of protest when there might be a difference of 50 cents between what it costs to launch a boat from a ramp on one side than on the other, and it was a fact that there was a variation.

This caused a lot of confusion and consequently a lot of complaints from the customers of the facilities. So, it seems to me uniformity is a very valuable thing in administering a Federal program.

Thank you, Mr. Greeley.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. No questions.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Greeley.

Our next witness is Brig. Gen. F. P. Koisch, Director of Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. F. P. KOISCH, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL WORKS, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY; ACCOMPANIED BY MARK GURNEE, STAFF MEMBER

General KOISCH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Brig. Gen. F. P. Koisch, Director of Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. I am accompanied by Mark Gurnee of the staff of that office.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on S. 2315, S. 2331, and S. 2197, relating to entrance and user fees at Federal recreation areas and to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

These bills propose to reverse the action of the Congress last year, taken in Public Law 90-401, to end the Golden Eagle permit system for Federal recreation areas. This reversal would be accomplished in S. 2315 and S. 2331 by simple repeal of the first section of Public Law 90-401. It would be accomplished in S. 2197 by authorizing an entrance and user fee system for areas under Interior and Agriculture administration.

The Department of the Army has no objection to enactment of any of these proposed measures.

If S. 2197 were enacted, it is clear that the Corps of Engineers would not be included in the entrance and user fee system.

If S. 2315 and S. 2331 were enacted, it is our belief that the provisions of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, Public Law 90-483, would restrict collection of fees at land and water areas under Corps of Engineers administration to certain situations.

Section 210 prohibits the collection at corps reservoirs of entrance or admission fees, and of user fees, except user fees for highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel. The revenues, however, would be deposited in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The role of the Corps of Engineers land and water areas under the jurisdiction of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program has been an unusual one, has been beset by many difficulties and misunderstandings.

For many years, it has been Department of the Army and Corps of Engineers policy to encourage non-Federal bodies to manage as much as possible of the land and water areas at corps reservoirs and to operate their related recreational developments. For this reason, our primary effort has been to develop areas that have the greatest potential for outlease under State or local administration.

The areas and facilities that have been retained under corps administration have generally been lightly developed; and our emphasis has been on access to water areas and minimum facilities necessary to protect public health and safety.

This policy was, in effect, carried further and formalized in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, Public Law 89-72. The intent of that act is clearly to make recreational development of land and water potentials at Federal reservoirs a non-Federal responsibility.

With passage and implementation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, we were faced with the problems of administering an entrance fee system that was in many cases difficult to reconcile with the physical system of access and public use development that had been evolved previously.

As the chairman and members of this committee know, we reached a decision to suspend collection of fees last October because we considered our fee system to be in violation of the provisions of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968.

This section does allow collection of user fees for highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel, but at present we have no such facilities.

Senator BIBLE. Then you collected no fees whatever; is that correct?

General KOISCH. We did in 1967 and 1968, but not at this time.

Senator BIBLE. Did you, previous to October of last year, collect fees for any of the facilities that are back of the corps projects?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir; we did.

Senator BIBLE. How much did you collect?

General KOISCH. We stopped collections in October of last year.

Senator BIBLE. I understand. Prior to that, how much did you collect?

General KOISCH. In 1966, sir, we collected fees at 152 areas at 57 projects and collected \$105,000.

In 1967, we collected at 168 areas at 65 projects and collected \$703,000.

In 1968, we collected fees at 189 areas at 65 projects and collected \$896,000.

Senator BIBLE. How many projects?

General KOISCH. 189 areas at 65 projects.

Senator BIBLE. And you collected 800—

General KOISCH. \$896,000.

Senator BIBLE. What was the nature of these 65 projects? Would you describe the facilities that were there because obviously I assume you feel that they were developed to such an extent that maybe you call them highly developed facilities. Were they or not?

General KOISCH. We developed a set of what might be called artificial criteria that they had to meet to be included in this program. The total Federal investment had to be greater than \$50,000. The recreation pool had to be greater than 100 acres; \$25,000 had to be spent on the recreational facilities apart from the roads. There had to be an estimated annual recreation attendance of at least 50,000 people a year and the area had to have the potential for further development.

Senator BIBLE. Did you have camping facilities on these 65 projects? Could I go in there and stay overnight?

General KOISCH. At most of them; yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. What type of camping overnight usage did you have on the 65 projects?

General KOISCH. Sir, I don't have that figure available. I could supply it for the committee.

Senator BIBLE. Just a rough idea. Did people go in for overnight or 2 weeks, the same as they do in the Park Service?

General KOISCH. Our standard rule is 2 weeks, and you can only be granted an extension if the area is not fully utilized.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have the annual visitation on these 65 projects?

General KOISCH. We don't have that here. As you know, our visitation was 227 million at all projects.

Senator BIBLE. Don't you have a head count on the 65 projects?

General KOISCH. I could supply that for you.

Senator BIBLE. Would you supply it for the record?

I intend keeping this record open until Monday next for any additional information taken. Oh, Monday is going to be a holiday, as I understand it. That is the day we celebrate the landing on the moon. So, we will keep the record open until Tuesday.

(The information requested is as follows:)

The annual attendance for 1968 at the 65 reservoir projects at which there were designated areas for which an entrance fee was required for admission from 1 April to 15 October 1968 totalled approximately 107,000,000. On the basis of 1967 attendance figures, without benefit of an actual count in 1968, the attendance in 1968 at the 189 charge areas at the 65 projects is pro-rated as 35,000,000.

Senator BIBLE. As I understand that part of your statement, General, you claim that it is the policy of the Army Engineers to lease the recreation facilities to the municipality in which the project is located, or it becomes a State project, or it becomes a private project. Do I understand you correctly?

General KOISCH. We don't go to private projects, sir. Some local entity, municipality, county, or State.

Senator BIBLE. That would be the county commissioners and county, where your reservoir is located could enter into a lease arrangement with you?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. In those areas where you enter into those type agreements with either the county or State or a joint county effort—maybe a number of counties get together—do the counties involved charge user fees?

General KOISCH. They are allowed to; yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. And do they, as a matter of fact?

General KOISCH. Not all of them.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have a record of what they do charge on the use of your facility?

General KOISCH. They are required to comply with the Government regulation which has been issued by the Department of the Interior and indicates a range of fees for the services.

Senator BIBLE. What happens to the fees that a county gets?

General KOISCH. They retain them, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Do they give you 10 percent override or anything?

General KOISCH. No, sir. They retain them and under the agreement they have to plow them back into the recreation facility.

Senator BIBLE. I see. So it becomes a local endeavor to take care of the recreation facility back of the corps project in the particular area where it is located?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. But all of the money they receive has to be plowed back into campsites, sanitary facilities, and so forth?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. How many projects of that kind do you have, total?

General KOISCH. Out of our over 4,000 recreation areas, 1,600 are in that category.

Senator BIBLE. You have a total of 4,000 recreation areas?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Of those 4,000 in 1968 you only had 189 areas at 65 projects that were so highly developed that at least under your criteria you felt justified in charging fees; is that correct?

General KOISCH. That is correct.

Senator BIBLE. From that you received \$849,000?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you.

You may proceed with your statement.

General KOISCH. Our decision was not lightly reached. It does not represent opposition to the Golden Eagle or Land and Water Conservation Fund concept. It has been discussed in more detail in a letter dated July 15, 1969, to the chairman of this committee.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, that letter will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your inquiry concerning the termination of collection of fees at outdoor recreation facilities under the administration of the Corps of Engineers.

Collection of these fees was originally authorized by Section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 which authorized the President to designate or provide for the designation of land or water areas administered by the heads of certain Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, at which entrance, admission, and other forms of recreation user fees shall be charged, and to provide for the establishment of such fees.

The President, in implementation of this authority, issued Executive Order 11200, which set forth criteria for designation of fee areas and provided that areas meeting those criteria shall be designated by the head of the agency having jurisdiction over them as areas at which recreational user fees will be charged. The Secretary of the Interior was directed to establish a schedule of fees, and criteria to be used in determining which of these fees are to be used at designated areas.

Pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and the above Executive Order, regulations were promulgated covering the application of recreation fees (43 C.F.R. 18). These regulations establish two general types of fees: entrance or admission fees, and user fees.

The Corps of Engineers, in accordance with the procedures established, issued regulations governing the collection of fees at its projects. Under these regulations, no entrance fees were charged at projects, where the total Federal investment in recreational facilities for the entire project was less than \$50,000, and the recreation pool was less than 100 acres. Entrance fees were collected at designated public use areas of the project where at least \$25,000

had been spent by the Federal Government on recreational facilities at each area, apart from roads; there were at least 25 acres of usable land available in the area above the conservation pool; there was an annual recreational attendance of at least 50,000 per year; and the area had potential for further recreational development. Consideration was also given to such factors as to whether there were other access areas on the same project with minimum recreation facilities where no fee was charged. There was at least one such no-charge area at each project. The developed areas for which entrance fees were charged contained such facilities as campsites, water, toilets, picnic tables, boat launching ramps, and the like.

As you note in your letter, Public Law 90-401 repealed the requirement for the uniform system of entrance and user fees, effective March 31, 1970. However, the termination of fee collection at Corps projects was not done pursuant to this Act, but rather because of the prohibitions on user fees contained in section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-483), enacted subsequent to passage of Public Law 90-401. This section provides that:

"Sec. 210. No entrance or admission fees shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by any officer or employee of the United States at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. *User fees* at these lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees of the United States only from users of highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision of the facilities, and *shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.*"

The section recognizes the two types of fees authorized to be charged at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps: entrance or admission fees, and user fees. The collection of entrance or admission fees was prohibited after March 31, 1970. As to user fees, Section 210 provides that they may be collected only for highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel, and not for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

We interpreted this provision of the section, in view of the legislative history, as taking effect immediately upon enactment. This view finds support in the floor discussion on the section. During the House debate on the conference report on S. 3710, 90th Congress, Congressman Edmundson stated, with regard to Section 210 (Vol. 114, Cong. Rec., No. 135, p. H7946):

"Government personnel administering fee programs at these reservoirs are expected to take note of the provisions of Section 210 regarding user fees in general at these lakes and reservoirs, and *should move without delay to eliminate all fees in conflict with the provisions stated therein.* No fees of any kinds should be imposed for access to, or use of, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided (*italic added*)."

Congressman Albert stated (Vol. 114, Cong. Rec., No. 121, p. H6579):

"The same provision (Sec. 210) assures that user fees at these lakes, following enactment and presidential approval of S. 3710, will no longer be used to deny access to and use of water areas. Picnic areas, lightly developed shorelands, scenic drives and many other areas of our lakes would be freed from these user fees."

In addition, shortly after enactment, the House Public Works Committee with which Section 210 originated, passed a resolution affirming the intent that termination of user fees be effected immediately. That resolution stated:

"Resolved that it is the consensus of the Committee on Public Works that new policy on fees charged the public at the Army Engineer reservoirs established in the 1968 River and Harbor Flood Control Act (P.L. 90-483) should be implemented by the Chief, Army Engineers without further delay, to assure immediate free access to and use of waters in these reservoirs by the public."

While Section 210 is somewhat unclear as to the effective date of the provision concerning user fees, in view of the above legislative history we feel that our interpretation that it provided for the termination of certain user fees immediately upon enactment was a reasonable one.

Prior to the enactment of Section 210, the Corps of Engineers, pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, imposed charges, characterized as entrance fees, at designated outdoor recreation areas.

The only areas so designated were those containing facilities such as picnic tables, boat launching ramps, water, sanitary facilities, and campsites. This fee was payable by persons entering for the purpose of using any of these facilities.

After the enactment of Section 210, we considered it necessary to discontinue the existing system of charges, as its continuance would violate the prohibitions as to user fees for lightly developed facilities as defined in Section 210. This is because persons entering an area to engage in activities for which Section 210 prohibits a user fee would be paying such a fee if the entrance fee were retained, just as would those persons entering to utilize a highly developed facility for which a user fee may be charged.

Accordingly, the existing system of charges was discontinued in October of 1968, in favor of a system of user fees as provided for in Section 210. At present, no such fees are being charged, as there are no areas which meet both the requirements of Section 210 and of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

When and as areas are developed which meet these requirements we will, of course, impose user fees as authorized by Section 210.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. CLARKE,

Major General, USA, Deputy Chief of Engineers.

General KOISCH. Our reservoirs are primarily used by family units. Our experience indicates that the family unit is willing to pay for services rendered. These include camp sites and utilities of all types.

In addition, families desire adequate security or protection in the form of rangers or supervisory personnel. It has not been possible to provide all the facilities and the protection that are needed. If sufficient funds and personnel were available to provide adequate facilities and services, charges could properly be made under the provisions of section 210 of Public Law 90-483.

Designing a satisfactory system of fees for recreational use of Federal water resource projects is a complex task as this committee well knows. Such a system must provide fair treatment for the public, assure adequate user charges, and recognize the special problems relating to the different types of projects administered by various Federal agencies.

We understand that the Department of the Interior is recommending a study to reevaluate the Government-wide recreation fee program, including the Golden Eagle program, before action is taken on the present bills. We have no objection to this approach and we believe that such a study should be highly useful in designing a satisfactory system of recreational fees.

We have ideas which would be proper for consideration by such a study group. It would be expected that agencies affected by proposed legislation, including the Corps of Engineers, would actively participate in the study.

It has been a pleasure to appear before you today. My colleague and I are ready for whatever questions you may wish to put to us.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, General.

Senator Moss?

General KOISCH. Sir, may I note first that the statement I have just made has been cleared with the Secretary of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator BIBLE. Yes.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Koisch, you, I think, were here when we began the hearing and I indicated that I had amendments that I would offer. The third one of those if enacted, would repeal section 210 of the Flood Control Act.

If that were the case, would the corps then go back to the position you were in in 1968 and begin to collect at 65 or more places?

General KOISCH. Under the law, I believe we would do so, sir.

Senator MOSS. And I think in this letter that you referred to, you described the places where you did impose charges somewhere. The areas so designated were those containing facilities such as picnic tables, boat launching ramps, water, sanitary facilities, and campsites?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator MOSS. Did you only have 65 that qualified under that criterion?

General KOISCH. Sir, there were 189 areas at 65 projects.

Senator MOSS. Oh, I see.

General KOISCH. At our projects, we have so much shoreline. We cover about 28,000 miles of shoreline now, so we only selected designated areas and each one is called a recreation area.

Senator MOSS. I see. So you might have even a dozen places on a project suitable for recreation?

General KOISCH. That is right.

Senator MOSS. Now, during the time that the corps was collecting an entrance fee, Golden Eagle passport or otherwise, did you encounter any difficulties because of any variants with other Federal recreation areas?

General KOISCH. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Senator MOSS. What was the experience of the corps so far as the expense of collecting these fees was concerned?

General KOISCH. In general, sir, it cost us more to collect the fees than we received in fees.

I might note what we collected went into the Land and Water Conservation Fund but the cost of collecting came out of other appropriations and there was never any return to the corps.

Senator MOSS. And this was part of the reason that it was not desirable from the corps' point of view?

General KOISCH. I don't think it should be stated that way, sir.

Our general trend in recreation is different from the other Federal agencies. We are at the stage now where our visitations are so great we are in the recreation business essentially to stay, and we are finding we must find ways and means of upgrading our recreation areas; we have to find some method of getting a revolving fund or some other comeback to the corps to maintain the recreation areas other than the method that we are using which, in effect, is a plea to Congress each year for the moneys to maintain these areas.

We don't have what you call quality areas. We are dealing principally and primarily in mass recreation. We have a feeling we should always have at every project at least one free area to take care of certain parts of the population.

We are in this dilemma now of trying to find the ways and means of upgrading the recreation, getting some sort of funding, so that the user fees are plowed back instead of going into the Land and Water

Conservation Fund, and so that it would start the funding cycle over once more.

Senator Moss. Your present policy doesn't serve that very well, does it?

If you permit the counties or others to charge fees for coming on there, none of that gets back to the corps, does it?

General KOISCH. No, sir; that does not, but it does get plowed back into a recreation area which benefits the public.

Senator Moss. Because of your contract with them, you say they are required to spend that money on further development?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator Moss. But it doesn't come back to the corps.

You say it costs more to collect the money than you get in fees. Why was your experience so different from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation or the Forest Service?

General KOISCH. I honestly can't answer that, sir, but I am positive that we can justify what I have told you.

For instance, when we were required to collect the fees and designate the areas, we hired certain people as fee collectors. If you maintain a 16-hour surveillance over any area, it takes about three and a half people to do this. Add the salaries for that to the other costs involved and that comes out that way.

Senator BIBLE. At that point, Senator, if you would permit a question, do you mean to tell me that out of the money appropriated to you for your public works projects, \$896,000 was appropriated to you for the purpose of collecting these fees?

General KOISCH. Not specifically earmarked, sir, but there was no prohibition against using it that way.

Senator BIBLE. But you did use it.

I would be interested in having you, without making it a lifetime project, supply whatever backup you have for that statement. That is a little unusual, it seems to me. But isn't it also true, General, that in making the justifications for the Appropriations Committees you do have moneys allowed to you for development of recreation areas, don't you?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

(The information requested is as follows:)

The cost of collection for 1968 has not been obtained, but detailed cost figures for 1967 (1 April 1967 to 31 March 1968) were compiled for 168 designated areas at 65 reservoir projects and would be comparable to corresponding costs in 1968. This cost was \$769,176, broken down as follows:

Personnel (temporary)-----	\$329, 749	Materials and supplies-----	\$25, 722
Personnel (permanent)-----	188, 365	Construction costs-----	65, 207
Transportation-----	53, 103	District overhead-----	86, 985
Correspondence-----	10, 680	Division overhead-----	9, 365

Senator BIBLE. You do get appropriation moneys to develop recreation areas, the same as the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service?

General KOISCH. Most of our fee collection people were the summer-hire types. We only collect the fees from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

Senator BIBLE. I understand. It is just hard for me to believe that you spent \$896,000, but I would be interested in having you develop that further.

Senator Moss. Is your collection of fees, then, all done by full-time personnel at the gate, as it were, of people going in and out of there, and his whole salary would be charged to this?

General KOISCH. One of our real problems, sir, is the fact that at most areas we don't have this gate system. We can't enclose our areas and have one entrance and exit point. We have so many points of access to our areas that the rangers are constantly roaming, looking for the violator, finding them, and seeing whether they have the requisite permit or have paid the fee for using the campsite and so on. It is just so difficult to administer. That is the reason we come up with such a poor business proposition as the state we are in now.

Senator Moss. You heard the Associate Chief of the Forest Service say they used the game warden system of checking. Just sort of checking people who are there, and this is their principal means of enforcement. Wasn't this ever tried by the corps?

General KOISCH. Even with the people that we have, sir, that is what you end up with when you go around looking for automobiles and people. We are unable to sit at a gate and check everyone in and out.

Senator Moss. On a sizable project like one of these we are talking about, you would have a certain number of personnel that would have to be there for general management of the project; isn't that right?

General KOISCH. This is true, but in many cases you have seven people with 1,400 miles of shoreline.

Senator Moss. Yes, but with the personnel that you have, wouldn't it be possible to utilize some of this spot-checking, intermittently done, in a more or less voluntary system the way the Forest Service does and thus reduce very largely the cost of collection?

General KOISCH. We do that, sir, and have done it.

Senator Moss. Well, like the chairman, I am a little startled that it could be \$896,000-plus to collect fees on 65 major projects. That does seem high to me.

Isn't the corps somewhat concerned at least with the public who are using recreation areas—and it is primarily what they are, recreation areas that the corps is involved in—who say, "Well, I have to have an entrance ticket to go into a national recreation area or a national park or national forest, and yet I can come to a large lake with camp sites and water and sanitary facilities without any Federal entrance fee being charged."?

General KOISCH. Are we concerned with this?

Senator Moss. Yes.

General KOISCH. We are complying with the current directives and laws as we are obliged to, sir. In terms of our policies, our current trend in thinking, it is as I told you before. It appears we should have some areas which are free and that the others should be upgraded and placed into a user-fee system of some kind that can provide a return to the area and upgrade it.

Senator Moss. Well, are you saying, then, that internally, at least, there is some concern and talk within the corps? Of course, you are complying with the law and section 210 was enacted that exempted the corps from the Golden Eagle passport program, but I think perhaps you have answered my question.

What I am concerned about is whether internally this doesn't appear to the corps to be an equitable difference and therefore some remedy ought to be afforded?

General KOISCH. We actually go along with the current policy that the taxpayer is entitled to the use of this water, so this in effect says you shouldn't have an entrance fee. However, you provide him a service, he should be willing to pay for that. That is the state we are in right now.

Senator MOSS. Basically, isn't that what the Golden Eagle passport does in the forest, anyway? If you can go in the forest—and you heard my questioning of Chief Greeley about this—you can go to the undeveloped parts of the forest and make your camp and get your water out of the stream, and whatever else, and nobody expects you to pay a fee for that. But if you go to the Forest Service campsite, where they have water in a pipe and provide some sanitary facilities and maybe a fireplace or something, you are expected to pay an entrance fee.

General KOISCH. Sir, despite what others may have said here before me this morning, the corps have never been against the Golden Eagle program. We are on record to that effect.

Senator MOSS. Thank you.

I am glad to have that in the record because I have been concerned about that.

I think the Congress has been responsible, and I think maybe you heard me before saying that a lot of the blame would rest here, of course. But I think the impression has been abroad that the corps has resisted this and therefore the Congress has moved to free them from it, and it seems to me it breaks up this whole uniformity that we tried to develop of a policy of having some user fees at our recreation areas. I am glad to have you say that the corps is not against having a reasonable user fee. Maybe you would make the guidelines a little bit different, but in principle you would accept it.

General KOISCH. This is what I was about to mention.

When you charge a man an entrance fee to go somewhere, you ought to have something there to give him, and in many of our places we just don't have it.

Senator MOSS. I can understand that because of what you said about the criteria of the places where you didn't charge, when it had less than a certain area of water. Of course, these are practical distinctions that have to be made, I think, but the corps, whether it wants to be or not, is very much in the recreation business with these large projects that have been created.

I have no further questions.

Senator BIBLE. Just following through, I have just one further question.

If I understand you correctly, General, the corps has no objection to charging a fee or user's fee or permit, or whatever you want to call it, on the 65 projects where you have picnic tables and boat-launching ramps, water, and sanitary facilities. Your objection is that, since you collect \$896,000, you would like to have that go to you instead of to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

General KOISCH. No, sir; that would only be a part of it. You will recall now in complying with the law we have to allow people to get to water, and the Congress has dictated that we shall not collect any fee for access to this water area unless certain things are there, and we don't have any of these at this stage of the game.

We never objected to the collection of the fee and it was in agreement with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that we studied at which areas we would charge Golden Eagle and user fees. Now, whether they be for camping site, or use of a picnic table, or grill or whatever, all go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Senator Bible. Thank you.

Senator Nelson?

Senator Moss. Just one other thing.

Senator BIBLE. Of course.

Senator Moss. Section 210 of Public Law 90-483 provided that no entrance or admission fee shall be collected after March 31, 1970, but the corps just stopped last October, was it?

General KOISCH. Yes, sir.

Senator Moss. Why did they accelerate?

General KOISCH. If I may quote, sir, this is in the letter that is part of the record. The House Public Works Committee, which originated section 210, passed a resolution affirming the intent that termination of the water fees be effective immediately, and I quote:

Resolved, that it is the consensus of the Committee on Public Works that the new policy on fees charged the public at the Army Engineers reservoirs established in 1968 Flood Control Act should be deleted by the Chief, Army Engineers, without further delay to assure immediate access to and use of waters in these reservoirs by the public.

However, the early termination was in compliance with section 210, Public Law 90-483, which provided that fees shall not be collected for relatively undeveloped areas.

Senator BIBLE. They passed a resolution that overrode a congressional act.

Senator Moss. It also provided access to water.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, General.

I understand that Senator Nelson had a question of the Secretary.

Senator NELSON. I was wondering if I could ask Secretary Loesch and Mr. Stevens a question.

Senator BIBLE. Would Secretary Loesch and Mr. Stevens return to the witness table?

I might mention that we are going to have a live quorum call in just a few minutes.

We still have three more witnesses to hear from, old and dear friends of mine. I want to accommodate them, but I don't think we can do it and conform with this highly secret session that we are going to have—closed doors and all this business—in just a few minutes.

So, I am going to ask the other witnesses who have asked to be heard if they would come back tomorrow morning. We are going to have a short hearing on the Everglades at 10 o'clock.

I think all three of you on the witness list—Dr. Spencer Smith, Joe Penfold, and the representative from the Wildlife Federation—could return tomorrow at 10:30, we could certainly hear you at that time. I think it will work out better because Senator Nelson may have some questioning. We will recess just as soon as we get the live quorum.

Senator Nelson.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRISON LOESCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT; ACCOMPANIED BY LAWRENCE N. STEVENS, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION; AND HARRY W. RICE, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Resumed

Senator NELSON. Mr. Secretary, I was alarmed by the request of the administration for only \$124 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Now, correct me if I am wrong. As I understand it, the money from the Continental Shelf oil money is earmarked for the fund for a 2-year period.

Mr. LOESCH. Five-year period.

Senator NELSON. Well, if it isn't used, I mean. In other words, the billion that we spent, all the fighting and fussing over in Congress last year and showed our concern by passing legislation to guarantee the fund \$200 million a year; in other words, if I remember the bill correctly, we would get the money from the disposal of surplus properties; then if that did not equal \$200 million, which it hasn't, that the funds from the Continental Shelf oil money would be added to the surplus property moneys to reach \$200 million; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. This is correct.

Senator NELSON. Then the difference between the amount that the fund got from the sale of surplus properties and \$200 million would be earmarked for a period of 2 years and if it was not used in that 2-year period, it would go to the General Treasury; correct?

Mr. LOESCH. I do not think so, Senator. I believe that the earmarking for the fund of our Continental Shelf moneys is for the entire 5-year period. Now, I may be in error on that.

Senator BIBLE. My impression is that the Outer Continental Shelf revenues are earmarked for the full period of the 5 years; that the others lapse after the 2 years.

Senator NELSON. I am incorrect on this?

Senator BIBLE. Yes. I think there is a difference between the two. We will have Mr. Stevens explain it.

Mr. STEVENS. The oil revenues are different from the original sources of revenue which do revert after that 2 years. The oil revenues stay in the fund until appropriated.

Senator BIBLE. Correct.

Mr. STEVENS. As we understand it.

Senator BIBLE. There is a difference.

Senator NELSON. I apologize. I misread section 3, then. I read that to apply to oil revenues, but you are saying that only surplus property funds would lapse at the end of 2 years?

Mr. STEVENS. At the end of 2 years after the end of the year in which it was appropriated.

Senator MOSS. So, then, we have a situation here where the oil revenues do not lapse until they are not used within the 5-year period; is that right?

Mr. STEVENS. I think it is beyond the 5-year period. I think it is indefinite.

Senator BIBLE. They remain in perpetuity, I think that is correct, until they are spent or appropriated out.

Senator Moss. So it sits there, so to speak, as earmarked funds that cannot be used by the Federal Treasury for any other purpose?

Mr. LOESCH. That is correct.

Senator Moss. That is the part that puzzles me.

The request of the administration, the Bureau of the Budget request, is \$124 million. If I have the figures correct, we have authorized projects now, passed both Houses, signed by the President, of recreation projects for a little over \$497 million.

Senator BIBLE. At least.

Senator NELSON. At least.

And if we add the full \$200 million into the fund for the 5-year period, the Federal share would be just \$500 million, assuming our guess was correct, where every penny is obligated.

Well, what I don't understand is whether there was some mistake or misunderstanding by the Bureau of the Budget, or something, because there is no budget balancing question, no money-saving question here. Why do they only request \$124 million?

Mr. LOESCH. Senator, I think, of course, it was part of the constraint of the expenditure ceiling. It wasn't balancing the budget particularly, but it has to do with the expenditure, overall expenditure ceiling.

Senator NELSON. I don't understand that.

Do you mean—

Mr. LOESCH. Well, just trying to hold down the total Federal outlay.

Senator NELSON. In other words, you are not saying that there is a ceiling that has been set so that you could not have a \$200 million land and water fund?

Mr. LOESCH. No. I don't think you could perhaps apply the total ceiling to any one portion of what comes under the roof, but I assume without knowing that it was felt that in order to arrive at the overall ceiling all of our programs in the Interior Department were constrained to some extent, of course, but the Land and Water Conservation Fund bore its share of the constraint.

Let me say that I don't think that made very good sense, Senator, in view of the fact, as we have mentioned earlier this morning, there is a substantial increase in costs continuing on land acquisition, very necessary land acquisition, so I don't—

Senator NELSON. Well, I hadn't thought of that angle that you just mentioned.

Are you saying that these funds are counted within the ceiling? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes; within the expenditures ceiling. Sure.

Senator NELSON. My guess would be, since it was only last year when we had extensive debate and discussion and passed the authorization to take Continental Shelf moneys, with everybody recognizing that we need at least \$200 million a year in that fund, that certainly Congress was not contemplating that this year we turned around and put a ceiling on that. I don't think we were anyway—at least, it never occurred to me.

Maybe what we need is an amendment then exempting this fund from it, because, Mr. Chairman, it really doesn't make much sense just to sit here and hold the oil moneys in escrow, so to speak, while the land price escalates.

Senator BIBLE. Yes; I think you are undoubtedly correct, and, of course, I would be interested in knowing exactly where these additional moneys that make the total of \$200 million are? Where do they find them? If I was looking for this money which remains unexpendable because a freeze order has gone on, and in order to cool the economy I suppose that is the philosophy, the President only asked for \$124 million. But where is the balance? Is not a trust fund marked "Unexpended 1969 moneys due to the Land and Water Conservation Fund from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues"?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, sir; it has to be in some fund of that nature.

Senator BIBLE. Perhaps Mr. Stevens would answer that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, it is the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Senator BIBLE. What is the balance in the fund, then, as of this date?

Mr. STEVENS. It would be over \$100 million.

Mr. LOESCH. It would be \$6 million plus \$44 million.

Senator BIBLE. In other words you have in trust in the Land and Water Conservation Fund \$76 million accruing because it is not being requested and budgeted in fiscal year 1970, plus the carryover of \$44 million?

Mr. LOESCH. Yes, sir. The level last year was \$154 million, so there was \$44 million left over last year, and there will be \$76 million left over this year.

Senator BIBLE. Will you verify that and supply that for the record?

I want to know as of this very date how much money have we accumulated and are holding in trust for the Land and Water Conservation Fund which is not being appropriated out because of the feeling that it overheats the economy, I suppose, but as the Senator from Wisconsin so well says, and as we know so extremely well, the constant land escalation will eat up whatever money we have because it moves faster than the dollars.

So, I wish you would supply that for the record and supply the source. So when I call up the Secretary of the Budget, I can say, "You look on page so-and-so and you will see a number of dollars held in trust."

(The information requested appears on p. 31.)

Senator NELSON. There isn't any doubt in your mind or anybody's mind here about the absolute necessity for this minimum amount if we are going to maintain any reasonable land acquisition fund, is there?

Mr. LOESCH. No doubt in my mind, Senator. In fact, I don't think it is enough.

Senator NELSON. I don't, either.

That is all I had, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. I have no further questions and, gentlemen, thank you very much.

We will, as I just previously announced, hear the additional three witnesses tomorrow morning at 10:30, and the record will be kept open until Tuesday next.

Senator NELSON. May I ask one question of the chairman?

I realize it is getting late and I didn't want to ask the corps questions, but I have been looking over the history of quite a few land develop-

ment sites on public lands in the last half dozen years and I have been horrified at some of the plans that have been developed on shorelines. I am wondering if at some stage the chairman could have a hearing involving the Forest Service, Interior Department, and Corps of Engineers and ask them for a presentation as to who is developing their plans and how they are being developed? I just looked at one last week that, in my judgment, is a disgraceful development plan and is just going to ruin a lakeshore.

Senator BIBLE. Sure. We would be very happy to go into that. We will be here until Christmas this year, so we will get into it some time in September.

We stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Friday, July 18, 1969.)

GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

FRIDAY, JULY 18, 1969

U.S. SENATE,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION

OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:35 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 3112, New Senate Office Building, Senator Alan Bible (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Alan Bible (Nevada), Frank E. Moss (Utah), and Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin).

Also present: Jerry T. Verkler, staff director; Stewart French, chief counsel; Roy Whitacre, professional staff member; and Charles Cook, minority counsel.

Senator BIBLE. The hearing will come to order.

When we concluded our hearings yesterday on the Golden Eagle, we had three witnesses who, because of time limitations and because of the fact that we had a closed session of the Senate, were unable to present their testimony, so we will now proceed to S. 2315.

Our next witness on the Golden Eagle is Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., the secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

Dr. Smith?

STATEMENT OF DR. SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY, CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Dr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., the secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with offices in Washington, D.C.

We support S. 2315 which would restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The 1964 act entitled "The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965," Public Law 88-578, provided a uniform system of entrance and user fees for all Federal recreation areas. At that time, the annual fee was established at \$7 and would permit admittance to all Federal recreation areas during a given year. This program was designated the Golden Eagle program.

During the consideration of S. 1401 the Senate agreed to review the entire fee system. The House of Representatives, however, struck the fee program. The conference established March 31, 1970, as the date at which the fee system would terminate and this provision was incorporated into Public Law 90-401.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that section 210 of Public Law 90-483 now prohibits the Corps of Engineers from charging fees for recreation areas administered by the corps. It would appear that if it is the intent of S. 2315 to reestablish fees on those Corps of Engineers areas, then a specific amendment would be required.

There are many that would continue the abolition of fees charged upon projects administered by the Army Corps of Engineers. The corps has consistently fought the fee program since its inception. There have been many Members of the Congress who have opposed instituting fees in any of the corps-administered areas because of the significant complaints of their constituency.

I am certain it would be difficult to prove that the corps failed in the exercise of good faith in administering this program, nor could one charge that their administration of the program was designed to provoke criticism and resentment. For whatever the reason, however, problems of instituting fees at corps-administered areas have always been more difficult than in other areas.

It is impossible for us to judge whether these areas administered by the corps represent such a significant difference relative to other Federal areas wherein fees are charged without the attendant agony that seems to attend the efforts of the corps.

If the Golden Eagle is to continue, however, it would appear that the price should be increased. A \$7 fee is such a bargain that there are legitimate questions as to whether we are receiving more or less revenue than previously. The judgments must remain conjectural, however, since records were not kept in a fashion that comparisons can be made.

In assessing the fee, we have no serious objection to some exemption for the handicapped and aged, but we hope that the committee would give its most serious attention to any exemptions in view of the fact that once a single exemption is made, it becomes a basis for a series of such exemptions. This would erode the base and therefore the purpose of the fund.

It is our understanding that through 1968 the funding has gradually increased, though we would be the last to suggest that the receipts from the fees approximate the original expectations for these fees and as a source of revenue.

The following represents the receipts through 1968:

1965—\$2,125,062.	1967—\$4,408,216.
1966— 3,280,414.	1968— 5,104,336.

Mr. Chairman, we were of the opinion that fees may not be needed in order to fund properly the land and water conservation fund. We had assumed that with the passage of S. 1401 last year, which became Public Law 90-401, that the total revenue covered in the Land and Water Conservation Fund would be adequate.

The committee will recall, I am sure, the extensive colloquy that took place at the time when the measure was considered by both the House and the Senate regarding the establishment of the fund at an authorized figure of \$200 million for each of 5 fiscal years beginning July 1, 1968, and ending June 30, 1973. It also approved that \$30 million of the money authorized to be appropriated could be obligated by contract authority.

It is almost impossible to ascertain the nature of what progress has been made since the enactment of the recent amendment to the fund. Last fiscal year \$90 million was appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It should be pointed out this amount was appropriated prior to the effective date of Public Law 90-401. After that time, \$19 million was allocated to Redwoods, \$2.5 million to Cape Hatteras, making a total amount from the fund of \$111.5 million. Later, \$53 million was made as an advance to the fund for purposes of purchases in the Redwood area.

For the present fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, the previous administration had requested \$154 million. This was reduced by \$30 million, so the effective request of the executive branch is \$124 million. This is somewhat deceptive since \$15,528,000 was used to liquidate the contract authority for 1969, with the remaining amount of the contract authority being canceled.

We would presume, therefore, that there is \$164.5 million which has been authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and 1970 but which has not been appropriated as of this date. It would appear to be a reasonably prudent judgment that the administration would not request nor would the Congress approve \$364.5 million for fiscal year 1971 which would be required to meet the authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, we are acutely aware of the fact that the administration and the Congress must make some set of priorities and judgments. We are somewhat stunned, however, in view of the extensive rhetoric as to how recreation is going to be extended to all peoples and the importance of an expansion in a balanced and effective manner, to find the funding lagging so far behind. All of which brings to mind the old bromide that "What one does speaks so loud that what one says cannot be heard."

There seems to be no evidence that other environmental needs are given such a high priority that the recreation uses must be curtailed, since the appropriations for water pollution abatement, air pollution prevention appear to experience a travail similar to that of recreation needs.

It would be hoped that the Appropriations Committees and the administration may look more kindly to appropriating more money from the fund if there are increases in receipts from fees. This would constitute payment by people who have used recreation facilities.

The reluctance to draw upon the receipts from leases on the Outer Continental Shelf appears fairly obvious. We should underscore the fact that an increase in fees from the Golden Eagle would have no serious impact upon the total amount of the fund which is stipulated at \$200 million. We do feel, however, that the charging of fees is justified and we also feel that the chances of having these receipts appropriated are reasonably good.

The American people should know what specifically is being done in order to improve our recreation resources and recreation problems. It is a considerable temptation to engage in the numbers game of project total dollar amounts for recreation needs. Suffice for our purposes here, is to note that the needs are so far beyond any demonstrated ability to meet them at the present that authorizations and appropriations would have to continue at a much higher level for a longer period than anything that is now envisaged.

One rather specific item that is involved is the continuation of the Golden Eagle. We also share, however, with Senator Moss, Senator Nelson, Senator Hatfield, and others the hope that at some future time we will be able to extend these Federal recreation areas to the public without cost.

When Senator Moss raised the question of fees with the corps, you almost had a cardiac case in the Senate room yesterday, involving myself, when I heard the corps indicate that they couldn't understand how people suggested that they were opposed to charging of fees.

I lobbied this bill, Senator, in 1964, when we passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and the corps representatives on both the House and Senate were as thick as fleas on a dog's back, and smote us hip and thigh in opposition to fees. It strikes me a little odd at this particular point, that they have no strong opinions on fees.

Senator BIBLE. I think all he said was that he was not opposed now. He probably was bitterly opposed when it started out.

Dr. SMITH. I am glad you mentioned this, Mr. Chairman. As I understood the testimony, it was mentioned that administrative costs in the Park Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was 10 percent of collection of fees. The corps testified, however, that their administrative costs on the collection of fees was much, much higher than that.

Senator BIBLE. So they stated, and I asked them to furnish criteria, because their collection costs and those of the Forest Service were a long way apart. Of course, I think anybody can do almost anything with figures. It depends on what ingredients you put into the recipe.

Dr. SMITH. The Outdoor Recreation Bureau, as we know, administers no land at all, so they are just reporting.

I think the difference between the parks and the forests are pretty clear cut. I would suspect that the parks' administrative costs are somewhat below 10 percent because they do have an entrance and exit that are clearly marked. In addition they have had this practice over a long period of time, thus their administrative costs are lower.

Now, I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the corps' problems and the Forest Service problems are not essentially or significantly different. I think Mr. Greeley testified rather carefully yesterday as to the way in which they cooperated to work out the guidelines of the Executive order.

All I am saying is this simply did not happen as far as the corps' projects are concerned.

Senator BIBLE. Well, maybe they are seeing the daylight.

Dr. SMITH. Well, the daylight seemed to get dim when they charged \$896,000 off for administrative costs.

Senator BIBLE. And I asked them to justify it.

Dr. SMITH. I want to bring one other matter to the attention of the committee, section 210 of the Flood Control Act of last year. I have the language of section 210 here. I would hope that it would be a part of the record in order that this committee could judge whether the failure of the corps to charge fees after October is in full compliance with this statute.

Senator BIBLE. I think the very obvious answer is it is not, but they have a resolution of the House Public Works Committee that runs counter to a congressional act, and obviously the statute is of higher

authority than a resolution, but I suppose, having received a resolution from a House committee, that they decided to implement it a little ahead of time.

I am sure a lawyer would tell you—and you know this—that the statute must be followed because that is the law of the land until it is changed.

Dr. SMITH. This was my understanding, and I am not a lawyer, so sometimes I am not bothered by some of these other necessary restraints.

Senator BIBLE. But in that event, you came to the same conclusion.

Dr. SMITH. I came to the same conclusion.

One other fact that was discussed in the colloquy yesterday as if there was something new in the last Flood Control Act relative to access to the shoreline.

The 1964 act entitled "The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965" made this perfectly clear, and this has never been in contention, and it states:

All other provisions of law that prohibit the collection of entrance, admission, or other recreation user fees or charges by this Act are hereby also repealed, provided that no provision of any law or treaty which extends to any person or class of persons a right of free access to the shoreline of any reservoir or any other body of water.

This was the so-called Church amendment, so this did not come about by the act last year of 90-401 and it did not come about by section 210 of the Flood Control Act that the corps cited. This has been in the language of the original statute from the time of its signing.

I do wish to call attention again to the amount authorized and the amount appropriated. Senator Nelson mentioned this yesterday. I assume that next year we would have to appropriate \$364.5 million since this would be the amount remaining under the authorization.

Senator BIBLE. I have asked them to give me an exact figure, and it occurs to me that we did appropriate a terrific amount of money for the Redwoods and that was something I did not take into account yesterday in my rather rapid mental calculations, but I have asked for a complete rundown from Assistant Secretary Loesch of all of the figures and I am going to verify it with my own Appropriations Committee to see just how much remains unexpended in the conservation funds.

Dr. SMITH. There has been some misunderstanding Mr. Chairman, that the act of last year, which established \$200 million authorization, began in fiscal 1970. The act very specifically states that it shall begin July 1, 1968, which is fiscal 1969, and concluded June 30, 1973.

Now, according to our calculations, \$90 million was appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It should be said that this was done before the act amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund in raising the authorization to \$200 million actually passed the Congress.

Senator BIBLE. The one act you are overlooking is the 1968 act on expenditures and controls, and that was a limitation on everything done by the Appropriations Committees.

Dr. SMITH. I am perfectly aware of that, but we did have some items set aside.

Senator BIBLE. But not this one. We had exclusions, but this was not one of them.

Dr. SMITH. We spent \$90 million—

Senator BIBLE. I am on your side, but all we have to do is get our figures and see what we can do about it. You know the Appropriations Committees can appropriate, but we can't compel the administration to spend it.

Dr. SMITH. This is my next point. We have been talking about the escalation, and Senator Jackson and yourself were people who worked the hardest to obtain the \$30 million of contract authority, which hopefully would dampen down this problem of escalation that takes place from the time something is authorized until the appropriations are available. What happened to that \$30 million?

In the first place, \$124 million is requested for next fiscal year by the administration, which isn't quite fair because it really comes out to \$109 million, since they liquidated contract authorities of slightly over \$15 million, and canceled the other \$15 million. The \$30 million contract authority had been impounded by the Budget Bureau. So the areas for which these funds were available never were affected.

We have this money, as was pointed out yesterday, in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Treasury has not transferred \$110 million from receipts of the oil leases, as stipulated in the act of Public Law 90-401 on the estimate of the Secretary of the Interior. This amount now is available.

Apparently this is just going to pile up and up.

Senator BIBLE. We will put good use to it once we get beyond the spending control acts.

The thing you overlook is that the 1968 Congress in its wisdom—and I did not vote for it—passed an Expenditure Control Act which was the overall limitation of all of these expenditures and that superseded all the rest of these acts.

But you and I are on the same side. We need \$500 or \$600 million to acquire all the lands that we have authorized to date, something in that range, and it is probably going up every day as we talk about it.

Dr. SMITH. I appreciate that, but the citizens committee wanted it to be on the record that this authorization of \$200 million is supposed to be available until spent.

Senator BIBLE. It is going to be available. The trouble is you are constantly overlooking the 1968 Expenditure Control Act that says, "No, you can't do it because we say you can't do it." That is what this \$6 billion cutback was all about.

Dr. SMITH. What you are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that there was a ceiling imposed on the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Senator BIBLE. That is right, except where specifically excluded. No doubt about it. But you examine that because we are on your side.

Dr. SMITH. We have examined it. We didn't interpret it quite that way. We knew there was a total amount of expenditures involved, but it occurs to me that this is a special fund and how that would figure into the cutback is very difficult to understand unless you simply assign an across-the-board freeze. I notice it didn't affect the highway trust fund.

Senator BIBLE. Yes, it did.

Dr. SMITH. Well, they impounded the money and then they let it go.

Senator BIBLE. No, sir; they didn't even leave it go at that level, and it was only because it affected highways in the States of Wisconsin, Nevada, and 48 others that the pressures came on and they finally released it, but that is the only way it was jarred loose, because it was frozen. They stopped some projects right in the middle of the construction.

Dr. SMITH. Well, I know it was frozen for a while. I don't know what the ceiling is in terms of land and water conservation funds but I think this money should be released.

Senator BIBLE. We are on your side, and the argument you are making here should be directed to a man by the name of Robert P. Mayo. You get him to agree with you and we will be happily getting more land, as we both agree we should.

Senator NELSON. Mr. Chairman, this much can be said, that the \$124 million spent of the \$200 million total makes a cut in this particular budget of better than a third of the whole budget.

Senator BIBLE. I want to see the figures on that because I don't think the figures we were using yesterday gives cognizance to the great amount of millions of dollars which were earmarked.

Senator Nelson, do you have any questions?

Senator NELSON. No, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. I have no further questions.

Thank you very much, Dr. Smith. The committee is always glad to see you.

(Subsequent to the hearing, the following additional information was received:)

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1969.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In regard to the consideration by the Committee of S. 2315 and related measures, which would extend the life of the "Golden Eagle" permit for Federal recreation areas, I ask the Committee's attention to two major matters: (1) the present failure of the Corps of Engineers to comply with the statute, and (2) the previous and present relevance of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 to the Land & Water Conservation Fund.

In the first instance, the Corps of Engineers should be required by the Congress to comply with P.L. 88-578 as amended by P.L. 90-401. Section 201 of P.L. 90-483, the Flood Control Act of 1968 did not relieve the Corps of the responsibility of charging fees established under the two previous statutes. If the Congress is not disturbed by this present failure, it should be noted that the Corps so interprets P.L. 90-483 to prohibit collection of admission and user fees except under special circumstances even if S. 2315 is enacted as introduced.

It appears most difficult to rationalize a fee structure that excludes Corps projects just as it is difficult to justify the different administrative costs indicated by the Corps when compared to other Federal Agencies with recreation responsibilities.

The restrictions imposed by the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act were known and understood by the Congress when P.L. 90-401 was enacted. The Revenue and Expenditures Control Act having been signed into law on June 28, 1969, and the Land & Water Conservation Fund Act amendments on July 15, 1968.

It would appear, therefore, highly incongruous for the Congress to specifically authorize the transfer of receipts from the oil leases of the Outer Continental Shelf and hold them while the price of property was increasing. While this failure to spend the amounts authorized for fiscal year 1969 has imposed an egregious burden, the action of the Conference Committee regarding the Second Supplemental Appropriations should help ease the problem for fiscal 1970. The Conference Report strikes Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditures Control

Act and by so doing should remove restrictions sufficiently in order that a greater proportion of the amounts authorized can be appropriated.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr., *Secretary.*

Our next witness is Joseph Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League. Mr. Penfold, we are glad to have you before the committee.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH W. PENFOLD, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA**

Mr. PENFOLD. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your courtesy in carrying the hearings over to today so that we could be heard.

Senator BIBLE. I am just sorry I didn't get to you yesterday. Proceed.

Mr. PENFOLD. Mr. Chairman, I am Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. The league is a nationwide citizen organization concerned with the conservation and wise use of America's natural resources and the protection of its environmental quality.

We strongly support the legislation, S. 2315, to restore the Golden Eagle passport. This support was reaffirmed by the league's national annual convention last week in Cincinnati by resolution unanimously adopted as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 13. GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

Whereas the Golden Eagle program was authorized by Congress in 1965 to provide needed funds to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for additional recreation lands; and

Whereas public participation in the Golden Eagle program steadily increased from 90,400 in 1965 to 692,000 in 1968, with a possible increase to 800,000 permit holders in 1969;

Whereas this steady increase of nearly 100 percent in 4 years indicates wide acceptance of the program by the American public who voluntarily contributed more than \$18 million for the purchase of park and recreation areas; and

Whereas the 90th Congress, despite these gains, voted against the continuation of the Golden Eagle program beyond 1970; and

Whereas recent appropriations to the Land and Water Conservation Fund have been woefully inadequate, resulting in the curtailment of park services and jeopardizing completed acquisition of many park and recreation facilities already authorized by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Izaak Walton League of America, in Convention assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, this 10th day of July 1969, That it reaffirms its wholehearted support for continuation of the Golden Eagle program beyond 1970; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress and the administration be urged to recognize the serious gap which has developed between appropriations and authorizations for needed public park facilities, and in addition to restoration of the Golden Eagle program, take such other measures as are necessary to meet the goals established by the Land and Water Conservation Act.

I might say further we would support the amendments that were suggested yesterday by Senator Moss.

Mr. Chairman, we believe the 90th Congress was in error when it passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Amendment Act including the provision that the Golden Eagle passport be terminated.

We stated this as strongly as we could in our testimony before the House Interior Committee at that time. We questioned the true substance of the criticisms leveled at the Golden Eagle. We said:

There has been discussion which leads us to believe that Congress may act to discontinue in whole or in part the user fee system and the Golden Eagle. We believe this would be a mistake and a serious step backward. I say this not because the user fee system has channeled substantial revenues into the land and water conservation fund—it has not. It has fallen far short of expectations in that regard. But the amount of revenue raised is perhaps the least important factor.

The Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission recognized a fair and reasonable system of fees as a basic revenue producer, but it did not believe that such could recover more than a portion of the costs of administering, operating, and maintaining recreation facilities.

I do not believe anything substantive has occurred which disputes the wisdom of the action Congress took in 1964. There have been administrative problems in extending the user fee system to Federal areas where there had been none before, and we knew there would be.

There have been differences in the speed at which the various bureaus have been able to implement the system, and frankly differences in their zeal as well. We knew this would be the case. There has not been consistent uniformity in the application of the system. We knew this could not be achieved overnight. There have been differences in public acceptance of the system. We know there would be. There have been wide differences in the cost of collection of user fees between areas of controlled access like some national parks and extensive areas like some reservoirs. This was inevitable.

We knew there would be real headaches which would take time to iron out. I do not believe our experience the past three years is remarkable because of its problems and headaches, but rather it is remarkable for the solid progress which has been made in which was really an uncharted area. I believe we are over the hump.

By the foregoing comments, I do not mean to imply that we should not utilize fully the experience the country has had with the fee system to date to effect the adjustment and improvements that experience may dictate. We should. I felt strongly at the time the fee system was instituted that in a few years after the system had had a thorough test that it should be carefully reviewed for the purpose of perfecting the system in terms of the principles and purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and its effectiveness as far as the citizens are concerned.

Those are some of the things which we said to the House Interior Committee at that time and, as I said, we made it just as strong as we could to try and discourage these things from happening which actually did happen.

Mr. Chairman, our opinion today is the same as it was a year ago when we said that and 6 years ago when we said the same thing as the land and water conservation fund bill was first considered.

We respectfully urge that the Golden Eagle passport be restored and that a careful study and review of the entire recreation entrance and user fee structure be undertaken. We believe that there has been enough experience now with the studies that were mentioned yesterday by the Little Co., by the materials which the various agencies have assembled, and that such a study could be a very useful thing in achieving the ultimate aim of complete consistency and uniformity across the federal system.

We certainly commend the sponsors of the legislation and we also commend the committee for moving quickly on its consideration. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much. I have no questions.

Senator Nelson?

Senator NELSON. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Mr. Thomas Kimball of the National Wildlife Federation was scheduled to be our next witness. Because of illness Mr. Kimball is unable to be here. His statement will be incorporated and made a part of the record in full at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS L. KIMBALL ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation which has national headquarters at 1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W., here in Washington, D.C.

Ours is a private organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means. The Federation has independent Affiliates in 49 States. In turn, these Affiliates are made up of individuals and organizations who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated 2½ million persons.

We welcome the opportunity to make these brief comments upon S. 2315, restoring the Golden Eagle passport, or annual entrance fee, to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The National Wildlife Federation was one of the original supporters of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program, hailing it as one of the historic, landmark pieces of legislation in the conservation and recreation field. And, our organization supported the recreation fee principle which became the Golden Eagle passport, believing that those who use outdoor facilities for recreation should help bear the cost. This, of course, was to be one of three primary modes of financing for the Fund, with other income being added from the sales of surplus Federal property and from Federal taxes on motorboat fuels. And, we were disappointed that the \$7 annual fee portion of the financing was knocked out last year. Thus, we still are in support of this portion of the program and hope it can be restored.

There is some evidence from people directly connected with public camping facilities in the field that when people are obliged to pay for facilities they are more concerned over the welfare of their surroundings. We feel this aspect is quite important since the success of any public endeavor finally rests with the attitude of the people. We must improve this attitude in every way possible. When it appears that the public is getting something for nothing they have no regard for it. The Golden Eagle concept gives people a personal interest in their share of public lands and facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the hearings on this bill serve an even more important function in highlighting overall problems with the Land and Water Conservation Fund program. It is floundering at a time when an emergency exists with the acceleration of prices for properties needed for the establishment of public areas such as parks and monuments, seashores and lakeshores, wildernesses, wildlife refuges, and recreational areas. The 90th Congress, of course, recognized this situation by approving of an expanded Land and Water Conservation Fund, to a maximum of \$200 million. But even this action, which conservationists hailed as recognition of a highly-important step, is being watered down. The distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee, Sen. Bible, is well aware of the problem because of the other hat he wears as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which votes money for the program.

Mr. Chairman, in our opinion, these difficulties should be laid right at the doorstep of the Bureau of the Budget.

Ink on the President's signature on the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was hardly dry when the Bureau of the Budget invoked its infamous "full-funding" concept. The sponsors of the Land and Water Fund Act never had the idea that this Fund would do anything but supplement regular appropriations for at least some of these facilities. Then, however, under this concept, it has had to bear the entire burden for State and Federal programs, the latter with respect to acquisitions for units of the National Park System, Forest recreation areas, and endangered wildlife. In practice, of course, the authorizations for new units have outrun the appropriations and the program is at a virtual standstill.

Then, to compound the misery, the Budget Bureau is not allowing anything near the full \$200 million authorized as an emergency measure last year as a means for working off the major backlog of acquisitions. The Chairman of this Sub-

committee, when a Federation staff member testified earlier this year on behalf of the full \$200 million properly pointed out the question that the Budget Bureau would allow use of any more than it had requested even if the monies are appropriated. And so, conservationists are left with the dilemma of what to do when the Congress and the Budget Bureau fail to carry out their commitments. While we understand that "appropriations" and "authorizations" are two vastly different things, the Public takes the view that promises are not being carried out.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of making these remarks.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness will be Lemuel Johnson, president of the International Avion Travelcade Club.

STATEMENT OF LEMUEL JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, MID-ATLANTIC UNIT OF THE INTERNATIONAL AVION TRAVELCADE CLUB

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am president of the Mid-Atlantic unit of the International Avion Travelcade Club.

At our winter meeting in Sebring, Fla., in January, it was voted to send a letter to Secretary Hickel with reference to the Golden Eagle.

Our club represents a very small minority compared to the Izaak Walton League, probably, but it is in comparison to the Airstream Wally Byrum Caravans, with which most people, I think, are familiar. I am speaking for our international president. I don't have a prepared statement. I am sorry. This is new to me and I was not aware of all of the provisions.

Senator BIBLE. That is all right. We are perfectly happy to have you, whether you have a statement or not. Go right ahead.

Mr. JOHNSON. Our people are mainly senior citizens, retired people, who are making their homes in travel trailers and traveling over the country. A good part of them are on limited incomes and they find that admissions to these parks is very important to their welfare and pleasure.

They have worked long years and they certainly deserve this. The ending of the Golden Eagle would probably curtail a lot of their visits to the parks. So I strongly urge, in behalf of our international club, that the appropriate congressional committee do what they can to restore this.

We have no objection to the increased fee to \$10.

Senator BIBLE. Yes, that seems to me to be a good figure. I don't think anybody would argue about that.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is, and I noticed there was discussion of some means of having it on a per person basis.

Senator BIBLE. I like it the way it works.

Mr. JOHNSON. We feel it should be limited to per family.

Senator BIBLE. Yes, I agree with that. I think this has been a great family used passport, so to speak, because that is what it is, the Golden Eagle passport, and as the spokesman for the travel club, how many people do you represent?

Mr. JOHNSON. Approximately 6,000 trailers, or 15,000 to 20,000 people. That is our particular club.

Senator BIBLE. Oh. You said that was in the southeast region?

Mr. JOHNSON. No. This is the United States and Canada. It is international in scope.

Senator BIBLE. Is it a dues-paying organization? I am just not familiar with it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. It coincides with the Wally Byrum Caravan of Airstream Trailers.

Senator BIBLE. I see. Well, my mail has reflected just what you are saying, and I think this is good for elderly people who are traveling, and I think it encourages them to see America.

The testimony from both the Forest Service and the Park Service was the fact that people kind of take a little pride in having a Golden Eagle passport. Unfortunately, there was some indication that it had already expired and the publicity waned and we prohibited them from using the publicity, but it seems to me this has been a very worthwhile program.

Someday I hope we will not have any admission to our parks and forests, so all the people will be able to enjoy it.

Mr. JOHNSON. We certainly do. I am not retired, but I buy Golden Eagle every year and it certainly enables the working class of people also a better opportunity. Due to the high cost of living, their expenses are very high, too.

Senator BIBLE. I agree.

Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

As I indicated yesterday, the record will be kept open until Tuesday at 5 o'clock. We will close the record then.

Statements or letters we have before us and any additional communications will be printed at this point.

(The letters referred to follow:)

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The American Automobile Association supports and urges passage of S. 2315 which would restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The American Automobile Association was the first non-government issuer of Golden Eagle and last year we sold, at not cost to the government, more than 30,000 passports.

Recently we forwarded to all affiliated AAA clubs throughout the country a letter with a fact sheet on the Golden Eagle passport program (copy attached). As you will note, we have requested our AAA clubs throughout the country to seek members views on the Golden Eagle program.

Letters that we have received to date in response to our inquiry of June 2 unanimously support the continuation of the Golden Eagle program.

It is for these reasons that we support and urge passage of S. 2315.

It is requested that this letter with the attachment be made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DE LORENZI,

Managing Director, Public and Government Relations.

[Enclosures]

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., June 2, 1969.

To: AAA Club Managers and Secretaries:

GENTLEMEN: We have been receiving inquiries from AAA Clubs concerning the future of the Golden Eagle passport which, for an annual fee of \$7, entitles families or individuals virtual unlimited access to National parks, forests and other government recreation sites.

An amendment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1968 repeals the unified fee system throughout Federal recreation areas as of March 31, 1970. This, in effect, means the end of the Golden Eagle Passport as of that date.

Currently there are bills before Congress that would either stop the repeal and preserve the Golden Eagle as it is, or keep the program alive through modifications of the plan. Presently no hearings are scheduled on these bills, however.

AAA Clubs issuing Golden Eagle passports as a public service sold more than 30,000 of them last year. For these reasons we believe that an expression of opinion from AAA members on the Golden Eagle issue might be in order. Do they want Golden Eagle continued? What do they like or dislike about the program? Do they use Golden Eagle enough to make its \$7 annual fee practical? Would they pay more than \$7 if necessary to preserve it? Would they frequent Federal recreation fee areas as often as they do currently without Golden Eagle on a pay-as-you-go basis?

Answers to such questions might be generated through AAA Club publications to allow direct membership participation in the formulation of an AAA position on this issue. National Headquarters would appreciate your reaction as well as those of your members.

On the chance that you might be interested in querying your members on this matter, we have attached a fact sheet on the Golden Eagle which might be helpful to you.

Thank you for your interest.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN DE LORENZI,

Managing Director, Public and Government Relations.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT FACT SHEET

Golden Eagle is the name given to the Federal recreation fee program by which families or individuals can gain entry to more than 7,000 Federal recreation areas (National parks, forests, reservoirs, monuments, historical sites, etc.) for a \$7 annual passport fee.

A valid Golden Eagle passport will admit the purchaser, regardless of his mode of transportation, to designated fee areas. It also admits all persons who accompany the holder in a private noncommercial vehicle, with the exception of a small number of museum-type historical sites where only the passport-holder may enter free of additional charge.

Golden Eagle passport is, in itself, a gold and blue, wallet-sized card. When signed by its owner, it is valid from April 1 to March 31 of the following year.

Revenues received from Golden Eagle sales are deposited in the Land and Water Conservation Fund along with other Federal outdoor recreation fees and revenues from surplus Federal real property sales, Federal motorboat fuel taxes, general receipts of the Treasury and some receipts from mineral leases on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Land and Water Conservation Fund monies are used to acquire recreation lands for the National Park, Forest and Wildlife Refuge systems as well as for the states and territories, and to acquire lands needed to protect rare and endangered wildlife species.

Through last March 31, Golden Eagle had contributed \$15 million into the fund. In 1965, Golden Eagle's first year, only \$1 million accrued from the Department of the Interior-administered program.

During the past four years of its own existence, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has made apportionments of \$259 million to states and territories to help them acquire and develop some 3,300 local and state parks and recreation areas. Approximately \$226 million has gone into acquiring lands for the National systems and for wildlife sanctuaries.

Golden Eagle passports can be purchased at most entrances to Federal recreation areas; through the Department of the Interior and its bureaus; by writing Operation Golden Eagle, P.O. Box 7763, Washington, D.C. 20044; and through such nongovernment channels, on strictly a public service basis, as the American Automobile Association.

AAA was the first non-government issuer of Golden Eagle, and last year sold more than 30,000 Passports.

Golden Eagle's congressional opponents claim that although the program has steadily grown from a \$1 million revenue supplier in 1965, it is a disappointment

and is not garnering nearly enough moneys for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Golden Eagle's proponents in the Department of the Interior say Golden Eagle is doing its job well. They claim that people would not go as often to recreation fee areas without Golden Eagle as they are increasingly doing with it, and that consequently fewer dollars would actually be provided the fund's kitty without Golden Eagle.

Interior also believes Golden Eagle is enabling more people to see, learn and understand Federal recreation endeavors than ever before. This, to the Interior Department, is an important public relations tool.

Officially, this is Golden Eagle's last year unless any of several bills before Congress are passed into law. One would simply stop the repeal of Golden Eagle as passed last year, and reinstate the passport program as is beyond the March 31, 1970, deadline. Another would set up a program similar to Golden Eagle but costing the consumer "not more than \$10 a year." Others would reinstate Golden Eagle with similarly minor changes and modifications.

Other entrance permits now available at Federal recreation fee areas—aside from Golden Eagle—include a \$1 daily carload permit valid until noon of the day following purchase in a single area. If an individual is not entering a Federal recreation area in a private noncommercial vehicle, he may purchase a 50-cent daily permit for himself.

Golden Eagle and other entrance permits are not camping or hunting and fishing permits within the Federal recreation areas. User or service fees may be charged singly or in addition to entrance fees. For example, user fees may be charged for camping, bathhouses, lockers, boat launching facilities, cabins or overnight shelters, electrical outlets, cut firewood or other fuels, duck blinds and winter sport facilities, boats, guided tours and elevators.

Persons hunting or fishing on Federal recreation areas must comply with applicable state regulations requiring hunting or fishing licenses.

THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The American Forestry Association recommends enactment of S. 2315 so that the "Golden Eagle" program may be continued as an essential part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We believe it to be sound policy to require people who use publicly-owned recreation facilities to contribute to the costs of acquisition, development and maintenance by means of entrance and user fees. Such a program is receiving general acceptance as indicated by the fact that revenues from the present \$7 Golden Eagle passport have increased progressively from \$633,600 in the initial year in 1965 to more than \$5,000,000 in the current year.

We have heard proposals that the fee be increased from \$7 to \$10 or even \$15 so that more revenues could be obtained. In our opinion such an increase at this time would be a mistake. This program has not yet been sold thoroughly to the public. The public must be convinced first of its merit, then administrators can think about increasing the fee.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. POMEROY,
Chief Forester.

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1969.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The National Grange has consistently supported legislation to preserve, protect and extend the National Parks system and Federal outdoor recreation areas.

We therefore would like to add to this long history by urging early approval of S. 2315, a bill to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The establishment of one annual and uniform entrance and user fee, honored at all Federal outdoor recreation areas, in our judgment, makes good sense. With

such areas now numbering over 3,000, it will make the fee program easier to administer and far less confusing to the user.

More and more, young and old Americans alike are taking to the highways in campers, trailers and travel buses to enjoy the great outdoors which is their rightful heritage. The Golden Eagle program is particularly popular with retired and elderly persons who have more opportunity to visit extensively a number of the outdoor recreation areas to which the pass provides admission.

We fully realize the slow start of the Golden Eagle program. We feel, however, that with more than 3,000 Federal outdoor recreation facilities now available in 47 states and the tremendous increased interest in camping and outdoor activities, the popularity and use of the Golden Eagle pass will continue to grow by leaps and bounds.

The revenues from it increased from \$633,600 in 1965 to \$4,846,200 in 1968. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation estimates that at least \$5,200,000 will come into the fund during this year.

We are convinced that the repeal of the Golden Eagle program was a mistake; therefore, we urge prompt, favorable consideration of this legislation by this Committee and the Congress to restore the program to the American people.

However, we would like to call to this Committee's attention the fact that each time public land is taken from the tax rolls to create Federal parks or recreational areas, the local community suffers tax losses, placing additional strain on the already tight financial situation facing many rural communities in providing adequate schools, roads and other services.

In the case of Federal forests, stumping fees, grazing fees, etc., 25 percent of such user fees collected are returned to the local community to help offset this tax loss.

We therefore respectfully urge that S. 2315 be amended to provide that 25 percent of such user fees refunded to the states be allocated to the communities in which the Federally owned recreational area is located, to help offset that community's loss in tax revenues brought about by the loss of the land from the tax rolls.

The cost of this program to the individual is small indeed and the funds aid both state and Federal activities. The program furthers the use of our magnificent outdoor recreation areas for the benefit of our citizens.

We would appreciate this letter being made a part of the hearing record.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. FREDERICK,
Legislative Representative.

THE TRAILER LIFE FAMILY OF PUBLICATIONS,
July 10, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: I am pleased to enclose an advance copy of the August issue of Trailer Life and would like to call your attention to the editorial on page 75, "The Golden Eagle Gains Official Help."

This magazine and the great bulk of our readers are enthusiastically behind your efforts to Save the Golden Eagle. We wish to express our thanks to you for your contribution to save this worthwhile program.

Also enclosed is a bumper sticker which we are offering to all our readers in the hopes of keeping interest alive.

We would certainly appreciate your comments on the editorial.

Cordially,

ART ROUSE,
Editor and Publisher.

[Enclosure]

[From Trailer Life, August 1969]

CONGRESS RECONSIDERS—THE GOLDEN EAGLE GAINS OFFICIAL HELP

Public opinion expressed on paper is effective!

That fact has just been proved by RecV enthusiasts nationwide, whose thousands of letters to the U.S. Congress in recent months have now stimulated action leading to the possibility of new life for the Golden Eagle passport.

Last month we reported to you (*Mail Box page 13, July TL*) that bills had been introduced into both branches of Congress to extend the life of the Golden Eagle beyond the April 1, 1970, deadline imposed last year.

Now, as we go to press with this issue, another bill has been introduced into the U.S. Senate, this one co-sponsored by a group of five influential Senators. Senate Bill 2315 intends to reinstate the Golden Eagle passport by repealing the 1963 amendment to the Land and Water Fund Act that provided for the elimination of the Golden Eagle program.

This is exactly the action RecV'ers have been asking for. Further, since four of the five co-sponsors of this new bill are members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs . . . the same committee which must first pass on any such action before it is sent to the Senate floor for debate and vote . . . the bill would seem to have the best chance for action.

Involved as sponsors are: Senators Henry M. Jackson (D-Washington), Frank Church (D-Idaho), Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), Alan Bible (D-Nevada), and Warren Magnuson (D-Washington). Senator Jackson, who came to defense of the Golden Eagle when legislation to eliminate it was being considered last year, is chairman of the Senate committee mentioned above; Senators Church, Moss, and Bible are members of the same committee; Senator Magnuson has worked with his fellow senators in defense of the Golden Eagle.

Senator Jackson introduced the bill, making the point that the passport is particularly popular with retired persons and others "who have the opportunity to visit extensively a number of the outdoor recreation areas to which the pass provides admission." He also stated, "Clearly the program furthers the use of our magnificent outdoor recreation areas for the benefit of our citizens."

The Senator added, "... much of the mail which I received linked the projected termination of the Golden Eagle Passport with the consideration being given by the National Park Service to turning over the operation of major campgrounds to private concessioners. Most of the passport users vigorously oppose such changeover, fearing that greatly increased fees will result."

Also speaking for the proposed bill, Senator Moss stated, "There is no doubt in my mind that the American people want to see this particular American Eagle kept alive." And he entered several letters from his constituents into the Congressional Record.

Mid-June, speaking to representatives of the TRAILER LIFE staff by phone, Senator Jackson indicated confidence that he and his co-sponsors would be able to pass the bill in the Senate, though he could not predict disposition of the bill in the House of Representatives. He intended to schedule consideration of the bill by his committee during July and he added: "I urge all those who favor the bill and continuation of the Golden Eagle pass to so advise their representatives and senators in Congress . . ."

We cannot urge you too strongly: as soon as you have read this and whether or not you have already written your congressmen on this subject, write again regarding, particularly now, Senate Bill 2315. Tell your Senator or Congressman just how much the Golden Eagle means to you.

Mailing address for Senators is United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510; for Representatives it is the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

The fight for the Golden Eagle has really only begun. To make sure that the Passport gains new and long life, *keep* your letters going to Washington . . . particularly during these days and weeks when they can add force to the bills now under consideration.

Your pen is and can be mighty!

HYATTSVILLE, Md.,

July 11, 1969.

CHAIRMAN,

*Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Subject.—Hearings on the authority to issue the Golden Eagle passport.

We are a family of 6. Like many other families, we appreciate and enjoy the Federal recreation areas.

For the past several years we have subscribed to the Golden Eagle passport issued by the Department of the Interior. The passport has made it possible for us and many other families to voluntarily contribute to the recreation areas. The passport has also permitted us to make fuller use of the areas.

We understand you have scheduled hearings for July 17 on the proposed repeal of the authority to issue the Golden Eagle passport. We strongly recommend that the authority be contained in substantially its present form for the following reasons:

The passports invite voluntary contributions to the recreation areas. (In many instances, the cost of the passport is in excess of the use made of the passport.)

The passports invite fuller use of the recreation areas by families with children. (Many areas would be "passed by" if separate entrance fees were required.)

The passports promote a feeling of participation and a fuller awareness of the areas. (The holder feels that he is a member of a worthy activity.)

The passports help remove, to a large extent, the feeling of having to pay to use a public heritage. (Few things detract from the enjoyment of a recreation area as much as commercialization.)

If desired, you may make this letter a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD AND FERN WOODWORTH.

Senator BIBLE. The hearing stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11 a.m., the committee was adjourned.)



It is understood that the following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...

The following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...

The following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...

It is understood that the following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...

The following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...

The following list of names is for the purpose of being included in the list of names of the following...



