

1023

Y4
. In 8/14
93-56

93-56
In 8/14
93-56

AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Storage

C 1 1 19/4

HEARINGS

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON

NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2844, H.R. 11921, AND H.R. 13913

CAMPGROUND FEE LEGISLATION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

APRIL 8 AND 9, 1974

Serial No. 93-56

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



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1974

36-622 O

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION



47
N/8 nt.
22-22

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JAMES A. HALEY, Florida, *Chairman*

ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
PHILLIP BURTON, California
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
ABRAHAM KAZAN, Jr., Texas
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Georgia
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
TENEO RONCALIO, Wyoming
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio
HAROLD RUNNELS, New Mexico
YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE,
California
ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, Guam
WAYNE OWENS, Utah
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma

CRAIG HOSMER, California, *Ranking
Minority Member*
JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
SAM STEIGER, Arizona
DON H. CLAUSEN, California
PHILIP E. RUPPE, Michigan
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP, Oklahoma
MANUEL LUJAN, Jr., New Mexico
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
RALPH S. REGULA, Ohio
ALAN STEELMAN, Texas
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
JAMES G. MARTIN, North Carolina
WILLIAM M. KETCHUM, California
PAUL W. CRONIN, Massachusetts
DON YOUNG, Alaska
ROBERT E. BAUMAN, Maryland
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho

CHARLES CONKLIN, *Staff Director and Chief Clerk*

LEE McELVAIN, *General Counsel*

CHARLES LEPPERT, Jr., *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION

ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina, *Chairman*

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
ABRAHAM KAZAN, Jr., Texas
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Georgia
TENEO RONCALIO, Wyoming
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio
ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, Guam
WAYNE OWENS, Utah
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands

JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
CRAIG HOSMER, California
DON H. CLAUSEN, California
PHILIP E. RUPPE, Michigan
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP, Oklahoma
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
RALPH S. REGULA, Ohio
ALAN STEELMAN, Texas
JAMES G. MARTIN, North Carolina
WILLIAM M. KETCHUM, California
PAUL W. CRONIN, Massachusetts
ROBERT E. BAUMAN, Maryland

CLEVE PINNIX, *Staff Consultant*

CLAY PETERS, *Minority Staff Consultant*

NOTE.—The chairman of the full committee is an ex officio voting member of this subcommittee. The first listed minority member is counterpart to the subcommittee chairman.

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held :	
April 8, 1974.....	1
April 9, 1974.....	97
Text of :	
S. 2844.....	2
H.R. 11921.....	8
H.R. 18913.....	10
Report of the Department of the Interior.....	14
Statements :	
Dellenback, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.....	18
Dickenson, Russell E., Deputy Director, National Park Service.....	29
Hulett, Stanley W., Deputy Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	117
Jones, Hon. James R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Oklahoma.....	97
Kelly, Brig. Gen. James L., Deputy Director, Civil Works, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.....	28
Nelson, Thomas C., Deputy Chief, Forest Service.....	30
Newbold, Billy C., executive director, National Campground Institute.....	142
Peoples, Vasco, chairman, legislative committee, Kampground Own- ers Association.....	92
Watt, James G., Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Depart- ment of the Interior.....	25
Letters :	
Cleveland, Hon. James C., Member of Congress, to Hon. John R. Rarick, dated March 28, 1974.....	16
Curry, Richard C., Associate Director, legislation, National Park Ser- vice, to Hon. Don H. Clausen, dated April 26, 1974 (plus enclosure) ..	125
NPS consideration of concessioner operated campgrounds (ques- tions and answers).....	126
NPS campground reservation system.....	127
Listing of parks and campgrounds proposed for reservation oper- ation (table).....	128
Daily camping fees charged by campground and park in 1973 (table).....	130
News release, National Park Service, dated February 25, 1974.....	133
Dickenson, Russell E., Deputy Director, National Park Service, to Mr. Lee McElvain, dated April 26, 1974.....	136
Evans, Brock, director, Washington Office, Sierra Club, to Hon. Roy Taylor, dated April 25, 1974.....	145
Forman, Robert N. L., executive director, International Federation of Recreational Vehicle Users, to Hon. James A. Haley, dated April 12, 1974.....	144
Hulett, Stanley W., for James G. Watt, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, to Hon. Alan Steelman, dated May 3, 1974 (plus en- closure) ..	49
Golden Eagle and Golden Age Passport—rules and regulations— from the Federal Register, February 6, 1973.....	50
Hutchins, Jerald N., area ranger, Siuslaw National Forest, Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, to Congressman John Dellenback, dated April 12, 1974.....	143
McElvain, Mr. Lee, General Counsel, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to Mr. Russell E. Dickenson, Deputy Director, Na- tional Park Service, dated March 8, 1974.....	135

IV

Nelson, Thomas C., Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, to Hon. Alan Steelman, dated May 22, 1974 (with enclosure)-----	Page 45
RIM special—Number of campgrounds by National Forest from RIM basic address inventory as of June 30, 1973, development scale 2 through 5 only (table)-----	47
Parish, John V., Jr., Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Executive Director of Civil Works, Department of the Army, to Mr. Lee McElvain, dated May 10, 1974 (plus enclosure)-----	112
Answers provided to questions asked by Congressman Jim Jones of General Kelly-----	112
Peterson, R. Max, Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation, Forest Service, to Hon. Roy A. Taylor, dated April 25, 1974 (plus enclosures)-----	82
National Forest levels of outdoor recreation experience (table)---	84
Methods of fee collection at currently designated fee campgrounds—Region 8 (table)-----	85
Region 9 (table)-----	85
Picnic sites that would qualify for user fees under S. 2844 (table)-----	86
Boating sites that would qualify for user fees under S. 2844 (table)-----	86
Answers to questions raised during hearing on S. 2844-----	86
Rarick, Hon. John R., Member of Congress, to Hon. Roy Taylor, dated April 4, 1974-----	16
Reed, Hon. Nathaniel, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Hon. James A. Haley, dated April 5, 1974 (report)-----	14
Regula, Hon. Ralph S., Member of Congress, to Mr. Ronald H. Walker, Director, National Park Service, dated March 14, 1974-----	17
Smith, Anthony Wayne, president and general counsel, National Parks and Conservation Association, to Hon. Roy A. Taylor, dated April 15, 1974-----	143
Steelman, Hon. Alan, Member of Congress, to Mr. Ronald H. Walker, Director, National Park Service, dated April 10, 1974-----	57
Steelman, Hon. Alan, Member of Congress, to Mr. James G. Watt, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, dated April 10, 1974-----	49
Steelman, Hon. Alan, Member of Congress, to Mr. Thomas C. Nelson, Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, dated April 19, 1974-----	44
Walker, Ronald H., Director, National Park Service, to Hon. Ralph S. Regula, dated April 8, 1974-----	18
Walker, Ronald H., Director, National Park Service, to Hon. Alan Steelman, dated May 10, 1974 (plus enclosures)-----	58
Concessioners furnishing accommodations and services for the public in areas administered by the National Park Service (table)-----	62
National Park concessioners and total collective years of service, plus current contract or permit and parent ownership (table)---	76

CAMPGROUND FEE LEGISLATION

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, the Hon. Roy A. Taylor (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation will come to order.

The business before the subcommittee today is the consideration of further legislation relating to the collection of fees for special outdoor recreation facilities at various areas administered by Federal agencies. Now, we have before us today three bills, S. 2844, a bill that has been approved by the Senate; H.R. 11921, a bill by Congressman Talcott; and H.R. 13913, a bill by Congressman Dellenback.

In the absence of objection copies of these bills, and copies of the Departmental report will be placed in the record at this point.

[The bills and Departmental report are as follows:]

(1)

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 1, 1974

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

AN ACT

To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund
4 Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 789), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4001-
5 6a), is further amended as follows;

6 (a) The heading of the section is revised to read:

7. "ADMISSION AND USE FEES; ESTABLISHMENT AND
8 REGULATIONS".

9 (b) The second sentence of section 4 (a) is amended to
10 read: “No admission fees of any kind shall be charged or

1 imposed for entrance into any other federally owned areas
2 which are operated and maintained by a Federal agency and
3 used for outdoor recreation purposes.”

4 (c) Subsection (a) (1) is revised to read:

5 “(1) For admission into any such designated area,
6 an annual admission permit (to be known as the
7 Golden Eagle Passport) shall be available, for a fee
8 of not more than \$10. The permittee and any person
9 accompanying him in a single, private, noncommercial
10 vehicle, or alternatively, the permittee and his spouse,
11 children, and parents accompanying him where entry
12 to the area is by any means other than private, non-
13 commercial vehicle, shall be entitled to general admis-
14 sion into any area designated pursuant to this sub-
15 section. The annual permit shall be valid during the
16 calendar year for which the annual fee is paid. The
17 annual permit shall not authorize any uses for which
18 additional fees are charged pursuant to subsections (b)
19 and (c) of this section. The annual permit shall be non-
20 transferable and the unlawful use thereof shall be punish-
21 able in accordance with regulations established pursuant
22 to subsection (e). The annual permit shall be available
23 for purchase at any such designated area.”

24 (d) Subsection (a) (2) is revised by deleting in the
25 first sentence “or who enter such an area by means other
26 than by private, noncommercial vehicle”.

1 (e) Subsection (a) (4) is amended by revising the
2 first two sentences to read: "The Secretary of the Interior
3 and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish procedures
4 providing for the issuance of a lifetime admission permit
5 (to be known as the 'Golden Age Passport') to any citizen
6 of, or person domiciled in, the United States sixty-two years
7 of age or older applying for such permit. Such permit shall
8 be nontransferable, shall be issued without charge, and shall
9 entitle the permittee and any person accompanying him in a
10 single, private, noncommercial vehicle, or alternatively, the
11 permittee and his spouse and children accompanying him
12 where entry to the area is by any means other than private,
13 noncommercial vehicle, to general admission into any area
14 designated pursuant to this subsection."

15 (f) In subsection (b) the first paragraph is revised
16 to read:

17 "(b) RECREATION USE FEES.—Each Federal agency
18 developing, administering, providing or furnishing at Fed-
19 eral expense, specialized outdoor recreation sites, facilities,
20 equipment, or services shall, in accordance with this subsec-
21 tion and subsection (d) of this section, provide for the col-
22 lection of daily recreation use fees at the place of use or any
23 reasonably convenient location: *Provided*, That in no event
24 shall there be a charge by any such agency for the use,
25 either singly or in any combination, of drinking water, way-

1 side exhibits, roads, overlook sites, visitors' centers, scenic
2 drives, toilet facilities, picnic tables, or boat ramps: *Pro-*
3 *vided, however,* That a fee shall be charged in picnic areas
4 or at boat ramps for the use of specialized facilities or serv-
5 ices such as, but not limited to, electric or gas grills, and
6 mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts: *Provided further,* That
7 in no event shall there be a charge for the use of any camp-
8 ground not having the following—tent or trailer spaces,
9 drinking water, access road, refuse containers, toilet facilities,
10 and simple devices for containing a campfire (where camp-
11 fires are permitted). Any Golden Age Passport permittee
12 shall be entitled upon presentation of such permit to utilize
13 such special recreation facilities at a rate of 50 per centum
14 of the established use fee."

15 (g) In subsection (b) paragraph "(1)" is deleted;
16 the paragraph designation "2" is redesignated as subsection
17 "(c) RECREATION PERMITS.—"; and subsequent subsec-
18 tions are redesignated accordingly.

19 (h) In new subsection (d) the second sentence is
20 revised to read: "Clear notice that a fee has been established
21 pursuant to this section shall be prominently posted at each
22 area and at appropriate locations therein and shall be in-
23 cluded in publications distributed at such areas."

24 (i) In new subsection (e) the first sentence is re-
25 vised to read: "In accordance with the provisions of this sec-

1 tion, the heads of appropriate departments and agencies may
2 prescribe rules and regulations for areas under their admin-
3 istration for the collection of any fee established pursuant to
4 this section."

5 (j) In new subsection (f) the first sentence is revised
6 to read as follows:

7 "(f) Except as otherwise provided by law or as may be
8 required by lawful contracts entered into prior to Septem-
9 ber 3, 1964, providing that revenues collected at particular
10 Federal areas shall be credited to specific purposes, all fees
11 which are collected by any Federal agency shall be covered
12 into a special account in the Treasury of the United States
13 to be administered in conjunction with, but separate from,
14 the revenues in the Land and Water Conservation Fund:
15 *Provided*, That the head of any Federal agency, under
16 such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, may
17 contract with any public or private entity to provide visitor
18 reservation services; and any such contract may provide
19 that the contractor shall be permitted to deduct a commis-
20 sion to be fixed by the agency head from the amount charged
21 the public for providing such services and to remit the net
22 proceeds therefrom to the contracting agency."

23 SEC. 2. Section 6(e) (1) of title I of the Land and
24 Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as

1 amended (16 U.S.C. 4601), is further amended by adding
2 at the end thereof the following:

3 "Whenever a State provides that the owner of a single-
4 family residence may, at his option, elect to retain a right of
5 use and occupancy for not less than six months from the date
6 of acquisition of such residence and such owner elects to re-
7 tain such a right, such owner shall be deemed to have waived
8 any benefits under sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 of the
9 Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisi-
10 tion Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894) and for the pur-
11 poses of those sections such owner shall not be considered a
12 displaced person as defined in section 101 (6) of that Act."

13 SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Land and Water Conservation
14 Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C.
15 4601-10a), is further amended by deleting in the first sen-
16 tence "section 6 (a) (1)" and substituting "section 7 (a)
17 (1)".

Passed the Senate March 29 (legislative day, March 28),
1974.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

93^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11921

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 12, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To amend certain provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 relating to the collection of fees in connection with the use of Federal areas for outdoor recreation purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first paragraph of section 4 (b) of the Land and
4 Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l-
5 6a) is amended to read as follows:
6 “(b) SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES.—Each Federal
7 agency developing, administering, or providing specialized
8 sites, facilities, equipment, or services relating to outdoor

1 recreation shall provide for the collection of special recrea-
2 tion use fees for the use of sites, facilities, equipment or serv-
3 ices furnished at Federal expense."

4 SEC. 2. Section 4 (a) (2) of the Land and Water Con-
5 servation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a) is
6 amended to read as follows:

7 "(2) Reasonable admission fees for a single visit at any
8 designated area shall be established by the administering
9 Secretary persons who choose not to purchase the annual
10 permit or who enter such area by means other than by
11 private, noncommercial vehicle."

93^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 13913

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 2, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 4 of the Land and Water Conservaation Fund
4 Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-
5 6a), is further amended as follows:

6 (a) The heading of the section is revised to read:
7 “ADMISSION AND USE FEES; ESTABLISHMENT AND
8 REGULATIONS”.

I

1 (b) Subsection (a) (1) is revised to read:

2 “(1) For admission into any such designated area, an
3 annual admission permit (to be known as the Golden Eagle
4 Passport) shall be available, for a fee of not more than \$10.
5 The permit holder and any person accompanying him in a
6 single, private, noncommercial vehicle, or alternatively, the
7 permit holder and his spouse, children, and parents accom-
8 panying him where entry to the area is by any means other
9 than private, noncommercial vehicle, shall be entitled to
10 general admission into any area designated pursuant to this
11 subsection. The annual permit shall be valid during the
12 calendar year for which the annual fee is paid. The annual
13 permit shall not authorize any uses for which additional
14 fees are charged pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of
15 this section. The annual permit shall be nontransferable and
16 the unlawful use thereof shall be punishable in accordance
17 with regulations established pursuant to subsection (e). The
18 annual permit shall be available for purchase at any area
19 designated pursuant to this subsection.”.

20 (c) In subsection (a) (2) delete in the first sentence
21 “or who enter such an area by means other than by pri-
22 vate, noncommercial vehicle”.

23 (d) In subsection (a) (4) revise the first two sen-
24 tences to read: “The Secretary of the Interior and the Sec-
25 retary of Agriculture shall establish procedures providing

1 for the issuance of a lifetime entrance permit (to be known
2 as the Golden Age Passport) to any citizen of, or person
3 domiciled in, the United States sixty-two years of age or
4 older applying for such permit. Such permit shall be non-
5 transferable, shall be issued without charge, and shall en-
6 title the permit holder and any person accompanying him
7 in a single, private, noncommercial vehicle, or alternatively,
8 the permit holder and his spouse, children, and parents
9 accompanying him where entry to the area is by any means
10 other than private, noncommercial vehicle, to general ad-
11 mission into any area designed pursuant to this subsection.”.

12 (e) In subsection (b) the first paragraph is revised to
13 read:

14 “(b) SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES.—Each Federal
15 agency developing, administering, or providing specialized
16 sites, facilities, equipment, or services related to outdoor
17 recreation shall, in accordance with subsection (d) of this
18 section, provide for the collection of special recreation use fees
19 for the use of sites, facilities, equipment, or services furnished
20 at Federal expense: *Provided*, That in no event shall there
21 be a charge for the use of picnic areas or boat ramps without
22 specialized facilities or services, drinking water, wayside ex-
23 hibits, roads, trails, overlook sites, visitors’ centers, scenic
24 drives, and toilet facilities, or the use of a combination of
25 these.”.

1 (f) In subsection (c) the second sentence is revised to
2 read: "Clear notice that a fee has been established pursuant
3 to this section shall be prominently posted at each area and
4 at appropriate locations therein and shall be included in pub-
5 lications distributed at such areas."

6 (g) In subsection (d) the first sentence is revised to
7 read: "In accordance with the provisions of this section, the
8 heads of appropriate departments and agencies may prescribe
9 rules and regulations for areas under their administration for
10 the collection of any fee established pursuant to this section."

11 (h) In subsection (e) the first sentence is revised by
12 changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding
13 the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the head of any Fed-
14 eral agency, under such terms and conditions as he deems
15 appropriate, may contract with any public or private entity
16 to provide visitor reservation services; and any such contract
17 may provide that the contractor shall be permitted to deduct
18 a commission to be fixed by the agency head from the
19 amount charged the public for providing such services and to
20 remit the net proceeds therefrom to the contracting agency."

21 SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Land and Water Conservation
22 Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C.
23 4601-10a) is further amended by deleting in the first sen-
24 tence "section 6(a)(1)" and substituting "section 7(a)
25 (1)".

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1974.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to the request of your Committee for the views of this Department on S. 2844, a bill "To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes", as passed by the Senate March 29.

We recommend the enactment of S. 2844.

Public Law 93-81, enacted in August 1973, amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act in a way that severely restricted the number of campgrounds for which use fees may be charged by Federal agencies. Campgrounds at which fees may be charged must now have "flush restrooms, showers reasonably available, access and circulatory roads, sanitary disposal stations reasonably available, visitor protection control, designated tent or trailer spaces, refuse containers and potable water". We interpret Public Law 93-81 as requiring all these facilities to be furnished at Federal expense.

The effect of this provision has been substantial loss of revenues by the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Army Corps of Engineers and other agencies which had been collecting campground fees at campgrounds which no longer qualify for fee collection. We estimate the total loss at between \$7.2 million and \$8.2 million per year.

We believe that there is considerable support among campground users for the concept of paying reasonable fees for use of campgrounds; these users for the most part appear to be willing to pay fees if this will contribute to availability of well-maintained campgrounds. As you know, most fees collected under the fee program are funneled back into outdoor recreation functions of the collection agency under section 4(e) of the Act. In addition, the sudden availability of free campgrounds has affected visitation at state, local and private campgrounds, and has interfered with planning of state and local governments and with income normally received by private areas.

Section 1 of S. 2844 will meet these problems by permitting use fees to be charged at Federal campgrounds containing specialized outdoor recreation sites, facilities, equipment, or services furnished at Federal expense. The bill would take the approach of establishing a minimal level of campground development which must be present before a use fee may be charged by prohibiting fees at campgrounds not having tent or trailer spaces, drinking water, access roads, refuse containers, toilet facilities, and simple devices for containing a campfire (where campfires are permitted).

With respect to facilities other than campgrounds, the bill deletes the test established in Public Law 93-81 that there be no charge for facilities which "virtually all visitors might reasonably be expected to utilize", and replaces this with a specific list of facilities for which charges may not be made whether the facilities are used singly or in any combination. Under S. 2844 charges could not be made for picnic areas or boat ramps unless they contained specialized facilities or services; and charges could not be made in any event for drinking water, wayside exhibits, roads, overlook sites, visitors' centers, scenic drives, and toilet facilities.

Section 1 of S. 2844 also deals with several other issues involving the charging of fees under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act where either clarification of existing authority or new authority is needed. Specifically, the section:

1. Permits Federal agencies to collect user fees at the place of use or at a place other than where the facility is provided as long as the collection point is reasonably convenient to the collecting agency and the public.

2. Clarifies that the Golden Eagle and Golden Age passports allow entry by means other than private, noncommercial vehicle, and may be used by parties entering, for example, on foot, by commercial bus, or by horseback. This clarification will place less reliance on automobile access in conformity with the policy of the agencies involved.

3. Provides that Golden Eagle passports can be purchased at any of the designated areas where they may be used and deletes the requirement that they

be available at specified types of post offices. This amendment will result in significant economies in administration and should not result in any inconvenience to purchasers.

4. Clarifies that the prohibition in section 4(a) on charging admission fees at federally owned areas (other than National Park and Forest System areas) applies only to those operated and maintained by a Federal agency. Outdoor recreation sites in Federal areas are now leased to a variety of non-Federal public and private entities and are operated and/ maintained by them. The Fund Act does not prevent these entities from collecting admission fees.

5. Provides that the Golden Age Passport will be a lifetime passport, rather than one which must be reissued annually. There appears to be no reason to require reissuance once adequate proof of age has been furnished.

6. Requires the recipients of the Golden Age Passports to be citizens of the United States, or persons domiciled in the United States.

7. Clarifies the status of fees charged under section 4(b) (2), which authorizes issuance of special recreation permits for uses such as group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicles, and other specialized recreation uses. The bill would make it clear that these are a separate category of fees which, unlike special recreation use fees, may be charged even in the absence of specialized facilities, sites, equipment, or services.

8. Amends section 4(e) so it is clear the fees covered into the special account in the Treasury under that section apply only to fees collected by a Federal agency and not to fees collected by a non-Federal entity that operates and/or maintains a recreation facility at its own expense.

9. Gives the head of any Federal agency the authority to contract with any public or private entity to provide visitor reservation services and to permit the contractor to deduct a commission, fixed by the agency head, from the amount charged the public before remitting the net proceeds to the contracting agency. This amendment is needed to clarify authority to contract for reservation services in this manner.

Section 2 of S. 2844 amends the State grant provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This section provides that whenever a State uses Fund monies to acquire recreation lands and permits the owner of a single family residence, at his option, to retain a right to use and occupancy for not less than 6 months and if the owner elects to do so, he shall be deemed to have waived replacement housing benefits and advisory assistance under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. That Act was primarily intended to ease the impact of acquisitions under federally assisted urban renewal and highway programs where land owners were forced to vacate their property immediately and should therefore be assured of replacement housing. When an owner of recreational land wishes to retain use and occupancy rights for a significant period of time, we believe a governmental agency should not be required to provide him with replacement housing at the end of his retained term.

Section 3 of S. 2844 makes a perfecting amendment in section 9 of the Fund Act, changing the reference to area, for which funds may be obligated under section 9 from areas listed in section 6(a) (1) to areas listed in section 7(a) (1). This corrects an obvious error in a section reference.

In view of the continuing substantial losses of revenues from Federal campgrounds and the adverse competition to private campgrounds, we strongly support the purposes of Senate-passed S. 2844, and we urge prompt and favorable consideration of the bill.

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

Sincerely yours,

NATHANIEL REED,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. I also have a letter from Hon. John Rarick with a letter addressed to Mr. Rarick from Hon. James Cleveland. Without objection they will be placed in the record at this point.

Hearing none, so ordered.

[The letters follow:]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1974.

HON. ROY TAYLOR, *Chairman,*
Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation,
House Committee on the Interior.

DEAR ROY: I am referring the attached letter from our colleague Jim Cleveland because his remarks are addressed to legislation before your subcommittee.

It is my understanding that you expect to hold hearings on this legislation this coming Monday and Tuesday.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1974.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
Chairman, Forests Subcommittee,
1525 Longworth HOB,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Last year in a moment of misguided exuberance, Congress abolished user fees on facilities in our national forests. The Senate did this to us by adding it to a House passed bill eliminating user fees for Corps of Engineer operated day-use facilities.

I happen to believe that user fees in national forests are excellent and should be restored. For one thing, I think that a lack of user fees causes a lack of respect for the forests. For another, the fees provide money to pay for the services that the people are receiving. As yet, another reason, I believe that user fees encourage the development of privately owned facilities adjacent to the forests. A final concern is that a total lack of fees will encourage large numbers of people to spend extended periods of time in the forests, thereby straining facilities and lowering the rate of turnover in users.

Based on the above, I would deeply appreciate your subcommittee looking into the situation, with the hope that you will take action so that user fees can be restored before the summer season.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, I want to point out that this is not a new subject before this subcommittee, even though some of our new members may not be as familiar with it as some of the others are. We have struggled with the issue since the Land and Water Conservation Fund became effective in 1965. Most of us thought we had resolved the controversies 2 years ago when Public Law 92-347 was enacted. Unfortunately, some agencies chose to ignore the legislative history and the intent of Congress in interpreting that act, and a new set of problems emerged.

Last year the Public Works Committee addressed this issue, and we thought that the main thrust of this committee's recommendation would be to make certain that fees would be charged only for facilities which required a substantial Federal investment.

Now, when this legislation passed the House it applied only to the Corps of Engineers; it was finally adopted in such a way as to apply to all Federal agencies. This legislation became Public Law 93-81 and due to many unforeseen complications led to a complete disruption of the user fee-collection system.

This committee has always contended that recreationists who receive a special and exclusive benefit at Federal expense should help to pay the costs of providing the facilities and services from which they benefit. To that end, we have provided for reasonable charges for developed campgrounds, for sophisticated boat launching ramps, for bath houses and for other special facilities which would normally not be used by almost every visitor to a Federal outdoor recreation area.

By the strict interpretation of Public Law 93-81, the Federal agencies have virtually eliminated the collection of all campground fees, even though these same agencies generally desire to impose a fee structure on these special facilities, and even though the general public seems to favor a reasonable charge for the use of them.

Now, I frankly regret that it is necessary for us to face this legislation again and rewrite something which I thought had been placed in pretty good condition 2 years ago. I do want to be convinced before we adopt this legislation that the various agencies who administer it will show good faith in this thing and will make every effort to carry out the intent of Congress, and will make every effort to see that it works, and works effectively.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Regula, who couldn't be here this morning, addressed a letter of March 14 to Ronald H. Walker, the Director of the National Park Service; and the substance of the letter was about the campground reservation system and charges. He has asked—and I ask unanimous consent—that his letter to Mr. Walker be placed in the record, and Mr. Walker's reply be placed in the record, also.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection it is so ordered.

[The letter to Ronald H. Walker and reply, are as follows:]

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1974.

Mr. RONALD H. WALKER, *Director,*
National Park Service,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RON: I am interested in the comment in your February 25, 1974, press release regarding your intention to discontinue the campground reservation system in the parks unless the campground user fees are reinstated by the Congress.

It is my understanding and impression that the pilot campground reservation system you inaugurated last summer was well received by the public, and was considered very successful by the Service and the contractor. It seems a shame that such a successful endeavor would be dropped purely for lack of authority to coincidentally charge user fees for the campground use.

Considering that the reservation system applies principally to those campgrounds where demand often exceeds supply, it would be my suspicion that the great majority of campers would prefer to pay a small fee to reserve a campsite and have the feeling of assurance and security that this buys rather than to pay nothing and be confronted with the apprehensions and hassles of the former first come—first served system where campers were often turned away with no place to go. As long as the reservation service fee is nominal, I fail to see where the camping public would prefer that the reservation system be discontinued, whether user fees are charged or not, particularly since campers are not forced to use the system since many campsites are still available on a first come—first served basis.

I would appreciate knowing more of your rationale for discontinuing this program, as I am not yet convinced that so doing is in the best interests of the camping public.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. REGULA,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1974.

HON. RALPH S. REGULA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REGULA: Thank you for your letter concerning the campground system.

As you noted, the evaluation of last year's pilot program termed it a success and recommended that the system be expanded to additional park areas. However, when Public Law 93-81 was signed into law on August 1, 1973, the reservation system in operation at that time showed an immediate increase in the number of campers with reservations who failed to appear for their campsites. At Everglades National Park, which was operated on a reservation basis throughout this winter without camping fees, we have experienced a "no-show" rate as high as 50 percent. This in part was due to the energy crisis which affected the east coast during this period.

With this in mind, we realize that we cannot operate a reservation system without authority to charge camping fees. As long as the public has to pay a fee to reserve free campsites, the system will seem unfair. We will not reinstate a reservation system unless pending legislation to restore camping fees is enacted by the Congress.

At this time, however, it appears likely that the necessary legislation will be enacted, enabling us to again collect camping fees and establish an expanded reservation system. We are presently proceeding with measures necessary to make this reservation system available to the public, when and if the necessary congressional action takes place.

We appreciate knowing of your interest in the reservation system.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD H. WALKER,
Director.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, this morning, what we want to do is have some oversight discussions with regard to the campground reservation systems, and in regard to any lease of campground concessions.

Our first witness this morning is our colleague on the committee, the Honorable John Dellenback. We welcome our colleague as a witness before his own committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the other members of the subcommittee very much for this opportunity to testify before you today.

I wish to express my support for the principles embodied in S. 2844 and H.R. 13913. I have not had a chance to read in detail the bill to which the chairman has just made reference, introduced by our colleague; so I don't know the points of distinction between that bill and the bill to which I do make reference in this testimony. But since S. 2844 and H.R. 13913 are almost identical in thrust and direction, I will primarily refer to H.R. 13913, which I introduced, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide for the collection of special recreation use fees at certain Federal

recreation areas. This bill would permit reinstating user fees of many federally operated recreation areas, thus helping to provide or reinstate collection of the increased Federal revenue necessary and badly needed for the maintenance of existing Federal recreation areas and the acquisition of new public areas.

On August 1, 1973, Public Law 93-81 went into effect providing that no fee could be charged for the use of certain recreation areas unless certain facilities were provided. The enactment of this law resulted in the virtual elimination of user fees at Federal campgrounds.

In my own State of Oregon, the Siuslaw National Forest, for an example, which contains the Dunes National Recreation Area recorded recreation use receipts of \$30,200 in fiscal year 1972 and of \$38,009 in fiscal year 1973, as compared with \$11,800 received in fiscal year 1974 before Public Law 93-81 went into effect. The drop in revenue will be even sharper this year if Congress does not enact legislation along the lines of H.R. 13913. When this effect is multiplied to cover recreation revenues nationwide, we can get some idea of the serious economic consequences the passage of Public Law 94-81 has had. If the present situation continues, it could mean a nationwide total yearly revenue loss of what the Senate bill report indicated would be at least \$7 million which is designated for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

And I might state parenthetically at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I have asked the Library of Congress to give me an estimate of revenue losses to the Federal Government, and the report under date of October 16, 1973, from the Library of Congress said, "Passage of 93-81 has had serious economic and administrative consequences. Estimates of revenue losses to the Federal Government range as high as \$26 million, for instance." I don't know which is the accurate figure, the figure which appears in the Senate report of the bill, or the figure that was reported to me by the Library of Congress. In any event, we are dealing here with a number of millions of dollars badly needed in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In addition to monetary impact, the Dunes National Recreation Area officials, again to use that as an example, have informed me that the curtailment of user fees has resulted in an increase in "squatting," where one user monopolizes a site. The imposition of a nominal user fee should help relieve this practice and encourage the desired turnover in the use of recreation sites.

Both H.R. 13913 and S. 2844 would reestablish user fees by listing exempted facilities and services for which no user fees may be charged if used either singly or in combination, while at the same time retaining the criteria already established in the basic Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to determine user fees for non-exempted sites. H.R. 13913 differs from S. 2844 in this section in that it lists "trails" as one of the exempted facilities for which user fees cannot be charged while S. 2844 does not. Since trails are such an essential part of almost any recreation area, it would certainly be undesirable to make them subject to a user fee. H.R. 13913 provides for the collection of special recreation use fees while S. 2844

provides for the collection of daily recreation use fees. The term "special" provides more flexibility as to the fee schedule, allowing agencies to collect fees on a seasonal or multivisit as well as on a daily basis.

That the use of Golden Eagle Passports is not restricted to persons entering an area by single, noncommercial vehicle, but that they can also be used by persons using other means, such as horse, foot, bicycle, or commercial vehicle, is clarified by H.R. 13913.

In addition, H.R. 13913 modifies the present law by replacing the term "person purchasing" with the term "permit holder" to acknowledge the possibility that a Golden Eagle Passport may be issued in the name of someone other than the purchaser, such as might take place in the case of a gift. It would also amend the present law to provide that the Golden Age Passport be a lifetime passport rather than one which is issued annually. Since these are issued free-of-charge to persons over 62 years and older, this change will eliminate much of the administrative burden placed on both the permit holder and the administering agencies.

Finally, H.R. 13913 gives the head of the administering Federal agency the authority to contact with any public agency to provide visitor reservation services.

The elimination of user fees last year as a result of the passage of Public Law 93-81 has led to a substantial cutback in Federal revenues which, if continued, could eventually result in a decreased availability of recreation areas—something none of us would like to see happen. I urge the subcommittee to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation in order to correct the present situation.

Once again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Mr. TAYLOR. We thank our colleague for his statement. Am I correct in stating that H.R. 13913 and S. 2844 were at one time very similar, or identical; and S. 2844 has been changed by Senate amendments since that time?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether that is indeed the case. I didn't go back to look at S. 2844 in its original form. Essentially I am not at issue with S. 2844, the points that I have made reference to in my testimony are not the major thrust of either piece of legislation; there are some issues which I, quite frankly, have discussed with the staff of this committee; and before introducing my bill, I made what I think, are some improvements to what is in S. 2844.

But, the basic thrust of both these pieces of legislation, Mr. Chairman, are very similar, they are reaching in a very similar direction; the differences are minor, compared to the similarities.

Mr. TAYLOR. Once again, the difference that you attempt to show by special recreation use fees, rather than daily recreation use fees—

Mr. DELLENBACK. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there may be times that the agency administering a given recreation area might want to issue a weekly fee, or a seasonal fee. Under the term "special" recreation, which I have used, special recreation use fees they could do that; whereas if we have the more stringent language

of daily recreation use fees, it would seem to me we do not have that flexibility. They will have to do it day, by day, by day. Now, that may be the normal way of utilizing these fees, but it seems to me they could still do that where it's desirable if we use the term "special" recreation use fees, and they would have greater flexibility in the administration of the given recreation area where there might be reasons why they would be there on a monthly, or weekly, or multivisits.

Mr. TAYLOR. As far as entrance is concerned, the Golden Eagle would take care of that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That's right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, user fees, thinking of camping, which would be one illustration, do we desire to encourage users to stay over long periods of time?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman because, again, one of the things that I pointed out in the beginning, in the other part of my testimony, that this squatting is apparently taking place in increased degree. They are finding that some people will come in, and without any sort of a user fee, reach toward monopolization of given recreation areas.

I'm not saying that would prove to be desirable. I am just saying that the use of the phrase "special" would permit some greater flexibility. I have not analyzed all of the recreation areas administered by the Park Service, or the Forest Service, or the other agencies which administer this kind of operation, the Army Corps.

All I was trying to do in using the broader phrase was to say there might be special uses in recreation areas around the country, with which I am not familiar, where it would be hamstringing if we insisted that it be daily. There may be some far back in the country where one goes into the bush and stays there for a week, and there is no reason why he shouldn't be able to do it on a weekly basis. I don't know that, Mr. Chairman, and I was really reaching for what could be a more flexible utilization, which would permit the administration of a given area to administer the area wisely.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the legislation was passed 2 years ago one of our problems in administering campgrounds was that some people went in and stayed, and stayed, and tried to spend the summer. And under the original interpretation of some agencies, if they had a Golden Eagle passport, they were permitted to stay there week after week.

Are there any other questions by anybody?

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I will quote you in your earlier remarks, which speak very soundly, in talking about distinctions between entry fees and user fees.

We are not talking about supplanting the Golden Eagle; we are not talking about doing away with the Golden Age, we are not talking about that in these bills. But, you have voiced it very soundly, Mr. Chairman, namely, there is a very real difference between some kinds of recreation areas, and utilization of facilities which have been put in at public expense, which are in short supply. If somebody comes in and monopolizes it, that means a great many other people don't have any chance of benefit.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct. Any questions? Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. SEBELIUS. You spoke of the Dunes National Recreation Area, do you know if at any given time it is overflowing, so that you cannot accommodate all that are coming?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes, Mr. Sebelius. This is really a very fine recreation area in the middle of the Oregon coast, and has some camping facilities, which are in short supply. When one person is permitted to go in, or family is permitted to go in and use it, that means that there are other people who will just have to pass by and not have a chance to use it.

Mr. SEBELIUS. And very briefly, do you know any comparison, say, in fiscal 1973 when we got to \$38,000 and the next fiscal year, when the fee was added, and now it's off?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I do not know the difference as to how many more people used it in one year than the other; so, I can't give you the answer. That is a very perceptive question.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Well, we might get the answer to that later, thank you.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The Dunes Recreation Area, I might call to the attention of my colleague, is under the administration of the Department of Agriculture, so I would suggest that those witnesses might be able to answer that question.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Steelman?

Mr. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question, two questions, actually, of my colleague. I am interested, philosophically, if user fees are appropriate, given the fact that the taxpayer paid once in the construction and operation; and why, following that, should he pay again?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Steelman, it's a situation of facilities. Take a State like my own, which I know best, there are not enough facilities to take care of all the people who would like to use them. At the height of the camping season along the Oregon coast you find that people without reservations are unable to stay. So, it's not a fact of trying to collect from the user in the way that would be profitable for the Federal Government. Frankly, the user fees that are charged in those places don't come close to carrying the capital investment return.

But, it's a case, really, of where it is a technique, or a tool which will make the use available to more people. Since they are going to be chuck-a-luck full at any time, the question is whether the one who happens to get there first can use them for a long time; or whether he can stay there one, or two, or three of whatever the time in that particular recreation area is, and then give somebody else a chance to use it. Somebody, I might say, who equally paid for the installation of the facility in the first place, but who was blocked by the fact that some people come there for a long period of time and make it a home away from home.

Mr. STEELMAN. So, you want to more or less ration the use.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Spread out the use; and not impose on a person that uses the facility the full cost of the facility.

Mr. STEELMAN. So, the revenue loss is not the major consideration.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The revenue loss is a significant loss when one

has done away with it in its entirety. The squatting is merely one of the options of that. And we go back to the question of Mr. Taylor, the chairman, on the difference between daily uses and special uses.

If you are going to charge the person that is there something of a user fee, the question still exists, do you then place a limitation on it. Do you state there shall be 1 week, or 2, or 3 limitation, as opposed to saying, you can stay just as long as you like.

So, there are two different issues involved in this bill; one is the loss of revenue, which is a significant loss in total; and the other one, is there some way of devising a method of spreading it out, so that a broader number of people can use the facilities.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, the loss in revenue doesn't seem to be that significant since the fund will increase over the next 5 years. You have been here longer than I and know how this fund operates, and the difference between property sales and these user fees over the life of the fund, have not been an overly significant portion. For example, in fiscal 1972, when the fund was highest, the surplus property sales amounted to \$38 million, field tax \$25 million; and the user fees \$9 million. Well, it was \$10 million in 1971, but with the exception of those 2 years, the highest it has ever been from user fees was \$6 million, as compared to \$25, or \$35 million in these other 2 years.

So, my point is, that if revenue is important to you in your rationale, I don't think it has to be important now when we can expect increases in the receipts; and that could be why more people use it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I should know this clear line of distinction and I must apologize that I do not, Mr. Steelman, but I will make it a point to learn it before I sit up there and deal with this piece of legislation.

I'm not sure that this would not be a question to put to the Park Service, the Army Corps, and to the Forest Service as to whether or not there are not some of these dollars used for operating purposes. It is my understanding that there is some sort of blend of those two, so that there is actually a difficulty in maintaining these facilities because of the drop of revenue, as well as the matter of acquisition. I am not sure where that line is drawn. That is once again a perceptive question and I should know the answer to it. I do not know the answer, but I will find out the answer.

Mr. STEELMAN. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are there any further questions?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Dellenback, on page 3 of your bill, on line 20 it states, "Provided, that in no event shall there be a charge for the use of picnic areas or boat ramps without specialized facilities or service, drinking water"—I think there should be a semicolon to separate that part from the rest of the phrase?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Those are meant to be not a case of picnic areas without drinking water; these are meant to be picnic areas without special facilities.

Mr. MARTIN. My question really is as to what you mean by specialized facilities. First, in the Senate bill there is a reference to

mechanical and hydraulic boat lifts, electric and gas grills. Is that what you are talking about?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Those are some of the types of things.

Mr. MARTIN. I assume that some of the places rent boats.

Mr. DELLENBACK. It is customary in my area to have boat ramps without mechanical aid. Where it's a case of a cement ramp going down into the water, and a trailer, or car furnishing the motive power to insert and withdraw. This kind of boat ramp shouldn't be charged for, in my opinion.

Mr. MARTIN. Do you think there should be a charge for rent?

Mr. DELLENBACK. For use of that ramp?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. No, not in this kind of situation. Not when it's a strip of cement and there is no appreciable wear and tear, no fee should be charged. If, on the other hand there is equipment which will wear out with a given number of uses, then I can understand there should be a reasonable charge.

Mr. MARTIN. That bill makes that distinction, and as I recall, that was one of the controversies last year, if people launch their boat themselves.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That is intended to be covered by this kind of language. Say we have a picnic area where you have nothing but a fire circle with grass around it, that's one thing; when you have an electric grill, or some kind of facility there that wear out with utilization, that's another kind of thing. This bill makes a distinction between the two.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from the Virgin Islands.

Mr. DeLUGO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to commend our colleague for his statement and the philosophy regarding user fees. I would just like to comment, I had the real pleasure, two summers ago, for a guy that lived most of his life on a small island, to hitch up a trailer to my car and put my family in it, and go across this great country of ours, visiting the national parks. It was a great experience, and I used my Golden Eagle Pass—is it Golden Eagle?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman does not qualify for the golden age, unless there is an awful lot of hair touchup.

[Laughter.]

Mr. DeLUGO. We planned to go all the way across the country to California, Colorado, Arizona; and we were planning on coming back by way of Oregon. But unfortunately my youngest daughter, when we got to the Grand Canyon of all things got appendicitis and we spent a week in Arizona.

But, these parks are just great, it was a great experience for my family; and I tend to agree with the gentleman's philosophy that we have to keep people moving, so that one person, or one family doesn't simply monopolize one particular place, a particular site in one of the parks.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am sure if my colleague went in the rush season, there were areas along the way where he might have had dif-

facility getting facilities, not only in the Northwest, but in other parts. That is what we are reaching for. The public's dollars are well invested in these facilities. And I think this subcommittee should be commended for what they have done in advancing this kind of facility in the country. But it isn't fair if we don't give everybody a chance to go in. That is what we are reaching for.

Mr. TAYLOR. We thank our colleague for his contribution.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has been suggested that we might let the witnesses that represent the Federal agencies join Mr. Watt and give all their statements; and then we could ask questions, individually or collectively.

With that in mind we might ask Brig. Gen. James L. Kelly, the Deputy Director for Civil Works, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I think we would like that, also the gentlemen from the National Forest Service and the National Park Service.

Mr. TAYLOR. Russell E. Dickenson, Deputy Director of the National Park Service; Thomas C. Nelson, Deputy Chief, Forest Service; and Stanley W. Hulett, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is here.

Mr. WATT. We are glad to have them here.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are there any other names you would like to hear? [Laughter.]

Mr. HULETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that Mr. Watt's statement is very, very short; he says in effect he's for it, but he doesn't say what he's for. I would suggest when you complete your prepared statement, or the remarks that you had in mind, that we take this bill section by section—by this bill I mean the Senate bill—and tell us exactly what it does; perhaps making some comparison between here and the law we enacted 2 years ago, or changes involved.

STATEMENT OF JAMES G. WATT

Mr. WATT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate the opportunity to present ourselves collectively to the committee.

The bill before the committee is one that is the result of many, many hours of negotiation between the several agencies now before you; and we can say that we do agree on all points and are most appreciative of the fact that this committee would meet in this timely manner to consider this bill which we hope will be acted upon favorably and in a timely manner that will allow us to have it fully implemented for this season's vacationing public.

So, we are hopeful that we might be able to have this in law by May 1. So, collectively, we thank you for holding hearings in such fashion, and quickly after the Senate enactment. We will present testimony on behalf of the administration, and if you have questions, we will be glad to resolve them collectively and individually, so we won't have a misunderstanding as happened last year. We share your views, Mr. Chairman, that we will hopefully dispose of this once and for all, and maybe with a bill such as this we can do that.

To proceed with the very short, 2-page statement that we have, Mr. Chairman, I'll read from it.

In view of the continuing substantial losses of revenue from Federal campgrounds and the adverse competition to private campgrounds, we strongly support the principal purpose of S. 2844 to reestablish campground fees. We urge prompt and favorable consideration of the Senate-passed bill in view of the imminence of the 1974 recreation season.

As you know, Public Law 93-81 of August 1, 1973, has been interpreted to restrict severely the number of Federal campgrounds where special recreation use fees may be charged. In the absence of an immediate legislative remedy, there will be an annual loss of more than \$7 million in Federal recreation fee collections.

Section 1 of S. 2844 would alleviate this continuing substantial loss of revenue by permitting use fees to be charged at Federal campgrounds containing specialized outdoor recreation sites, facilities, equipment, or services furnished at Federal expense.

We believe there is considerable support among campground users for the concept of paying reasonable fees if this will contribute to the availability of well-maintained campgrounds. As you know, most moneys collected under the free program are funneled back into outdoor recreation functions of the collecting agency under section 4(e) of the Fund Act.

The bill makes both the Golden Eagle and Golden Age Passports available at the Federal recreation areas where they may be used. This will avoid the high cost and inconvenience of distributing the Golden Eagle Passports at U.S. post offices, as required by existing law. We are eager that a record be established at this hearing which will indicate that the committee also agrees with terminating the costly distribution of the Golden Age Passports at post offices. With enactment of S. 2844 the record will be clear that the visitor will be conveniently served by availability of both the Golden Eagle and Golden Age Passports at the Federal recreation areas.

The remaining provisions of the bill are explained in detail in the Departmental report.

In conclusion, we again emphasize our strong support of the purpose of Senate-passed S. 2844 and urge its prompt enactment. We shall be glad to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. Chairman, you indicated the desire, and I think it's appropriate that we spend some time outlining what this bill will do. The bill would amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds; that's the principal thrust of this bill. If I may highlight this very briefly, so you can nail me down on it for the record.

Second, it approaches this use fee program so that we may list those facilities for which charges will not be made; emphasizing that there will be a use fee for those special campground areas where the additional investment is made, so that the cost of those will be paid in part by the beneficiary using it. That is the major thrust of this bill.

In addition the bill would allow for the collection of those user fees to be taken at a place close by and convenient to the facility being used, so that the administration costs don't overshadow the revenues to be realized.

Point three, the legislation would enlarge the coverage and clarify the language so that the Golden Eagle and the Golden Age Passports would allow entry by means other than in automobiles. We have experienced situations where hikers, and bike riders, and the like had difficulty in access; and this clarifies that point.

It also would foreclose, or limit the post office—excuse me, it also would terminate the relationship that we now have with the Post Office Department, so that we could sell the Golden Eagle Passports, and distribute for free the Golden Age Passports at the recreation site, rather than going through the costly, and burdensome, and inconvenient distribution of these passports through the post offices around the country.

The bill would also clarify the language so that fees could be charged by those operating concessions within Federal areas. Frequently we find, particularly in the case of the Corps of Engineers and the Park Service that State and local interests, or private interests are running facilities; and in the existing statute there is some confusion as to whether or not fees can be charged for nonfederally owned and operated facilities. That needs to be clarified, and we are recommending that the answer would be yes, fees can be charged by non-Federal interests operating their facilities for recreational purposes at Federal sites.

One change of major impact, but not of major significance would be making the Golden Age Passport a lifetime passport. Once a citizen has established that he is 62, the likelihood of that changing to a lower number is very slight.

Mr. TAYLOR. You don't get any younger.

Mr. WATT. No; he's not getting any younger, of course some of us are trying to find out how that might be established. But, once it has been issued, it will be a lifetime permit.

It would limit the existing law to limit the issuance of the free Golden Age Passports to citizens only. Under the existing law we have given the Golden Age Passport to all persons asking for it.

An additional change would be to clarify the law, so there would be an understanding for the fees of special events, caravans of cars, conventions, a Boy Scout pack, or some special fees for those situations, or events that might come up.

The bill then makes special provision for the reservation services that were initiated last year by the National Park Service; and I think Mr. Dickenson will want to comment on that. The indications were that this reservation system was going to be very effective and very beneficial; but because of the interpretation of the new law last year, that was terminated; and this would clearly allow for that.

The last general comment I will make, the bill also will make special provisions with regard to the Relocation Act, and would require that whenever a State uses Land or Water Conservation Fund money to acquire recreation land and permits, the owner of a

single-family residence at his option would retain a right of use and occupancy for not less than 6 months; and if he elected to do so he would be deemed to have waived replacement housing benefits and advisory assistance under the Uniform Relocation Property Policies Act of 1970.

Mr. Chairman, that outlines the major provisions of the bill, and some commentary on them. I recognize the comments were very general, we will be glad to address specifics.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Watt. We might as well let the others make their statements, and then have discussion.

The next witness will be Brig. Gen. James L. Kelly.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES L. KELLY

General KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think he had better move up to the table where we can see him a little better.

General KELLY. I am the Deputy Director of civil works at the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to testify on S. 2844, a bill as it was passed in the Senate on March 29, 1974, which would amend certain of the recreation fee provisions of section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended.

The most recent amendment to this act was Public Law 93-81, approved August 1, 1973, which established rather broad prohibitions on the authority of the Corps of Engineers to charge fees for the use of most of the public campgrounds developed and operated by the corps under its civil works authorities. The substantial impact on the corps' outdoor recreation program that would result from the enactment of S. 2844 is that the aforementioned prohibitions on the corps' authority to charge reasonable camping fees would be repealed.

We believed at the time of enactment of Public Law 93-81, and we continue to believe, that its prohibitions on our ability to charge camping fees are detrimental to the orderly and equitable operation of our campground program. For example, during the first part of the 1973 recreation season, the corps charged use fees at 725 family camping areas under authorities in existence at that time. When Public Law 93-81 was approved on August 1, 1973, our fee program was immediately reduced to 99 family camping areas and three group camping areas which met the new criteria.

The corps is presently proposing a fee program for the 1974 recreation season under the continuing criteria of Public Law 93-81 which we anticipate will include charges at approximately 150 camping areas. This increase in the number of eligible fee areas, as compared to the 1973 total number of eligible fee areas immediately after approval of Public Law 93-81, results from our upgrading of certain areas during fiscal year 1974, which were not included in the 1973 program. However, if S. 2844 is enacted into law, we anticipate that our 1974 recreation fee program would include about 700 to 750 family camping areas at which campground users would pay

reasonable fees as their fair contribution to the continued availability and good operation and maintenance of such campgrounds. Accordingly, the Department of the Army supports the enactment of S. 2844 in its impact on our authority to charge fees for the use of campgrounds.

I will briefly mention certain other provisions of this bill which we support because they would provide needed clarification of the fee provisions of the existing act.

The enactment of S. 2844 would not change the existing prohibition of the corps' charging any entrance or admission fees to its recreation areas. It would, however, eliminate some confusion which has arisen relative to this prohibition by clarifying the act to provide that we are authorized to charge out user fees for campgrounds at their place of use, or any mutually convenient location to the using public and the corps.

We also believe that it is noteworthy that enactment of S. 2844 would affirm that the act's restrictions on the charging of recreation fees at Federal areas and its special provisions for the disposition and use of resultant revenues are not incumbent on non-Federal interests who lease outdoor recreation areas and facilities at Federal projects. The Corps of Engineers has leased many such areas and facilities at corps projects to a variety of non-Federal public or private interests for their use in accordance with conditions approved by the Secretary of the Army. These non-Federal interests often have a proven need to charge reasonable admission and use fees at these leased areas and to use the resulting revenues for their legitimate purposes which include helping to defray the expenses of their continuing responsibilities of replacement, operation, and maintenance of the areas.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will conclude my prepared statement by noting that enactment of section 2 of S. 2844 would provide for a special circumstance under which certain benefits of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 might be waived by affected landowners. We interpret this special waiver provision to apply to the Department of Interior's financial assistance program to qualifying States for State acquisition of recreation properties. Therefore, this provision should not have any impact on the land acquisition authorities and policies of the Corps of Engineers.

I will be pleased to respond to any questions you may have at a later time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, General Kelly.

We will now hear Russell E. Dickenson, Deputy Director of the National Park Service.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL E. DICKENSON

Mr. DICKENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The National Park Service supports and endorses the testimony of Director Watt; and at your request I'm prepared to testify regarding the reservation system, and the proposed plan for operation of campgrounds by concessions, whenever you are ready for that. Otherwise we support the testimony of Director Watt.

- Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you. You do not have any written statement?
- Mr. DICKENSON. No, sir. The written statement, Mr. Chairman, deals with the two other subjects which you wish to cover.
- Mr. TAYLOR. Thomas C. Nelson, Deputy Chief, Forest Service.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. NELSON

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. The Department of Agriculture appreciates the opportunity to present its views on the bills being considered today which would provide amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

Of the three bills, S. 2844, H.R. 11921, and H.R. 13913, the Department of Agriculture recommends that S. 2844, as recently passed by the Senate, be enacted.

Most of the amendments contained in S. 2844 are technical in nature and would provide needed clarification of existing provisions. One amendment, however, would considerably change the authority of Federal agencies to collect recreation use fees. This amendment is contained in subsection 1(f). It would amend subsection 4(b) of the act to revise the itemized list of outdoor recreation sites and facilities for which use fees may not be charged. We consider this amendment to be of paramount need for restoring a viable recreation use fee program on the national forests. While the other bills, H.R. 11921 and H.R. 13913 would also provide some similar amendments and address the problem relating to the collection of recreation use fees, the Department prefers the language of S. 2844.

The present provisions of subsection 4(b) of the act set very precise and very high standards of development as prerequisites for charging recreation use fees for campgrounds and boat ramps. Additionally, a prohibition is placed on charging fees at any picnic area regardless of the level of facilities or services. These standards were implemented by Public Law 93-81, which was enacted last August. Public Law 93-81 had the effect of putting an end to the collection of use fees at over 2,200 national forest recreation areas. Presently, only 37 areas in the entire National Forest System qualify for fee collection.

The reduction in the number of national forest areas where fees are collected will result in a loss of approximately \$5 million in collections during the current fiscal year. I would like to point out that the loss of this \$5 million does not represent revenue that would have been deposited in the Treasury for general purposes. The loss will relate directly to the amount of funds we will have available in the future to operate and maintain our recreation areas. Sixty-five percent of the \$5 million would have been made available for appropriation under subsection 4(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to the Forest Service for use in carrying out its outdoor recreation functions. Of the remaining 35 percent, 25 percent would have been distributed to the States for the benefit of public schools and roads, and 10 percent would

have been made available for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within national forests.

Another result of ending fee collections at the 2,200 national forest recreation areas has been an increase in vandalism. The elimination of fees eliminated the need to have personnel stationed at the areas or visit the areas to collect fees and check compliance with fee collection systems. While at the areas to collect fees. These uniformed personnel also provided supervision and enforced other rules and regulations.

It also has come to our attention that non-Federal agencies and persons in the private sector, who provide and charge fees for comparable recreation facilities, are concerned about the impact that free Federal areas may have on the use levels of their areas.

This past summer we received many letters and comments from the public, expressing surprise and wonder at the fact that fees were no longer being collected at national forest areas. From their reaction we believe that fee collection had been well accepted and understood by most users.

The amendment provided by subsection 1(f) of S. 2844 would remove the restrictive language of Public Law 93-81 which virtually put the Forest Service out of the business of collecting use fees. We have no objection to the revised list of sites and facilities contained in the amendment for which there would in no event be a charge. We believe the amendment would restore the collection of recreation use fees on the national forest to a practical level, consistent with the principle which we believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act has sought to embrace from the beginning, that is, the principle that persons who use special recreation facilities provided at significant public expense should share in the cost of their operation and maintenance.

This completes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have, along with this panel.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much for your statement.

The first question is to Director Watt. As I understand it, the bills now before us contain exactly the same language that we had in the law prior to last August, in regard to admission fees. That is, no admission fees would be charged anywhere except in certain designated national park areas, and designated national recreation areas operated by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WATT. That is correct, Mr. Chairman; there is no change contemplated or recommended at this time.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we pointed out 2 years ago when we referred to national recreation areas administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, we were placing emphasis on the word "National," and we have only a few of these—and the fact that the Forest Service, or any other agency takes a section of forest and calls it a recreation area doesn't mean that entrance fees can be charged to get into that area; is that correct?

Mr. WATT. Yes, that is correct; and Mr. Nelson tells me that there are today six national recreation areas listed by the Forest

Service that are subject to entrance fees, or the Golden Eagle Passports.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you have national recreation areas administered by the Department of the Interior which are subject to entrance fees.

Mr. WATT. Yes, by the National Park Service; that is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. And in the legislation that we adopted 2 years ago, it was contemplated that fees would not be charged unless a gate could be manned, or an entrance place could be manned where someone would be in person to make collections. Is this contemplated in the bill now before us?

Mr. WATT. Yes, it is; and I might ask, if I need to be supplemented, for one of the other gentlemen to speak.

There must be someone there. We are asking that that issue be clarified in this legislation, so that it would allow for that man to be there in that area, not specifically at these points, so that administration cost and security provisions can be taken into consideration. We think it gives security, policing, and administrative control is needed. There would be somebody there to collect, not necessarily at each specialized, developed point.

[Editor's Note: Word was received from Interior that Mr. Watt was confused at this point. They recommend deletion of the previous two paragraphs. However, the question of personal fee collection was of particular concern to Mr. Taylor in his line of questioning.]

Mr. TAYLOR. What you are saying, then, is that all collections would be made in person by some individual.

What I'm getting at is this. The system that they had prior to 2 years ago, putting up a sign saying "Pay here" that sat on a box to put money in, just didn't work. Some paid and some didn't pay; and the ones who didn't pay got the same services.

I talked to the Superintendent out in Yellowstone, and he said, "We have 2,700 camp sites, which were \$3, or \$4 a night, and they are usually full all the time."

I said, "How many paid," and he said, "About half of them." And I asked them how they collect, and he said, "Well, we notify them to pay, and notify them where," and I said, "What do you do to the ones that don't pay," and he said, "Well, we don't have the personnel to do anything."

So, about half paid, and half didn't pay, and we don't want to get back to that kind of legislation. There has to be a requirement that actual collection be made by an individual.

Mr. WATT. I think it strengthens and clarifies the requirement, so that there would be treatment uniformity, and understanding by the beneficiaries.

Now, there are some areas where it would not be practical to charge a user fee; and in those instances where you couldn't have a man out there, collecting the fee; or the development did not warrant visitation, we would not be charging for the same type of use of a facility that may be charged in another area because of administrative considerations.

Mr. TAYLOR. If this bill is passed—and I'd like to direct this question to the Forest Service—how do you intend to make collections?

Mr. NELSON. In relation, if I may, to the National Recreation areas, we would not plan to make charges at any of the six national recreation areas within the Forest System because of the problem of ingress and egress, many, many roads coming into these areas.

In relation directly to your question, we would expect that at many places we would have entrance stations; in other places we would contemplate using a collector box type system.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, you say if this legislation is passed that you contemplate going back to that box-type fee collection system?

Mr. NELSON. Well, we think in some places it would hardly be practicable to have a full-time man on the site at all times to make collections; and that we would have to use a check system on the people that are using the area. Now, we have about 7,800 recreation areas, and we expect that fees would be charged at about 2,600 of these areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I'm not certain that I want to be a party of adopting any legislation which permits you to go back to this so-called honor system. I thought it was dishonorable to charge some of the people and not charge others.

Mr. NELSON. I should point out that it is not absolutely an honor system in that we do have people checking on compliance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, let me give you an example. Down in my district they had this system, and on one Sunday afternoon, according to the many letters I got, there were three cars of Rangers that showed up in one area, and checked everybody out who went out. Everyone who did not have a receipt showing he had paid was given a citation to go to court; and this caused a furor of opposition. And that is one thing that caused us to tighten up the restrictions and provide collection actually be made by some individual. And, if it's not practical to make such collections, I'll say it again, charge nothing.

I know in the national forest you have areas where you have one picnic table; where you have five picnic tables; they come in all sizes. Some areas are big, and some very, very small; and for the very small ones you can't make any charges. Of course, you are not going to charge for picnic areas anyhow. But, where it is not feasible to collect, my thinking is, again, don't go back to this so-called honor system.

Just to go a little bit further, the act that was adopted 2 years ago did not permit the charging of entrance fees by the Corps of Engineers at any place; and you didn't establish anything which you called entrance fees.

But you did set up charge areas, and provided that anyone going into those areas, regardless of his purpose, would be charged a fee. He may go there to picnic; he may go there to use the restroom; he may go there to get a drink of water; he may go there to camp for a day or two; but if he went in that area, he would be charged a fee.

Now, that was a misinterpretation of the intent of the act which Congress adopted 2 years ago. And, as I recall the situation, that was the thing which caused the Public Works Committee to promote legislation last year which ended up in the confusion that we now have.

Now, what is your response to that, Mr. Kelly?

General KELLY. First of all, sir, I think there is a misunderstanding of what was charged for. There was not a charge if someone wanted to get a drink of water, or use a picnic table; but if they wanted to go in and use the full range of facilities, which might include a boat ramp, bathroom facilities, picnic areas, in other words, a wide range, yes, there was a fee charged.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, again, how can you tell when he goes in which facilities he is going to use?

General KELLY. In this area, I guess we would just have to ask him; and we would presume that most people would be fairly honest about it.

However, under this bill that is not a factor, we would not be charging for anything but camping facilities. So, I think that is totally clear under the new legislation, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, it was the reaction of the public to the fee system that you had last year which caused the Congress to push the bill through. Well, your statement gives me some encouragement that this situation will not be a problem in the future.

General KELLY. Sir, if I may address the last point you made on collection of fees for camping. As I say, there won't be an entrance situation in the corps' project, it will simply be for camping. And we had envisioned that we would not have a person standing to collect fees at each campsite at the entrance site. We would foresee a roving Ranger coming through and checking to see in the campsite area that they had a receipt from the form they had filled out; or selling them—giving them a receipt as he came through.

So, this would have a potential impact of what we visualize the program to be, if you established that you must have an individual to collect a fee before the man can reach the campsite area.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I wouldn't necessarily say charge him before he reaches the area. If you have what you call a roving Ranger who goes around in that area and makes collections in person, rather than putting up a sign saying "Pay here," that would satisfy me.

General KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the type of program you have in mind?

General KELLY. Well, we actually had a situation where a man would fill it out, in one situation, and then the Ranger would come around and see if he had a receipt; in other places, large places we might have an entrance checkpoint with an individual there; in the third place we might have neither. If he comes in from a number of directions, we would simply have a man coming to the site, finding a group there, and collecting the fee at the site. So, it would perhaps impact on certain of our areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. I don't want to go back to the system where part of them pay, and the others receive the same services and do not pay. If I go to the theater, there is a man there that collects my money, and he collects from everybody. Now, if he just had a sign "Drop a dollar in the box and go in," he would have the same problem you have.

General KELLY. Yes, sir; although the reaction we get, it's just not that big a problem because we send someone around to check to see if they have paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, does this roving Ranger collect every day; would he try to contact every person who is supposed to pay?

General KELLY. Yes, sir; he should. Now, when I say collect, I would say in many cases we had not visualized, necessarily, his collecting. We would have visualized a collection box and he would have a receipt which he could show the Ranger. In other words, you would have a personal check, but you would not have a personal collection under that system.

Mr. TAYLOR. What would you do if you found me camping and I hadn't got a receipt?

General KELLY. We would ask you for your fee, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. You would collect.

General KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. I guess that would be pretty close to the system that we have at Yellowstone where half paid, and half didn't.

General KELLY. I would hope, sir, the closeness would be the system and not the collection; I think we would do considerably better than that. Now, obviously, we might have some cases we missed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, how did that so-called honor system work with the Corps, back when it was generally used?

General KELLY. This is input to me, sir, and I think it worked well. We wouldn't really call it an honor system in that we went around and checked. So, it's honor when you get in, but when you have a Ranger coming around that checks other things, security and maintenance, and answers questions; he is also checking, then, to see if people have paid their fees.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that system would work if you really checked everybody every day, so people would be pretty sure that they would be checked, and the Ranger would come around. Rangers are friendly fellows. I did a lot of camping before I came to Congress, and I enjoyed the Ranger coming around and talking to my children, and explaining the facilities and uses, and giving us any advice we needed.

General KELLY. One thing in the bill is, sir, that the area must be subject to surveillance and security; and this would of course require daily rounds by the Ranger.

Mr. TAYLOR. That's right; and the Ranger gives your family security.

General KELLY. Yes, sir. But, we would be trying to keep out of having him planted in place collecting money. As we see it, it would be much broader and of much more value if he is able to travel through the area.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Watt, when would charges be made for picnicking?

Mr. WATT. We don't envision that they would ever be made simply by the fact that the provision in 2844 spells it out.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, it says "special facilities", and I was wondering how many campgrounds you have without these facilities.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, there wouldn't be any charge for a picnic area except in a case where there might be such specialized services as electric or gas fire grills; but the rest of the areas, when the individual would want to come in and sit down and have a

picnic-lunch and leave and not remain over night, there would be no charge for that.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many picnic areas do you have that have electric or gas fire grills?

Mr. WATT. We haven't been able to discover any, as far as any Federal agency is involved, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I didn't understand your answer.

Mr. WATT. I said, we have not discovered any in the Federal areas involved.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do not have any, anywhere?

Mr. WATT. No, Mr. Chairman, not to our knowledge; and we are at a loss to explain that provision.

Mr. TAYLOR. That's what I was going to ask, why that provision is in the bill if you haven't got any.

Mr. WATT. That was our question to the Senate committee, and there certainly was good reasoning for it since the committee in their wisdom left it in.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, then the general answer is, considering the picnic facilities that the Forest Service has now, and the Park Service, and the Corps, that fees would not be charged for picnics.

Mr. WATT. That's correct. That is the answer, and I certainly don't want to belabor the point, but as Mr. Nelson pointed out, if there are certain circumstances in addition to the picnic, there may be a charge if there are group facilities, if you bring in a group; or reservations have been made, some additional service rendered to them, there may be a charge for that in connection with picnicking.

But, there is a prohibition against charging anyone for picnicking rights in any Federal area. I think that is understood by all the planning agencies, and there will be no conflict on that issue.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Won Pat.

Mr. WON PAT. Now, what is the effect of these noncharges for facilities on the commercial operator who operates a camping facility or recreational facility?

Mr. WATT. We have recommended that this legislation be adopted, which would require that when there is a special service, or special capital investment, that there be a user fee charged the beneficiary of that facility.

And one of the factors in establishing that fee would be that there be comparability between that fee and the private sector fees in that region, so that the Federal Government would not be subsidizing the camper to such an extent that we would run out of business the private sector.

We recognize that the private sector must be looked to more and more in the years ahead for providing campgrounds and recreation opportunities. And it is the responsibility we carry to see to it that the climate is such that they can make a profit in providing these types of facilities.

Mr. WON PAT. Thank you. And is it the objective that the agencies lease such areas to be operated by private enterprise?

Mr. WATT. Where it is appropriate we are encouraging the private sector to make the investment.

Mr. WON PAT. Now, there are State facilities which are provided free, aren't there?

Mr. WATT. Excuse me, State facilities?

Mr. WON PAT. Yes.

Mr. WATT. Yes, some States do have campground facilities that are provided on a free basis; for the most part the States construct campground facilities and do charge fees for them.

Mr. WON PAT. Don't you think that the problem of collection is very difficult? If you have to have more personnel, then it's going to cost more.

Mr. WATT. It can be a problem in those areas that are remote, where there isn't high traffic and limited personnel for it. But, it's a difficult situation to generalize, and as the General has mentioned, the Corps has a variety, and the Forest Service has a variety of administrative options to properly carry out the program. But, we believe that it is manageable, and the provisions of this act clarify that the land-managing agencies, the public, the user, will have an understanding of what should be charged for, and what should be provided on a free basis.

Mr. WON PAT. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Director Watt, you really offer two rationales, the one having to do with revenues, and the other having to do with rationed use of those areas. None of you has had anything to say about the second category. You don't think that is simply a revenue measure?

Mr. WATT. No, it's much more than a revenue-raising measure. The pressure for campground facilities is tremendous, and Mr. Dickenson may have some comments about limitations.

Mr. DICKENSON. That's very true, Congressman. What we are trying here to do is protect the resource. We have to define the campgrounds, have them regulated to restrict use; that is one device to control the amount of use that any area can receive. We do impose time limitations, generally; by and large 14 days is the maximum length of time that any one family, any one user can occupy a campsite in the National Park Service. That may come down to one day in high impact areas; in a few spots it's more than 14 days. But, by and large it is generally 14 days.

Mr. WATT. And Mr. Nelson informs me the Forest Service has the same type of limitations.

Mr. NELSON. It varies. We have places where the stay is limited to 14 days; in many areas, if they are areas of high use the stay there can be 7 days; and there are one or two where we have the critical limit of 1 or 2 days' stay limits on individual parties.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, how long have we had such demand for camp facilities, or park facilities that we had to start thinking about rationing their use. I mean, this is a philosophical departure from earlier days, obviously. How long have we had this?

Mr. DICKENSON. Speaking for the National Park Service, our biggest surge in demand started after World War II; and this has increased all through the 1950's and 1960's. So, this has been a continuous spiral for many years.

Mr. STEELMAN. And the trend now seems strongly set in that direction.

Mr. WATT. We think so, no matter what circumstances we envision, reduced travel or the like. We still think people are going to be camping more and more.

Mr. STEELMAN. Going over to the proceeds to the Land and Water Conservation Fund from user fees. I noticed that it has pretty well been in the \$4 to \$6 million range, however, in 1971 it was \$10 million, and in 1972 it was \$9 million.

Why the big spurt all of a sudden, did that simply have to do with increased demand, or new facilities built that require additional fees, or what?

Mr. WATT. I'll let Mr. Hulett answer that.

Mr. HULETT. Mr. Steelman, I think it's a combination of those factors that led to the rather wide spurt in that particular year. However, since the passage of Public Law 92-347 in 1972 the recreation use fees and entry fees are not covered in the Land and Water Conservation Funds per se as they were prior to that date. Those funds are now covered into a special account which allows reappropriation of those moneys to the Federal agencies involved for operation, maintenance, and capital investment in recreation fees areas.

Mr. STEELMAN. That leads me to my next question, on page 5, line 10 of the bill, "All fees which are collected by any Federal agency shall be covered into a special account in the Treasury of the United States to be administered in conjunction with, but separate from, the revenues in the Land and Water Conservation Fund."

Well, beginning in 1973, there actually was a loss to the Fund, whatever the amount, it was \$7 million.

Mr. HULETT. That's correct.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, will the Land and Water Conservation Fund make that up out of those receipts?

Mr. HULETT. No, not in that case at all, Mr. Steelman; that money was effectively lost to the Federal agencies involved because it was in effect no longer necessary to have people there to collect fees, there was no longer enough money for many of the agencies to provide control services, surveillance, and they actually reduced the amount of service to the visiting public by that amount of dollars.

That is why this is so critically important to the agencies involved because this money is appropriated directly back to them without regard to their other appropriations. Therefore, this is a bonus to the Federal agencies involved in the recreation fee business. So, there was no making up of that money, theoretically; services were reduced by that amount. And 40 percent of the money is appropriated back for enhancement of the fee-collection system. That places the personnel on the ground to collect those fees; developing areas where we might collect fees; and the other 60 percent is used for operation and maintenance of the areas.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, it was lost to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Hulett was directing his comments to the special account, but the fund, it was still maintained—

Mr. STEELMAN. Out of general revenues, or new service.

Mr. WATT. That's correct. But the fund, of course, was maintained at \$300 million.

Mr. STEELMAN. Let me direct this to the Forest Service. When you have your source of revenue cut off, do you just add an increase to your budget request, to make up the difference; or how do you handle that?

General KELLY. We did not, sir. It is connected very closely with reduced service, really, in having people on the ground, as much as anything else. It is not just that you send a man for fee collection, it is much broader than that. He provides Government presence and security, and this has been the sense of the letters we have gotten in the recent past, where they more or less encourage the collection of a fee for the camping area. The idea of rangers coming through is something which is very appealing I, think.

So, we really reduced our operation and maintenance capabilities by this small amount; and that also then tended to reduce the number of people that we had available.

Mr. NELSON. In the Forest Service we did not receive any increase in appropriations for operation and maintenance of our recreation programs with the loss that was brought about.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, did you ask for an increase and it was denied; or didn't you ask for one?

Mr. NELSON. With any budgetary limitations, yes, we did ask for an increase.

Mr. STEELMAN. You are saying charges are being levied for special uses, those being the projects requiring special investments, as I recall.

Who decides when a campground needs grass clippers, or needs some additional facility? Would that in effect be an increase in the cost of the user?

Mr. WATT. The land-managing agency, the Park Service, Forest Service, or Corps of Engineers.

Mr. STEELMAN. General Kelley, is the source of your income, for the Corps of Engineers, the general revenues and user fees, and of course the land and water conservation fund—those four or five categories; do you have any other sources?

General KELLY. No, sir; that is appropriated to the corps, and the user fee, which is in effect returned to us. Of course, that is presently very small.

Mr. STEELMAN. I was going to ask you what it was for the last 2, or 3 fiscal years.

General KELLY. Sir, I can just provide the most recent one that I have with me; I will provide the rest of them for the record. The first 7 months of 1973 we collected about \$1,200,000; and in the last 5 months about \$370,000. It was roughly about \$2.2 to \$2.3 million, I guess, in a fiscal year.

Mr. STEELMAN. All right. Now, you are allowed, under this legislation where private interests have contracts with the corps, to charge fees for boat facilities, and so forth. Could you give us some better feel for what costs are in a corps project using private facilities. What would the costs be for me if I launched my boat and brought the fuel?

General KELLY. Well, the cost, basically, if you just came with your fuel and your boat, and launched it off the normal ramp, would be nothing. However, if you wanted to maintain your boat at a public marina on that lake, it might then be privately operated; you would then have to pay for the facility, for being maintained. It would be whatever his monthly fee might be for boatowners. That would be the boat situation.

We have certain areas which are being highly developed by the State. In other words, they take over a significant piece of that land and develop it as a recreation area, as they see fit. Some of these have become rather extensive with motel accommodations and athletic facilities. Others might be just bare camping with a trade post type thing where you could buy supplies.

Mr. STEELMAN. Are there any cases where a private interest has the monopoly, owns the ramps and all—where the public is using the more expensive facilities?

General KELLY. When we build the facilities we design into them what we call the minimum essentials, so to speak, that which is required to make it a public facility which provides the minimum to the public. That would include boat ramps for boating situations; and that would include, normally, some fishing area that could be used, a dock on a lakeside area; and then some camping area.

And then this would be planned to be expanded over time, and hopefully we try to get local interests, or State, county in to take over as much of the operation and maintenance as we can.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEELMAN. Yes; I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that S. 2844 provides that charges can be made on boat ramps, provided, however:

That a fee shall be charged in picnic areas or at boat ramps for the use of specialized facilities or services such as, but not limited to, electric or gas grills, or mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts.

Can you give us a little more information, General Kelly, just when charges would be made by the corps for the use of boat ramps?

General KELLY. We don't have any boat ramps other than those which are nonmechanical, therefore there would be no charges for the boat ramps.

Mr. TAYLOR. Wasn't that one thing that created some problems 1 year ago when the Public Works Committee was taking action?

General KELLY. Yes, sir, it was. But, I think a good deal of the problems which arose was a misunderstanding of the announcement in the Federal Register. It actually appeared as if we were going to put a boat in the water, not just the ramp, but just to have the boat in the water. It actually was intended to be printed as "boat rental"; but this did not appear and created quite a stir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you say you do not have any hydraulic boat lifts, so charges will not be made anywhere to put a boat in the water.

General KELLY. That's correct, sir; at Federal facilities, that would not necessarily be true at a leased facility.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will direct this question to the Forest Service. How were fees in camping areas collected last June and July while we were operating under Public Law 92-247?

Mr. NELSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, we did have some entrance stations at which fees were collected. We had drop boxes, and we had people checking for compliance on the drop boxes. So, we had a variety of systems that were used prior to the passage of Public Law 93-81.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the average, was each camper contacted by at least one Ranger per day?

Mr. NELSON. I would say that on the average each camper was contacted by a Ranger, but I would not say that was every day. This could have been in some cases, in some of the farout campgrounds that were located at some distance and small, there could have been a several day interval.

Mr. TAYLOR. What percent compliance did you have on payment?

Mr. NELSON. We think that we had by and large very good compliance, Mr. Chairman. I couldn't give you the exact percentage, but I believe for some locations, and I believe you cited one, by and large we felt that the public accepted this way of doing business quite well.

Mr. TAYLOR. The situation I cited was maybe 2 years ago. That was one of the things that brought on the change in the law 2 years ago.

What about the Park Service? I am going to direct the same question to you, how you collected camping fees. I am talking about last summer, now, when we were operating under the law we are trying to get back to.

Mr. DICKENSON. Two general types of collection, Mr. Chairman. The larger types of campgrounds have a fixed Ranger station which is manned, generally, 12, or 14, or 16 hours a day, where a camper, or a prospective camper is met and the fee collected personally, at that time.

The second method involves virtually the roving Ranger type in which the station is not being manned full-time. For example, if the camper comes in the nighttime hours, he would then personally be contacted by the Ranger the following day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, does he make payment when he comes in? Where is he supposed to make his payment? Is he supposed to put the money in a box when he comes in, or does he wait until the Ranger contacts him?

Mr. DICKENSON. We do not use a box collection type, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do not.

[Ed. Note: NPS later stated that some campgrounds use "drop box" system with compliance checks by Rangers.]

Mr. DICKENSON. Those are the two principal methods of collection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, is it your intent if this legislation is approved, that you go back to that type of collection, that type of operation?

Mr. DICKENSON. Last summer's type of operation was very successful for us. The public accepted it very well.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, why did you quit making any collections when Public Law 93-81 was adopted last August?

Mr. DICKENSON. Why did we discontinue it, sir?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKENSON. On the advice of the Solicitor. In looking at the types of facilities which were offered in our National Park Service campgrounds it was interpreted that the requirement that showers be provided had not been met, or was not being met by National Park Service campgrounds; the Solicitor decided that we were in violation of the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. If Congress didn't pass any law this spring, or summer, would you make collections this year?

Mr. DICKENSON. No, sir, we would not, unless the law was amended.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did the Forest Service stop, or discontinue collection of fees after Public Law 93-81 was adopted, for camping?

Mr. NELSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, we stopped collections for the same reason that Mr. Dickenson indicated, that our campgrounds, by and large, did not meet the requirements of the law.

However, there were 36 campgrounds out of our total population of 5,000 which did meet this criteria, and in which we did in fact make collections during the remainder of the year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, the bill before us is a compromise, I would say, between Public Law 93-81, passed last August, and the law that was before that date; it contains some provisions that campsites must have certain minimums; but you can live with those requirements, is that correct?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir; we could live with those requirements, and in fact, there might just be a few more areas that would qualify under the language of S. 2844, and under the legislation prior to 93-81.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, a general question, directed to Director Watt. Except for the revenue needed, why do you support a fee schedule as proposed in this bill; in other words, what advantages are there besides the money?

Mr. WATT. We believe that the user fee program brings several advantages to the land-managing agencies in protecting these resources. So, in addition for collection, you have people there for policing, for security, for maintenance purposes that gives you the decided benefit associated with the presence of that Federal man. In addition you have a camper who is contributing what he feels is fair market value, or close thereto, for the services and benefits he is receiving. And he will conduct himself in a better spirit that is established by the American campers, realizing the benefits from the public land. It has been a happy, harmonious relationship, and I think another speaker has commented on it, to have campers writing us, asking to reestablish the fees for these several reasons. So, for management purposes, there are several dimensions to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course the fee will enable you to make a limited number of spaces available, and more people.

Mr. WATT. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it would be necessary, I would think, if we are going to permit a reservation system; we'll discuss that in a few minutes.

Mr. WATT. Yes, it's absolutely essential to that program.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, the Golden Eagle Passport will only be needed in National Park areas, areas operated by the National Park Service, and National Recreation Areas run by the Forest Service. But the Golden Age Passport will be needed by any person above 62 who goes camping in any facilities operated by any of the agencies.

Now, how can Golden Age Passports be made available at Forest Service areas?

Mr. NELSON. We expect that Golden Age Passports will be available at these campgrounds attendance; it will be available at Forest Service stations, Ranger stations, as well as our personnel assigned the recreation responsibilities.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let's take a park I'm familiar with, in my District; if a person who lives there wishes to get a Golden Age Passport and qualifies age-wise, how would he proceed?

Mr. NELSON. Well, one way would be to go to the supervisor's office in Nashville. Another possibility would be to go to the Ranger station at Pisca Forest, or at the Sycamore Campground. These are three distinct opportunities for him to get the Golden Age Passport.

Mr. TAYLOR. If this legislation is adopted, do you contemplate publicizing information as to who is entitled to this passport, and how you can get it?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can he write you a letter and enclose the proper amount of money, and get one?

Mr. NELSON. No, he must appear in person.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can see a reason for that. But why, Mr. Watt, are we getting away from selling them at the Post Office?

Mr. WATT. We found that this has been a costly way of proceeding, as well as inconvenient to the people.

Mr. TAYLOR. How can it be inconvenient for the people? You have a Post Office in every man's community.

Mr. WATT. We have found, people have complained that they have to make a trip to the Post Office—or think they do—to get their passport, and then go to the recreation area. It would be much more convenient to them if they could go to the place of destination and get the necessary passports that we require.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can see that, unless I showed up without it and you told me to get it at the Post Office. Why not sell them both places?

Mr. WATT. The reason in addition to convenience is cost. The Post Office is charging us cost for distributing the passport; and this year we had administrative problems with them in that the Golden Age Passport was free to the recipients, and yet, we were charged a rate for their distribution of them. And we got into an accountability problem with them because they didn't have to keep money income receipts. It was just getting out of hand. The problem came with the Golden Age Passport distribution.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much does the Post Office charge you for issuing each Golden Age Passport?

Mr. WATT. 75 cents per passport.

Mr. HULETT. In the last full year of operation, Mr. Chairman, on sales of \$1.1 million, the Postal Service figures \$375,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about duck stamps, how much do they charge for duck stamps?

Mr. HULETT. 18½.

Mr. TAYLOR. 18 cents?

Mr. HULETT. 18½ cents per stamp.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, why do they charge so much more for Golden Age Passports than they do the duck stamps?

Mr. HULETT. That is a question we are trying to get resolved, and I have been choosing my words, that isn't what we have paid them.

Mr. WATT. Negotiations are underway.

Mr. STEELMAN. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, but I would ask unanimous consent that further questions in writing be submitted to the witnesses.

Mr. TAYLOR. Unless there is objection by any member of the committee, questions and answers will be placed in the record at this point.

[Letters with information for the record and questions and answers follow:]

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1974.

Mr. THOMAS C. NELSON,
Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: As a followup to the hearings of April 8 and 9, 1974, before the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee dealing with campground user fees, I have several further questions which I would like to submit for your response. In accordance with Subcommittee Chairman Taylor's permission, these questions and your reply will be made a part of the hearing record.

1. What does the Forest Service envision as its role in satisfying the increasing demand for campsites and related outdoor recreation facilities and activities in the years ahead? What plans and commitments have you developed in this regard?

2. Does the recently released Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan, published by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, indicate any particular direction for the Forest Service in regard to the provision of outdoor recreation facilities on national forests?

3. Do you have any type of Departmental or Service policy statement or directive relative to the Service's role in providing campsites and related facilities to satisfy public demand for this type of outdoor recreation activity?

4. A few years back the Forest Service had a program called "Operation Outdoors". Please explain the objectives of that program, and detail its accomplishments. Were the program objectives achieved and satisfied, and do you perceive the need for any similar program thrusts in the future?

5. In backcountry and wilderness areas, have you developed management plans which identify the locations and types of primitive campsites available?

6. Are you experiencing full capacity frequently at campgrounds? Please comment on this situation as it has developed over the past five years, and as it projects through the next five years. What parts of the country experience the greatest severity of over-demand on Forest Service campsites?

7. Would you supply a breakdown by national forest, of the number of campgrounds and developed campsites (excluding backcountry and wilderness) which exist. How many additional campgrounds and campsites are planned for development within the next five years, by national forest?

8. Do you currently impose any limitation on length of stay at any campgrounds? Please detail. Do you anticipate inaugurating any type of campground reservation system in the near future at any campgrounds? What are you doing now in this regard relative to backcountry and wilderness campsites?

9. What degree of development, sophistication and modern convenience do you feel is appropriate to provide in national forest campgrounds? Should all modern convenience demands be met, or should users expect something less, and a more primitive experience in national forest campgrounds?

I think the answers to these questions will be helpful to the Committee in its future consideration of the role of the Forest Service in the field of outdoor recreation.

Sincerely,

ALAN STEELMAN,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1974.

HON. ALAN STEELMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: This is in response to your letter of April 19 asking additional questions to be made a part of the record of the April 8 and 9, 1974, meeting of National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee dealing with campground user fees.

Your questions are answered in the order raised:

1. The Forest Service role in outdoor recreation is chartered in existing legislation. The Organic Administration Act of 1897 gives authority to regulate occupancy, and use, and preserve the National Forests. The Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 directs that the National Forests shall be developed and administered for outdoor recreation, among other resources. As more and more people are continuing to discover the recreation opportunities on the National Forests, the role is expanding. We recognize the potential to provide increased recreational opportunities not only in terms of developed sites and facilities but opportunities for dispersed recreation such as hiking, fishing, backpacking, and hunting. The National Forests have the capability to meet many future outdoor recreation needs and the Forest Service has the plans to move forward providing National priorities permit expanded recreational programs. Alternative levels are discussed in our Environmental Program for the Future.

2. The recently released Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan provides a broad base for our role in outdoor recreation. We are presently reviewing our programs in relation to this plan. Among the factors we are considering are Federal, State, and local capabilities, recreation trends, and land capabilities of the National Forests. Basically, the Nationwide Plan provides for a shift from Federal to other government and private in the priority for actions, and emphasizes the need to round-out the Federal estate.

3. Our policy is to provide campgrounds and related facilities to offer a broad spectrum of recreation experience levels while protecting the natural resource. The degree to which we provide these type facilities varies throughout the country. In some locations, there is opportunity for private development and we support this where possible. In other locations, National Forest lands must play the major role in providing camping opportunities. Our ability to expand facilities is limited by present funding levels. The present program level makes it difficult to operate and maintain existing facilities. Plans are available to accommodate programs for increased facilities.

4. Operation Outdoors was basically a 5-year program starting in 1957 to modernize existing recreation facilities. The goal was to rehabilitate existing facilities so they would be safe and useable and to develop new facilities to alleviate overuse and accommodate future use. The program was largely successful; many facilities were rehabilitated and new facilities added. The greatest difficulty has been in providing adequate funding for maintenance since the program ended.

5. We have management plans for many of the 66 Wildernesses Congress has designated within the National Forests. Few do not have either completed plans or plans underway.

Wilderness management plans, however, do not identify the locations and types of primitive campsites available. One of the tenets of Wilderness philosophy is that users can meet nature on nature's terms, and can enjoy an unconfined type of recreation. An "unconfined type of recreation" means that the user is not regulated, nor constrained to a schedule or to location. If he has

the desire, he can depart from trails and strike cross-country. He can camp where previous campers have been, or he can camp where there is no evidence of prior camps.

On a practical note, there are certain locations which are so popular that they are adversely impacted by too many parties choosing to camp there, and we have found it necessary to prohibit camping. For instance, we may state that camping is prohibited within 200 yards of any lake. Or, we may restrict the use of recreation livestock within certain distances of lakes, streams, and springs—except for use on designated trails or within approved temporary corrals.

The term, "primitive campsite," indicates that there is something furnished for camping use—a development—however slight. Unless it is necessary to preserve the Wilderness resource, such development is contrary to the Wilderness Act. An example of such a development needed to protect the Wilderness resource would be the "fire boxes" provided within the Ventana Wilderness. Campers may not build a fire except within the fire box. Self-contained backpackers cooking stoves are permitted.

6. Full capacity of campgrounds is being felt in many areas throughout the country. It is not restricted to any one Region.

Full or over capacity occurs most often in the following situations:

1. Where sites are located near popular water bodies, i.e., lakes, reservoirs, rivers, streams.
2. Sites near nationally known areas such as National Recreation Areas, monuments, Wildernesses, historical sites, etc.
3. Popular camping spots in Wildernesses and at entrances to Wildernesses.

Full capacity at popular areas can occur at any time during the camping season. At most sites, especially where day-use is common, weekends and holidays are normally the times when sites are full. During the week, these sites often have vacant units.

Nationwide, National Forest sites experience the heaviest use during the period of summer vacation June-August. Several parts of the country, however, have equally heavy use periods during other times of the year. The southwest desert area of Arizona and New Mexico has heavy use during winter months when the weather is moderate. Florida receives an influx of winter visitors to their sites when snow is on the ground in the Northern States. Southern California Forests receive use year-round.

Hunting and fishing season often leads to full campgrounds in spring and fall.

During the past 5 years, 1969-73, campground use in National Forests has increased from 31,669,600 visitor-days to 39,965,200, an increase of 26 percent. During the same period, the capacity of campgrounds has increased only 6 percent.

If this trend continues, it will be necessary to turn more and more visitors away to prevent over-use and site deterioration.

7. Enclosed is a computer printout listing the number of National Forest campgrounds by Forest Service Region and National Forest.

For fiscal year 1975 recreation construction will be as follows:

	Number		Number
National Forest—Campgrounds:		National Forest—Picnic Areas:	
Sequoia.....	1	Chequamegon.....	1
National Forest of Texas.....	2	Allegheny.....	1
National Forest of North Carolina.....	1		
San Isabel.....	1		
Ashley.....	1		
Tahoe.....	1		
Olympic.....	1		
Daniel Boone.....	1		
Cherokee.....	1		
Total.....	10	Total.....	2

Many of the above are completion of sites where construction commenced in previous fiscal years. The number of new campgrounds developed each year

is not large, since we are concentrating on reconstructing and modernizing existing, but worn out, facilities. At the current level of funding, approximately 8 to 10 new campgrounds may be developed each year. We do not know the location of these sites for the next 5 years since priorities are highly speculative because new construction is most often centered at new reservoirs being constructed on National Forest lands by other public agencies. The construction schedule for these reservoirs is undetermined. At the present level of funding, over the next 5 years (FY '75-FY '79), we estimate 40 new campgrounds will be developed.

8. We do have stay limits at our campgrounds. These stay limits vary depending on the situation. The maximum stay is 30 days with the usual stay limit being 14 days. In areas of very heavy demand, the stay limit is 7 days; in a few critical places, the stay limit is as low as 2 days.

Last year, on selected campgrounds on two National Forests in California, we used a trial reservation system. Since the passage of P.L. 93-81 and the elimination of most recreation fees, a reservation system became impractical and we discontinued the trial system. We feel a reservation system has the potential of providing a desirable service to the public at destination areas of high demand and use. If legislation passes which expands the number of recreation fee areas, we expect to continue the trial of a reservation system.

This season we are using, for the first time, a reservation system in a Wilderness. The location is the Whitney Trail area of the John Muir Wilderness in California. Through this reservation system, use is being limited to protect the Wilderness values. It is not our intention to use Wilderness reservations widely. The action was necessary in the Mt. Whitney area because of extremely heavy use.

9. We feel the National Forests should provide a wide range of development. This will, in most cases, allow the users to choose the type of development they prefer. We class our developments on an experience level scale of 1 to 5. An explanation of this scale is enclosed. While our developed recreation sites fall in all five experience levels, we feel most of our facilities should fall in category three or below. Where full facilities are to be provided, we generally consider the possibility of a partnership arrangement with the private sector.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your questions. If we can be of further assistance please call on us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. NELSON,
Deputy Chief.

Enclosure.

RIM special—Number of campgrounds by National Forest from RIM basic address inventory as of June 30, 1973, development scale 2 through 5 only

Region 1		Region 2	
Forest name:	Number of campgrounds	Forest name:	Number of campgrounds
Beaverhead National Forest...	33	Arapaho National Forest.....	36
Bitterroot National Forest.....	22	Bighorn National Forest.....	39
Clearwater National Forest....	26	Black Hills National Forest....	32
Coeur D'Alene National Forest...		Grand Mesa Uncompahgr.....	30
est.....	9	Gunnison National Forest.....	37
Custer National Forest.....	29	Medicine Bow National Forest...	
Deerlodge National Forest.....	24	est.....	41
Flathead National Forest.....	29	Nebraska National Forest.....	5
Gallatin National Forest.....	42	Pike National Forest.....	47
Helena National Forest.....	11	Rio Grande National Forest....	40
Kaniksu National Forest.....	23	Roosevelt National Forest.....	24
Kootenai National Forest.....	20	Routt National Forest.....	27
Lewis and Clark National Forest...		San Isabel National Forest....	20
Forest.....	21	San Juan National Forest.....	40
Lolo National Forest.....	27	Shoshone National Forest.....	31
Nezperce National Forest.....	26	White River National Forest....	46
St. Joe National Forest.....	22		
Region total.....	364	Region total.....	495

RIM special—Number of campgrounds by National Forest from RIM basic address inventory as of June 30, 1973, development scale 2 through 5 only

Region 3		Region 6	
Forest name:	Number of campgrounds	Forest name:	Number of campgrounds
Apache National Forest.....	31	Deschutes National Forest.....	98
Carson National Forest.....	40	Fremont National Forest.....	51
Cibola National Forest.....	19	Gifford Pinchot National Forest.....	66
Coconino National Forest.....	23	Malheur National Forest.....	33
Coronado National Forest.....	27	Mount Baker National Forest.....	57
Gila National Forest.....	19	Mount Hood National Forest.....	106
Kaibab National Forest.....	8	Ochoco National Forest.....	34
Lincoln National Forest.....	12	Okanogan National Forest.....	61
Prescott National Forest.....	13	Olympic National Forest.....	20
Santa Fe National Forest.....	27	Rogue River National Forest.....	43
Sitgreaves National Forest.....	11	Siskiyou National Forest.....	27
Tonto National Forest.....	36	Siuslaw National Forest.....	36
Region total.....	266	Smoqualmie National Forest.....	61
		Umatilla National Forest.....	53
		Umpqua National Forest.....	67
		Wallowa Whitman National Forest.....	53
		Wenatchee National Forest.....	120
		Willamette National Forest.....	72
		Winema National Forest.....	28
		Colville National Forest.....	31
		Region total.....	1,117
Region 4		Region 8	
Forest name:	Number of campgrounds	Forest name:	Number of campgrounds
Ashley National Forest.....	50	National Forest Service in Alabama.....	11
Boise National Forest.....	93	Daniel Boone National Forest.....	12
Bridger-Teton National Forest.....	30	Chattahoochee-Oconee.....	30
Caribou National Forest.....	31	Cherokee National Forest.....	30
Challis National Forest.....	28	National Forest Service in Florida.....	31
Dixie National Forest.....	30	Kisatchie National Forest.....	12
Fishlake National Forest.....	21	National Forest Service in Mississippi.....	10
Humboldt National Forest.....	21	George Washington National Forest.....	24
Manti Lasal National Forest.....	17	Ouachita National Forest.....	24
Payette National Forest.....	24	Ozark St. Francis National Forest.....	23
Salmon National Forest.....	18	National Forest Service in North Carolina.....	36
Sawtooth National Forest.....	67	Francis Marion Sumter.....	17
Targhee National Forest.....	28	National Forest Service in Texas.....	14
Toiyabe National Forest.....	44	Jefferson National Forest.....	17
Uinta National Forest.....	37		
Wasatch National Forest.....	84		
Regional total.....	623	Region total.....	291
Region 5			
Forest name:	Number of campgrounds		
Angeles National Forest.....	69		
Cleveland National Forest.....	26		
Eldorado National Forest.....	41		
Inyo National Forest.....	80		
Klamath National Forest.....	27		
Lassen National Forest.....	42		
Los Padres National Forest.....	109		
Mendocino National Forest.....	25		
Modoc National Forest.....	18		
Six Rivers National Forest.....	17		
Plumas National Forest.....	40		
San Bernardino National Forest.....	55		
Sequoia National Forest.....	56		
Shasta Trinity National Forest.....	106		
Sierra National Forest.....	69		
Stanislaus National Forest.....	54		
Tahoe National Forest.....	79		
Region total.....	913		

RIM special—Number of campgrounds by National Forest from RIM basic address inventory as of June 30, 1973, development scale 2 through 5 only

Region 9		Region 10	
Forest name:	Number of campgrounds	Forest name:	Number of campgrounds
Chequamegon National Forest	26	North Tongass National Forest	98
Chippewa National Forest	26	Chugach National Forest	47
Huron Manistee National Forest	31	South Tongass National Forest	56
Clark National Forest	15	Region total	201
Nicolet National Forest	24		
Ottawa National Forest	26		
Shawnee National Forest	12		
Superior National Forest	29		
Hiawatha National Forest	23		
Wayne Hoosier National Forest	13		
Mark Twain National Forest	16		
Allegheny National Forest	26		
Green Mountain National Forest	8		
Monongahela National Forest	22		
White Mountain National Forest	22		
Region total	319		

Region All

Forest name:	Number of campgrounds
Service-wide total	4,589

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1974.

Mr. JAMES G. WATT, Director,
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: As a followup to the hearings of April 8 and 9, 1974, before the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee dealing with campground user fees, I have a couple of further questions which I would like to submit for your response. In accordance with Subcommittee Chairman Taylor's permission, these questions and your reply will be made a part of the hearing record.

1. We obtained what appears to be conflicting figures in testimony as to the annual Federal revenue loss resulting from the suspension of user fee charges resulting from the enactment of P. L. 93-81. Figures ranged from \$5 million per year for the U. S. Forest Service alone, to \$7.2 to \$8.2 million for all affected Federal agencies, and another figure cited was as high as \$26 million. Could you supply an estimate, by agency, as to what the annual revenue loss would be annually.

2. Are any user fees now charged, have they ever been, or are they anticipated, for facilities operated by the Bureau of Land Management or the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife? If so, would you please delineate these charges in some detail.

Thank you for your response.

Sincerely,

ALAN STEELMAN,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1974.

Hon. ALAN STEELMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 10, 1974, asking for clarification of the user fee revenue loss resulting from the enactment of P.L. 93-81.

The latest estimate by each agency of annual loss of revenue is as follows:

	<i>Million</i>
National Park Service-----	\$6.0
BSF&W and BLM-----	.1
Forest Service-----	5.0
Corps of Engineers-----	1.5
Total-----	12.6

The variations you observed in estimates of the amount of loss to be expected can be attributed, in part, to some forecasts made on different 12-month periods, incomplete information as to the public's continued utilization of areas where user fees could still be charged, and the uncertain availability of motor fuels for long distance travel.

In answer to your second question, as to whether user fees are now charged, or ever have been, or are anticipated for facilities operated by the Bureau of Land Management or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the following information is provided:

Bureau of Land Management—User fees are now charged for two sites in Alaska where two rustic cabins are rented for \$2.00 per night. User fees have been charged in the past for as many as 39 sites operated by BLM. It is anticipated that within a year after passage S. 2844 fees would be charged at 29 to 39 areas.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—Developed facilities at which charges have been made during the hunting season exist at five national wildlife refuges operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. During 1972, the BSF&W operated 25 recreation user fee locales, providing such specialized facilities as bathhouses, ferries, group camping sites, electrical hookups, trailer sites, highly developed launching sites, and guided tours. Passage of S. 2844 would bring about the reinstitution of user fees at many of these recreation facilities.

Fees and charges for Interior Department agencies will be in accordance with the rates established in the *Federal Register* pursuant to the legislation, and will be comparable to those shown in the enclosed list developed following passage of P.L. 92-347.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY W. HULETT,
(For James G. Watt, Director.)

Enclosure.

[From the Federal Register, February 6, 1973]

GOLDEN EAGLE & GOLDEN AGE PASSPORT—RULES AND REGULATIONS

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each month.

TITLE 43—PUBLIC LAND: INTERIOR

SUBTITLE A—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Part 18—Recreation Fees

Golden Eagle program. The Department of the Interior announces final rules for collection of entrance and special recreation use fees at designated Federal recreation areas or facilities.

On December 12, 1972, notice of proposed rule making regarding the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, as amended by the Act of July 11, 1972, which restores the Golden Eagle program, was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (37 FR 26424). After consideration of all such relevant matter as was presented by interested persons, the establishment of recreation fees as so proposed is hereby adopted, subject to the following changes:

1. The description of Authorities preceding § 18.1 is changed by inserting after "16 U.S.C." the following: "4601-4 et seq (1970), and 86 Stat. 461, 18 U.S.C. 715 (Supp. II, 1972)."

2. The first paragraph of § 18.1 is changed by inserting after "86 Stat. 459" the following: ", 16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq., and 86 Stat. 461, 18 U.S.C. 715."

3. In paragraph (b) of § 18.7 Fees for single-visit permits, the words "the one Designated Fee Area" are changed to read "the one Designated Entrance Fee Area". In paragraph (c) of this same section, the words "charged at Designated Fee Areas" are changed to read "charged at Designated Entrance Fee Areas".

4. Section 18.13 Enforcement is changed by inserting after the word "Part" the following: ", except those in § 18.16,".

5. The heading of § 18.14 is changed by replacing the word "Exclusion" with the word "Exclusions".

6. Subparagraph (2) of § 18.16 The Golden Eagle Insignia is changed by replacing the word "Part" with the word "section".

Effective date. This establishment of recreation fees is effective January 1, 1973.

CHARLES G. EMLEY,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 1, 1973.

Part 18 of Subtitle A of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations is revised to read as follows:

Sec.

- 18.1 Application.
- 18.2 Types of Federal recreation fees.
- 18.3 Designation.
- 18.4 Posting.
- 18.5 Golden Eagle Passport.
- 18.6 Golden Age Passport.
- 18.7 Fees for single-visit permits.
- 18.8 Validation and display of entrance permits.
- 18.9 Establishment of special recreation use fees.
- 18.10 Special recreation use permits.
- 18.11 Effective dates of Federal recreation fees.
- 18.12 Collection of Federal recreation fees.
- 18.13 Enforcement.
- 18.14 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions.
- 18.15 Public notification.
- 18.16 Golden Eagle Insignia.

AUTHORITY: Section 4, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, as amended by the Act of July 11, 1972, 86 Stat. 459, 16 U.S.C. 460 1-4 et seq. (1970), and 86 Stat. 461, 18 U.S.C. 715 (Supp. II, 1972).

§ 18.1 Application

This part is promulgated pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, as amended by the Act of July 11, 1972, 86 Stat. 459, 460 1-4 et seq., and 86 Stat. 461, 18 U.S.C. 715 (Supp. II, 1972).

(a) Any entrance fee which may be charged by the National Park Service at designated units of the National Park System shall be selected from the schedule of fees according to the criteria set forth in this part.

(b) Special recreation use fees charged by any bureau of the Department of the Interior for the use of sites, facilities, equipment, or services furnished at Federal expense shall be selected from the range of special recreation use fees set forth in this part or according to criteria set forth in this part.

§ 18.2 Types of Federal recreation fees

There shall be two types of Federal recreation fees: (a) Entrance fees for admission to any Designated Entrance Fee Area, and (b) special recreation use fees for the use of sites, facilities, equipment, or services furnished at Federal expense, or for group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicles, or for other specialized recreation uses. There shall be two types of entrance fees: (1) Fees for annual permits, which shall gain admission into any "Designated Entrance Fee Area" during the calendar year for which the fees are paid when entry is by a single, private, noncommercial vehicle, and (2) fees for single visits to any Designated Entrance Fee Areas, which shall be applicable to persons who choose not to purchase the annual permit or who enter such an area by means other than by a single, private, noncommercial vehicle.

§ 18.3 Designation

(a) An area or closely related group of areas shall be designated as an area at which entrance fees shall be charged (hereinafter "Designated Entrance Fee Area") if the following conditions are found to exist concurrently:

(1) The area is a unit of the National Park System administered by the Department of the Interior;

(2) The area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, or recreational purposes;

(3) The area has recreation facilities or services provided at Federal expense; and

(4) The nature of the area is such that fee collection is administratively and economically practical.

(b) Any specialized sites, facilities, equipment, services, or closely related groups of facilities related to outdoor recreation (hereinafter "facilities") shall be designated as facilities for which special recreation use fees shall be charged (hereinafter "Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities") if the following conditions are found to exist concurrently;

(1) The facilities are developed, administered, or provided by any bureau of the Department of the Interior;

(2) The facilities are provided at Federal expense;

(3) The nature of the facilities is such that fee collection is administratively and economically practical;

(4) A substantial investment has been made in the facilities;

(5) The facilities require regular maintenance;

(6) The facilities are utilized for the personal benefit of the user for a fixed period of time; and

(7) The facilities are not the kind of facilities which virtually all visitors might reasonably expect to use without charge, including, but not limited to, such facilities as roads, trails, overlooks, visitor centers, wayside exhibits, or picnic areas.

§ 18.4 Posting

The heads of the bureaus of the Department of the Interior shall provide for the posting of designation signs at all entrances to Designated Entrance Fee Areas and at areas with Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities in a manner such that the visiting public will be clearly notified that entrance or special recreation use fees are charged.

(a) All Designated Entrance Fee Areas shall be posted with a sign as indicated below with the following characteristics:

(1) Be constructed of enameled steel, coated aluminum, silk screen reflective materials attached to wood or metal, or other permanent materials;

(2) Consist of the basic elements, proportion, and color as indicated below:

(i) The Golden Eagle Insignia (hereinafter defined in § 18.16) with the words "The Golden Eagle" and the representation of an American Golden Eagle (colored gold) and a family group (colored midnight blue) enclosed within a circle (colored white with a midnight blue border) framed by a rounded triangle (colored gold with a midnight blue border).

(a) The color midnight blue shall be Pantone Matching System 282; the color gold shall be Pantone Matching System 130;

(b) The rounded triangle shall be 18 inches in vertical height at all Designated Entrance Fee Areas, except that at those areas entered only on foot, the rounded triangle may be 9 inches in vertical height;

(ii) Contains the words "U.S. Fee Area" as indicated below.

(b) All Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities shall be posted with signs identical to the above described sign.

(c) Appropriately sized replicas of the above described signs may be used in conjunction with all other signs erected by any bureau of the Department of the Interior which direct the public to Designated Entrance Fee Areas or Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities. Such signs may also be used in combination with other Federal recreation fee signs or incorporated into larger Federal recreation fee signs by the bureaus of the Department of the Interior or other Federal recreation agencies.

(d) No entrance fee or special recreation use fee established pursuant to this part shall be effective at any Designated Entrance Fee Area and/or Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities until that area or those facilities have been posted.

§ 18.5 Golden Eagle Passport

(a) The Golden Eagle Passport is an annual permit, valid on a calendar-year basis, for admission to any Designated Entrance Fee Area. The charge for the Golden Eagle Passport shall be \$10.

(b) The Golden Eagle Passport shall admit the purchaser and any person accompanying him in a single, private, noncommercial vehicle to Designated Entrance Fee Areas where entrance or admission fees are charged during the period for which the permit is valid.

(c) "Private, noncommercial vehicle," for the purpose of this part, shall include any passenger car, station wagon, pickup camper truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle which is conventionally used for private recreation purposes.

(d) The annual Golden Eagle Passport does not authorize any use of facilities which have been designated as Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities for which special recreation use fees shall be charged.

(e) The annual Golden Eagle Passport shall be for sale in all post offices of the first and second class and at such others as the Postmaster General shall direct, and at Designated Entrance Fee Areas of the National Park Service.

§ 18.6 Golden Age Passport

(a) Issuance of the Golden Age Passports:

(1) Golden Age Passports will be issued by appropriate Federal personnel (hereinafter "Issuing Officer") at all post offices of the first and second class and at such others as the Postmaster General shall direct, and at field offices designated by the heads of the bureaus administering Designated Entrance Fee Areas and Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities.

(2) Golden Age Passports will be issued free of charge upon the presentation of valid, suitable identification which attests to the fact that a person is 62 years of age or older. Such identification may include, but is not limited to, a State driver's license, a birth certificate, etc.

(3) Those persons 62 years of age or older not having in their possession any valid, suitable identification may be issued a Golden Age Passport on the basis of the affidavit below, if such an affidavit is signed in front of the Issuing Officer.

 Passport No. -----
Date

To the Secretary of the Interior:

I do hereby swear or affirm that I am 62 years of age or older and that I am duly entitled to be issued free of charge one Golden Age Passport pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, as amended by the Act of July 11, 1972, 86 Stat. 459.

 Signature

 Street

 Town/City, State

 Issuing officer

(4) The Passport must be applied for in person and signed in front of the Issuing Officer or otherwise it will be treated as invalid.

(b) The Golden Age Passport shall admit the bearer and any person accompanying him in a single, private noncommercial vehicle to Designated Entrance Fee Areas where entrance fees are charged during the period for which the permit is valid. The bearer of a valid Golden Passport shall be entitled upon presentation of the Passport to utilize Designated Special Recreation Facilities at a rate of 50 percent of the established daily fee charged for such facilities.

(c) The Golden Age Passport is an annual permit valid for the calendar year for which it is issued.

§ 18.7 Fees for single-visit permits

(a) There shall be two types of fees for single-visit permits charged at Designated Entrance Fee Areas: One applicable to those entering by private, noncommercial vehicle and one applicable to those entering by any other means.

(b) The fee for a single-visit permit applicable to those entering by private, noncommercial vehicle shall be \$1 to \$3 per vehicle per day at the discretion of the heads of the bureaus. The single-visit permit shall be valid only at the one Designated Entrance Fee Area for which it is paid. The single-visit permit shall admit, without further payment, the purchaser and all persons accompanying him in a private, noncommercial vehicle during its period of validity.

(c) The fee for a single-visit permit charged at Designated Entrance Fee Areas, applicable to those entering by any means other than private, noncommercial vehicle shall be \$0.50 to \$1.50 per person per day at the discretion of the heads of the bureaus and shall be valid at the one Designated Entrance Area for which it is paid.

(d) Any of the permits provided for in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section shall be valid at the Designated Entrance Fee Area for which it was purchased during the same calendar day or days for which it was purchased. In addition, at areas in which overnight use is permitted, such permits shall be valid until noon of the day following the last day for which entrance fees were paid, except as otherwise posted.

§ 18.8 Validation and display of entrance permits

(a) Every annual permit shall be validated by the signature of its bearer on the face of the permit at the time of its receipt.

(b) All annual and single-visit permits shall be nontransferable.

(c) Every permit shall be kept on the person of its owner, and shall be exhibited on the request of any authorized representative of the administering bureau.

§ 18.9 Establishment of special recreation use fees

(a) Special recreation use fees shall be selected by all outdoor recreation administering bureaus of the Department of the Interior from within the range of fees listed below provided that such fees are established in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) The direct and indirect cost to the Government;

(2) The benefit to the recipient;

(3) The public policy or interest served;

(4) The comparable recreation fees charged by other Federal and non-Federal public agencies within the service area of the management unit at which the fee is charge;

(5) The economic and administrative feasibility of fee collection; and

(6) Other pertinent factors.

(b) Special recreation use fees may be established for other types of facilities in addition to those which are listed below in such amounts as are recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) Range of Special Recreation Use Fees:

Camp and trailer sites.....	Up to \$4.50 for overnight use.
Group camping sites.....	Up to \$0.50 per person per day. ¹
Highly developed boat launching sites.....	Up to \$1.50 per boat per day.
Lockers.....	\$0.10 per locker daily.
Boat storage and handling.....	To be established at a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Elevators.....	At least \$0.10 per person round trip.
Ferries and other means of transportation.....	To be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Bathhouses.....	Up to \$0.50 per person per day.
Swimming pools.....	To be established at a daily rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Overnight shelters.....	To be established at a daily rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Precut firewood.....	To be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Guided tours.....	To be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Electrical hook-ups.....	Up to \$1 per hook-up per day.
Vehicle and trailer storage.....	To be established at a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual rate in accord with the criteria set forth in this section.
Boats, nonmotorized.....	A minimum of \$1 per boat per day or fraction thereof.
Boats, motorized.....	A minimum of \$5 per boat per day or fraction thereof.
Specialized sites (highly developed multiuse sites).....	Up to \$1.50 per person per day.

¹ Heads of administering agencies or departments may select group use rates in lieu of the above "Group Camping Sites" special recreation fee, and may establish a minimum group use charge of at least \$3 per day per group without regard to group size or other provisions of this part.

(d) Daily use fees for overnight occupancy within areas specially developed for such use shall be determined on the basis of the value of the capital im-

provements offered, the cost of the services furnished, and other pertinent factors.

§ 18.10 Special recreation use permits

Notwithstanding other sections of this part, special recreation permits for uses such as group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicles, and other specialized recreation uses may be issued in accordance with procedures and fees established by the bureau involved.

§ 18.11 Effective dates of Federal recreation fees

Effective January 1, 1973, the fees provided for in this part shall be charged at every posted Designated Entrance Fee Area and for posted Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities.

§ 18.12 Collection of Federal recreation fees

Heads of the bureaus of the Department of Interior shall provide for the collection of fees at posted Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities.

§ 18.13 Enforcement

Persons authorized by the heads of the appropriate bureaus to enforce these regulations may, within areas under the administration or authority of such bureau head and with or, if the offense is committed in his presence, without a warrant, arrest any person who violates these rules and regulations. Any violations of the rules and regulations issued in this part except those in § 18.16, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$100.

§ 18.14 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions

In the application of the provisions of this part, the following exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions shall apply:

(a) Nothing contained herein shall authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses or fees;

(b) No entrance fee shall be charged for travel or private noncommercial vehicle over any National Parkway, or any road or highway established as part of the National Federal-Aid System, which is commonly used by the public as a means of travel between two places, either or both of which are outside the area;

(c) No entrance fee shall be charged for travel by private noncommercial vehicle over any road or highway to any land in which such person has any property right if such land is within any designated Federal recreation fee area.

(d) No entrance fee shall be charged for commercial or other activities not related to recreation, including but not limited to organized tours or outings conducted for educational or scientific purposes related to the resources of the area visited by bona fide institutions established for these purposes; nor shall any entrance fee be charged any hospital inmate actively involved in medical treatment or therapy in the area visited.

(e) No entrance fee shall be charged any person conducting State, local, or Federal government business.

(f) No entrance fee shall be charged at any entrance to Great Smoky Mountains National Park unless such fees are charged at main highways and thoroughfare entrances.

(g) No entrance fees shall be charged for persons who have not reached their 16th birthday.

(h) Until July 12, 1975, no entrance fees shall be charged foreign visitors to the United States seeking admission to Designated Entrance Fee Areas upon presentation of a valid passport.

(i) No entrance fees shall be charged persons having a right of access to lands or waters within a Designated Entrance Fee Area for hunting or fishing privileges under a specific provision of law or treaty.

§ 18.15 Public notification

The administering bureaus shall notify the public of the specific Federal recreation fees which will be charged for each Designated Entrance Fee Area and Designated Special Recreation Use Facilities under their respective jurisdictions. Such notification shall be accomplished by posting such information at each area and facility, and by local public announcements, press releases, publications distributed at each area or facility, and other suitable means.

§ 18.16 The Golden Eagle Insignia

(a) Definitions. (1) The term "The Golden Eagle Insignia" (hereinafter "Insignia") as used in this section, means the words "The Golden Eagle" and the representation of an American Golden Eagle (colored gold) and a family group (colored midnight blue) enclosed within a circle (colored white with a midnight blue border) framed by a rounded triangle (colored gold with a midnight blue border) which was originated by the Department of the Interior as the official symbol for Federal recreation fee areas.

(2) The term "Secretary" as used in this part, means the Secretary of the Interior or any person designated to act for him in any matter to which this section refers.

(3) The term "commercial use," as used in this part, refers to any use, including the reproduction, manufacture, importation, or distribution, of the Insignia the primary purpose of which is to make a profit.

(4) The term "public service use," as used in this part, refers to any use, including the reproduction, manufacture, importation, or distribution, of the Insignia the primary purpose of which is to contribute to the public's information and education about the Federal recreation fee program.

(5) The term "official use" refers to uses of the Insignia pursuant to §§ 18.4, 18.5, 18.6, 18.8, 18.10, and 18.15, including, but not limited to the posting of Designated Entrance Fee Areas and Designated Special Recreation Facilities, and the design of Golden Eagle and Golden Age Passports.

(6) The Golden Eagle program refers to the Federal outdoor recreation fee program, which provides for the Designation of Entrance Fee Areas and Special Recreation Use Facilities, the issuance of Golden Eagle and Golden Age Passports, and the collection and enforcement of fees at Federal areas and facilities, established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, as amended.

(b) Licenses for commercial and public service use. (1) Any person, business, or organization (hereinafter called the applicant) wishing a license for commercial or public service use of the Insignia must make written application to the Secretary stating:

(i) The nature and scope of the intended use.

(ii) The applicant's name and address.

(iii) The nature of the applicant's business or activities, and the relationship between the intended use and said business or activities.

(2) The Secretary, in determining whether to grant a license for the commercial use of the Insignia, will consider the following criteria:

(i) Whether the intended use will be an enhancement of the Golden Eagle program which would complement the program as it is administered by Federal recreation agencies and departments.

(ii) Whether the intended use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive the general public by creating the impression that the use is official.

(iii) Whether the intended use is injurious to the integrity of the concept of the Insignia.

(iv) Whether the intended use is capable of generating enough royalty fee revenue to justify the administrative costs of licensing.

(3) The Secretary, in determining whether to grant a license for the public service use of the Insignia, will consider the following criteria:

(i) Whether the intended use will be an enhancement of the Golden Eagle program which would complement the program as it is administered by Federal recreation agencies and departments.

(ii) Whether the intended use is injurious to the integrity of the concept of the Insignia.

(4) Any license granted by the Secretary for commercial use of the Insignia is subject to the following terms and conditions:

(i) The license is nontransferable.

(ii) All proposed uses of the Insignia must be approved by the Secretary prior to manufacture, importation, or reproduction by the licensee. The Insignia shall not be used in conjunction with substances inherently dangerous to the public.

(iii) The license shall contain equal employment opportunity provisions in compliance with Executive Order 11246, 30 F.R. 12319 (1965), as amended, and regulations issued pursuant thereto (41 CFR Ch. 60) unless the royalty fees to be paid under the license are not expected to exceed \$10,000.

(iv) The license shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary at any time that he finds that: (a) The criteria under which the license was granted are not being fulfilled; or (b) there has been a violation of the terms and conditions of the license.

(5) Any license granted by the Secretary for public service use of the Insignia is subject to the following terms and conditions:

(i) The license is nontransferable.

(ii) All proposed uses of the Insignia must be approved by the Secretary prior to manufacture, importation, reproduction, or distribution by the licensee. that he finds that: (a) The criteria under which the license was granted are not being fulfilled; or (b) there has been a violation of the terms and conditions of the license.

(iii) The license shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary at any time that he finds that: (a) The criteria under which the license was granted are not being fulfilled; or (b) there has been a violation of the terms and conditions of the license.

(c) Unauthorized use of the Insignia. (1) Unauthorized use of the Insignia is all use except: The licensed commercial use or public service use of the Insignia, official use of the Insignia; and any lawful use of the Insignia, similar emblem, sign or words which antedates the Act of July 11, 1972, 86 Stat. 459.

(2) Whoever makes unauthorized use of the Insignia or any facsimile thereof, in such a manner as is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake or to deceive the public by creating the impression that the use is official, shall be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

(3) Any unauthorized use of the Insignia may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General upon complaint by the Secretary.

(d) Royalty fees for commercial and public service use. (1) Royalty fees for licensed commercial use of the Insignia shall be established at reasonable rates by contract between the licensee and the Secretary.

(2) Royalty fees for licensed public service use of the Insignia shall be waived by the Secretary.

(e) Abandonment of the Golden Eagle Insignia. The rights of the United States in the Golden Eagle Insignia shall terminate if the use of the Insignia is abandoned by the Secretary. Non-use for a continued period of 2 years shall constitute abandonment.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1974.

Mr. RONALD H. WALKER,
Director, National Park Service,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALKER: As a followup to the hearings of April 8 and 9, 1974, before the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, I have a number of further questions which I would like to submit for your response. In accordance with Subcommittee Chairman Taylor's permission, these questions and your reply will be made a part of the hearing record.

The following questions relate to S. 2844, which basically reinstates campground user fee charges, and to the oversight by the Subcommittee regarding last summer's campground reservation system and the Service's consideration of a pilot program for concessioner operation of campgrounds.

1. How many units of the National Park System have campgrounds and how many total campgrounds and individual campsites does this represent?

2. Prior to the enactment of P.L. 93-81, what was the fee structure for campgrounds—that is, how many campgrounds charged what fee (by even dollars)?

3. In your final analysis of last summer's pilot campsite reservation system, what is your conclusion as to public acceptance? What is the National Park Service's appraisal relative to its acceptability as a management tool? How acceptable was the operation to the contractor?

4. What are your principal recommendations for improvement of the campsite reservation system?

5. How will the reinstitution of campground user fees as proposed in S. 2844 affect the reservation system and the proposal to have concessioners operate campgrounds?

6. Would you supply us with some general data as to costs of constructing and operating a campground?

7. For all parks planned for inclusion in the future expanded campsite reservation system, could you please give us a list by park, showing the number of campgrounds and campsites within each park, along with the number of campgrounds and campsites which will be incorporated into the reservation system.

8. I am curious to know how you arrived at the specific consideration of having concessioners operate campgrounds. Did this evolve as a matter of one possible alternative of several as a result of identifying overall problems in other alternatives identified for consideration, and were any of them considered as viable as the concessioners alternative? Would you please identify other possible alternatives, and comment on their viability.

9. Would you supply us with a list of all parks which have concessioners, and delineate the following for each park:

- a. name of each concessioner
- b. nature of operation and type of service offered by each concessioner
- c. total collective length of service of each concessioner
- d. total length of contract (and termination date) under which current operation is conducted
- e. parent ownership of concessioner, if owned or controlled by another company or corporation

I would certainly appreciate your prompt response to these questions, and I am sure that the reply will be of value to the Subcommittee in its further consideration of the matters brought before it by the hearings.

Sincerely,

ALAN STEELMAN,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1974.

Hon. ALAN STEELMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning additional information on the hearings before the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee. We apologize for this late reply.

Your questions and our answers are as follows:

Question. 1. How many units of the National Park System have campgrounds and how many total campgrounds and individual campsites does this represent?

Answer. Nationwide, the National Park Service has 29,033 campsites in 433 campgrounds in 92 parks or areas. These range from Class A campgrounds with flush toilets, paved roads, picnic tables, and barbecue grills to more primitive Class B campgrounds without designated campsites and few improvements. Also included are some campgrounds designed particularly for the use of large organized groups.

Question. 2. Prior to the enactment of P.L. 93-81, what was the fee structure for campgrounds—that is, how many campgrounds charged what fee (by even dollars)?

Answer. Camping fees were charged at most well-developed Service campgrounds prior to August 1, 1973. These fees ranged from \$1 to \$4 per campsite per night, with the level of the fee dependent upon the level of services and facilities provided at each campground.

The following is a breakdown of the number of Service campgrounds and the amount of fees charged just prior to August 1, 1973:

Fee:	Number of campgrounds
\$4 per site per nite.....	7
\$3 per site per nite.....	38
\$2 per site per nite.....	36
\$1 per site per nite.....	41
No charge.....	311
Total.....	433

Question. 3. In your final analysis of last summer's pilot campsite, reservation system, what is your conclusion as to public acceptance? What is the National Park Service's appraisal relative to its acceptability as a management tool? How acceptable was the operation to the contractor?

Answer. Overall, last year's pilot campsite reservation system was successful, despite a lack of preparation time and advance publicity. It was well accepted by the public and it was felt by Service personnel to provide a needed service to visitors.

The pilot study provided that a nationwide, computerized campsite reservation system is practical from an operational standpoint. All indications are that it also provides a worthwhile convenience and service to the camping public. The public stands to benefit even more, however, if other overused popular national parks are included, and the reservation system should eventually be expanded to all national parks that experience near-capacity or heavier travel during the peak travel season.

The contractor stated that it was an excellent pilot program. The Service systems should be expanded. However, the discontinuance of the camping fees put a burden on the system because of problems of refunds, no-shows, and site availability at the park.

Question. 4. What are your principal recommendations for improvement of the campsite reservation system?

Answer. Principal recommendations for improvement are to expand the system to cover heavily used areas.

Question. 5. How will the reinstitution of campground user fees as proposed in S. 2844 affect the reservation system and the proposal to have concessioners operate campgrounds?

Answer. We believe that a camping fee system is necessary in order to proceed with any effort to have concessioners operate campgrounds. Fees collected at campgrounds, whether operated by the Service or by concessioners, would be deposited directly to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. However, funds collected would be available for appropriation back to the Service for operation of recreational facilities, including campgrounds. This would serve as a primary source of funding for campground operations.

It was our experience during the last month of last summer and during last winter's operation at Everglades that camping reservations were very difficult to handle when campers did not have to pay camping fees at the time they made their reservations. With no refund possibility involved, there was no incentive to cancel reservations and "no-shows" increased to an unmanageable level.

Question. 6. Would you supply us with some general data as to costs of constructing and operating a campground?

Answer. Within the past few years, development costs for standard Service campgrounds have been approximately \$2,600 per campsite. This is for campgrounds with designated sites, parking areas, circulatory and access roads, modern restrooms, centralized water, trash facilities, picnic tables, and fireplaces. Primitive campgrounds with minimal facilities have been developed for about \$250 per site.

Question. 7. For all parks planned for inclusion in the future expanded campsite reservation system, could you please give us a list by park, showing the number of campgrounds and campsites within each park, along with the number of campgrounds and campsites which will be incorporated into the reservation system.

Park	Total number of campsites in park	Name of campground and number of campsites in campgrounds	Total number of campsites in park subject to reservation system
Acadia.....	509	Blackwoods (320).....	320
Assateague Island.....	130	Maryland Section (130).....	130
Blue Ridge.....	1,053	Otter Creek (67).....	1,053
		Peaks of Otter (148).....	
		Roanoke Mountain (105).....	
		Rocky Knob (110).....	
		Doughton Park (124).....	
		Julian Price Park (196).....	
		Linville Falls (70).....	
		Crabtree Meadows (93).....	
		Mount Pisgah (140).....	
Cape Hatteras.....	701	Cape Point (203).....	601
		Frisco (136).....	
		Oregon Inlet (120).....	
		Salvo (142).....	
Catoctin.....	51	Owens Creek (51).....	51
Crater Lake.....	266	Mazama (200).....	254
		Rim (54).....	
Everglades.....	343	Flamingo (235).....	343
		Long Pine Key (108).....	
Glacier.....	1,113	Apgar (200).....	399
		Many Glacier (117).....	
		Rising Sun (82).....	
Grand Canyon.....	465	Mather (320).....	400
		Bright Angel Point (80).....	
Grand Teton.....	967	Colter Bay (520).....	685
		Jenny Lake (85).....	
		Signal Mountain (80).....	
Great Smoky Mountains.....	1,417	Elkmont (340).....	521
		Smokemont (181).....	
Greenbelt.....	178	Greenbelt Park (178).....	178
Gulf Islands.....	335	Fort Pickens (200).....	200
Joshua Tree.....	434	Indian Cove (114).....	244
		Jumbo Rocks (130).....	
Lassen Volcanic.....	515	Manzanita Lake (273).....	367
		Summit Lake (94).....	
Mammoth Cave.....	157	Headquarters (145).....	145
Platt/Arbuckle.....	475	Cold Springs (64).....	410
		Rock Creek (111).....	
		Buckhorn Rock (183).....	
		The Point (52).....	
Prince William Forest.....	120	Oak Ridge (120).....	120
Rocky Mountain.....	800	Moraine Park (260).....	360
		Timber Creek (100).....	
Sequoia and Kings Canyon.....	1,325	Dorst (257).....	457
		Lodgepole (200).....	
Shenandoah.....	709	Matthews Arm (186).....	709
		Big Meadow (260).....	
		Lewis Mountain (32).....	
		Loft Mountain (231).....	
Yellowstone.....	2,322	Bridge Bay (440).....	2,029
		Canyon (340).....	
		Fishing Bridge (317).....	
		Grant Village (433).....	
		Madison (292).....	
		Mammoth (91).....	
		Norris (116).....	
Yosemite.....	2,314	Lower River (154).....	1,074
		Upper River (212).....	
		Lower Pines (183).....	
		Upper Pines (239).....	
		North Pines (99).....	
		Wawona (187).....	

Question. 8. I am curious to know how you arrived at the specific consideration of having concessioners operate campgrounds. Did this evolve as a matter of one possible alternative of several as a result of identifying overall problems in campgrounds operations? If so, what were the other alternatives identified for consideration, and were any of them considered as viable as the concessioners alternative? Would you please identify other possible alternatives, and comment on their viability.

Answer. The proposal to have concessioners operate campgrounds is based upon the possibility that a contractor may be able to perform many of the recurring duties called for in a campground at a lower cost than in a National Park Service operation, and at the same time could provide better service to park visitors. Additionally, the use of concessioner personnel for this function would, in most cases, free considerable numbers of both permanent and seasonal Service personnel for use in other maintenance and visitor services functions where additional help is badly needed. Data on personnel and costs involved in campground operations now are not available in sufficient detail, but information in this area will be gathered during the coming season. This will allow a determination to be made later this year on whether or not a pilot operation should be tried in 1975.

Question. 9. Would you supply us with a list of all parks which have concessioners, and delineate the following for each park:

- a. Name of each concessioner
- b. Nature of operation and type of service offered by each concessioner
- c. Total collective length of service of each concessioner
- d. Total length of contract (and termination date) under which current operation is conducted
- e. Parent ownership of concessioner, if owned or controlled by another company or corporation

Answer. There are two lists enclosed which will answer your questions concerning concessioners. The first list delineates the name of each concessioner, the nature of operation, and service offered by each concessioner. The second list delineates the total length of contract or permit, the termination date under the current authorization, and also the parent ownership of concession if owned or controlled by another company or corporation.

The information listed under the "Total Collective Years of Service" heading may not be accurate in all cases, as many of the older files have been sent to the archives and are not readily available in the time allotted.

We appreciate your interest and hope the above answers the questions you have raised.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD H. WALKER,
Director.

Enclosure.

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
Acadia National Park, Bar Harbor, Maine 04609: The Acadia Corp., Charles K. Savage, president. Charles B. Bampton. Ruby Gooch's Taxi, Ruby Gooch, owner. John Jones & Son, Inc., John Jones, owner.	Seal Harbor, Maine 04675. Bar Harbor, Maine 04609. do. do.	Mount Desert St., Bar Harbor, Maine 04609. Same. do. do.	Meals, souvenirs (Jordan Pond); snacks, souvenirs (Cadillac Mountain and Thunder Hole). Sightseeing tours, taxi. Do. Do.
National Park Tours, Bernard Couch. William F. Tapley. Chester A. Goggin. Amistad National Recreation Area, Del Rio, Tex. 78840: Howard Baughman. Charles Baughn. Gus Carey. David Crawley. W. P. Fisher. Howard Cason Janes.	do. Seal Harbor, Maine 04675. Bar Harbor, Maine 04675. 1108 Avenue A, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 205 West Palford, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 217 Arroyo, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. P.O. Box 285, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 209 East 12th, Del Rio, Tex. Box 10, Highway 90 West, Del Rio, Tex. 78840.	do. North Brooklyn, Maine 04617. Same. do. do. do. do. do. do.	Sightseeing tours, bus. Saddle horse and carriage hire service. Taxi. Fishing guide service. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do.
Ron Lambert. Marine Recreation, Inc., Sam Buita. Norman E. McBride. Glenn McGonagill. Amistad National Recreation Area, Del Rio, Tex. 78840: Thomas E. Merkle. Rough Canyon Marina, Noble Taylor, president. Jerry Lee Rust. Lawrence R. Scruggs. Jack Skipworth. Badlands National Monument, Interior, S. Dak. 57750: Ogala Sioux Cedar Pass, Concession Enterprise, Gene Schnose, Manager. Bandler National Monument, Los Alamos, N. Mex. 87544: Leonard R. Bertram. Mrs. Evelyn C. Frey (Frijoles Canyon Lodge).	Del Rio Mobil Homes, Lot 62, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. Box 999, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 1910 Avenue E, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 205 Jodobo Dr., Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 1910 Avenue E, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. Box 1142, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. 1000 East 2d St. Del Rio, Tex. 78840. P.O. Box 435, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. P.O. Box 713, Del Rio, Tex. 78840. P.O. Box 71, Interior, S. Dak. 57750. Los Alamos, N. Mex. 87544. Los Alamos, N. Mex. 87544.	do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do. do.	Marina and boating services (Diablo East Area). Fishing guide service. Do. Do. Do. Marina and boating services (Rough Canyon Area). Fishing guide service. Do. Do. Lodging, meals, souvenirs gasoline, and oil. Food and beverage service (Frijoles Canyon). Lodging and souvenirs (Frijoles Canyon).

Big Bend National Park, Tex. 79834: National Park Concessions, Inc., Mr. Garner Hanson.	do	Mammoth Cave, Ky. 42259.	do	Lodging, meals, gift shop, photographic and supplies, souvenirs, house trailer sites (Chisos Basin); Service station (Panther Junction).
Gilbert C. Youngloff (Chisos Remuda)..... Big Bend National Park, Tex. 79834.	do	Big Bend National Park, Tex. 79834.	do	Saddle horse service (Chisos Basin).
Highoin Canyon National Recreation Area, Hardin, Mont. 59035: Crow Agency of Indians of Montana, David Stewart, tribal chairman. Norman Hoffman, Jr. Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Mon- ument, Montrose, Colo. 81401: The Rim House, Inc. Cathleen Koch, President. Blue Ridge Parkway, P.O. Box 1710, Roanoke, Va. 24008: Richard Brogan..... S. S. Clark.	do	Hardin Montana 59034	do	Marina services (Ok-A-Beh).
261 Hampshire Ave., Lovell, Wyo. 82431.	do	261 Hampshire Ave., Lovell, Wyo. 82431.	do	Food and beverage service, marina (Horseshoe Bend).
1019 North First St., Montrose, Colo.	do	1019 North First St., Montrose, Colo.	do	Lunches, refreshments, and souvenirs.
Route 8, Roanoke, Va. 24014. Blowing Rock Stables, Blowing Rock, N.C. 3701 28605. P.O. 9145, Asheville, N.C. 28805	do	Route 8, Roanoke, Va. 24014. Blowing Rock Stables, Blowing Rock, N.C. 3701 28605. P.O. 9145, Asheville, N.C. 28805	do	Firewood services (Roanoke Mountain Campground). Saddle horses and carriage rides (Moses Cone Park).
Crafts of Nine States, Inc., Robert W. Gray, vice president. Homer Harris.	do	Same	do	Handicraft demonstration sales and craft instructions (Cone Park).
Meadow of Dan, Va. 24120	do	Meadow of Dan, Va. 24120	do	Pioneer home industry demonstrations, sale of homemade products (Marbury Mill).
P.O. Box 264, Elkin, N.C. 28621	do	P.O. Box 264, Elkin, N.C. 28621	do	Interpretive exhibit of mountain textile handicraft and sales of handmade or homespun textiles and related articles (Brinegar Cabin in Doughton Park).
National Park Concessions, Inc., Garner Hanson.	do	Mammoth Cave, Ky. 42259	do	Lodging, meals, service station (Doughton Park); service station, housekeeping cabins (Rocky Knob); coffee shop (Wabry Mill); restaurant, service station (Crabtree Meadows); coffee shop, service station (Cherry Hill).
Northwest Trading Post, Inc., Stella Anderson, President. Pisgah Inn, Inc., J. Aaron Prevost.....	do	West Jefferson, N.C. 28694	do	Country store, sale of homegrown and grown articles and products typical of northwest North Carolina (Glendale Springs).
Virginia Peaks of Otter Co., Bryce Wagoner, president. Bryce Canyon National Park, Bryce Canyon, Utah 84317:	do	C/O First Union National Bank, 302 North Main St., Waynesville, N.C. 28786. 3900 Merton Dr., Raleigh, N.C. 27609.	do	Lodging, meals, gifts, service station (Mt. Pisgah).
Jack H. Church..... TWA Services, Inc., Jack Audley, general manager. Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Chinle, Ariz. 86503: Justin's Inc. (Thunderbird Guest Ranch), Gerald A. Lea Font, manager.	do	P.O. Box 368, Fredonia, Ariz. 86022 P.O. Box 400, Cedar City, Utah 84720.	do	Lodging, meals, transportation service (Peaks of Otter); refresh- ments, service station (Otter Creek and Whetstone Ridge).
	do		do	Saddle and pack animal services.
	do		do	Lodging, meals, souvenirs, transportation, service station.
	do		do	Lodging, meals, souvenirs, canyon trips, gasoline, oil.

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, Mass. 02663:			
Edward and Anna E. Benz (Nauset Motor Lodge).	Beach Rd., East Orleans, Mass. 02643	do	Lodging (Nauset Beach).
Edward G. and Nancy A. Benz (Salt Pond Motel).	Eastham, Mass. 02643	Chatham Rd., South Orleans, Mass. 02662	Lodging (Eastham).
Charles W. Silva	Off Shank Painter Rd., Provincetown, Mass. 02657	41 Norton Rd., Quincy, Mass. 02169	Refreshments, snack bar (Herring Cove Beach).
Town of Truro, Chairman of Board of Selectmen.	Truro, Mass. 02662	Same	Golf course (Highland Town of Truro).
Cape Hatteras National Seashore, P.O. Box 457, Manteo, N.C. 27954:			
Avon Pier and Recreation Enterprises, Inc., Joe M. Jordana, president.	P.O. Box 35, Avon, N.C. 27915	637 West Kingston Lane, Virginia Beach, Va. 23452	Fishing pier and related services, tackle, bait, candy, beverages.
Cape Hatteras Fishing Pier, Inc., Robert O. Comstock, Secretary.	Hatteras, N.C. 27943	Rt. 2, Box 223-F, Leesburg, Va. 22075	Do.
Chicamacomico Enterprises, Inc., Rick H. Ferrell, president.	Rodanthe, N.C. 27968	Moyock, N.C. 27958	Fishing pier and related services.
Oregon Inlet Fishing Center, Wayland W. Baum, president.	P.O. Box 533, Manteo, N.C. 27954	New Holland, N.C. 27885	Marina, restaurant, and related services.
Carlsbad Caverns National Park, Carlsbad, N. Mex. 88220:			
Cavern Supply Co., Inc., George Crump, president.	Drawer Y, Carlsbad, N. Mex. 83220	Same	Restaurant and fountain services, nursery, kennel, film, souvenirs.
Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, 1 Castillo Drive, St. Augustine, Fla. 32084:			
J. Carver Harris (The Castillo Shop)	Box M, St. Augustine, Fla. 32034	do	Souvenirs, literature, film, camera, supplies.
Colonial National Historic Park, P.O. Box 210, Yorktown, Va. 23490:			
Frank P. Dickenson (Swan Tavern Antiques).	Yorktown, Va. 23430	do	Colonial period antiques and quality handmade reproduction representative of the colonial period (Main St.).
Yorktown Pewter, Ltd., Mr. Shirley Robertson, president.	do	do	Pine furnishings and pewter ware (Main St.).
Yorktown Shoppe, Ltd., Roger L. High and John P. Scotton.	do	do	Hand dipped candles and handturned pottery (Main St.).
Coulee Dam National Recreation Area, Coulee Dam, Wash. 99116:			
Herbert Armstrong.	Harrington, Wash. 99134	do	Boat mooring and marine supplies (Piney Point).
Alfred McCoy.	Fruitland, Wash. 99129	do	Marine supplies and snack items (Fort Spokane).
Willard Plafie.	Wilbur, Wash. 99185	do	Boat mooring, covered docks, marine supplies (Keller Ferry).
Win M. Self, Seven Bays Inc.	East 10514 28th Ave., Spokane, Wash. 99206	do	Service stations, beverages, food service, fishing supplies (Fort Spokane).
Sonja Everett.	Grand Coulee, Wash. 99133	do	Boat mooring, marine supplies, snacks (Spring Canyon).
Joe Boyce, Boyce Charters.	Box 104, Coulee Dam, Wash. 99116	do	Houseboat rentals (Spring Canyon).

Crater Lake National Park, Crater Lake, Oreg. 97604:	P.O. Box 97, Crater Lake, Oreg. 97604	P.O. Box 25160, Portland, Oreg. 97225	Lodging, meals, transportation, service stations, souvenirs, boat services.
Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., Ralph Peyton, president.			
Curecanti National Recreation Area, Montrose, Colo. 81401:			
The Denver Post, Mr. Goldie Sebring, District	606 West New York, Gunnison, Colo. 81230	do	Newspaper.
Le Fevre Enterprises, Frank Le Fevre, president.	421 North Boulevard, Gunnison, Colo. 81230	do	Ship rentals, boat mooring, marina supplies, snacks, camping supplies.
Death Valley National Monument, Death Valley, Calif. 92328:			
TWA Services, Inc., John Van Enige, resident manager.	P.O. Box 128, Death Valley, Calif. 92328	do	Gasoline, curios and souvenir sales, quick food service (Scotty's Castle).
Dinosaur National Monument, Vernal, Utah 81610:			
Hatch River Expeditions, Inc., Don & Ted Hatch, owners.	411 East Second, North Vernal, Utah 84078	do	River float trips.
Western River Expeditions, Inc., Jack Curry, president.	Maeser, Utah 84078	P.O. Box 6339, Salt Lake City, Utah 84105	Do.
Wilkins Transportation Co., Wayne Wilkins, president.	343 South Vernal Ave., Vernal, Utah 84078	Same	Shuttle bus service.
Everglades National Park, P.O. Box 279, Homestead, Fla. 33030:			
Brouwer Park Co., Inc., Robert Brouwer, executive vice president.	18494 South Federal Highway, Miami, Fla. 33157	do	Lodging, meals, marina services, charter fishing boats, gift shop, service station, sightseeing boat trips, bicycle rentals.
Sammy Hamilton, Jr.	Box 119, Everglades City, Fla. 33929	do	Sightseeing boat service.
Fire Island National Seashore, Patchogue, N.Y. 11772:			
Howard T. Rose Co., Inc., Howard T. Rose, president.	Box 445, Sayville, N.Y.	do	Food service, groceries (Sailors Haven site).
Watch Hill Marina, Inc., Martin Gunkel, president.	520 Shore Dr., Oakdale, N.Y. 11769	do	Marina services, boat rentals, food services, groceries (Watch Hill site).
Fort McHenry National Monument, Baltimore, Md. 21230:			
Evelyn Hill, Inc., James Hill, manager.	Liberty Island, New York, N.Y. 10004	do	Souvenirs, postcards, film, literature.
Fort Sumter National Monument, Box 428, Sullivan's Island, S.C. 29482:			
Fort Sumter Tours, Inc., George Campsen, president.	Municipal Yacht Basin, Box 59, Charleston, S.C. 29402	do	Boat transportation to Fort Sumter.
Glacier Bay National Monument, P.O. Box 1089, Juneau, Alaska 99801:			
Roland K. Gildersieve, president (Glacier Bay Airways).	Glacier Bay National Monument, Gustavus, Alaska 99826	280 Douglas Highway, Juneau, Alaska 99801	Air tours and air charter.
Glacier Bay Lodge, Orion C. Shockley, president.	do	do	Lodging, meals, transportation, marine fuel, boat tours, fishing.
Glacier National Park, West Glacier, Mont. 59936:			
Glacier Park Boat Co., Inc., Arthur M. Burch, president.	East Glacier Park, Mont. 59434	444 Woodland, Kalispell, Mont. 59901	Boat rentals and launches (Swiftcurrent Lake, Josephine Lake, Two Medicine Lake, Lake McDonald, St. Mary Lake.)
Glacier Park, Inc., Don Hummel, president.	do	P.O. Box 4340, Tucson, Ariz. 85719	Lodging, meals, services, photo and camper supplies, souvenirs, sundries, auto service stations, transportation.
B. Ross Luding	Box 37, West Glacier, Mont. 59936	Box 157, Martin City, Mont. 59936	Lodging and meals.
Rocky Mountain Outfitters, Inc., Al Donau, general manager.	East Glacier, Mont. 59434	Route 2, Box 39, Columbia Falls, Mont. 59912	Saddle and pack horses and horse-drawn vehicles.

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Page, Ariz. 86040; Bullfrog Marina, Inc., Richard K. Reuling.	260 East 6th South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111	Same	Marina and related services, trailer village, snacks, beverages, service station.
Canyon Tours, Inc., Arthur H. Green, Jr.	P.O. Box 1597, Page, Ariz. 86040	do	Lodging, restaurant, graveled airplane landing strip, trailer village, marina, service station, related services.
Fort Lee Co., Tony Lee Sparks, president.	Page, Ariz. 86040	do	Chartered boat service, boat rentals, snacks, beverages, service station (Lee's Ferry).
C. Ward Howard, Hite Marina.	P.O. Box 218, La Mesa, Calif. 92041	do	Sale of gasoline, boating and camping supplies.
Lake Powell Ferry Service Inc., J. Frank Wright, president.	Hall's Crossing, Blanding, Utah 84511	do	Marina and related services, boat trips, service station, trailer village, beverages, snacks, graveled airplane landing strip, ferry service from Hall's Crossing to Bullfrog.
Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason, San Francisco, Calif. 94123; Harbor Carriers, Inc.	Pier 41 Bulkhead, San Francisco, Calif. 94123.	do	Boat transportation to Alcatraz Island from San Francisco Pier #43.
Golden Spike National Historic Site, Brigham City, Utah 84302; Business Enterprises Program of the State of Utah.	State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah.	do	Vending machine operation.
Grand Canyon National Park, Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023; American River Touring Association, Lon Elliott, Director.	1016 Jackson St., Oakland, Calif. 94607	do	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
Arizona River Runners, Inc., Fred Burke.	Box 2021, Marble Canyon, Ariz. 86036	do	Do.
Babbitt Bros. Trading Co., P. J. Babbitt, president.	Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023	do	Groceries, drugs, dry goods, campers supplies, delicatessen, soda fountain (South Rim).
Canyonairs, Inc., Jan Staveley, vice president.	Box 957, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001	do	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
Colorado River & Trails Expeditions, Inc., David J. MacKay, outfitter.	1449 East 30th South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84106	do	Do.
Cross Tours & Explorations, Inc., John L. Cross.	274 West 1400 South, Orem, Utah 84057	do	Do.
Fried Harvey, Inc., Bruce Curtis, vice president.	Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023	do	Lodging, meals, transportation (including sightseeing mules and saddle horses), curios, newsstand, trailer village, camper services, barber, laundry, service station, garage (South Rim).
George's Royal River Rats.	P.O. Box 12489, Las Vegas, Nev. 89112	do	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
Grand Canyon Expeditions, Inc., Ron Smith.	P.O. Box 0, Dept. NPS, Kanab, Utah 84741	do	Do.
Grand Canyon Youth Expeditions, Dick McCallum.	Route #2, Box 755, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001	do	Do.
Harris Boat Trips, Don Harris.	250 North 500 East, Box 776, Centerville, Utah 84014.	do	Do.
Hatch River Expeditions, Inc., Ted Hatch.	411 East 2d North, Vernal, Utah 84078	do	Do.
Emery C. Kolb, Kolb's Studio.	Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023	do	Mounted motion picture of trip down Colorado River, photographs, souvenirs (South Rim).

Moki Mac River Expeditions, Rich Quest.	6829 Bella Vista Dr., Salt Lake City, Utah 84121.	do	do	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
O.A.R.S., Inc., George Wendt.	1310-20th St., Santa Monica, Calif. 90404.	do	do	Do.
Outdoors Unlimited, John Vail.	2500 Fifth Ave., Sacramento, Calif. 95818.	do	do	Do.
Riordan's Inc. (Northern Arizona Gas Service, Inc.), Grady Austin.	Post Office Box 459, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86002.	do	do	Liquefied petroleum gas.
Sanderson River Expeditions, Jerry Sanderson.	P.O. Box 1535, Page, Ariz. 86040.	do	do	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
Tour West, Inc., Russell H. Hansen.	P.O. Box 333, Orem, Utah 84057.	do	do	Do.
TWA Services, Inc., Utah Parks Division, Jack Audley, manager.	North Rim Rural Station, North Ariz. 86023.	Box 400,	Cedar City, Utah 84720.	Lodging, meals, transportation, curios, barber, service station (North Rim).
Verkamp's, Inc., Verkamp, Jack, president.	P.O. Box 96, Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023.	Same	Same	Souvenirs, curios (South Rim).
MarDean Waymire (Grand Canyon Scenic Rides).	North Rim, Ariz. 86022.	Box 127,	Grand Canyon, Ariz. 86023.	Saddle and pack animal services, snacks, soft drinks (North Rim).
Western River Expeditions, Inc., Jack Curry.	P.O. Box 6339, Salt Lake City, Utah 84106.	Same	Same	River outfitter, Colorado River float trips.
White Water River Expeditions, Harry Falany.	P.O. Box 1249, Turlock, Calif. 95380.	do	do	Do.
Wilderness World, Ron Hays.	1342 Jewell Ave., Pacific Grove, Calif. 93950.	do	do	Do.
Wonderland Expeditions, Ken Sleight.	P.O. Box 338, Green River, Utah 84525.	do	do	Do.
Grand Portage National Monument, Grand Marais, Minn. 55604.	Grand Portage, Minn. 55605.	do	do	Grand Portage Trading Post, meals, souvenirs, parking lot services (Grand Portage).
Reservation Business Committee, Grand Portage Band, Jim Hendrickson, chairman.	366 Lake Ave., South, Duluth, Minn. 55802.	do	do	Boat passengers—Grand Portage to Isle Royale.
Sivertson Bros. Fisheries, Stan Sivertson.	Box 1872, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do	do	Guided float trips.
Grand Teton National Park, Box 112, Moose, Wyo. 83012.	Moose, Wyo. 83012.	459 Bal Tontain St.,	Pasadena, Calif. 91106.	Accommodations for mountain climbers.
American Alpine Club, Nicholas Clinch, treasurer.	Box 1243, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	Same	Same	Guided float trips.
Barker-Ewing, Frank Ewing & Dick Barker.	Box 1176, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do	do	Do.
Boots Allen & Son, Inc., Richard Allen.	P.O. Box 1113, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do	do	Do.
George N. Clover.	P.O. Box 1226, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do	do	Do.
John Crane (Sundance Ski Tours).	Box 1346, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do	do	Do.
Dennis & Kinker, Jack Dennis & Jim Kinker.	Moose, Wyo. 83012.	do	do	Mountain guiding.
Exum Mountain Guide Service and School of Mountaineering, Inc., Glen Exum, president.	Box 269, Wilson, Wyo. 83014.	do	do	Guided float trips.
Flagg Float Trips, John E. Simms.	Moran, Wyo. 83013.	640 East Highpoint Terr.,	Peoria, Ill. 61614.	Lodging, food, souvenirs, gasoline.
Flagg Ranch, Leo Dentino.	do	209 Post St.,	San Francisco, Calif. 94108.	Transportation, lodging, meals, service stations, boating, horses, souvenirs, general store.
Grand Teton Lodge Co., Vernon Johnson, executive vice president and general manager.	Box 1300, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	Same	Same	Guided float trips.
Headwater Float Trips, Geo. Northrup, president.				

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
Heart Six Float Trips, James F. Stone & Bud Salors.	Moran, Wyo. 83013.	do.	Do.
Huckleberry Hot Springs, Arthur Flansburg.	Box 1934, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Campground, store, service station, swimming pool.
Maurice Horn (Wilderness Expeditions).	P.O. Box 471, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Guided ski tours.
Jack Frie Ski Shop, John Hix, president.	P.O. Box 1036, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Do.
Jackson Hole Mountain Guides, Inc., James Hudenoper, director.	Teton Village, Wyo. 83025.	1175 Vine St., Denver, Colo. 80206.	Mountain guiding.
Jackson Hole Ski Corp., Pepe Spiegler, director.	do.	Same.	Guided ski tours.
Johnson Float Trips, Francis Johnson.	Moran, Wyo. 83013.	do.	Guided float trips.
Leek's Lodge, Inc., James K. Sanderson.	do.	do.	Lodging, meals, boat rental.
Mad Dog Enterprises, Geo. Sweet, president.	Box 482, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Guided float trips.
National Park Float Trips.	Box 411, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Do.
Old Timer Float Trips, Charles M. Peterson, president.	Box 1074, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Do.
OSPREY Enterprises, Gene Downer & Ramona Brasser.	Wilson, Wyo. 83014.	do.	Do.
Parkland Expeditions, Danny Becker, president.	Box 371, Jackson, Wyo. 3001.	do.	Do.
Powderhound Ski Tours, Bruce Simon.	Box 752, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Guided ski tours.
Red & Real Float Trips, Jack D. Dever & Tom Rylands.	Box 577, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Guided float trips.
Signal Mountain Lodge, Inc., Martin J. Harris, president.	Moran, Wyo. 83013.	do.	Lodging, meals, auto services, boat rental, saddle and pack horses.
Saltitude Float Trips, H. G. Hanson & Jerry Hanson.	Box 112, Moose, Wyo. 83012.	do.	Guided float trips.
Teton Boating Co., Arthur E. McCain.	P.O. Box 528, Jackson, Wyo. 83001.	do.	Do.
Teton Trail Rides, Lowe L. Rudd, general manager.	Moose, Wyo. 83012.	Route #2, St. Anthony, Idaho 83445.	Saddle horses (Cottonwood Creek).
T. Angie X Ranch, Louise Bertschy, manager.	do.	Same.	Guest ranch.
Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Gatlinburg, Tenn. 37738:			
Herbick B. Brown.	LeConte Lodge, Gatlinburg, Tenn. 37738.	do.	Lodging, meals (atop Mount LeConte).
Cades Cove Riding Sabes, Inc., Hugh L. Meyers, president.	Cades Cove Star Route, Townsend, Tenn. 37801.	do.	Saddle horse livery (Cades Cove).
Floyd E. Cate, manager.	1617 LeConte Dr., Maryville, Tenn. 37801.	do.	Campground store (Cades Cove).

Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Gallatinburg, Tenn. 37738: Cherokee Boys Club, Inc., Kay Kinsland, manager.	P.O. Box 507, Cherokee, N.C., 28719	do	Firewood (Balsam Mountain Campground).
McCarter's Riding Stables, Inc., Marvin McCarter, manager.	Gallatinburg, Tenn. 37738	do	Saddle horse livery (Twomile Branch).
Glen R. McHan, manager.	P.O. Box 267, Cherokee, N.C. 28719	Whittier, N.C. 28789	Campground store.
Clarence Ray	R.F.D. 6, Sevierville, Tenn. 37862	Same	Firewood and newspapers.
Smokemont Riding Stables, Inc., Lawrence E. Segrist, manager.	Route #1, Cherokee, N.C. 28719	do	Saddle horse livery (Smokemont Creek).
Smoky Mountain Riding Stables, Inc., Bill Cox, manager.	P.O. Box 445, Gallatinburg, Tenn. 37738	do	Saddle horse livery (Dudley Creek).
Gulf Islands National Seashore (Florida Unit) P.O. Box 100, Gulf Breeze, Fla. 32561: Accommodations and facilities are available within the National Seashore. For further information contact the seashore superintendent.			
Gulf Islands National Seashore (Mississippi Unit) P.O. Box 862, Ocean Springs, Miss. 39564:			
Noel James Skrimetta	2808 Lewis St., Biloxi, Miss. 39531	Same	Excursion boat services.
Peter W. Skrimetta	514 Iroquois, Biloxi, Miss. 39530	do	do.
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii National Park, Hawaii 96718: Kilauea Volcano House, Ltd., W. H. Charlock, III, president.	Hawaii National Park, Hawaii 96718	do	Lodging, meals, cocktail lounge, souvenirs, natural steam baths.
Isle Royale National Park, Houghton, Mich. 49931: Isle Royale Queen, Donald E. Kilpela, owner.	Copper Harbor, Mich. 49918	do	
Isle Royale Seaplane Service	P.O. Box 371, Houghton, Mich. 49930	do	Boat transportation of passengers and freight (Copper Harbor).
National Park Concessions, Inc., Garner Hanson.	Rock Harbor Lodge, Isle Royale National Park, Mich. 49940:	Charles J. Grognet, Isle Royale Seaplane, Grognet Flying Service, Airport Rd., Chawane, Wis. 54166	Seaplane transportation service (National Park Service Visitor Center, Houghton).
Katmai National Monument, McKinley Park, Alaska 99755: Wein Consolidated Airlines, Inc., Ray- mond Peterson.	366 Lake Ave., South, Duluth, Minn. 55802	do	Lodging, meals, marina, souvenirs, grocery store, public showers, laundry (Rock Harbor, Windigo). Ferry transportation of passengers and freight (Grand Portage).----
Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Boulder City, Nev. 89005: Cottonwood Ccvc, Development Co., Don D. Toney.	Box 6247, International Airport, 4100 International Airport Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99502.	do	Lodging, meals, air and boat transportation, limited camping and fishing supplies (Brooks River, Grosvenor Lake).
Eldorado Canyon Resort, Inc. Byron P. Rynd, president.	Star Route, Box 10-A, Searchlight, Nev. 89046.	do	Marina, boat rentals, lodging, trailer village, meals, refreshments, groceries, service station, fishing supplies.
Forest Enterprises, Inc., Arvis C. Forrest, president.	Boulder City, Nev. 89005	do	Lodging, snack bar, boat rentals, marina, trailer village, groceries, stadium, fishing supplies.
Lake Mead Ferry Service, Inc., Gayle M. Dawdy, president.	5441 Paradise Rd., Suite A-101, Las Vegas, Nev. 89109.	do	Trailer village, groceries, refreshments, snack bar, swimming and beach supplies, coin operated showers. Scheduled boat tours and unscheduled charter boat service (Lake Mead).

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
Lake Mohave Resort, Inc., E. H. Pratt, vice president.	Bullhead City, Ariz. 86430	do	Lodging, food and beverage facilities, trail village, marina, boat rentals, automobile service station, fishing supplies, groceries and sundries, small merchandise.
Las Vegas Boat Harbor, Inc., Robert A. Grippentog, president.	P.O. Box 771, Henderson, Nev. 89015	do	Marina, boat rentals, boat sales, fishing supplies, groceries, sundries, meals, small merchandise.
L. M. Enterprises, Inc., Carl D. Plunkett, president.	2103 Western Ave., Las Vegas, Nev. 89102	do	Food and beverage facilities, groceries, sundries, marina (Callville Bay).
Leisurama, Inc., (Lake Meade Lodge, Lake Mead Marina), Robert A. Mahieu, president, Paul G. McVey, vice president.	P.O. Box 96, Boulder City, Nev. 89005	do	Marina, lodging, food and beverage facilities, swimming pool, boat rentals, small merchandise store, groceries, sundries, fishing supplies.
Moccasin Tours & Transportation, Inc., Merlin D. Bundy.	P.O. Box 231, Fredonia, Ariz. 86022	do	Air transportation, mule rides, bus (from canyon to airport for river trips).
Mule Train Tours, Merlin D. Bundy	P.O. Box 213, Fredonia, Ariz. 86022	do	Mule rides, bus (from canyon to airport for river trips).
Overton Beach Resort, Inc., Ronald Griswell, vice president.	P.O. Box 714, Overton, Nev. 89040	do	Lodging, food, marina, boat rentals, trailer village, fishing supplies, groceries and sundries.
Temple Bar Marina, Inc., Milton Warner, general manager.	Temple Bar, Ariz. 86443	do	Lodging, food, and beverage facilities, marina, service station, boat rentals, fishing supplies, groceries and sundries, air landing strip, general merchandise.
Willow Beach Resort, Inc., W. E. Webb, president.	P.O. Box 187, Boulder City, Nev. 89005	do	Lodging, food, trailer village, marina, boat rentals, fishing supplies, groceries, sundries, general merchandise, automobile service station, coin operated showers.
Monroe Beecher, director Hualapai Wildlife & Outdoor Recreation Department.	Box 216, Peach Spring, Ariz. 86434	do	Raft trips.
Lassen Volcanic National Park, Mineral, Calif. 96063:	Manzanita Lake, Calif. 96060	3000 Sand Hill Rd., Menlo Park, Calif.	Lodging, meals, groceries, souvenirs, boat rentals, saddle horses, laundromat, showers, service station, mechanical service.
Smith, general manager.			
Lassen Volcanic National Park Co., Geryl Nev. 89311:			
Shirley George and Majorie Robinson----	Lehman Caves National Monument, Baker, Nev. 89311.	Box 364, Ely, Nev. 89301	Restaurant and souvenirs (park headquarters).
Mammoth Cave National Park, Mammoth Cave, Ky. 42259:			
M. E. Nash and Robert McDaniel, president, Miss Green River Boat Concession, Inc.	Box 25, Cave City, Ky. 42127	Lakeside Trailer, Moore Haven, Fla. 33471	Scenic boat trip on Green River.
National Park Concessions, Inc., Garner B. Hanson.	Mammoth Cave, Ky. 42259	Same	Lodging, meals, service station, souvenirs, campstore, laundry, showers.
Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. 81330:			
Emmett C. and Frances M. Koppenthafer (M.V. Pack & Saddle).	Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. 81330	320 South Market, Cortez, Colo. 81321	Pack and saddle horses.
Mesa Verde Co. Wm. Winkler, president.	Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. 81330	Mancos, Colo. 81328	Lodging, meals, store, showers, laundry, transportation within park, souvenirs, service station.

Mount McKinley National Park, Mount McKinley, Alaska 99755: Outdoor World, Ltd., George Fleharty, president.	McKinley Park, Alaska 99755	P.O. Box 144, Menlo Park, Calif	Lodging, meals, bus transportation, groceries, souvenirs, service station, mechanical service.
Mount Rainer National Park, Longmire, Wash. 98397: Mount Rainer National Park Hospitality Service, Pat Davis, general manager.	P.O. Box 1136 Tacoma, Wash. 98401	Same	Lodging, meals, transportation, service stations, snack bar, souvenirs.
Parkland Sport Center, Dick Vanderlute, Rainer Mountaineering, Inc., Lou Whitaker & W. Gerald Lynch.	11122 Pacific Ave., Tacoma, Wash. 98444	do	Ski Tows (Paradise).
Mount Rushmore National Memorial, Keystone, S. Dak. 57751: Mountain Company, Inc., Mrs. Kay Valdes, president.	Paradise Inn Post Office, Paradise, Wash. 98402	201 St. Helen, Tacoma, Wash.	Mountain guiding.
Muir Woods National Monument, Mill Valley, Calif. 94941: Jackdo, Inc., John F. Schlette (Muir Woods Inn).	Keystone, S. Dak. 57751	Same	Meals, souvenirs, handicrafts, gifts, sundries.
Natchez Trace Parkway, P.O. Box 943, Tupelo, Miss. 38801: C. W. Gary.	Muir Woods National Monument, Mill Valley, Calif. 94941.	do	Food Service, redwood souvenirs (administration area).
National Capital Parks, Washington, D.C. 20242: Almoors Securities, Inc., Frank Madonia, general manager.	Eupora, Miss. 39744	do	Camping supplies, service station (Jeff Busby Park).
Appliance Fix-It, Inc., Bob Helton, president.	Mount Vernon Shops, Va. 22121	do	Meals, snacks, souvenirs (Mount Vernon).
Belle Haven Marina, Inc., Walter A. Stonell, president.	6401 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Va.	do	Bicycle rental.
Buzzard Point Boatyard Corp., Marvin Schneck, president.	P.O. Box 7093, Alexandria, Va. 22307	do	Mooring, storage, launching.
Capitol Cycles Corp., Raymond Greene.	Foot of 1st St. SW., Washington, D.C. 20024	P.O. Box 8292, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024.	Mooring, storage, boat rentals, boat repairing.
Albert C. Enders, president, Prince William Trailer Park, Inc.	1711 Taylor St., #4, Arlington, Va. 22204	Same	Bicycle rental.
Julius W. Fletcher (Fletcher's Boat House).	c/o Prince William Forest Park, Triangle, Va. 22072.	do	Trailer park and related services.
Government Services, Inc., M. T. Allen, president.	4940 Canal Rd. NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.	5022 Cathedral Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.	Refreshments, fishing supplies, boats, boat equipment, bicycle rental.
Landmark Services, Inc., Tom Mack, general manager.	1135 21st St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036	Same	Tennis courts, marinas, refreshments, rentals, C&O Canal barge trips.
Thomas C. Long (Anacostia Marina)	900 Ohio Dr., SW., Washington, D.C. 20024	do	Mail visitor interpretive shuttle service.
Rock Creek Park Horse Centre, Inc., Bob Douglas, president.	Anacostia Park, Washington, D.C.	do	Refreshments, mooring, launching ramp, boat repairing, oil, marine supplies.
S. G. Leffler Co., Severn Leffler.	Rock Creek & Potomac Parkway, Military and Glover Roads, NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.	do	Riding stable and related facilities.
Frederick O. and Virginia Swain	East Potomac Park, SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.	do	Golf course, supplies, refreshments.
	10700 Swain's Lock Rd., Rockville, Md. 20854.	do	Rowboat and canoe rental, refreshments, bait, bicycle rental.

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
North Cascades National Park, 311 State St., Sedro Woolley, Wash. 98284; Diablo Lake Resort, Howard Bradley, manager (Ross Lake)	Box 194, Rockport, Wash. 98283	do	Lodging, snack bar, gasoline, boat rental (Diablo Lake).
North Cascades Lodge (Stehakin Landing Inn), Robert Byrd, manager	Stehakin, Wash. 98352	do	Food, lodging, marine and vehicle gasoline, shuttle bus transportation (Stehakin).
Rock Lake Resort, Wayne Dameron, manager	Rockport, Wash. 98283	do	Lodging and related services.
Olympic National Park, Port Angeles, Wash. 98362; Becker's Ocean Resort, Inc., Charles Becker	Clearwater, Wash. 98399	do	Lodging, meals, store, service station (Kalaloch).
Henry A. Brown, Ski School	3207 Maple St., Port Angeles, Wash. 98362	do	Ski instructions (Hurricane Ridge).
Log Cabin Lodge	Route 1, Box 416, Port Angeles, Wash. 98362	do	Lodging, meals, store, boat rentals (Lake Crescent).
LaPush Ocean Park, Inc., William G. Tennessee, president	LaPush, Wash. 98362	do	Lodging, souvenirs.
National Park Concessions, Inc., Esters, Bedford, manager	Star Route 1, Port Angeles, Wash. 98362	do	Lake Crescent Lodge Hurricane Ridge Visitor Center, Sol Duc Hot Springs, lodging, meals, etc., ski equipment rental, trailer sites.
Olympic Ski Lift, Inc., Dr. Frank Skerbeck	112 South Lincoln St., Port Angeles, Wash. 98362	do	Ski tows (Hurricane Ridge).
Oregon Caves National Monument, Cave Junction, Ore. 97523; Oregon Caves Co., Harry Christianson, manager	Cave Junction, Ore. 97523	P.O. Box 151, Grants Pass, Ore. 97525	Lodging, meals, cave guiding, souvenirs.
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, P.O. Box 448, Van Buren, Mo. 63965; Alley Spring Concession, Edna Staples, manager	Alley Spring, Mo. 65431	Same	Wood sales, snack shop, laundry, curios, groceries.
Big Spring Concession, Faye Burrows, manager	P.O. Box 73, Van Buren, Mo. 63965	do	Cabin rental, food service, firewood, curios, trailer hookups, laundromat.
Sullivan's Concession & Canoe Rental, Doug Keeling, manager	Eminence, Mo. 65476	do	Canoes, snacks, souvenirs, firewood, laundromat, showers.
Big Spring John Boat Rental, Philip Moss and Noah Rector	Van Buren, Mo. 63365	do	Johnboat rides.
Padre Island National Seashore, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78403; Padre Island National Seashore Co., Ernest Seiliff, general manager	P.O. Box 6741, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78411	do	Food and beverages, merchandising, sale and rental of beach and camping equipment and supplies (Malaquite Beach).
Petrified Forest National Park, Ariz. 86025; Fred Harvey, Inc., Bill Maxwell, general manager	Box 247, Petrified Forest National Park, Ariz. 86025	do	Meals, souvenirs, service station (Painted Desert).
Rainbow Forest Lodge, Inc., J. Dolman Robinson, president	2074 First Ave., Holbrook, Ariz. 86025	do	Meals, souvenirs, service station (Rainbow Forest).

Platt National Park, Post Office Box 539, Sulphur, Okla. 73086:-----	810 West 12th St., Sulphur, Okla. 73086-----do-----	Camping equipment. Do.-----
Dooley's Laundry, Jess L. Dooley-----	300 West Muskogee, Sulphur, Okla. 73086-----do-----	
Point Reyes National Seashore, Point Reyes, Calif. 94956:-----		
Jackglo, Inc., John F. Schlette, president-----	Muir Woods National Monument, Mill Valley Calif. 94941.-----do-----	Fast Food Service (Drakes Beach).
Rocky Mountain National Park, Estes Park, Colo. 80517:-----	650 15th St., Denver, Colo. 80202-----do-----	Newspaper. Summer: Food service, gift shops (Fall River Pass store, Hidden Valley. Winter: Hidden Valley Ski Resort.
The Denver Post editor-----	P.O. Box 1020, Estes Park, Colo. 80517-----	Newspaper. Livery and pack service.
Rocky Mountain Park Co., T. L. James, Sr., chairman, T. L. James, Jr., presi- dent-----	Box 1707 Estes Park, Colo. 80517-----Same-----	
Trail-Gazette Publishing Co., editor-----	P.O. Box 1111, Estes Park, Colo. 80517-----do-----	
Paul & Wm. Van Horn, Hi Country Stables, Sagamore National Historic Site, Box 304, Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y. 11771:-----	Statue of Liberty National Monument, Liberty Island, New York, N.Y. 10004.-----do-----	Food, beverages, merchandise (Sagamore Hill).
Saga-Hill Corp., James Hill, general manager-----		
Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Salem, Mass. 01970:-----	170 Derby St., Salem, Mass. 01970.-----do-----	Antiques, historical objects (Salem).
Edward B. Rushford-----		
Sanford National Recreation Area, P.O. Box 325, Sanford, Tex. 79078:-----	P.O. Box 1257, Fritch, Tex. 79036-----do-----	Snack bar, marina and related services, charter boats and tour trips, enclosed fish house for all season angling (Sanford-Yake).
Fritch Fortress, Inc., W. W. Braden, Jr., president-----	P.O. Box 804, Fritch, Tex. 79036-----do-----	Mobile snack bar food service.
Cherry Hamilton & Nell Goodwin (Goodie Truck).-----		
Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Three Rivers, Calif. 93271:-----	P.O. Box 61, Three Rivers, Calif. 93271.-----30547 Mehrtlen Dr., Exeter, Calif. 93221-----	Pack and saddle horses (Wolverton Meadow).
William E. DeCarteret (DeCarteret Pack Trains).-----		
Sequoia & Kings Canyon Hospitality Service, L. L. Caulum, manager-----	Sequoia National Park, Calif. 93262-----do-----	Lodging, meals, transportation, souvenirs, service station, skiing in season.
Allen R. Simmons (Kings Canyon Pack Station).-----	Cedar Grove, Kings Canyon National Park, Star Route, Squaw Valley, Calif. 93646-----	Pack and saddle horses (Cedar Grove).
Dick R. Wilson-----	Calif. 93633-----do-----	
Shadow Mountain National Recreation Area, Grand Lake, Colo. 80447:-----	1716 Meadow Lane, Visalia, Calif.-----do-----	Pack and saddle horses (Grant Grove).
Mrs. Burton S. Adams (Sunrise Harbor).-----	P.O. Box 574, Grand Lake, Colo. 80447-----254 Marble Circle, Golden Terr. Village, Golden Colo. 80401.-----	Marina.
William W. Bell (Bell Crest Resort).-----	P.O. Box E, Grand Lake, Colo. 80447-----do-----	Do.
Joe Carpenter (Beacon Boats).-----	110 Hooker St., Denver, Colo. 80200-----do-----	Do.
Alexander Duncan (Highland Marina).-----	Star Route, Granby, Colo. 80446-----do-----	Do.
Estes Park Trail, Gazette, Inc., Wm. C. Robinson, manager-----	Estes Park, Colo. 80517-----do-----	Vending machines.
Gala Marina, Inc., Geo. T. Winkler-----	Grand Lake, Colo. 80447-----do-----	Marina.
Glenn R. Moss (Shadow Mountain Lake Boat Service).-----	P.O. Box 608, Grand Lake, Colo. 80447-----5110 Stuart St., Denver, Colo. 80212.----- 11305 Mountainview Blvd., Aurora, Colo. 80010.-----	Do.

CONCESSIONERS FURNISHING ACCOMMODATIONS AND SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC IN AREAS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued

Concessioner	Summer address	Winter address	Facilities and services
R. Frank Norton, III (Norton's Marine)..... Egil A. Scott (El Navajo Lodge)..... William K. Steuben (Lake Shore Cabins and Marine)..... J. R. Steward (Trail Ridge Marine)..... Shenandoah National Park, Luray, Va. 27835: ARA Virginia Sky-Line Co., Inc., Grant R. Bannen, general manager.	Lake Granby, Colo. 80446..... Box 295, Grand Lake, Colo. Star Route, Granby, Colo. 80446..... P.O. Box 588, Grand Lake, Colo. 80447..... P.O. Box 727, Luray, Va. 22835.....	do..... 10017 North 28th, Phoenix, Ariz. 85028..... do..... do..... do.....	Do..... Do..... Do..... Lodging, meals, refreshments, stores, service station, souvenirs, handicraft, saddle horses (Panorama, Skyland Lodge, Big Meadow, Lewis Mountain, Loft Mountain). Appalachian Trail shelter cabins.
Potomac Appalachian Trail Club, Inc., Dr. Ed B. Garvey, president. Shiloh National Military Park, Shiloh, Tenn. 38376: R. D. Shaw and A. B. Phillips State of Liberty National Monument, Liberty Island, New York, N.Y. 10004: Circle Line-Statue of Liberty Ferry, Inc., Frank Barry, president. Evelyn Hill, Inc., James Hill, general manager.	1718 North St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20036..... Shiloh, Tenn. 38376..... Pier 83, Foot of West 43d St., Liberty Island, N.Y. 10004..... Liberty Island, New York, N.Y. 10004.....	do..... do..... do..... do.....	Refreshments souvenirs..... Boat transportation, souvenirs, refreshments (Battery Park). Refreshments, souvenirs, photographic service (Statue of Liberty).
Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, Medora, N. Dak. 58645: Alvin Tescher (Tescher's Trail Rides)..... Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Ameri- can Fork, Utah 84003: Mrs. Betsy Wagner.....	Medora, N. Dak. 58645..... 95 South 700 East, American Fork, Utah 84003.....	Dickinson, Rt. 3, N. Dak. 58601..... do.....	Saddle horses, buckboard rides, vending machines..... Sandwiches, refreshments, pictures, slides, film.
Virgin Islands National Park, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I. 00802: Caneel Bay Plantation, Inc., Richard L. Erb, general manager.	P.O. Box 4930, St. Thomas, V.I. 00801.....	do.....	Beach cottage rentals camping equipment and supplies (Cinnamon Bay) refreshments, rental and sale of beach equipment and supplies, souvenirs (Trunk Bay)
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Whiskeytown, Calif. 96095: H. I. & Dan Froese (Oak Bottom Marina)..... Wind Cave National Park, Hot Springs, S. Dak. 57747: Dick A. Turbiville & Carl F. Oberlitter..... White Sands National Monument, Alamogordo, N. Mex. 88310: White Sands Souvenirs, Inc., T. L. Womack, president.	P.O. Box 197, Whiskeytown..... Hot Springs, Rt. 1, S. Dak. 57747..... 1414 Juniper, Alamogordo, N. Mex. 88310.....	do..... do..... do.....	Snack bar, camp supplies, marine service and rentals..... Lunchroom, fountain service, souvenirs, etc..... Refreshments, souvenirs.

Wright Brothers National Memorial, c/o Capé
Hatteras National Seashore, Box 457, Man-
teo, N.C. 27954:

o, N.C. 27954;
Manteo Flying Service, Brantley Twiford --

Yellowstone National Park, Yellowstone Park,
Wyo. 82190.

yo. 82150:
Hamilton Stores, Inc., Trevor Povah,
president.

President,
Yellowstone Medical Service Livingston
Clinic

Clinic.
Yellowstone Park, Co., John Ammerman,

president & general manager.
Yellowstone Park Service Stations,

Charles H. Gallagher, general manager.
Yosemite National Park, Yosemite, Calif.

Primate National Park, Yosemite, Calif.
389:
Bayer Studio Inc The Angel Adams

Best's Studio, Inc. (The Ansel Adams Gallery), Bill Turnage, manager.

Roger Hendrickson, M.D., James Wurgler, M.D., W. R. LeBourdais, M.D. (Lewis

M.D., W. K. LeBoeuf, M.D. (Lewis Memorial Hospital).

Charles A. Woessner, D.D.S.
Yosemite Park & Curry Co., Ed Hardy,

manager.

Portal Administrative Site, Yosemite National Park Calif 95389.

El Portal Motor Service, George Hardin,

owner.
Standard Oil Co. of California, Robert F.

David L. and Jack W. Vaughn
Bevington.

David L. and Jack W. Vaughn
National Park, Springdale, Utah 84767:

Jack H. Chruch-----
TWA Services, Inc., John A. Audley,

general manager.

Concessioner	Total collective years of service	Current contract or permit	Parent ownership
Acadia National Park:			
The Acadia Corp. (contract).....	55	Jan. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹ ...	
Charles B. Bannon (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Ruby Gooch's Taxi (permit).....	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
John Jones & Son, Inc. (permit).....	3	do.....	
National Park Tours (permit).....	3	do.....	
William F. Tapley (permit).....	3	do.....	
Chester A. Gogins (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Amistad National Recreation Area:			
Howard Baughman (permit).....	2	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Charles Baughn (permit).....	1	Sept. 1, 1973 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Gus Carey (permit).....	1	do.....	
David Crawley (permit).....	3	do.....	
W. P. Fisher (permit).....	3	do.....	
Howard Cason Jones (permit).....	2	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Ron Lambert (permit).....	1	Sept. 1, 1973 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Marine Recreation, Inc. (contract).....	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1990.....	
Norman E. McBride (permit).....	1	Sept. 1, 1973 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Glenn McGonagill (permit).....	3	do.....	
Thomas E. Merkle (permit).....	3	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Rough Canyon Marina (permit).....	5	Apr. 1, 1971 to Mar. 31, 1975.....	
Jerry Lee Rust (permit).....	1	Sept. 1, 1973 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Lawrence R. Scruggs (permit).....	3	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Jack Skipworth (permit).....	1	Sept. 1, 1973 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Badlands National Monument:			
Oglala Sioux Cedar Pass Concession Enterprise (contract).....	5	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Bandelier National Monument:			
Leonard R. Bertram (permit).....	5	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Evelyn C. Frey (permit).....	49	do.....	
Big Bend National Park:			
National Park Concessions, Inc. (see Mammoth Cave) Gilbert C. Youngdoff (contract).....	10	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area:			
Crow Agency of Indians of Montana (contract).....	4	Sept. 15, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1999.....	
Norman Hoffman, Jr. (permit).....	4	Apr. 1, 1970 to Mar. 31, 1975.....	
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument:			
The Rim House, Inc. (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Blue Ridge Parkway:			
Richard Brogan (permit).....	2	do.....	
S. S. Clark (permit).....	4	do.....	
Crafts of Nine States, Inc. (permit).....	20	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Homer Harris (permit).....	14	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹ ...	
Miss Grace Laffoon (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
National Park Concessions, Inc. (see Mammoth Cave) Northwest Trading Post, Inc. (contract).....	16	do.....	
Pisgah Inn, Inc. (contract).....	11	Jan. 1, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1982.....	
Virginia Peaks of Otter (contract).....	16	Dec. 1, 1958 to Nov. 30, 1978.....	
Bryce Canyon National Park:			
Jack H. Church (contract).....	9	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1979.....	
TWA Services, Inc. (see Zion N.P.).....			
Canyon de Chelly National Monument:			
Justin's Inc. (contract).....	20	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Cape Cod National Seashore:			
Edward & Anna E. Benz (contract).....	5	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹ ...	
Edward G. & Nancy A. Benz (contract).....	5	do. ¹	
Charles W. Silva (permit).....	11	Apr. 19, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Town of Truro (contract).....	6	May 23, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹ ...	
Cape Hatteras National Seashore:			
Avon Pier & Recreation Enterprises, Inc. (contract).....	2	Apr. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹ ...	
Cape Hatteras Fishing Pier, Inc. (contract).....	8	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Chicamacomico Enterprises, Inc. (contract).....	10	do.....	
Oregon Inlet Fishing Center (contract).....	8	Jan. 1, 1966 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Carlsbad Caverns National Park:			
Cavern Supply Co., Inc. (contract).....	22	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1989.....	
Castillo de San Marcos National Monument:			
J. Carvei Harris (contract).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Colonial National Historic Park:			
Frank P. Dickinson (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Yorktown Peyster Ltd. (permit).....	3	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Yorktown Shoppe, Ltd. (permit).....	3	do.....	
Coullee Dam National Recreation Area:			
Herbert Armstrong (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Alfred McCoy (permit).....	5	June 1, 1969 to May 31, 1974.....	
Willard Paffle (permit).....	9	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Win M. Self (permit).....	5	July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1974.....	
Sonja Everett (permit).....	7	July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1974.....	
Joe Boyce (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Crater Lake National Park:			
Crater Lake Lodge, Inc. (contract).....	7	Nov. 1, 1967 to Oct. 31, 1997.....	

See footnote at end of table.

Concessioner	Total collective years of service	Current contract or permit	Parent ownership
Curecanti National Recreation Area:			
The Denver Post (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977....	
Le Fevre Enterprises (permit).....	3	Feb. 16, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Death Valley National Monument:			
TWA Services, Inc. (see Zion N.P.).....			
Dinosaur National Monument:			
Hatch River Expeditions (permit).....	13	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1973....	
Western River Expeditions, Inc. (permit).....	11	do.....	
Wilkins Transportation Co. (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978....	
Everglades National Park:			
Everglades Park Co., Inc. (contract).....	18	Jan. 1, 1956 to Dec. 31, 1975....	General Host Corp.
Sammy Hamilton, Jr. (contract).....	13	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1981....	
Fire Island National Seashore:			
Howard T. Rose Co. (contract).....	6	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Watch Hill Marina, Inc. (contract).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974....	
Fort McHenry National Monument:			
Evelyn Hill, Inc. (contract).....	9	do.....	
Fort Sumter National Monument:			
Fort Sumter Tours, Inc. (contract).....	12	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1977....	
Glacier Bay National Monument:			
Roland K. Gildersleve (permit).....	5	Mar. 18, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1974....	
Glacier Bay Lodge (contract).....	5	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1991....	
Glacier National Park:			
Glacier Park Boat Co., Inc. (contract).....	9	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977....	
Glacier Park, Inc. (contract).....	13	Jan. 1, 1961 to Dec. 31, 1985....	
B. Ross Luding (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Rocky Mountain Outfitters, Inc. (contract).....	8	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977....	
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area:			
Bullfrog Marina, Inc. (contract).....	8	Jan. 1, 1966 to Dec. 31, 1985....	
Canyon Tours, Inc. (contract).....	10	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1998....	
Fort Lee Co. (contract).....	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1990....	
C. Ward Howard (contract).....	3	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978....	
Lake Powell Ferry Service, Inc. (contract).....	5	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973....	
Golden Gate National Recreation Area:			
Harbor Carriers, Inc. (contract).....	1	Oct. 25, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1978....	
Golden Spike National Historic Site:			
Business Enterprises Program of the State of Utah (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Grand Canyon National Park:			
American River Touring (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Arizona River Runners, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Babbitt Bros. (contract).....	53	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1987....	
Canyoneers, Inc. (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Colorado River & Trails Expeditions, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Cross Tours & Explorations, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Fort Lee Co. (see Glen Canyon).....			
Fred Harvey, Inc. (contract).....	55	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1998....	AMFAC, Inc.
Georgie's Royal River Rats (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Grand Canyon Expeditions, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Grand Canyon Youth Expeditions (permit).....	2	do.....	
Harris Boat Trips (permit).....	2	do.....	
Hatch River Expeditions, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Emery C. Kolb (contract).....	44	Jan. 1, 1957 to Dec. 31, 1973....	
Moki Mac River Expeditions (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
O.A.R.S., Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
Outdoors Unlimited (permit).....	2	do.....	
Riordan's, Inc. (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974....	
Sanderson River Expeditions (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Tour West, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
TWA Services, Inc. (see Zion N.P.).....			
Verkamp's Inc. (contract).....	6	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1977....	
MarDean Waymire (contract).....	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1979....	
Western River Expeditions, Inc. (permit).....	2	Aug. 19, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
White Water River Expeditions (permit).....	2	Aug. 9, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Wilderness World (permit).....	2	do.....	
Wonderland Expeditions (permit).....	2	do.....	
Grand Portage National Monument:			
Reservation Business Committee Grand Portage Band (permit).....	13	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Silvertson Bros. (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975....	
Grand Teton National Park:			
Abercrombie Float Trips (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
American Alpine Club (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974....	
Barker-Ewing (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	
Boots Allen & Son, Inc. (permit).....	2	do.....	
George N. Clover (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973....	
John Crane (permit).....	3	July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1976....	
Dennis & Kinker (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976....	

See footnote at end of table.

Concessioner	Total collective years of service	Current contract or permit	Parent ownership
Exum Mountain Guide Service and School of Mountaineering Inc. (permit).....	10	do.....	
Flagg Float Trips (permit).....	2	do.....	
Flagg Ranch (permit).....	2	do.....	
Grand Teton Lodge Co. (contract).....	21	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 2002	
Headwater Float Trips (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Heart Six Float Trips (permit).....	2	do.....	
Huckleberry Hot Springs (permit).....	2	do.....	
Maurice Horn (permit).....	3	do.....	
Jack Pine Ski Shop (permit).....	3	July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1976	
Jackson Hole Mountain Guides, Inc. (permit).....	6	do.....	
Jackson Hole Ski Corp. (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975	
Johnson Float Trips (permit).....	5	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Leek's Lodge, Inc. (contract).....	2	do.....	
Mad Dog Enterprises (permit).....	16	Oct. 1, 1968 to Sept. 30, 1988	
National Park Float Trips (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Old Timer Float Trips (permit).....	2	do.....	
OSPREY Enterprises (permit).....	2	do.....	
Parklands Expeditions (permit).....	2	do.....	
Powderhound Ski Tours (permit).....	3	do.....	
Rod & Reel Float Trips (permit).....	2	July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1976	
Signal Mountain Lodge, Inc. (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Solitude Float Trips (permit).....	20	Dec. 5, 1966 to Dec. 31, 1981	
Teton Boating Co. (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Teton Trail Rides (permit).....	25	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975	
Triangle X Ranch (contract).....	10	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Great Smoky Mountains National Park:	21	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973	
Herrick B. Brown (contract).....	9	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974	
Cades Cove Riding Stables, Inc. (permit).....	7	do.....	
Floyd E. Cate, (permit).....	15	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973	
Cherokee Boys Club, Inc. (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
McCarters Riding Stables, Inc. (permit).....	12	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Glen R. McHan (permit).....	19	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1978	
Clarence Ray (permit).....	9	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1974	
Smokemont Riding Stables, Inc. (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977	
Smoky Mountain Riding Stables, Inc. (permit).....	11	do.....	
Gulf Islands National Seashore:			
Noel James Skrmetta (permit).....	2	Nov. 14, 1972 to Mar. 15, 1977	
Peter M. Skrmetta (permit).....	2	Nov. 20, 1972 to Mar 15, 1977	
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park:			
Kilauea Volcano House, Ltd. (contract).....	48	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1987	
Isle Royale National Park:			
Isle Royale Queen (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Isle Royale Seaplane Service (permit).....	9	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974	
Sivertson Bros. (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Katmai National Monument:			
Wein Consolidated Airlines, Inc. (contract).....	13	Jan. 1, 1961 to Dec. 31, 1974	
Lake Mead National Recreation Area:			
Cottonwood Cove Development Co. (contract).....	20	Jan. 15, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1991	
Eldorado Canyon Resort, Inc. (contract).....	4	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Forrest Enterprises, Inc. (contract).....	6	Jan. 4, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1977	
Lake Mead Ferry Service, Inc. (contract).....	5	Mar. 31, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1979	
Lake Mohave Resort, Inc. (contract).....	17	Jan. 1, 1957 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Las Vegas Boat Harbor, Inc. (contract).....	8	Nov. 1, 1972 to Oct. 31, 1987	
L. M. Enterprises, Inc. (contract).....	7	Jan. 1, 1967 to Dec. 31, 1986	
Leisurama, Inc. (contract).....	2	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1997	
Moccasin Tours & Transportation, Inc. (permit).....	4	May 22, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974	
Overton Beach Resort, Inc. (contract).....	6	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1973	
Temple Bar Marina, Inc. (contract).....	14	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1986	
Willow Beach Resort, Inc. (contract).....	15	Oct. 10, 1962 to Dec. 31, 1982	
Monroe Beecher (permit).....	1	July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1978	
Lassen Volcanic National Park:			
Lassen Volcanic National Park Co. (contract).....	7	Nov. 1, 1967 to Oct. 31, 1987	U.S. Natural Re- sources.
Lehman Caves National Monument:			
Shirley George & Majorie Robinson (permit).....	5	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976	
Mammoth Cave National Park:			
M. E. Nash & Robert McDaniel (permit).....	14	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974	
National Park Concessions, Inc. (contract).....	12	Jan. 1, 1962 to Dec. 31, 1981	
Mesa Verde National Park:			
Emmett C. & Frances M. Koppenhafer (contract).....	23	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977	
Mesa Verde Co. (contract).....	11	Nov. 1, 1963 to Oct. 31, 1983	
Mount McKinley National Park:			
Outdoor World, Ltd. (contract).....	6	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1987	
Mount Rainier National Park:			
Parkland Sport Center (permit).....	2	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1973	
Rainier Mountaineering, Inc. (permit).....	2	Apr. 15, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1973	
Mount Rushmore National Memorial:			
Mountain Co., Inc. (contract).....	19	July 23, 1971 to Feb. 28, 1991	

Concessioner	Total collective years of service	Current contract or permit	Parent ownership
Muir Woods National Monument:			
Jackglo, Inc. (contract).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1979.....	
Natchez Trace Parkway:			
C. W. Gary (contract).....	13	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
National Capital Parks:			
Almours Securities, Inc. (contract).....	17	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1993.....	MCA Corp.
Appliance Fix-it, Inc. (permit).....	9	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Belle Haven Marina, Inc. (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Buzzard Point Boatyard (permit).....	5	Sept. 1, 1972 to Aug. 31, 1977.....	
Capitol Cycles Corp. (permit).....	3	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Albert C. Enders (contract).....	4	Mar. 17, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Julius W. Fletcher (permit).....	5	Jan. 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹	
Government Services, Inc. (contract).....	22	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1991.....	MCA Corp.
Landmark Services, Inc. (contract).....	7	May 29, 1967 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Thomas C. Long (contract).....	23	Jan. 1, 1951 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹	
Rock Creek Park Horse Center, Inc. (contract).....	11	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
S. G. Leoffler Co. (contract).....	22	Jan. 1, 1951 to Dec. 31, 1973 ¹	
Frederick O. and Virginia Swain (permit).....	6	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
North Cascades National Park:			
Diablo Lake Resort (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
North Cascades Lodge (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Rock Lake Resort (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Olympic National Park:			
Becker's Ocean Resort (contract).....	21	Jan. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1972.....	
Henry A. Brown Ski School (permit).....	8	Dec. 1, 1973 to Nov. 30, 1976.....	
Carl G. & Isabel Hansen (contract) Log Cabin Lodge.....	21	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
LaPush Ocean Park, Inc. (contract).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1982.....	
National Park Concessions, Inc. (see Mammoth Cave).....			
Olympic Ski Lift, Inc. (permit).....	3	Oct. 16, 1971 to Oct. 15, 1976.....	
Oregon Caves National Monument:			
Oregon Caves Co. (contract).....	43	Nov. 1, 1971 to Oct. 31, 1986.....	
Ozark National Scenic Riverways:			
Alley Spring Concession (permit).....	4	Apr. 15, 1970 to Apr. 15, 1975.....	
Big Spring Concession (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Sullivan's Concession & Canoe Rental (permit).....	4	Dec. 31, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Big Spring John Boat Rental (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Padre Island National Seashore:			
Padre Island National Seashore Co. (contract).....	5	July 23, 1969 to Mar. 31, 1990.....	
Petrified Forest National Park:			
Fred Harvey, Inc. (contract).....	34	Jan. 1, 1962 to Dec. 31, 1981.....	AMFAC, Inc.
Rainbow Forest Lodge, Inc. (contract).....	12	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Platt National Park:			
Dooly's Laundry (contract).....	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Hick's Service (contract).....	3	do.....	
Point Reyes National Seashore:			
Jackglo, Inc. (contract).....	1	Jan. 15, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1982.....	
Rocky Mountain National Park:			
The Denver Post (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Rocky Mountain Park Co. (contract).....	19	Oct. 22, 1971 to May 31, 1991.....	
Trail-Gazette Publishing Co. (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Paul & William Van Horn (contract).....	15	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1979.....	
Sagamore Hill National Historic Site:			
Evelyn Hill, Inc. (contract).....	4	Apr. 17, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Salem Maritime National Historic Site:			
Edward B. Rushford (permit).....	15	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Sanford National Recreation Area:			
Fritch Forterss, Inc. (contract).....	7	Jan. 1, 1967 to Dec. 31, 1986.....	
Cherry Hamilton & Nell Goodwin (permit).....	2	Jan. 1, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1978.....	
Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks:			
William E. DeCartefet (permit).....	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974.....	
Sequoia & Dings Canyon Hospitality Service (contract).....	22	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1992.....	
Allen R. Simmons (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Dick R. Wilson (permit).....	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Shadow Mountain National Recreation Area:			
Mrs. Burton S. Adams (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
William W. Bell (permit).....	8	do.....	
Joe Carpenter (permit).....	8	do.....	
Alexander Duncan (permit).....	5	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
Estes Park Trail, Gazette, Inc. (permit).....	5	do.....	
Gala Marina, Inc. (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Glenn R. Moss (permit).....	14	Jan. 31, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
R. Frank Norton, III (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Ecil A. Scott (permit).....	7	do.....	
William K. Steuben (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977.....	
J. R. Steward (permit).....	8	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975.....	
Shenandoah National Park:			
ARA Virginia Sky-Line (contract).....	37	Jan. 1, 1959 to Dec. 31, 1988.....	
Potomac Appalachian Trail Club, Inc. (permit).....	7	Jan. 1, 1972 to Dec. 31, 1976.....	
Shiloh National Military Park: R. D. Shaw & A. B. Phillips (permit).....	19	do.....	

Concessioner	Total collective years of service	Current contract or permit	Parent ownership
Statue of Liberty National Monument: Circle Line-Statue of Liberty Ferry, Inc. (contract)-----	20	Oct. 1, 1962 to Sept. 30, 1982----	
Evelyn Hill, Inc. (contract)-----	30	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1977----	
Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park: Alvin Tescher (permit)-----	7	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977----	
Timpanogos Cave National Monument: Betsy Wagner (permit)-----	9	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975----	
Virgin Islands National Park: Caneel Bay Plantation, Inc. (contract)-----	4	June 1, 1970 to May 31, 1990----	
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area: H. I. & Dan Forseth (contract)-----	3	Jan. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1975----	
Wind Cave National Park: Dick A. Turbiville & Carl F. Oberlittner (permit)-----	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1977----	
White Sands National Monument: White Sands Souvenirs, Inc (contract)-----	9	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1974----	
Wright Bros. National Memorial: Manteo Flying Service (permit)-----	5	-----do-----	
Yellowstone National Park: Hamilton Stores, Inc. (contract)-----	17	Oct. 1, 1969 to Sept. 30, 1999----	
Jack Pine Ski Shop (permit)-----	2	Dec. 1, 1972 to Apr. 30, 1975----	
Yellowstone Medical Service Livingston Clinic (contract)-----	6	Apr. 1, 1972 to Mar. 31, 1976----	
Yellowstone Park Co. (contract)-----	18	Oct. 1, 1966 to Sept. 30, 1996----	General Host Corp
Yellowstone Park Service Stations (see Hamilton Stores, Inc. above)-----			
Yosemite National Park: Best's Studio, Inc. (contract)-----	47	Oct. 1, 1968 to Sept. 30, 1983----	
Yosemite Medical Group Lewis Memorial Hospital (contract)-----	6	Apr. 3, 1974 to Dec. 31, 1977----	
Charles A. Woessner, DDS (contract)-----	21	Jan. 1, 1968 to Dec. 31, 1974----	
Yosemite Park & Curry Co. (contract)-----		Oct. 1, 1963 to Sept. 30, 1993----	MCA, Inc.
El Portal Administrative Site: El Portal Motor Service (permit)-----	5	Nov. 1, 1969 to Oct. 31, 1974----	
Standard Oil Co. of California (permit)-----	4	Apr. 1, 1975 to Mar. 31, 1975----	
David L. & Jack W. Vaughn (contract)-----	7	July 7, 1967 to Sept. 30, 1971----	
Zion National Park: Jack H. Church (contract)-----	4	Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1979----	
TWA Services, Inc. (contract)-----	1	Jan. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1982----	TWA.

¹ Under renegotiation.

Mr. TAYLOR. This question is directed to the Corps of Engineers. How would you make available the Golden Age Passport to citizens who are entitled to them?

General KELLY. We would handle them either at our district offices for one; and also at the process site as well.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, how many process sites do you have in relation to campgrounds?

General KELLY. I just can't answer that, sir. I am sure it would vary, depending on the specific areas. In some we may have one, in others we may have a greater number.

Mr. TAYLOR. What I'm getting at is that in providing this service for older citizens, we don't want to make it so difficult for them they won't be able to avail themselves of it.

Now, the legislation continues to provide that the proceeds will be deposited with the agencies.

Mr. WATT. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. No change there. Legislation adopted 2 years ago contemplated that need for recreation areas will be clearly marked; this legislation says the same.

Mr. WATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does counsel have any questions?

Mr. McELVAIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a few, if you don't mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. Proceed.

Mr. McELVAIN. How do you classify campgrounds at the present time? I'll take it one agency at a time, starting with the Corps.

General KELLY. I'd like to let Mr. Crane answer that.

Mr. CRANE. We have no formal classification system at this time for campgrounds. We formerly had a classification system under 82347 based on the availability of facilities to set the limits of charge at the direction of our field officers. I assume if the present legislation is passed, that we would get together with all the other agencies and set up a similar type of program.

Mr. McELVAIN. Is it the objective of the various agencies to charge pretty much uniform fees for the same kinds of facilities at all the various Federal areas?

Mr. WATT. Yes, it is.

Mr. CRANE. Yes.

Mr. McELVAIN. Is it possible for a campground classification, say it's classified as a "B" class campground, to be changed at a later time if the facilities are improved?

General KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McELVAIN. Is that done in any formal procedure? I mean, is it published in the Federal Register, or how do you do that?

Mr. CRANE. If I may, if you are speaking in the future, in the Corps of Engineers under current administration procedure any further development of a recreation area, adding to it, will require 50-50 cost-sharing of local interest; it must be operated and maintained. So, in the future, if there is any upgrading, any thing of significance other than very minor items, it will be operated by others than the Federal Government.

Mr. NELSON. We do have a level system for our campgrounds within the Forest Service, level 1 to 5. It depends whether it is primarily developed for the user, or protection of the site. It also brings into account site modification, density, access, and types of improvements. It has been our position that we had expected we would charge for levels 3, 4, and 5, the higher development levels, which are comparable in some respect to those in the private sector. Our level 1 and 2 by and large are not the types of campgrounds that the private sector would be involved in.

Mr. McELVAIN. Mr. Dickenson, does the Park Service have a classification system on its campgrounds?

Mr. DICKENSON. We do. We have two types which are classified as family campgrounds. Type A consists of more sophisticated facilities, well-defined roads, toilets, water, et cetera. In type B campgrounds, there are minimal facilities. Then, the third type is a type C, which is designated for use by groups, for group use only.

Mr. McELVAIN. And you anticipate charging for all three of them?

Mr. DICKENSON. Type A, obviously, with the physical criteria listed in this bill. There are some type B campgrounds for which there would not be a charge because they are primitive campgrounds and have only minimal facilities.

Mr. McELVAIN. As a campground is improved in the forest system, would it change a class 3 to a class 2 campground, which would thereby be subject to a higher charge?

Mr. NELSON. The higher number is the more developed type of campground. And I would expect that if a campground in fact would meet new criteria set up in the legislation that is passed, that charges could be instituted in an area that would be of sufficient size and location; such that it would be feasible.

Mr. McELVAIN. Would it be possible to submit for the record criteria for each agency for its various campgrounds, so we will have it in the record?

Mr. WATT. Fine.

General KELLY. Yes.

Mr. McELVAIN. Is there any way that you can estimate the amount of money that you budget for campground development and improvement at the present time, for each agency?

Mr. WATT. We could supply that for the record.

Mr. NELSON. I would submit that the Forest Service has operation and maintenance on campgrounds of a little over \$43 million.

Mr. McELVAIN. Is that annually?

Mr. NELSON. Annually, yes. I think it's \$43,200,000 annually. In addition we have been getting returns—

Mr. McELVAIN. That is just for operation and maintenance, does that include development and other improvements, capital improvements?

Mr. NELSON. No, sir; it does not include improvements, construction. We will be glad to provide the construction items for the record over the past several years if you wish, although this is not a fixed budgetary item.

Mr. McELVAIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that would be very helpful to have in our record for each one of the agencies, if they can break it down that way, as an explanation as to why the Government feels that it is necessary to have a charge program.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without objection the information will be furnished and placed in the record at this time.

Mr. McELVAIN. Under the terms of this bill the new designation of what we used to call special recreation use fees would now be called recreation use fees. Recreation use fees becomes more or less a term of art.

Could you give us any examples of the facilities that would be subject to the recreation use fee charge, and as an example the facility that would not be. Perhaps you might have a list, and you could supply that for the record.

Mr. WATT. We can give you a more complete list for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without objection it will be submitted and placed in the record at this point.

[The information follows:]

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1974.

Hon. ROY A. TAYLOR, *Chairman,*
Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the April 8th hearing on S. 2844, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Subcommittee requested the Forest Service to provide for the record certain data relating to National Forest recreation areas. The requested data has been tabulated and is presented below or enclosed in separate tables.

1. Criteria describing campground development levels.—The criteria are contained in the enclosed table entitled "National Forest Levels of Outdoor Recreation Experiences."

2. Present and past fiscal year appropriations to the Forest Service for recreation construction.—

Fiscal year	Recreation— public use	Water resource development and related activities	Total
1971 -----	\$3,241,700	\$559,000	\$3,800,700
1972 -----	4,509,200	1,885,000	6,394,200
1973 -----	7,191,400	3,190,000	10,381,400
1974 -----	1,075,000	169,000	1,244,000

3. Anticipated number of facilities by categories where fees would be collected under S. 2844.—

Campgrounds -----	2,221
Picnic sites -----	34
Swimming Sites -----	115
Boating sites -----	4
Guided tours -----	1
Total -----	2,375

4. Breakdown of how fees were collected at the 36 National Forest campgrounds qualifying for fee collection under P.L. 93-81.—

The methods of fee collection are contained in the enclosed table entitled "Methods of Fee Collection at Currently Designated Fee Campgrounds."

At the hearing, the Committee expressed concern that substantial numbers of campground users may be avoiding the payment of fees when such fees are collected by means other than full-time attendants. In the National Forests full-time attendants are utilized at our larger and more heavily used campgrounds. Self-service fee collection systems are used to a considerable extent for other campground sites. Such systems reduce the costs of collecting fees considerably and permit more efficient use of personnel. We would like to emphasize that our self-service collection system is *not* an "honor system." Users are responsible for depositing fees in designated places. To ensure payment, compliance checking procedures are established for each area. Persons found to have not made payment are issued citations. Our experience with self-service systems has been that the occurrence of non-payment is very minimal.

5. List of National Forest picnic and boating sites that provide specialized facilities or services qualifying for user fees under S. 2844.—

A list of picnic sites and a list of boating sites are enclosed.

If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

R. MAX PETERSON,

Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation.

Enclosures.

NATIONAL FOREST LEVELS OF OUTDOOR RECREATION EXPERIENCES Associated With Environmental and Development Considerations

LEVEL	EXPERIENCE	ENVIRONMENT	FACILITY
PRIMITIVE	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to the full measure of the user's ability. No special skills required. Experience of adventure, challenge, and discovery. Physical exertion and mental alertness are essential. Freedom of choice in the selection of activities. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	No environmental modification unless absolutely necessary for comfort and convenience. Unmodified natural environment and scenic resources are maintained. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	No facilities except as determined essential for resource protection. Native materials utilized where possible. Natural weathering of surfaces.
1	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to a full measure of the user's ability. Some special skills required. High degree of basic outdoor recreation experience. Freedom of choice in the selection of activities. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	Minimal modification of the natural environment. Only necessary modification for comfort and convenience. Unmodified natural environment and scenic resources are maintained. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	Facilities generally harmonize with surrounding natural environment. Materials used are native or compatible with the environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Use of paint or synthetic materials is avoided.
2	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to a near maximum extent as tempered by authorized access through challenging natural areas. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	Some modification of the natural environment. Basic or rudimentary facilities for comfort and convenience of the user. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	Facilities more for resource protection than for the user's convenience. Materials used are native or compatible with the environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Use of paint or synthetic materials is avoided.
3	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to an intermediate degree. Moderate degree of outdoor recreation experience. Freedom of choice in the selection of activities. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	Intermediate modification of the natural environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	Facilities more for resource protection than for the user's convenience. Materials used are native or compatible with the environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Use of paint or synthetic materials is avoided.
4	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to a high degree. High degree of outdoor recreation experience. Freedom of choice in the selection of activities. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	High degree of environmental modification. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	Facilities generally harmonize with surrounding natural environment. Materials used are native or compatible with the environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Use of paint or synthetic materials is avoided.
5	Recreation opportunities to satisfy basic-needs to a maximum degree. Maximum degree of outdoor recreation experience. Freedom of choice in the selection of activities. A feeling of being a part of both nature and a wilderness setting.	Maximum degree of environmental modification. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Only necessary modification of spaceness--keeping unutilized areas open.	Facilities generally harmonize with surrounding natural environment. Materials used are native or compatible with the environment. Facilities are designed to be durable and weather-resistant. Use of paint or synthetic materials is avoided.

METHODS OF FEE COLLECTION AT CURRENTLY DESIGNATED FEE CAMPGROUNDS—REGION 8

Forest	State	Campground	Method of fee collection
National Forests in Alabama	Alabama	Corinth	Manned entrance during heavy use periods or self-service fee box at other times.
Chattahoochee-Oconee	Georgia	Lake Sinclair	Same as above.
Do	do	Rabun Beach	Do.
Cherokee	Tennessee	Indian Boundary	Do.
National Forests in Florida	Florida	Juniper Springs	Do.
		Alexander Springs	Do.
		Lake Dorr	Self-service fee box.
		Clearwater Lake	Do.
		Silver Lake	Manned entrance during heavy use periods or self-service fee box at other times.
		Ocean Pond	Self-service fee box.
George Washington	Virginia	Sherando Lake	Manned entrance during heavy use periods or self-service fee box at other times.
Do	do	Trout Pond	Same as above.
Jefferson	do	Grindstone	Do.
Do	do	Cave Springs	Manned entrance during heavy use periods or self-service fee box at other times.
Kisatchie	Louisiana	Caney Lake	Same as above.
Do	do	Valentine Lake	Do.
National Forests in Mississippi	Mississippi	Chewalla Lake	Do.
National Forests in Texas	Texas	Willow Oak	Self-service fee box.
		Caney Creek	Same as above.

REGION 9

Name of site	Kind of site	Development scale	Capacity (PAOT)	User fee
Alleghany National Forest:				
Kiasutha	Campground F	4	475	\$3.00 Manned station entrance.
Dew Drop	do	4	430	2.00 Do.
Red Bridge	do	4	275	2.00 Do.
Twin Lakes	do	4	300	2.00 Do.
Do	Campground G	4	50	10.00 Do.
Chippewa National Forest: ¹				
Norway Beach	Campground F	4	370	3.00 Self-service fee box.
Wanaki	do	4	210	3.00 Do.
Clark National Forest:				
Markham Spring	do	4	305	2.00 Do.
Monongahela National Forest:				
Lake Sherwood	do	3	485	2.00 Manned station entrance.
Do	Swimming site		500	1.00 Do.
Shawnee National Forest: ²				
Oak Point	Campground F	4	360	\$3.00 Self-service fee box.
Goose Bay	Picnic G	4	185	³ 10.00 Do.
Hoosier National Forest: ⁴				
Pine	Campground F	3	205	3.00 Common manned entrance station.
Holland	do	3	80	3.00 Do.
White Oak	do	3	80	3.00 Do.
Blue Gill	do	3	260	3.00 Do.
Southern Point	do	3	360	3.00 Do.
Eads	do	3	120	3.00 Do.
Region 5				
Pope-Baldwin Beach El Dorado National Forest.	Swimming site			.50 Manned entrance station.

¹ All sites listed in Norway Beach Recreation Area.² All sites listed in Lake Glendale Recreation Area.³ Minimum.⁴ All sites listed in Hardin Ridge Recreation Area.

PICNIC SITES THAT WOULD QUALIFY FOR USER FEES UNDER S. 2844

Region	Forest	State	Name	Family or group	Criteria met
2	Bighorn	Wyoming	Hettinger	G	Reservation system.
2	do	do	Ranger Creek	G	Do.
2	do	do	Pine Island	G	Do.
2	Medicine Bow	do	Hidden Valley	G	Do.
2	Arapahoe Roosevelt	Colorado	Pickle Gulch	G	Do.
2	Pike	do	Pike Community	G	Do.
2	San Juan	do	Emerson	G	Do.
2	do	do	Florida	G	Do.
3	Lincoln	New Mexico	Slide group area	G	Reservations.
3	Prescott	Arizona	Thumb Butte	G	Do.
4	Ashley	Utah	Lucerne Valley	G	Level 5 develop. Scale-group site. Reservations.
4	do	do	Antelope Flat	G	Level 4 develop. Scale-group site. Reservations.
4	do	do	Uinta	G	Level 4 develop. Scale-group site. Reservations.
4	Dixie	do	Ponderosa	G	Do.
4	Uinta	do	Trumbolt	G	Do.
4	do	do	Bear Canyon	G	Do.
4	do	do	Theater in the Pines	G	Do.
4	do	do	Whiting	G	Do.
4	Wasatch	do	Jordon Pines	G	Do.
4	do	do	Shingle Creek	G	Do.
4	Toiyabe	Nevada	Mahogany Grove	G	Do.
4	do	do	Deer Creek	G	Do.
4	do	do	Cathedral Rock	G	Reservations—level 4 develop scale-group site.
5	Sierra	California	Recreation Point	G	Reservations.
8	George Washington	Virginia	Sherando Lake	F	Full-time attendant.
8	do	do	do	G	Full-time attendant and leve 4 develop scale-group site.
9	Allegheny	Pennsylvania	Twin Lakes	F	Full-time attendant.
9	do	do	Loleta	F	Full-time life guard at adjacent beach.
9	do	do	Kiasutha	F	Full-time attendant.
9	do	do	Kinzua Beach	F	Do.
9	Monongahela	West Virginia	Lake Sherwood	F	Do.
9	do	do	Stuart	F	Do.
9	Wayne-Hoosier	Indiana	Saddle Lake	F	Do.
9	do	Ohio	Big Bend	F	Do.

BOATING SITES THAT WOULD QUALIFY FOR USER FEES UNDER S. 2844

Region	Forest	State	Name	Criteria met
4	Ashley	Utah	Cedar Springs	Floating comfort station. ¹ Sewage disposal station for boat holding tanks. ²
4	do	do	Lucerne Valley	Same as above.
4	do	Wyoming	Buckboard Crossing	Do.
4	do	do	Firehole	Do.

¹ On Order, no fees until facilities are in place.

² Planned, no fees until facilities are in place.

ANSWERS TO GENERAL QUESTIONS RAISED IN HOUSE PARKS AND RECREATION
SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON S. 2844, APRIL 8, 1974

Question. What criteria does the National Park Service use in classifying campgrounds?

Answer. The following three broad types of campgrounds cover all campgrounds operated by the National Park Service. Not every campground within a class has equal facilities and user fees are based upon the level of facilities and services available in a particular campground.

Definitions of Campground Types:

Type A—Campground. A campground area is classified as having well-defined roads, parking spaces, and campsites. Drinking water and sanitary facilities, including flush toilets and refuse cans, are furnished on a community

basis. Each campground has a designed capacity based on the number of campsites therein.

A typical campsite in a campground would include parking space, fireplace, table and bench combination and tent space; in a walk-in campground or walk-in section of a campground, the parking space is provided but not as an integral part of each campsite.

Type B—Camping Area. A camping area is an area (other than a campground) designated and regularly used for camping by individuals, families or parties. Camping areas may be accessible by either road or trail. Facilities provided are minimal, generally being limited to access roads, basic sanitary facilities and a limited number of fireplaces and tables. Trail camps fall within this category, and shelters of the Adirondack or fully enclosed type may be provided.

Type C—Group Camp. A group camp is an area designated for use by organized groups, such as Boy Scouts, school groups, or other large parties. It is composed of one or more group spaces, each of which is provided with a large fireplace, several tables, and parking space for buses or a number of cars.

Question. How much does the National Park Service budget for development and improvement of campgrounds?

Answer. In the 1973 fiscal year, the total amount allocated to development and improvement of campgrounds was \$5,922,000. This figure represents only capital costs involved and does not include any operating expenses.

There was no complete development of campgrounds, as such, accomplished with these funds, but projects such as sewage systems and improved roads were constructed in order to bring existing campgrounds up to acceptable standards. During the 1974 fiscal year, with emphasis on preparation for the Bicentennial, no construction projects tied directly to campgrounds were programmed.

At recent prices, the average cost per campsite to develop a complete campground is approximately \$2,600. Operating expenses for the typical campground average approximately \$200 per campsite per year, with wide variations from this average due to level of campground development and services, use patterns and size of campground.

Question. Give examples of types of facilities and services in National Park System areas for which user fees are charged and for which they are not charged.

Answer. Before the enactment of Public Law 93-81 on August 1, 1973, special recreation user fees were charged for the following:

1. Developed campgrounds
2. Guide service
3. Cabin rental (in two parks only)
4. Elevator

No charges were made for the following:

1. Picnicking
2. Backcountry and primitive campgrounds
3. Boat launching
4. Visitor centers
5. Interpretive programs

Mr. McELVAIN. Mr. Nelson, you said there were 37 campgrounds where fees were collected last season. What were the mechanics of that fee collection; did you use the drop box, or did you have manned collection stations for those 37 campgrounds?

Mr. NELSON. There were 36 campgrounds, and then we had one other user installation—

Mr. McELVAIN. Well, that's pretty limited. I think you could pretty well limit the access to that one.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, there is no problem there, at all. On the others, on some of these we did have entrance stations; on others we used collection boxes. We can supply this information correctly for the record, how many in each category.

Mr. McELVAIN. If you could, and if you could show us the estimated number of users at those sites, compared to the estimated number of collections. So we will see very dramatically, I think, what

the compliance ratio would be for the drop boxes, versus the manned stations, if you could.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without objection it will be placed in the record at this point.

Mr. McELVAIN. Have you had any problems, now, in securing the revenues collected from those sites for future use; and how do you propose to use them?

Mr. NELSON. No, we have had no difficulties at all. The Appropriations Committee and the Congress has appropriated funds under the L. & W.C. Fund for operations and maintenance with no difficulties. We propose to use it, as was explained previously, for developing the fee collection system better than it now operates; and then use the additional funds for operation and maintenance of these campgrounds and other facilities.

Mr. McELVAIN. I have only one other question, and that is, in your statement, Mr. Nelson, you said that 65 percent of the money will be used for outdoor recreation functions. Now, what functions were you talking about? That is on page 2 of your statement, the last full paragraph.

Mr. NELSON. I was talking about 65 percent of the receipts from the recreation would be used for operation and maintenance of recreation areas. The reason the figure is 65 percent is because 25 percent of the funds in the National Forest, user fee fund fees revert to the counties for roads and schools; and another 10 percent reverts to the road and trail fund.

Mr. McELVAIN. And that is by statute?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. McELVAIN. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Sigler, any questions?

Mr. SIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask two questions. First I would like to know whether any of the witnesses on behalf of their agencies proposes any amendments to the Senate bill. If you do, would you raise your hand.

[No response.]

Mr. SIGLER. I take it, then, all witnesses are agreeable to the enactment of the Senate bill in its present form.

Mr. WATT. That is correct.

Mr. SIGLER. The second is a philosophical question. I know the answer, but I want to ask it anyway, of the Forest Service; is there any reason why, philosophically, rather than politically, 35 percent of the revenues, recreational revenues should go elsewhere than into the maintenance of the recreational facilities; while in the case of the other agencies, the Park Service and the corps, there is no such provision?

Mr. NELSON. I think, sir—I see no reason why these 35 percent should not revert to those other funds. I think it follows that same type of philosophy that is inherent in the receipts from grazing, and timber, and minerals on acquired lands, and the other receipts to the Treasury from goods and services from National Forest lands.

Mr. SIGLER. That's not quite my question. In the case of the Park Service all fees, or collection from recreational purposes go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In the case of the Forest Service only 65 percent of them do. Is there any reason, other than political reason for that?

Mr. NELSON. I believe it's by statute.

Mr. SIGLER. I know it's by statute, but is there a reason why there should be such a distinction?

Mr. NELSON. I cannot come up with a reason very readily.

Mr. SIGLER. As I said, historically and politically it has developed that way. But in terms of today's circumstances, is there a reason for continuing that system?

Mr. NELSON. The only reason I can think of is consistency with the other goods and services derived from the National Forest.

Mr. SIGLER. But the consistency I would compare it with is the revenues for recreational purposes from other Federal lands, and they go into the general Treasury, not to the States.

Mr. NELSON. I agree with that.

Mr. SIGLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Suppose we place language like this in our committee report: "We feel that fees should only be charged where someone will be present to collect the fees from everyone, or enforce collection, rather than depending on some kind of honor system." Would there be objection to that language?

That language is not tight enough to force discontinuation of the plans that I have in mind. Maybe it would encourage having someone present more often, to see that frequent checks are made, and to see that people actually pay.

General KELLY. Read that one more time, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. All right. "The Committee is of the opinion that fees should only be charged where someone would be present to collect the fees from everyone, or to enforce collection, rather than depending on some kind of honor system."

Mr. NELSON. We could agree with that.

Mr. WATT. That would allow for the roving Ranger pickup.

Mr. TAYLOR. That would be broad enough to allow for a roving Ranger coming in and say, "You folks came in last night, I came by now to collect from you," that type of situation.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, everyone is nodding their head. I think the record should be clear that the Park Service, the Corps of Engineers and the Forest Service collectively and individually agree with that language.

Mrs. TAYLOR. Fine, thank you.

Now, one more question. In the Senate bill, no charge for the use of—and then it names a whole bunch of things, including picnic tables and boat ramps; and then the proviso we mentioned two or three times,

Provided, however, that a fee shall be charged in picnic areas or at boat ramps for the use of specialized facilities or services such as, but not limited to, electric or gas grills, and mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts.

Do any of the agencies have electric or gas grills?

Mr. WATT. No, Mr. Chairman, we do not have electrical or gas grills in any of the Federal installations.

Mr. TAYLOR. If that language remains in the bill, would it be the intent of any of the agencies to charge for the use of picnic tables under any circumstances?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, we had envisioned at picnic sites where these facilities were involved, or if a reservation system came in for picnic areas or for complimentary recreation opportunities, such as swimming or boating, to charge.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the swimming and boating, that would be a different charge. I am talking about just for picnicking.

Mr. NELSON. Well, in some of the areas it's difficult to separate these. But, if there were complimentary facilities, of some kind, perhaps some playgrounds that were well developed, we had envisioned that perhaps in these three situations there might be charges in picnic areas.

In reference to the boating sites, the mechanical or hydraulic lifts, or launching service such as we use is included. We also felt where there were sophisticated boat docks, there was a floating comfort station for boaters, or a sewage disposal station for boat holding-tanks, that it might be feasible to charge under those situations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many situations do you have of that type?

Mr. NELSON. On picnic sites we have about 180 situations like that, out of around 1,600. As far as boating sites are concerned, we have less than 100 out of a population of over 800.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the record, could you give us a breakdown on those. Can you give us a detailed list for the record?¹

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, if you have one of these areas where you have a swimming pool, you intend to charge. Now, I just want to go in to picnic, and for no other purpose. Are you going to charge me?

Mr. NELSON. Of course it depends on how the language is finally written, sir. But it had been our feeling that in this type of area, that if the public was aware this was a swimming and picnic area, we had envisioned charging in that case.

Mr. TAYLOR. What would be the reaction of the different agencies if the committee saw fit to just strike out that proviso? No charges shall be made for the use of, period. Strike out that proviso entirely. We don't have any electric or gas grills, do you? You don't have any hydraulic boat lifts, even the Corps of Engineers hasn't got any.

What would that do to the bill?

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, you are talking about striking the line starting on the bottom of page 3?

Mr. TAYLOR. I'm reading the top of page 4.

Mr. WATT. Provided, however—

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, "Provided, however"; the first proviso.

Mr. WATT. The agencies would not object to it. Obviously the question has to come of a trade-off. We don't feel that that language is detrimental to our objectives, and if it clarifies we have no objection to it. But, we wouldn't have strong feelings one way or the other.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, the question comes up in my mind, why mention picnic tables and electric or gas grills if we haven't got any in the Nation.

¹ See list on p. 86.

Mr. WATT. I share your concern.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be hard for us to answer on the House floor why we put that in there when we have to admit that we haven't got any of those.

Mr. NELSON. We would have no objection to picnic sites, or boating sites, if they were eliminated from the charge system.

Mr. TAYLOR. The legislation would then only read that no charge in the use of these facilities can be made, without the proviso. Those are just some thoughts.

Are there any more questions anyone has? The House is now in session, we will continue the hearing tomorrow. Mr. Watt, can you come back?

Mr. WATT. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Dickenson?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I don't believe we will need the other witnesses tomorrow. Tomorrow we will ask questions about this planned reservation system for the Park Service.

Mr. WATT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; we appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one question, Mr. Nelson, you mentioned reservations of picnic tables. Do you have any system whereby a person can reserve a picnic table?

Mr. NELSON. We have not in the past. We have had a reservation system on trails and for campgrounds; and we have been thinking in the Wasatch Front, where there is a tremendous amount of day use; and the public has felt some kind of a reservation system might be of value. So, we would institute a trial of some type of reservation system on picnic areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. Suppose I go into a picnic area and I want to picnic; I see three empty tables, and signs are there saying "Reserved." That would produce a bad reaction, I think, from the general public.

Mr. NELSON. I think you have a point there. We were thinking, of course, of reservations for groups.

Mr. TAYLOR. Large groups?

Mr. NELSON. Large groups is the first priority. There has been some indication from the public that a reservation system might be desirable in areas such as I have indicated. In all the ones we have tried so far on a trial basis, and campgrounds, we have left undesignated portions of the campgrounds, outside of the reservation system in an attempt to clarify and get away from the difficulty that you indicated.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think reservations would be more difficult for picnicking than for camping.

Mr. NELSON. I agree, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. When all the unreserved ones are taken up and people want to picnic, and you have a few tables marked "Reserved," they are going to wonder, "How come these people get special rights?"

Well, you have given us a lot to think about.

We will excuse all the witnesses except Mr. Vasco Peeples who is here from Florida and has to return there tonight. So, I will listen to him at this time.

The witnesses need not come back tomorrow, except from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the National Park Service.

STATEMENT OF VASCO PEEPLES

Mr. PEEPLES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, when the final record is prepared, Mr. Peeples' statement will appear after the continuation of the testimony of the Park Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Go ahead, Mr. Peeples.

Mr. PEEPLES. I appreciate the opportunity, I appreciate the courtesy; and I think your opening statement covered practically everything in my thinking. It was a very fine statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. What particular part of my opening statement are you referring to?

Mr. PEEPLES. Just generally the whole statement, it was very good.

I'm not going to argue here, or discuss the mechanics of the bill, how to apply it; how collection is to be made. I will leave that to this committee and its very competent staff; I think it's in good hands.

I'll just want to make a brief statement, and I'll leave a copy with your committee staff.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without objection a copy of your entire statement will be placed in the record.¹

Mr. PEEPLES. OK. I represent the Kampground Owners of America; and in representing them I cannot say I'm not representing the interests of others, of the private camping sector.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, those members that you refer to are entirely owners of private campgrounds?

Mr. PEEPLES. Yes, private campgrounds. Kampground Owners of America is an association of franchise camp owners, or campground owners. Kampground Owners, Inc., or KOA; they represent about 700 campgrounds.

Now, there are two main points, the points I want to make are direct to the merits of the legislation; the mechanics, that's your job, the job of your committee, I might say.

The first is, we think it's important to reestablish the collection of fees because of the loss of needed revenue to the Federal parks system. We consider national parks one of our greatest natural assets. They should be maintained so that present and future citizens may be able to visit and enjoy these areas of natural beauty. We do not believe that they should be used for free camping, and do not think that the taxpayers' money should have to be used to clean up and maintain camping areas. Those who use camping areas should pay for that service.

¹ See statement on p. 94.

Secondly, there has been a large growth in private campgrounds, ownership and operation to provide facilities for the present day camper. This has become more of a lodging type with more conveniences and facilities than usually found in public camping areas. These private campground owners are primarily small business operators. They provide employment for tens of thousands, and represent investments of hundreds of millions of dollars. If we are a free enterprise system it is hardly reasonable for taxpayers' money to provide free services in competition to private enterprise.

Private campgrounds have to meet many expensive conditions not required of Federal campgrounds, and are required to pay licenses, taxes, property taxes, and Federal income tax, if they make any money.

Thousands of these private campgrounds are like many other businesses, mortgaged, and with any substantial slowdown in business many will face bankruptcy. Government competition will accelerate and multiply the bankruptcies. Many of these campgrounds are financed by Small Business Administration loans, or guarantees. That's our point, Mr. Chairman.

I'm glad to try to answer any questions. I don't know all the answers, but I'll stab a few if you want to ask questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, we don't know all the answers, either; that's why we are holding these hearings, and sometimes we get ideas that help us.

Well, of course the Government is not making an effort to provide a sufficient number of campsites—

Mr. PEEPLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR [continuing]. To meet the needs of our people. The Government has encouraged private industry, private business to invest their money and develop campsites around national parks, and around national forests, and other public-owned lands.

And your point is, since you and the people you represent have been encouraged to make such investments, that you should have some protection by way of some kind of reasonable charge to be made for the publicly owned and developed campsites.

Mr. PEEPLES. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you have no objection to the publicly owned campsites being without charge.

Mr. PEEPLES. The only problem about camping, another problem develops, and I get this from campers because while I have other interests, I spend a lot of time on my own campground, and I have been in contact with people from the 50 States, and all the Provinces of Canada, and plenty from foreign countries that have signed in my campground. You do have a discipline problem in free camping areas.

I have had people tell me they would not camp at any place that didn't make a fair and minimal charge because you accumulate the type of people they don't want to camp amongst. You have more vandalism, it's free and belongs to the public; everybody thinks that he owns part of it, and he should treat it like he wants to.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he wants to get his part.

Mr. PEEPLES. He wants to get his part. So, a camping service will have discipline problems. We have less problems with discipline

and vandalism in our privately owned campgrounds than they do in the State and Federal campgrounds. And part of the reason is the attitude about public-owned property. You go up and down the roads in many places, you'll have a garbage dump several miles long where people throw their beer cans along the road because that's public property.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the average charge that is now being made for the use of privately owned campsites?

Mr. PEEPLES. That varies all over the country, it varies greatly because of the investment; but basically I would say from about \$3.50 to \$5 a day; some places higher, some places less. I have a friend of mine, he owns a campground that he placed on land that cost him \$200 an acre for the land. Another man has a campground of 10 acres, it cost him \$10,000 an acre for the land, in a more congested area. So, prices have to fluctuate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do most of them have a separate spot for the camping vehicles, as compared to the tent campers?

Mr. PEEPLES. Most camping now, generally, particularly in south Florida, is the camping vehicle; it is a travel trailer, it is a motor home, it is a pickup camper, it is a minihome, it is the converted van, it is the tent trailer, the folddown; and a few tents. In our facility, less than 5 percent of our total occupancy, no, I would say 2 percent of our total occupancy is tents.

Now, I know in the Northwest area in the summertime they have a higher rate of tents, tent trailers, folddowns. But the people, particularly the upper age bracket, the group that is entitled to the Golden Age Passport—

Mr. TAYLOR. They go in comfort.

Mr. PEEPLES. Yes; if they go into a vacation area, they go with large equipment. Now, people have asked me, where do your people come from? They come from every way of life. And the camping family has on the average more income than the average noncamping family. I have seen them come in with backpacks. The most expensive unit I have ever had come in was a \$150,000 unit that had its own private chauffeur on a full-time basis. So, you get them from all walks of life.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, thank you, Mr. Peebles.

Mr. PEEPLES. Thank you.

[Mr. Peebles' written statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF VASCO PEEPLES, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
KAMPGROUND OWNERS ASSOCIATION

There are two main points to consider in re-establishing user's fees for camping in our National Parks.

No. 1.—Is the loss of needed revenue to the Federal Park system. We consider National Parks one of our great natural assets. They should be maintained so that present and future citizens may be able to visit and enjoy these areas of natural beauty. We do not believe that they should be used for free camping, and we do not think that taxpayers' money should have to be used to clean up and maintain camping areas.

No. 2.—There has been a large growth in private campgrounds, ownership and operation to provide facilities for the present day camper. This has become more of a lodging type with more conveniences and facilities than are usually found in public camping areas. These private campground owners are primarily small business operators. They provide employment for tens of thou-

sands and represent investments of hundreds of millions. If we are a free enterprise system, it is hardly reasonable for taxpayers' money to provide free services in competition with private enterprise.

Private campgrounds have to meet many expensive conditions not required of Federal Campgrounds, and they are required to pay licenses, taxes, property taxes, and Federal income tax, if they make any money.

Thousands of these private campgrounds are like many other businesses . . . mortgaged . . . and with any substantial slow down in business, many will face bankruptcy. Government competition will excellerate and multiply the bankruptcies. Many of these private campgrounds are financed by Small Business Administration loans or guarantees.

Mr. TAYLOR. The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Tuesday, April 9, 1974.]

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work of the Commission. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

2. The second part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

3. The third part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

7. The seventh part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

8. The eighth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

9. The ninth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

10. The tenth part of the report deals with the work of the Commission in the various fields of its activity. It is a summary of the work done during the year and is intended to give a general impression of the work of the Commission and of the progress of the work of the Commission.

TO AMEND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION
FUND ACT, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE FOR COLLEC-
TION OF SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES AT ADDI-
TIONAL CAMPGROUNDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Roy A. Taylor (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation will come to order.

We continue the hearing that was started yesterday on S. 2844 and H.R. 11921 and H.R. 13913 dealing with fee charges for campgrounds and other services.

The first witness this morning is Hon. James Jones, a member of our committee from Oklahoma. We are glad to welcome our colleague before the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES R. JONES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area of great concern and great interest to me and to the people I represent. As you know, last year two of my colleagues from Oklahoma, Clem McSpadden and Tom Steed and I joined a lawsuit to restrain the Corps of Engineers from charging certain user fees for Corps of Engineer recreation projects and subsequent to that we worked diligently with members of the Public Works Committee to get a bill passed in order to direct that legislation at the Corps of Engineers. That is the reason we are here today to discuss new legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, when that legislation passed the House, it applied only to the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JONES. Right.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we were given some assurances they would amend that to make it more in keeping with legislation applicable to other agencies and then when it reached the Senate on the Senate floor, a Senator from Oklahoma amended the bill or submitted a bill,

which was drafted, which would amend a different section of the law and the result was it was made applicable to all agencies.

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. And I can't find anybody in the House that realized what was happening at that time.

Mr. JONES. That was certainly not the intent of our efforts. Our efforts were designed specifically to correct an injustice as to the Corps of Engineers and their interpretation of the law and that is the purpose of my testimony today.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you mean when you say, "that was not the intent of our efforts?"

Mr. JONES. Well, first of all we think there is some historical difference between the park system and the charging of user fees and that of charging user fees in Corps of Engineer projects. The reason my two colleagues and I brought our lawsuit against the Corps of Engineers last year is we felt they were misinterpreting the law that was passed in the 92d Congress.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with you in regard to that. That is the reason we got into trouble, because the corps was not following the law.

Mr. JONES. That is right and the corps was totally disregarding your comments on the floor of the House in explaining the law and so we had to take them to court. The court, although giving us a temporary restraining order did not want to get into this area to give permanent injunctive relief against the corps. That is why we had to go for legislation. In the House side the legislation was aimed at correcting a misinterpretation by the Corps of Engineers.

Now when it got to the Senate side, crazy things developed and so that is why we are back here today. But I am still primarily interested in correcting the situation as it pertains to the Corps of Engineers.

I would like to focus the attention directly on the Corps of Engineers and its historical context. At the inception of some of the laws involved—

Mr. TAYLOR. A copy of your statement will be included in the record at this place.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES R. JONES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you this morning, and yet I am also distressed that such an appearance is necessary. I had hoped, as did we all, that the matter of admission fees and user fees had been fully and finally decided last summer through P.L. 93-81. However that does not seem to be the case.

It is clear from the deliberations of the Public Works Committee that the language of P.L. 93-81 was aimed directly at the Corps of Engineers. The legislation was expanded, however, to apply to all Federal recreation areas, including those administered by the Park Service and the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself directly to Section (f) of S. 2844, relating to "Recreation Use Fees". The subject of admission fees and user fees, as determined and assessed by the Corps of Engineers early last summer, is the primary reason we are gathered here today, for that arbitrary and illegal action, flying directly in the face of enacted legislation and clearly-expressed Congressional intent, led to the need for P.L. 93-81.

I feel it is essential for us to focus our attention directly on the Corps of Engineers in its historical context. At the inception of some of the laws involved, the primary and motivating purpose was that of flood control, navigation, and generation of hydro-electric power. Recreational benefits were sec-

ondary to the ultimate and fundamental purpose of such Corps legislation, and certainly secondary to the purpose of the Corps itself.

The historical and primary function of the Corps has not been, nor is it today, the construction and administration of recreational facilities. Recreation is absolutely secondary—so secondary that for many years, the Corps did not include in its cost-benefit analyses of potential flood control projects by-product recreational benefits. And the cost-benefit figures as originally calculated for the vast majority of the Corps projects in Oklahoma did not include recreational benefits.

Until this year, as you know Mr. Chairman, legislation having to do with the Corps' recreational areas has always been under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. That in and of itself tells us something about the Corps—it is a different agency with different purposes from those of the Park Service—with different goals and different operating principles—and perhaps most importantly, having created different expectations in the minds of the American public. The American people believe they have sealed at least a tacit, if not an express, agreement with the Federal Government and the Corps. The American people believe that as taxpayers they should be able to use the recreational facilities run by the Corps without charge—unless the facility is highly developed or specialized, and then they should pay a small fee. There would have been no need for special legislation aimed at a special agency if that agency had served the American people. Congress may have overreacted last summer, but to strip away all of our efforts is itself a breach with the American people.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to trace some of the major legislation in this area over the past thirty years.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, P.L. 78-534, provides in part:

"The water areas of all such reservoirs (constructed and operated by the Corps) shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing and other recreational purposes . . ."

And although this legislation was amended in 1965 to delete the phrase "without charge", the intent of the legislation is clear.

The most recent Congressional statement specifically on the Corps and recreation charges came in Section 210 of the River and Harbors Act, P.L. 90-483, approved in 1968, which provides:

"No entrance or admission fee shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by an 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 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."

This legislation is as explicit as can be, and yet does not seem to have convinced the Corps. Instead, the Corps chose to ignore this explicit language, and chose to misread P.L. 92-347. Last year, two of my Congressional colleagues and I brought suit to restrain the Corps. We remembered what Chairman Taylor said on the Floor in reference to P.L. 92-347 and special recreation user charges:

"Third, special recreation user charges are authorized to be collected for the exclusive use of recreation sites and equipment in which the Government has a substantial investment, such as campsites, and boat launching ramps. No special charge is to be imposed for the use of facilities which are basic or incidental to the day use of an outdoor area. In other words, the committee bill is intended to preclude additional charges for the use of visitor centers, roads, trails, overlooks or lightly developed or back country camp areas or for the use of picnic areas. Charging a fee for the use of a picnic table is too petty, too hard to enforce and causes people to picnic along roadsides and in pullovers, producing traffic and litter problems. We feel that these are facilities which almost all of the visiting public can be expected to use or where the collection of a special fee would be impractical."

So we went to Court, and then we came to Congress, to get P.L. 93-81. Now, under the language of S. 2844, the arrogance of the Corps once again is rearing its ugly head. The Corps has given me figures on the number of sites in Oklahoma for which it has and would charge fees: 1) P.L. 92-347, 108 sites;

2) P.L. 93-81, 27 sites; and 3) under S. 2844, 113 sites. Once again the faith of the American people would be undermined, and I for one am not willing to allow that to happen.

Yet let us go one step further, and assume a Corps cost-benefit mentality. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the record a copy of a letter I received over a year ago on this subject from Colonel John Driskill, District Engineer for the Tulsa District of the Corps. This letter was in response to an inquiry I had addressed to Colonel Driskill requesting information on the cost of collecting user fees, compared with the revenue derived therefrom. According to Colonel Driskill's own figures, the Corps expended \$24,000 more over the years 1970, 1971, and 1972 in the collection of user fees than it realized in revenue in the Tulsa District. Mr. Chairman this seems a most unwise use of public funds, a real waste of the taxpayers' dollars.

As I have said before, this is one more example of penny wise and pound foolish governmental action. Even if we assume they made a slight profit, as may be the overall case, you have to build into that ratio the American people—is it worth it? For those of us who represent areas where the feeling is very, very high, it is *not* worth it. In yesterday's testimony you heard much about the importance of user fees to the revenue of the Corps and its ability to staff these recreation areas. Yet we heard nothing about the cost of collecting these fees, and I believe I know why we cannot get the complete facts, though time after time we have tried—it just does not make economic sense compared with the collection on a personal basis, the way this Subcommittee would like to see fees collected.

Further much testimony has been given regarding the importance of a fee to the turnover in the users of a facility in effect stimulating people to enjoy the facility on a short-term basis, and then move on. And yet, we also heard how many areas simply set a time limit, such as fourteen days for the use of a camp site—that has nothing to do with the fees involved. Given adequate notice, that seems to be a perfectly sensible approach to limiting use of these facilities. Why do these officials believe that a small fee is needed to induce turnover when all that is needed is an imposed time constraint?

And Mr. Chairman, we heard so much about the importance of a "Federal presence" in a recreation area, a roving ranger, and how these fees enabled these agencies to have such personnel. I wholeheartedly concur with the importance of a Federal presence, in terms of safety, medical assistance or simply educating yourself and your family in the ways of nature. Yet if this was so important, and it is, why does S. 2844 strike "visitor protection control" as one of the criteria on which a campground fee is based. P.L. 93-81 includes this language, and yet the Administration bill omits it, along with showers, flush toilets, and sanitary disposal stations.

But getting back to protection, I have been told by a number of rangers that because of the prohibition against their carrying guns, they tend to refrain from interjecting themselves in really serious altercations because of their inability to control the situation. So when we talk of security, let us be certain we understand the level of that security. Our rangers do a magnificent job, but we should not expect them to do that for which they are neither trained nor equipped.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to discuss one implication of the Corps and the user fee which has not yet been brought out in these hearings. A deeper motive underlies the Administration's actions here. The prime mover is the Office of Management and Budget under Roy Ash. OMB has been putting much pressure on all involved Federal agencies to raise user fees so high that an area can be self-supporting, even to the point of land acquisition costs for new campgrounds. I find this an intolerable position, alien to the notion of public use, and one which will price moderate and limited income families right out of Federal recreation areas. I will fight this OMB position whenever and wherever I can.

In the realm of the Corps of Engineers, this OMB thinking ultimately extends to getting the Corps to impose toll charges on all inland waterways. OMB sees the issue of recreational user fees in Corps projects as merely a proving ground, a precedent setter, so that it can impose tolls and user fees on the Arkansas River and other navigation systems. Imposition of tolls on the Arkansas River, for example, would have a severe and detrimental impact on the future development of this vital waterway, and I will oppose such fees with every means at my disposal.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave you and the Subcommittee with a final reminder from the people who are the primary users of Corps recreation projects. These are not people who can afford to travel across our great nation, reaching a relatively inaccessible national park. These are people who historically depend on nearby Corps lakes and fishing areas, they are people who have come to use these easily accessible areas often and with great pleasure. I want to stress once again that this is a fundamental difference with the great tradition of our National Parks, for Corps areas are far more accessible, many times part of a community, and used by citizens from all walks of life.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of your deep concern for our national recreational areas. I have great confidence that you will guide this Subcommittee in a constructive and judicious manner, as you continue your deliberations on this important legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. JONES. But the primary motivating purpose of the laws pertaining to the Corps of Engineers was for flood control, navigation, and generation of hydroelectric power. Recreational benefits were secondary to the fundamental purpose of such corps legislation and certainly secondary to the purpose of the corps itself. Recreational benefit was merely a byproduct. It was a secondary use to the ultimate and fundamental purpose of the corps legislation. As a matter of fact, the majority of the corps recreation projects in my area do not even include recreation as a part of the benefit-cost ratio. The primary purpose is flood control and hydroelectric power and navigation, as I said.

So historically the Corps of Engineers is distinct from the National Park System. Until this year legislation having to do with the corps recreational areas has always been under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. That in and of itself tells us something about the corps.

It is a different agency with different purposes from those of the Park Service with different goals and different operating principles. Perhaps most importantly, having created different expectations in the minds of the American public who use Corps of Engineer projects, this sets out the difference.

The American people believe that they have sealed at least a tacit, if not an expressed, agreement with the Federal Government and the corps. The American people believe that as taxpayers they should be able to use the recreational facilities run by the corps without charge—unless the facility is highly developed or specialized, and then they should pay a small fee. There would have been no need for special legislation aimed, as I mentioned earlier, for special legislation aimed at a special agency if that agency had served the American people and interpreted the law correctly. Now, Congress may have overreacted last summer, but to strip away all of our efforts is itself a breach with the American people.

Now briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to trace some of the major legislation in this area over the past 30 years.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, Public Law 78-534, provides in part:

The water areas of all such reservoirs (constructed and operated by the Corps) shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing and other recreational purposes.

And although this legislation was amended in 1965 to delete the phrase "without charge", the intent of the legislation is clear.

Now the most recent congressional statement specifically on the corps and recreation charges came in section 210 of the River and Harbors Act, Public Law 90-483, approved in 1968, which provides:

No entrance or admission fee shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by an 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 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.

This legislation is as explicit as can be, and yet does not seem to have convinced the corps. Instead, the corps chose to ignore this explicit language, and chose to misread Public Law 92-347. And that was the basis of our suit by Congressman McSpadden and Congressman Steed and myself last year against the corps, which we already discussed.

Anyway, we want to go one step further and discuss the cost benefit mentality. I do have a letter, which I would like to submit, a letter from Colonel John Driskill, the District Engineer for the Tulsa District of the corps in answer to my question about whether the user fees being charged at the corps project in our district are actually economically sound.

And according to Colonel Driskill's own figures, in 1970, 1971, and 1972 the collection of user fees in our area for corps projects, for corps recreational projects, created a net deficit of \$24,000. It was again penny wise and pound foolish governmental action.

But even if we assume that they made a slight profit, which some of their testimony I understand yesterday indicated, you still have to build into that benefit cost ratio the American people, what is it worth to have that aggravation, what is it worth when you consider the breach of faith of their Government to the American people? And for those of us who represent areas where the feeling is very, very high, it simply is not worth it.

So I think that it is a question that does not sway me, that is, the economic argument of charging fees.

Further, Mr. Chairman, much testimony I think yesterday had been given regarding the importance of a fee to the turnover in the users of the facility. In effect user fees would stimulate people to enjoy the facility on a short-term basis and then move on. Yet, we have all heard how many areas simply set a time limit such as 14 days for the use of a campsite and that has nothing to do with involving fees at all. Given adequate notice, that seems to be perfectly sensible to limiting the use of these facilities. To say that you charge a fee in order to limit the use of a facility by a person to me makes the same argument that was made during the recent energy crisis by those people who said we ought to have a high gasoline tax and perhaps get the cost of a gallon of gasoline up to \$1 a gallon in order to reduce the consumption of gasoline. Well I rejected that idea and I reject the same idea as a valid reason for charging a fee to get into a Corps of Engineers project in order to keep things moving on.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we heard about the importance yesterday of Federal presence in a recreation area, having a ranger, and how these fees enable those agencies to have such personnel. I wholeheartedly concur with the importance of a Federal presence in terms of safety, medical assistance, or simply educating yourself and your family in the ways of nature. Yet, if this is so important, then why does S. 2844 strike visitor protection control as one of the criteria on which a campground fee is based? Public Law 93-81 includes this language and yet the administration bill omits it along with showers, sanitary disposal stations, and so on.

But finally, getting back to protection, I have been told by a number of rangers, particularly at corps area, that because of the prohibition of their carrying guns, and also their inadequate training, they tend to refrain from interjecting themselves in really serious altercations because of their inability to control the situation. So when we talk of security, let us be certain we understand the level of that security. Our rangers do a magnificent job, but we should not expect them to do that for which they are neither trained nor equipped.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to discuss one implication of the corps and the user fee which has not yet been brought out in these hearings. A deeper motive underlies the administration's actions here. The prime mover is Office of Management and Budget under Roy Ash. OMB has been putting much pressure on all involved Federal agencies to raise user fees so high that an area can be self-supporting, even to the point of land acquisition cost for new campgrounds. I find this an intolerable position, alien to the notion of public use, and one which will price moderate and limited income families right out of federal recreation areas. And I think we ought to fight this OMB position whenever and wherever we can.

In the realm of the Corps of Engineers, this OMB thinking ultimately extends to getting the corps to impose toll charges on all inland waterways. Now this is another area which is not under the jurisdiction of this committee, but I think it is indicative of what the OMB was trying to do in helping to encourage the corps last year to charge the fees which they did, and which resulted in a court suit and legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave you and the subcommittee with a final reminder from the people who are the primary users of corps recreation projects. These are not people who can afford to travel across our great Nation. These are people who historically depend on nearby corps lakes and fishing areas and they are people who come to use these easily accessible areas often and with great pleasure. I want to stress once again that this is a fundamental difference between the great tradition of our national parks for corps are far more accessible, many times part of a community, and used by citizens from all walks of life.

That is a major difference in my judgment that will enable this subcommittee to differentiate between a corps project and a National Park System. The National Park System historically has been used for recreation purposes, a fee was charged and it was expected to be charged, whereas the corps projects in our area were historic-

ally not originally intended for recreation purposes, but recreation became a byproduct. It became a free inexpensive source of entertainment and recreation and an accessible source of recreation, and totally thousands of people in my State and in others surrounding the State felt this was a commitment, a compact, a contract between the Federal Government and themselves. They felt this was a project they paid for with their local tax dollars and to charge further fees for services that did not reflect a substantial Federal investment was a breach of faith between the Government and themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit to any questions you and the subcommittee may have.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you favor curtailment in the development of recreational facilities at corps projects?

Mr. JONES. Well, not necessarily, but I will make this distinction. The development of recreation facilities in corps projects to be financed by a user fee program is simply not feasible in my judgment. It is not economically sound because another difference between a corps project and a park system is one of the primary purposes of a corps project is flood control. When we have the annual floods in our part of the country, they flood these recreation areas and you simply are not going to be able to rebuild them with the money you are going to get from the user fee program.

So I would say, yes, we ought to continue to try to build recreation facilities in corps projects and we ought to try to get national park land for all of our people, but a great deal of this ought to come out of the general appropriations.

I think this is a small price to pay for the benefit that is going to come to all of our citizens.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now you stated flood control is the main purpose of the Corps of Engineers and not recreation. Would you favor closing and removing of these special recreation facilities which are causing the problem?

Mr. JONES. No, I would not favor that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you want to have your cake and eat it too?

Mr. JONES. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we spend a great deal of money in a lot of different projects from the basic projects such as education and other Federal programs right on to job training, and I think that the money we spend in recreational development is a legitimate Government expense and one which should be supported in the future and also it is a very small expense.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have studied S. 2844?

Mr. JONES. Somewhat.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are familiar with its terms?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir. And I thought that the language, when I first read it, was fairly reasonable, but then we contacted the Corps of Engineers and they interpret the language in such a way that they feel that they can put user fee charges on more areas in our district than they were able to before the bill was passed last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now what type of user fee charges are you referring to?

Mr. JONES. User fee charges for camping, for example, where basically what you have is a pit latrine type thing and no substantial

investment or facilities such as showers and electrical hookups and what have you.

Mr. TAYLOR. General Kelly, a representative of the Corps, testified yesterday and he did point out that it would be an increase in the number of camping sites that they could make charges for in relation to the present law. As I interpreted his testimony, though, he would not go back to the system which was causing the problem last summer; the system whereby they designated certain mini-recreation areas and charged you for entering those areas regardless of your purpose. He would not make any charge for the use of water areas and there would be almost no cases in which they would charge for lowering boats into the water. They had very few facilities that would comply with the requirements so that the charges could be made.

So it appeared to me that in the main the Corps charging program would be similar to the Forest Service's and Park Service's in that emphasis would be placed on user charges for camping.

Mr. JONES. Well, I would like to have this cleared up. I didn't understand how the corps could misinterpret the law year and charge the fees they did, but they did, and a court case didn't solve it. All I am saying is that the court historically and otherwise is a unique situation. And if the intent of Congress is going to be upheld, why don't we spell it out now instead of having to pass a law and go to court every year?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well now, the Senate bill I thought spelled it out mighty well.

Mr. JONES. Well apparently the corps' interpretation in response to our telephone call didn't show that.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Glad to yield.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Jones, as you know I have worked with Mr. Edmondson over there on the Public Works Committee to try to assist on what, in effect, was a special Oklahoma problem. And when the Chairman stated earlier that not many of the people knew what was taking place on the floor of the House, I can tell you that the Speaker knew what was going on because he scheduled it and they marked up the Senate version. Somehow it moved through the House in the closing days of the Congress. So the Speaker was from Oklahoma and he certainly knew what was going on I think or he wouldn't have scheduled it.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the gentleman would yield? I don't think they intended to do what was done. I don't think he intended to cut off all fee charges for camping and all national parks' areas, rest areas, and other areas throughout the Nation.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I think you are right. But I do say I was one of the members on the committee and it went through so fast that I wasn't aware of the magnitude of what had been included on the Senate side.

But returning back to the general line of comment that our Chairman is making, do you have a copy of S. 2844?

Mr. JONES. I don't have that now.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Could you give him a copy? And read on page 3 down starting on line 17 where it says:

Recreation use fees. Each Federal agency developing, administering, providing or furnishing at Federal expense, specialized outdoor recreation sites, facilities, equipment, or services, shall, in accordance with this subsection and subsection (d) of this section, provide for the collection of daily recreation use fees at the place of use or any reasonable convenient location. Then you have some provisos. I would like to find out where you disagree with them.

It states:

Provided, That in no event shall there be a charge by any such agency for the use, either singly or in any combination, of drinking water, wayside exhibits, roads, overlook sites, visitors' centers, scenic drives, toilet facilities, picnic tables, or boat ramps: provided, however, that a fee shall be charged in picnic areas or at boat ramps for the use of specialized facilities or services such as, but not limited to, electric or gas grills, and mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts.

Then again you have another negative proviso which says: Provided further, That in no event shall there be a charge for the use of any campground not having the following—tent or trailer spaces, drinking water, access roads, refuse containers, toilet facilities, and simple devices for containing a campfire (where campfires are permitted).

Now, if I recall correctly, a discussion we had earlier, it is my understanding your principal concern was one of providing unrestricted access to the water so that you didn't want entrance fees and you didn't want initial fees so people could have access to what in effect was a federally sponsored and maintained water recreation area, correct?

But returning to what I see is the language that tends to limit what can be charged for, the question of toilet facilities and picnic tables and that sort of thing where there is no mechanical equipment, that is included in the law; is that the way you understand it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman is correct. These all are intended to be prohibitions on charges. It appears to me, if the gentleman would yield further, that we are putting in the bill a good deal of language which was in our committee report 2 years ago.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Right.

Mr. TAYLOR. And which was in the statement which I made on the House floor 2 years ago. It is legislative history. The Corps of Engineers didn't see fit to go by the law as we intended and therefore at this time we are putting these restrictions in the bill. It is so that they will be legally bound and you will have less difficulty in winning your next suit, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES. Since our attorney was your former colleague, Mr. Edmondston, I am sure he will appreciate that we are developing more litigation for him.

Well, I think—

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well I guess what I wanted to ask—

Mr. JONES [continuing]. That there are two areas here: one is on the camping sites, Mr. Clausen. I still basically feel that where there is not substantial Federal investment such as the shower facilities and the things that were written into the bill last year, that there should not be a fee to allow someone to go into a recreation area and just camp overnight, and I don't believe the Corps of Engineers interprets it the same way as this bill.

Secondly, the second point, even though I am a member of this committee and respect its jurisdiction, I think as to the Corps of Engineer projects that the Public Works Committee ought to be investigating the type of language that should be written that would be peculiar to the Corps of Engineers because they basically have jurisdiction in that area.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, as you know, I am on that committee, and there have been times when each one of us has sort of preempted the other committee's jurisdiction. Oftentimes it is on the basis of mutual consent when it is in the overall interest to move something forward, I mean, something that would be beneficial because of the time limit involved.

What I am wondering about is whether or not this language that says "in no event" is unclear. It seems to me to be pretty clear:

In no event shall there be a charge by any such agency for the use, either singly or in any combination, of drinking water, wayside exhibits, roads, overlook sites, visitors' centers, scenic drives, toilet facilities, picnic tables, or boat ramps.

Mr. JONES. Well, I think if we can spell out and if we can get some assurances from the Corps of Engineers that they are not misinterpreting again, perhaps then this would be sufficient, although I still have my doubts.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, I stand corrected. Counsel has just advised me that toilet facilities do not include showers.

Mr. JONES. That is right. The Senate version specifically declares that that is pit toilets and says nothing about shower facilities or flush toilets or anything like that.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Would counsel like to make any comments?

Mr. McELVAIN. Mr. Chairman, the understanding I have had is that the requirement for showers in the act that was passed last year is one of the major problems in having fee charges at other areas in the National Park System and the National Forest System. The act of last year says that showers must be reasonably available and that was interpreted as meaning available at the Federal site and not necessarily available at some concession operated site. And that interpretation pretty much eliminated the national parks from having any charges at their facilities.

Mr. JONES. Well, I would agree that the bill last year infringed on the jurisdiction of this committee and infringed on the ability of the park system to carry out its historical program.

Mr. McELVAIN. Now as far as—

Mr. JONES. What I am saying is let's don't compound that through the bill this year.

Mr. McELVAIN. Well, as I say—

Mr. JONES. The 1968 Flood Control Act still should control the intent of whether you are going to charge fees or not.

Mr. McELVAIN. Well I would take issue with you on that particular jurisdictional question. The question of jurisdiction over outdoor recreation programs I think has been resolved in favor of this committee. The Land and Water Conservation Act originally set up the entrance and user fee program and it also provided for a uniform program for entrance and user fees throughout the Federal

administering agencies. It turned out that there were some complications with respect to Corps of Engineers projects, and over the years, and just about every year, if not every year at least every other year, this committee and its counterpart on the Senate side has been confronted with a new problem at the Corps of Engineer project and we have always tried to work it out in a manner which would satisfy the objections.

At one point, Congressman Edmondson, your predecessor to Congress, came in and testified at great length and the effect of his testimony was that he had no objection to the charge of a reasonable fee for special user facilities. He did object to an entrance fee program.

Mr. CLAUSEN. That is right.

Mr. McELVAIN. And the act that was enacted by Congress, and that came out of this committee that year, provided that there would be no entrance fees at any place except units of the national park systems and national recreation areas created by Congress under the jurisdiction of the National Forest Service and that user fees would be limited to those facilities which require a significant Federal investment and which provided a special benefit for an individual to the exclusion of the general public. And that is where the fly got into the ointment with the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JONES. Well, may I just make these comments? First of all I used to work for Congressman Edmondson, and when I left him, I went to the White House and was part of the administration which helped draw up the proposal for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We had some disagreements on it at that time.

I would agree with Mr. Edmondson. I have no objection to a use fee for a special service. If you have an electrical hookup, you may pay for that portion of that service, or if you are using a hydraulic boat lift for your use, you pay for that use. But, as I believe what the Corps of Engineers will do in interpreting the language and the record that has been made by the Senate on this bill, I believe that they will charge for overnight camping where there is substantially no special investment or special facilities which will be used, and that that charge for overnight camping will in effect amount to an entrance fee for those who have been using these camping facilities free for all of these years.

Mr. McELVAIN. Well, I don't see how you could say that is an entrance fee. There is nothing in the bill or nothing in the act which precludes an individual from having access to and use of the reservoir and all of the general facilities. In fact, the bill pretty explicitly makes certain that there be no charge for picnic areas or for restroom facilities or for drinking water and so forth. But if you do take advantage of staying overnight, I think it is intended that a charge would be imposed for that use.

Mr. JONES. So what I am saying is if you are asking me how you could accommodate these particular problems, I would say if you could interpret into the language pertaining to the Corps of Engineers, that is the language of what constitutes a substantially built-up area like the showers and flush toilets and so on that we had in the last year's bill, and apply that language just to Corps of Engi-

neers projects, I think that would meet the peculiar problem of corps recreation projects.

Mr. McELVAIN. Well the net result of that would be that you wouldn't have any areas to charge for.

Mr. JONES. No, that would not be true. In our district alone you would have roughly 27 areas to charge fees.

Mr. McELVAIN. Out of how many total?

Mr. JONES. And you have roughly 113.

Mr. SKUBITZ. You have 27 areas in Oklahoma where they have shower facilities?

Mr. JONES. You would have about 27 areas under the language, and if I will check this if I am wrong because I don't have that in front of me. But I believe under the language of the bill that was passed last year it specified what was a substantial investment. You would have about 27 areas in the Tulsa district Corps of Engineers which would be charging fees for these services.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the gentleman yield to the chairman?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Counsel just mentioned that Congressman Edmondson was a leader in opposing entrance fees and opposing fees for charge for ordinary daily use facilities. Back in 1965 maybe when the original land and water conservation fund program was being set up and emphasis was being put on fees, Congressman Edmondson opposed entrance fees and fees for charge of ordinary daily use facilities.

And I would classify myself as being his No. 1 assistant because at that time I opposed entrance fees and opposed fees for daily use charges contending that they were not practicable. Well, we lost that fight. And he said—and he and I sat side by side over here—and he said so often in his public statements and conversations with me that the emphasis should be placed on daily use charges for facilities in which the Government had a special investment and camping fees was the No. 1 illustration in all discussions.

Now we have moved towards that and worked towards it and we are anxious to get your views because we want to get a practical bill. We don't have to fight this thing again next year if we can get a bill out that covers all problems. So if you have any specific suggestions as to how this language that the gentleman from California read should be amended, we will listen to them, especially in the full committee. You are a member of the full committee and I am sure you will be presenting amendments as reflecting your thinking. Go ahead.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would say this bill is a great improvement, but I still have my doubts on the camping aspects and would like to submit later some specific language.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now your two Senators supported the bill in the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Well, Mr. Chairman, I never presumed to speak for them.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are not responsible for them, I know.

Mr. JONES. I have never spoken for my two Senators or the Senate in general.

Mr. STEELMAN. Everybody is entitled to one mistake.

Mr. JONES. That is right. When the 300,000 bass anglers start writing me, I will refer all of my letters to the Senators from Oklahoma.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Skubitz brought up a point here. Let me make this one observation. In comparing the language on page 4 that I read so many times, it tends to compare pretty much with the language that we include in the 1968 act, section 210 specifically. It seems to come fairly close. As a matter of fact, where it states "picnic grounds" where there should not be any fees collected, it states just "picnic grounds" and this even goes further in this bill to include "the picnic areas and picnic tables."

So it seems to conform fairly close to what we had in the 1968 act, section 210, and so I was wondering if, as a method of orderly procedure, now could we work out what is in effect your unique Oklahoma problem by some specific language in the report that would not be subject to misinterpretation by the Corps of Engineers? Because as I get your testimony, you don't have too much of a hangup with the language of the bill as presented to us; it is the interpretation of the Corps of Engineers. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. CLAUSEN. And I am wondering if we couldn't—

Mr. JONES. And I think perhaps that would work, that is, what you are suggesting.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I am wondering if we couldn't move in the direction of placing some specific language in the conference report that could not be misinterpreted. Now would that be helpful?

Mr. JONES. I think that may be our answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the gentleman yield for 1 second?

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. SKUBITZ. First I got to go to another committee because there is some talk of doing something for our stripper oil producers—

Mr. CLAUSEN. You got to take care of your strippers?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Yes, take care of my strippers and not my streakers.

Congressman, I am fearful that unless we do something about some sort of camping fee we are going to stop the construction of a lot of corps projects. Now let me tell you why. I can still remember that years and years ago before the Roosevelt period none of these corps projects based solely on flood control were feasible. It wasn't until President Roosevelt came along and through in such intangibles as benefit to wildlife and recreation that we were able to build up the cost-benefit ratio in order to get these projects on the road.

Now you have a lot of projects in your State and I have a lot of projects in my State. Most of them in my State, and I am quite sure a number of them in your State, would never have been constructed or declared feasible if the basis was purely flood control.

I can't quite agree when you say a breach of trust even though I would like to see our people use these things free of any cost. We are getting to the point though where we have to raise money somewhere in order to take care of these projects. Your projects are a

lot better developed than mine. I visited Beaver Dam and a few of the others last summer. And when you speak of latrines, I can't quite classify them that way. I have some lovely pictures that I brought back of the camping facilities, the beach areas, the docking places, and the camping grounds, and they are all very nice.

I spoke to some of the superintendents who took me through the area and pointed out areas where people are camping. The problem that is worrying them today is actually sanitary facilities. They don't have the money to construct them.

Now one or two things are involved here. Either we've got to get money in there by appropriation, which we may find a little difficult, or maybe there ought to be some sort of a fee. An advance fee of some sort might be in order so that the corps in that particular reservoir area can use the funds to take care of the facilities that they have today and also develop others because your projects as well as mine are really getting a lot of use.

Now that sounds kind of odd coming from a fellow that has a number of reservoirs in his State, but I want to see our reservoirs developed more. I think we are going to have to do our share if we obtained the reservoir on the basis that they were built, because of recreational benefits. I feel that way about these projects just the way I feel about the Park Service giving free transportation within the parks. I intend to look into this just a little bit more. I find that we have free transportation all over LBJ's ranch and I didn't know that the Park Service was going into this sort of thing. I see that my park friends have dozens and dozens of studies for free transportation in scores of parks and historical sites. One day I heard the director come in and tell us, "Well, it was for the convenience of people that we provide these things." I think that if we provide the facilities and the historical sites then the people ought to take care of getting back and forth themselves.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I've got to rush over to another committee.

Mr. JONES. I would just make two observations and I can't speak for all projects, but the majority of projects in my State, the recreation aspect in those projects does not enter into the benefit-cost ratio nor do I think we should ever get into the position where the Corps of Engineers are building recreational facilities, primarily recreational facilities. I think they should be building flood control and hydroelectric facilities. The Bureau of Outdoor Reclamation and others should be building our recreational facilities.

Mr. TAYLOR. Pardon our discussion while you were talking.

Now in addition to the statements made by the gentleman from California, for your protection I would suggest you read yesterday's record. I attempted to pin General Kelly down in regard to just how they would interpret the Senate bill if it became law and after a few further questions I turned over to Mr. McElvain. We have permission to ask them questions, which was already granted, and we will be glad to ask them questions for you and get the answers in the record before the matter comes to the full committee so that you will have his answers to any questions that you want to ask in regard to how it would be interpreted.

Mr. JONES. O.K.
[The information follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1974.

Mr. LEE McELVAIN, *General Counsel,*
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McELVAIN: This is in response to your letter of 24 April 1974 addressed to Brigadier General Kelly requesting an answer by 15 May to questions you inclosed from Congressman Jim Jones of Oklahoma, regarding S. 2844.

Answers to Mr. Jones' questions are provided in the enclosure. If we can be of further assistance please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. PARISH, JR.,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Executive Director of Civil Works.

Enclosure.

ANSWERS PROVIDED TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY CONGRESSMAN JIM JONES OF GENERAL KELLY IN REGARD TO S. 2844 ON RECREATION USE FEES

Question. 1. How much was actually collected in user fees by the Corps nationwide in 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Answer. Use fees collected by Corps nationwide: 1971, \$318,000; 1972, \$378,000; 1973, \$1,559,551.

Question. 2. How much revenue was actually collected in user fees by the Corps, in the State of Oklahoma, in 1971, 1972, and 1973?

Answer. Use Fees collected by Corps in Oklahoma: 1971, \$16,928; 1972, \$22,461; 1973, \$26,817.

Question. 3. What was the actual (not net) cost of collecting user fees for 1971, 1972, and 1973 nationwide? In Oklahoma? In making this determination, what are the factors included and considered in costs?

Answer. The Corps has to have a minimum number of Rangers at its projects for surveillance, supervision, public relations and orderly operation of the public recreation facilities. Included in their range of work is the duty of use fee collection where use fees are collected. Past cost estimates have been based on unstructured estimates and have not been consistent nor proven to be uniform on a nationwide basis. We are instituting a bookkeeping system beginning 1 July 1974 to break out the specific recreation use fee collection costs.

Question. 4. Under statute and/or regulation, what, if any, provisions are there for earmarking a certain percentage of collected user fees for the collection of user fees? for any other program or uses?

Answer. The statute (P.L. 92-347) provides that not more than 40% of collection for use fees may be used for the enhancement of the fee collection system, including the promotion and enforcement during the five fiscal years following enactment of the law. Remaining fee revenue is to be expended for other recreation purposes.

Question. 5. Would you please list for the record, the number of Corps facilities at which user fees have been and would be charged in the State of Oklahoma (1) before P.L. 92-347, (2) after P.L. 92-347, and (3) after enactment of S. 2844.

Answer. Corps areas in Oklahoma where use fees have been charged and would be charged under the specific statutes are:

	<i>Number areas</i>
Before Public Law 92-347 (1971-72)-----	9
After Public Law 92-347 (thru July 1973)-----	108
After Public Law 93-81 (after Aug. 1, 1973)-----	27
After enactment of S. 2844 (estimated)-----	100 to 113

Question. 6. Do you envision the primary purpose of the Corps, as it relates to the administration and operation of recreation areas as serving the public or keeping private facilities in operation by charging a comparable user fee?

Answer. The Corps has interpreted its responsibility as that of providing those recreation facilities which make the recreation resources of a project available to the public (i.e., access, parking, boat ramps, sanitation). Any facilities or services that are in the nature of a convenience facility (such as developed camping sites) requiring larger federal investments are over and above the Government's responsibility to provide without some compensation by the user.

Question. 7. Does the Corps have any plans to sell its recreation facilities or sites to private operators?

Answer. The Corps does not have authority to sell its recreation facilities or sites to private operators. However, authority does exist for leasing facilities and sites.

Question. 8. On page 54, lines 20 through 23, of the transcript of the hearing, before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (hereafter referred to as the transcript), you testified:

... this would be planned to be expanded over time and hopefully we try to get local interests, or State (or the) country in to take over as much of the operation and maintenance as we can.

Subsequently, on page 65, lines 10-17, Mr. Crane explained the future for Corps development of recreation areas:

... if you are speaking in the future, in the Corps of Engineers under current Administration procedure any further development of a recreation area, adding to it will require a 50-50 cost sharing of local interests it must be operated and maintained ... in the future, if there is any upgrading, anything of significance other than very minor items, it will be operated by others than the Federal Government.

This seems to signal a new and important direction for the development and operation of Corps recreation projects. Would you please explain this new direction, including its rationale and goal, in as much detail as possible.

Answer. The Federal Water Project Recreation Act (P. L. 89-72) establishes recreation as a full project purpose at Federal water resource projects and provides that non-Federal public interests cost share in the provision of public recreation at projects authorized after enactment of P.L. 89-72. P.L. 89-72 recognizes the need to provide uniform policies and the need for preserving and enhancing the quality of outdoor recreation. It further recognizes the equity of requiring beneficiaries to bear part of the costs of the recreation. In this regard the law provides that non-Federal public interests cost share in the separable recreation development costs and operate and maintain those recreation facilities to be provided at all projects authorized after enactment of P.L. 89-72.

In regard to projects authorized prior to enactment of P.L. 89-72 a new administrative policy was introduced in conjunction with FY 74 budget that the principles of cost sharing with non-Federal public interests will be applied. Thus, wherever new recreation developments are initiated at completed projects, cost sharing of the development by non-Federal public interests is required and they must also agree to operate and maintain the recreation facilities. The new policy is in the transition stage in FY 1974 but will be fully effective in FY 1975.

Question. 9. Under the legislation now reported out by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, fees are not to be charged for individual or combined use of picnic tables, drinking water and toilet facilities, among others.

a. Do you envision, or does the Corps plan, the charging of fees for use of picnic tables under any condition? If so, please describe them.

b. Does the Corps plan to charge fees for access to areas in which a visitor might obtain a drink of water, use a restroom, or use a picnic table? If so, please describe these plans.

c. Does the Corps believe it would have the legal right under S. 2844, as reported out of the Subcommittee, to charge for access or use of picnic tables, restrooms or non-mechanical boat ramps? If so, please state fully the legal arguments, and describe the legal possibility for such charges.

Answer. a. We do not plan to charge for the use of picnic tables as a separate item. However, where the table is part of a use fee area such as an overnight tent and trailer camp area, the table will be part of the facilities provided under the use fee charged for that area.

b. The Corps will not charge a fee for use of picnic areas which contain drinking fountains, restrooms or picnic tables. Use of such facilities in a fee

camp area will also be permitted providing the non-paying user does not interfere with those who have already established their camp.

c. The Corps does not believe that it would have authority under S. 2844, as reported, to charge fees for use of the facilities listed. Fees for use of a developed camp area containing such facilities among others, would be for use of the total camp site not for access thereto nor for each facility provided.

Question. 10. The legislation in question contains exactly the same language that was in P.L. 92-347 in regard to admission and entrance fees. This language expressly prohibits the charge of admission and entrance fees at Corps areas. Would you please confirm that under such language, the Corps would not charge such fees?

Answer. Admission and entrance fees to Corps operated areas at projects under our jurisdiction have not been and will not be made.

Question. 11. In pages 29-30, lines 20-25, 1-2, of the transcript, you state that the language in S. 2844 allows the Corps to charge user fees at their place of use or any other mutually convenient location to the public and the Corps. What assurance does the Congress and the public have that the Corps will not use this language to impose, once again, an access fee or a charge fee to a recreation area or any part thereof?

Answer. As stated in answer to question 10 above, the Corps of Engineers has not and will not charge admission or entrance fees under prior and existing authorities. Fees for the use of the overnight camping facilities which we operate will be charged at their place of use or any reasonably convenient location to the using public and the Corps.

Question. 12. On pages 39-40, lines 15-25, 1-4, of the transcript, Chairman Taylor described the Corps action in early 1973 of setting up "charge areas" which were not entrance fees but which were charges for access to an area, regardless of the purpose of the visit, be it to picnic, use a restroom, or get a drink of water. On page 40, lines 6-12, in your response, you said that there was not a charge if someone wanted to get a drink of water or use a picnic table; but if someone wanted to go in and use the full range of facilities which might include a boat ramp, a restroom, a picnic area, in other words, a wide range of things, then yes, there was a fee charged for access to that area. Yet in reality, we all know, the fee was not a charge for use of a special facility—it was not a user fee, it was instead an entrance fee into an area, the boundary of which was drawn very carefully by the Corps. Given this exchange:

a. Does the Corps acknowledge that such action was at best a misinterpretation of the statute, P.L. 92-247? If not, please explain.

b. Does the Corps understand that access is not to be the basis for a charge, only the use of a specially defined facility or service? If not, please explain.

c. Does the Corps understand that if a person wants to drive through a campground, or picnic there, he or she is not to be charged unless overnight use is made of the campground facility? If not, please explain.

Answer. a. Following passage of P.L. 92-347 with its stress on comparability of fees to be charged by public recreation agencies for comparable facilities and services the Corps of Engineers in consultation with the several other Federal agencies agreed upon a common schedule of fees to be charged for the use of highly developed day use areas. We believe that this fee program was in compliance with the provisions and intent of P.L. 92-347. However, the 93rd Congress in its enactment of H.R. 6717, elected to prohibit this coordinated day use fee program as we were administering it at that time. Accordingly, the Corps has not administered this program since the approval of that enactment as P.L. 93-81 in August 1973. The Corps of Engineers does not believe that it misinterpreted any provisions of the aforementioned previous law, P.L. 92-347, or any other pertinent provisions of law regarding existing prohibitions on our authority to charge entrance or admission fees and, we will continue to adhere to any such prohibitions which remain incumbent on us in this regard in the administration of our outdoor recreation programs in the future.

b. & c. Our answer to your question number 11 above applies also to this portion of question number 12.

Question. 13. Further, in your response on page 40, lines 18-20, you state: "we (the Corps) would not be charging for anything but camping facilities (under S. 2844)."

a. Is that a correct statement of the Corps position? If not, please explain.

b. Is that a correct statement of the Corps legal position as interpreted by the Corps? If not, please explain.

c. Is it a correct statement to say that the Corps will not, nor can it legally, charge for access to, or use of, any part of a Corps recreation area or any special facility except statutorily defined campgrounds? If not, please explain.

Answer. a., b. & c. The only recreation facilities that the Corps of Engineers administers under our present state of recreation facilities development at our water resources projects which we estimate would qualify for immediate use fee charges upon enactment of S. 2844, would be campgrounds which meet the criteria detailed in the provisions of the bill. Our preliminary estimates of the number of such campgrounds under our administration which we believe would qualify under those provisions have been noted in our answer to question 5 above.

Question. 14. Is it correct that the Corps does not operate any mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts, as you testified on page 55, lines 10-12? If not, please explain.

Answer. The Corps presently does not operate any mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts.

Question. 15. If the Corps has only non-mechanical boat ramps, is it correct to say that there will be no fee or charge imposed for use of boat ramps in Corps operated areas?

Answer. There will be no charges made for use of non-mechanical boat ramps in Corps operated areas.

Question. 16. Does the Corps have any electrical or gas grills at any Corps operated picnic areas?

Answer. No.

Question. 17. On page 43, lines 23-25, you state that in the bill, S. 2844, an area would be subject to surveillance and security. Important as this is, would you please indicate where in this legislation such action is mandated?

Answer. Section 4.c. of P.L. 92-347 states that all fees shall take into consideration the benefits to the recipient. We certainly feel that surveillance of the fee areas and provision of security services for those who pay a fee for the use of a recreation area constitute valid benefits which should be considered under this provision. This language is not altered by S. 2844.

Question. 18. What would be the Corps reaction to the idea of leaving a certain percentage, 1/3, of campgrounds in a given area unimproved in order that the sites might be used free of charge?

Answer. The objective of the Corps of Engineers in providing public recreation at Corps water resource projects is to provide a range of facilities including camping facilities ranging from wilderness to highly developed campgrounds. Whether a use fee is charged depends on the level of development. We provide some campgrounds which don't warrant a use fee. However, we don't restrict the levels of development to a given percentage of areas. We generally provide at least one camping area (composed of several campsites) at each lake where no fees are charged and we provide overflow areas which would be free under provisions of S. 2844.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask you, do you have any problems in connection with the language as it deals with boat ramps? I have before me the language in section 210 of the 1968 Flood Control Act and it states:

No charge shall be made for boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

Mr. CLAUSEN. That is section 210.

Mr. TAYLOR. Section 210, yes. And that is just about the same language in the Senate bill. If there is any way of getting closer to that language, it is all right with me to get a little closer.

Mr. JONES. Well for a hydraulic lift where you are providing a service such as that, I have no objection to a fee being charged.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now you understand that the fees collected in the corps in areas are turned over to the corps to enhance its outdoor recreational program projects. So all of the money your citizens or other citizens pay for fees goes right back to the recreation program for improvement there.

Mr. JONES. Yes, I understand that.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was not the case originally, but it is now.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes, in the area.

Mr. TAYLOR. It goes back to the corps to be used for recreation enhancement at corps projects.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. We are dealing with a time problem and we have some other witnesses and I believe that we ought to be moving on and hearing other witnesses and then consider marking up the bill and, Mr. Jones, between now and the time that this committee marks it up for the full committee, if you need to have some refinement of the language, you can check with counsel or we can crank something into that report to handle your own immediate situation. But I do think it seems to me we need to move along with dispatch with this thing because we have the upcoming tourist season and, as I see it, the situation is people out in the field are going to be on the horns of a dilemma unless they have something very clear and very specific. So I would like to see us move this thing out of the committee if we can.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any other questions?

Mr. KETCHUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too have another commitment I want to go to. I just want to get on the record as far as my feelings on user fees that I am just 100 percent totally in favor of it. I think my colleague from California, Mr. Clausen, and I probably understand user fees very, very well because both of us are pilots. Our gasoline tax refund is taken from us and I am very happy they do it. It is taken from us for the development of airports, which we then use. Everyone doesn't use those airports and everyone does not use the national parks or the Bureau of Land Management projects or the Corps of Engineer projects. I am of the opinion that any of these projects, particularly if they are in any way connected with water, that you have to make provision for recreation simply because of the demand.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Precisely.

Mr. KETCHUM. Because of the demands of our people for them. Now when we get to boat ramps, in California our gasoline tax there, again the refund would normally go for off-road use, and is utilized by the State of California to build boat ramps for those individuals who use boat ramps so they in essence pay for the boat ramps they are using and I am in favor of that. But there are so many thousands of people, that utilize these part facilities or recreational facilities that I really don't think there is a strong objection on their part for paying for a little piece of the action—and I don't think they should pay for all of it—but just a little for what they are using. That is because there are many more of us who do not have the time or opportunity to use those parks. I just want that statement on the record.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of these fees and if there are some problems with the bill, I would be glad to work on that in any way that I can.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any other questions?

Mr. CAMP. If I read the legislation right, we provided again for the Golden Age Passport for the \$10 fee, which I think has been accepted by practically all of the people I have been in correspondence with even when we had correspondence against the other fees that were projected by the Corps of Engineers in Oklahoma, which I agree with you and I didn't think they were quite fair either, but as they interpreted the law at that time it was necessary for them to go ahead and carry out the instructions that had been given to them by the law. So they had really no other choice until we got involved. And that it is why I think it is so important, particularly for your people in eastern Oklahoma where we have the problem of the lake waters that we have, so important that you do get together with staff to get this thing worked out and ironed out so we sure won't run into any problems this time like we did before.

Mr. TAYLOR. If there are no other comments and suggestions, we thank our colleague for his contribution. Really I don't think we are very far apart.

Mr. JONES. No, we aren't.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we are trying to do just about what you have done. You just want to make sure it is done and done in such a way that it won't be misinterpreted.

Mr. JONES. That is the point.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we are anxious to help you reach that situation.

Our next witness is James G. Watt, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and Russell E. Dickenson, Deputy Director, National Park Service.

I suggest you come up together and I see Mr. Stanley Hulett will represent Mr. Watt.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY W. HULETT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, ACCOMPANIED BY RUSSELL E. DICKENSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. HULETT. Yes, Mr. Watt was detained at the Department and he asked me to fill in today for him.

Mr. TAYLOR. We appreciate that. Do you have an additional statement?

Mr. HULETT. No, no additional statement unless you wish me to read Mr. Watt's statement from yesterday which I understand has been made available to those members who were not present yesterday. We would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we pretty well covered the subject matter yesterday and the questions pertaining to the bill before us. It leaves the discussion of the campground reservation system. And while this bill is necessary in order to have a campground reservation system, in the main it is oversight jurisdiction that we have in regards to the reservation system because it is not involved in the legislation specifically.

Mr. HULETT. I believe Mr. Dickenson is prepared to speak on that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Dickenson, you do have a statement in regard to that on the campground reservation system pertaining to the

National Park Service. The other agencies have not produced such a system so we will go ahead and recognize Mr. Dickenson to present his statement.

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

During the 1973 camping season, a reservation service was begun at six national parks as a convenience to the camper. These parks were: Grand Teton, Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Acadia, and Everglades National Parks. The objective of the pilot 1-year program was to determine whether and to what extent park campers would avail themselves of this convenience.

Our reasoning was to explore a means whereby all potential users, and not just those who may happen to live near the park, have the same opportunity to camp in a park. A secondary objective was to determine whether such a reservation service could materially assist campground management by eliminating waiting lines and control-in campground use.

For the first time in 1973, campers planning to visit a national park could reserve a campsite well in advance of their trip and be assured of having a suitable site available when they arrived. The reservation service, provided under a contract with American Express Reservations, Inc., was well received by the public. Reservations were available for 3,436 campsites in 19 campgrounds in the six parks. Approximately 60 percent of the available campsite-nights in these campgrounds were sold through the reservation system. Based on a survey questionnaire, approximately 83 percent of the users preferred the reservation system, while 8 percent preferred to camp on a first-come-first-served basis. The other 9 percent indicated no preference.

The pilot 1-year program proved, in our opinion, that a nationwide, computerized campsite reservation system is practical, and that it does provide a worthwhile service to the camping public. On this basis, we issued a prospectus on February 21 of this year inviting offers for a computerized reservation system with nationwide capability. The system will be expanded to cover 23 areas of the National Park System, as opposed to the six included in the pilot program. The operation is to be by means of a concession contract which will cover a total of 11,026 campsites in 67 campgrounds.

Three offers have been received from interested applicants as of March 25, which was the date for submission under the prospectus. We are now in the process of evaluating these offers.

For the committee's information we have compiled a report on the 1-year pilot program just completed, and copies of the report were furnished to the committee on February 21.

Mr. CAMP. Is that word "not" or "now."

• Mr. DICKENSON. That is an error and the correct word is "now," Mr. Camp. That was a typographical error in the statement.

Mr. Chairman, I understand earlier that the committee was also interested in hearing in the proposed operation of campgrounds by the concessionaires and not the National Park Service. I will be glad to cover that at your convenience.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; please do.

Mr. DICKENSON. All right, sir. Mr. Chairman, our goal in managing the National Park System is to provide a sensitive, high-

quality experience for every visitor. To do this we are looking at ways to better utilize the people we have, in order to assist the visitor and interpret what he sees and experiences in the parks.

In this regard, it has occurred to us that duties such as collecting campsite permits, routinely assigning camping spaces, and similar recurring functions at a campground might be done by a contractor, and perhaps at a lower cost, rather than by National Park Service Rangers. We had planned, after certain data were available, to begin such a program during the 1974 camping season for Yosemite and Shenandoah National Parks on a 1-year pilot basis.

Adequate information we need to evaluate a program of this type is not available. For example, we believe we should have current data on the amount and cost of maintenance to keep a campground at a high standard, and the number of people necessary to maintain a campground when we separate campground maintenance from general park maintenance. We know we will need at least this information to evaluate any contractor's bid for operating a campground. We would especially be interested in any suggestions this committee may have as to other information you feel we should look at before any decision is made to start a 1-year pilot program. We welcome any of your suggestions in this regard.

Because these data are not yet available, we have determined at this time not to begin the pilot contractor-operated camping program. Instead, during this coming 1974 season we will identify several areas which would be possible candidates for a pilot project in the 1975 season. During this year we will analyze the benefits and costs involved and then decide whether to proceed further. At that time we will advise your committee of what we determine is the best course to follow. I am advised that we should be in a position about October of this year to decide whether or not to go forward with the pilot project.

I would be glad to answer any question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did American Express not seek to renew or extend its contract to carry out the reservation program?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well that was a decision by the corporation, Mr. Chairman. I understand that their operation was very marginal from a profit standpoint but I am not sure that was the entire reason. I think it was a desire by the corporation related to the totality of their operations and not just the reservation system.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now you state here in the bottom of page 2 of your statement, "The operation is to be by means of a concession contract which will cover a total of 11,026 campsites in 67 campgrounds." Now I wonder what services will the concession contractor obtain and what will it cost?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, the concession contract that we are referring to here, of course, relates to the reservation system and the contractor would be asked to provide both telephone and mail reservation centers throughout the United States at the principal cities. They would also be required to furnish computer terminal equipment at each of the parks which are under the system this year and that would be 23 parks. So that any prospective camper, Mr. Chairman, who desires to make a reservation can either call or write to determine the availability of a campsite at any of the

23 areas in the system. We anticipate that the fee this year, although that decision has not been made, but we anticipate that the reservation fee may well be about \$2.00.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is regardless of whether it is one night or several nights?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. \$2 per reservation?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who pays that?

Mr. DICKENSON. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAYLOR. Who pays the \$2?

Mr. DICKENSON. The camper himself pays that.

Mr. TAYLOR. And when?

Mr. DICKENSON. He pays that at the time he makes the reservation.

Mr. TAYLOR. All right, if I call one of these numbers and I ask for a reservation of a campsite at a certain park in a certain area, how do they collect my money?

Mr. DICKENSON. This can be sent in by mail following the contact either by telephone or by mail or it may be paid in person by going to the reservation center at one of the larger cities, or if you decide to make that reservation at one of the areas actually under the reservation system, you may pay at the park.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will any deposit be required for the reservation.

Mr. DICKENSON. No, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will prepayment of that \$2 be required for the reservation?

Mr. DICKENSON. At the time that the reservation is confirmed payment is due, sir, for not only the reservation but for the bill for the campsite itself depending upon the number of nights.

Mr. TAYLOR. How will you control situations in which reservations are made but the parties do not show?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, under the camping fee payment system the number of no shows would be diminished rather sharply we believe, Mr. Chairman, as illustrated by our experience last year. Prior to the time that we had to discontinue the collection of fees, which was about August 1, a payment for the campsite and the reservation service was required. In other words, if you were going to go to Yosemite for two nights, for two nights of camping, that was collected far in advance of your going. If you didn't go, you forfeited that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was that your system last year?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir, up until August 1. After August 1 when we no longer collected the fee but only the reservation service charge, the number of no shows increased dramatically, which simply shows that people will honor their commitments when they pay cash for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought you said just a minute ago that this year you didn't plan to require a deposit except for payment of the reservation \$2 cost.

Mr. DICKENSON. Well I guess this is a matter of semantics using "deposit" in the sense that if you make a reservation for four nights, you will be required to pay for four nights.

Mr. TAYLOR. In advance?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. That will have a bearing on your no shows?

Mr. DICKENSON. No question about that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well suppose I find out a week before that the time I am supposed to appear, that I can't go and I had to cancel my trip. Now is there any chance of getting my money back?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir. Then you may cancel. Last year the cancellation fee in advance was \$1.00 and that wiped out the obligation.

Mr. TAYLOR. How far in advance did I have to make my request?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, as I recall it was 72 hours, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. 72 hours?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if I didn't make a cancellation request within 72 hours then I lost my money?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if I didn't show up by the first day, by the first night, you held it for me just one night?

Mr. DICKENSON. One night, yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And then the next day if I still didn't show up, then you leased the campsite to someone else?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. So, you get paid two times for it, for a couple of days?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, I guess that is right.

[Ed. Note: NPS later stated that this was incorrect; reservations could be cancelled as late as 11:00 a.m. of arrival date.]

Mr. TAYLOR. Now you mentioned here that functions at a campground might be done by the contractor perhaps at a lower cost rather than the National Park Service rangers.

Why would functions at campgrounds have to all be made by National Park Service rangers? Can't you hire students in the summer time or other persons in the summer time who are seeking work to assist the rangers in making these?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir. Of course many of the activities within a campground are handled by other than rangers—

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKENSON [continuing]. But we believe that in those aspects of getting out and meeting the public and the orientation and the interpretive aspect and also law enforcement, that these things can and should be done only by the uniformed people, which are the rangers. Now when you are dealing with the maintenance aspects, you can use an entirely different skill, a different type of person, but there are somethings that just have to be done by our uniformed people.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with that 100 percent and that is what worries me in regard to this concession proposal that you lease campsites to concessionaires. How much of that responsibility is going to still be in the rangers' hands? Are they going to continue visiting there as often as they have in the past?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir, certainly that would be our intention. There is no intention of withdrawing the National Park Service

from campground management and its public service that it carries on. Indeed we see an opportunity to enhance and expand upon the type of public service which is needed in our campgrounds and many places throughout the parks. We see a chance to increase our interpretive activities, our information-giving activities, and the other aspects of public contact as opposed to the clerical routine assignment of campsites and the collection of monies, which is a clerical function purely and simply.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well now, is this the function that you turn over to the concessionaires?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The clerical aspects of it?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the maintenance and cleaning up and the policing?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, under the pilot program we are talking about here in order to see what the problems might be, we propose to make an arrangement with the concessionaire that he will be responsible for the routine day-to-day cleaning, not the heavy maintenance, but simply the day-to-day housekeeping activities.

Mr. TAYLOR. All right, he collects the fees and he does the day-to-day routine cleaning. What else does he do?

Mr. DICKENSON. That would be the major features involved in our pilot program, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why can a concessionaire perform these functions better than hired personnel?

Mr. DICKENSON. I am not sure that he can do it all that much better except that the National Park Service must find ways in which to more effectively and efficiently use the limited manpower that we have at the present time. And since the modern day management of campgrounds falls very clearly into the pattern of public service in which our concessionaires have been traditionally involved, we would simply like to explore on a pilot one-year basis to see whether or not this is indeed feasible and whether savings do occur.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are familiar with the background on this, with the fact that a few years ago the Park Service did announce the intention of leasing all campgrounds to concessionaires and you are familiar with the fact that there was a furor of opposition nationwide developed toward that?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think you are proceeding with a lot more caution now than then, but I am still concerned as to whether we are going in the right direction. People then feared that campgrounds and national parks would be operated like a motel and too much emphasis would be placed on making dollars, on the commercial aspects, and there would be too much crowding. You know, they would put in another camper to make another \$3 and the park experience would be lost. People go into a park for a national park experience and not just like you go to a motel and find a place to sleep for the night. And my constituents have the feeling that the presence of rangers constitutes a very valuable part of that park experience and the fact that a ranger comes around in uniform and talks with

the children and talks with the family members is of benefit. If he is the type of ranger which most of our rangers are, his presence in just a few minutes they feel will make them love nature more and appreciate the campsite more and try harder to take care of it and preserve it and leave it in as good a condition as it was when they got there.

Now those are things you can't lease out to a Tom, Dick, or Harry. Now that just presents my concern in regard to that.

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that is the same concern that I expressed a few years ago when I was trying to help block the movement towards concessions. Now, you say that you are just going to turn the clerical services over to the concessionaires and the day-to-day maintenance over to the concessionaires. Of course, I don't know whether that is much improvement or much of a change from just hiring personnel to do that under the supervision of the rangers.

Mr. DICKENSON. Mr. Chairman, certainly we share the same concerns that you have just expressed so well. What we propose to do under the pilot program is in two parts: Yosemite and Shenandoah, in those two areas, we would make an arrangement with the existing concessionaires in those parks, both of whom have conducted their operations in exemplary fashion and they have been very cooperative with the National Park Service, and we would have the two for one season make a service contract, a management contract in which they would perform the specified functions. There would be no increase in the size of the campground and they would not convert any of the collected camper fees into profits for the company. Indeed, all of the collections would come to the special account just as though they were collected by the National Park Service.

Under the service contract they would collect a small profit paid by the National Park Service, in other words a cost-plus type of arrangement.

We would set it up this way in order to give us a chance to really explore, to see whether or not it is a feasible type of operation. We believe that the concessionaire, due to the wage differential, for example, can maintain those campgrounds at the same standard of operation and the restrooms will be maintained at the same standard of operation and cleaned with the same frequency as before and the number of hours at which the entrance station at the campground would be open and serve the public would be the same. In other words, the garbage would be picked up on the same schedule as it was by the National Park Service, but due to the wage differential which the concessionaire pays versus the schedule that the National Park Service must pay, there is a likelihood we feel that there will be a savings.

Now by trying this we will be able, before we go into another season, to see how this works and to say to the committee that, yes, we believe it is a good idea for these reasons and then show the facts, or to say, no it is not a good idea and give the facts.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you pay the concessionaire on a commission basis?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, it would be the same as the cost that it costs the National Park Service, plus a reasonable profit to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. You don't have in mind leasing a campground to a concessionaire on a flat seasonal basis and then letting him make what money he can?

Mr. DICKENSON. Absolutely not. We believe the income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the special account, as I am sure the committee does, is much too important, and the National Park Service intends to maintain a strong rigid managerial control over campground operation. We are simply seeing about ways to make it a more efficient operation in regard to these two or three specific items I mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. I make these points and ask these questions just to emphasize I am concerned and I think we need to move with extreme caution.

Mr. DICKENSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Campgrounds are going to have to be under the control of park rangers and under the control of the Park Service. The gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAMP. What happens if Joe Doe comes driving in to one of the parks in his camping vehicle and he hasn't made a reservation? What are his opportunities of finding a place to spend the night?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir. OK, under the proposed operations this year, Mr. Camp, 65 percent of the campsites are under the reservation system in the 23 parks. Under those 67 campgrounds, 65 percent of the campgrounds are under a reservation system and 35 percent are not. So this gives an opportunity for the nonreserved family to have a chance at a campsite.

Mr. CAMP. What is the term of occupancy? How long can he stay?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, in most of our campgrounds, there is a 14-day limit, but this varies somewhat because in certain intensively used campgrounds, that limit goes down to a 5-day limit or even lower, but 14 days tends to be pretty much the standard.

Mr. CAMP. Well, you know my point is that people do this the year round. They live within their trailer and go from one camp to another and one park to another.

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, I am familiar with that and we are very sensitive to it and to the abuse of the long-term stayer in our campgrounds. That is one thing that by providing a limit, it assures that the use of these facilities will be used more equitably. That is one reason for the limit really.

Mr. CAMP. All right, now Joe Doe comes in and he is in this 35 percent that don't have a reservation and you assign him a parking space and he can take that for 1 or 2 or 3 days, whatever the time limitation might be, and he pays you for it, right? And if he wanted to leave that stall to run errands or whatever it might be, it would still be available for him when he comes back?

Mr. DICKENSON. Yes, sir. If I understand you correctly, yes. As a matter of fact, in most parks he may stay up to a maximum of 14 days because that is our limit. If he comes in even without a reser-

vation and there is an open spot and it has not been reserved to anybody else, why then, he may stay up to a maximum of 14 days.

Mr. CAMP. And is protected if he should move his vehicle in and out of that camping spot?

Mr. DICKENSON. If he desires to go in and out of the park, why then, he is concerned with an admission fee and not a camping fee in that case, yes.

Mr. CAMP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one more question. I make a reservation, for instance, and I send in my money. I guess I get a receipt showing I have a reservation?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will that receipt show that if I do not show up by a certain time, that the reservation will be cancelled?

Mr. DICKENSON. It does have instructions printed thereon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Instructions clearly printed thereon? So if I show up in the afternoon of the second day after you have cancelled me out and leased the spot, I have been told that I have lost my reservation previously? Well now, suppose I show up and you do have a spot and I paid for it, do you still accept me?

Mr. DICKENSON. By all means, sir. We have the capability right at each of the parks there through the terminal system to know not only what is available in that park but throughout all of the rest of the system.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, I have lost my reservation but you still make every effort to get me a campsite and let me use it for the money I have already paid?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct, sir, absolutely right.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well first, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions that I wanted to direct to Mr. Dickenson that are here in writing and I ask unanimous consent that I submit them to him and that he can respond. I do this in the interest of time.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, the questions and answers will be inserted into the record at this point.

[The questions referred to follow:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1974.

Hon. DON H. CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: In response to your request at the hearing on S. 2844, the legislation to provide for reinstatement of campground user fees, held on April 8 and 9 by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, we are enclosing answers to your questions pertaining to campground operations in the National Park System.

We appreciate this opportunity to supplement our testimony. A similar letter is being supplied to the Honorable Roy A. Taylor, Chairman of the Subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD C. CURRY,
Associate Director, Legislation.

Enclosures.

NPS CONSIDERATION OF CONCESSIONER OPERATED CAMPGROUNDS

Question. 1. What are the principal objectives you have in mind accomplishing by turning some park campgrounds over to concessioners for operation? What are the benefits to be gained by this approach—to the public, the Park Service and the concessioner?

Answer. By turning the campground operations over to concessioners, we feel that operating costs to the National Park Service would be reduced because a contractor may be able to perform many of the recurring duties at a lower cost. Also, such an approach would free considerable numbers of both permanent and seasonal Park Service personnel for use in other maintenance and visitor service functions where additional help is badly needed.

Question. 2. What are some current problems which you would hope to alleviate?

Answer. We will identify the problems of this approach this coming season. One problem, however, has already been defined; that is, the collection of camping fees. A solution to this problem will be studied during the coming season.

Question. 3. What are other alternatives to the campground problems have you identified in addition to concessioner operation?

Answer. The only other feasible approach to the campground situation is continued operation by the Government, specifically the National Park Service.

Question. 4. Could the objectives you have for improved campground operation also be achieved by more funding or more manpower being made available?

Answer. Yes.

Question. 5. I understand that a few years ago the concessioners at Crater Lake and Everglades National Parks operated the campgrounds there, and the public reaction was not very favorable. Can you comment on this, and explain why you think concessioner operated campgrounds may work better today.

Answer. Our statistics indicate that only about 20% of the complaints received showed negative feelings about private enterprise operating the campgrounds. However, at the time there was a 50%-complaint rate about a charge for camping. Over the past few years this feeling has reversed, though. Now we are receiving letters from camping enthusiasts enclosing money. It now appears that the camping public wants to pay for the facilities, the thinking being that such a charge will help ensure the quality of the parks and in the end the quality of the service available to the visitors.

Question. 6. Do you feel that user fees are necessary in order for concessioners to operate the campgrounds? If so, why? The National Park Service has operated the campgrounds for years without user fees being charged. Won't the concessioner be merely doing the same job?

Answer. We believe that a camping fee is necessary in order to proceed with any effort to have concessioners operate campgrounds. Fees collected at campgrounds, whether operated by the National Park Service or by concessioners, would be deposited directly to a special account in the Treasury. These funds would be available for appropriation back to the Service for operation of recreational facilities, including campgrounds. This would serve as a primary source of funding for campground operations.

Question. 7. Are the concessioners eager to venture into such an operation, and are many of them able to perform the job satisfactorily?

Answer. Yes, there are many capable corporations and individuals interested in performing such a service. The general feeling is that it could be a profitable operation for them.

Question. 8. What types of data do you plan to assemble on this concessioner campground operation matter before you make a decision as to whether to implement it or not?

Answer. We will determine such items as the cost of operation, the requisite staffing, and the projected income before deciding on implementation.

Question. 9. Do you intend to consult this Committee further before you finalize your plans as to whether to proceed with this idea?

Answer. Yes.

Question. 10. Please explain precisely what you have in mind with this idea. Will the concessioner completely take over the campground and collect fees, pick up the garbage, clean the restrooms and perform maintenance on the facilities? What functions will he *not* perform?

Answer. The concessioner would do the entire job. However, such areas as law enforcement and interpretive activities would remain with the Park Service. Also, certain items such as capital improvements and the provision of utilities under certain circumstances would probably remain the responsibility of the Park Service. Just to reiterate here, we do not plan to abdicate our role as overall manager. The concessioner would be held accountable to the Service.

Question. 11. Do you feel that a concessioner can operate a campground more cheaply than can the Park Service? If so, on what basis do you feel this?

Answer. Yes, we believe that a concessioner-operated campground would be more economical on the basis of the cost staffing alone. Presently rangers, who are highly paid personnel, are doing jobs that can be performed by personnel who are in a lower salary range, do not require as many associated benefits, and do not have such specialized training. Also, a saving could be affected by more effectively utilizing Park Service personnel, both seasonal and permanent, in other existing programs.

Question. 12. In an average campground operation, how many park employees are now involved? What percentage of them perform which duties, and overall, what percent of them are seasonal employees versus permanent employees?

Answer. These figures will be established during the upcoming camping season.

Question. 13. If a concessioner would perform all of the maintenance functions, how would he manage to acquire all of the equipment needed—especially garbage trucks and any other specialized maintenance equipment? What would happen to all this type of equipment which the Park Service now has to do this job?

Answer. Specialized equipment would be deemed a cost that must be absorbed by the concessioner. It must be considered here that most individuals interested in this type of operation already have the necessary equipment. Another thought is that the parks do have quite a lot of the necessary equipment which could be leased or turned over to the concessioner, whichever is the most expedient and economical at the time.

NPS CAMPGROUND RESERVATION SYSTEM

Question. 1. You recently issued a news release¹ (copy attached) saying that the campground reservation system would be discontinued unless the Congress reinstates campground user fees. Why do you feel that the campground reservation system cannot operate unless user fees are also charged? If the Congress did not see fit to reinstitute campground user fees, do you mean to say that the visitor's ability to reserve a campsite in advance should be discontinued? Do user fees and the reservation system necessarily have to be together?

Answer. As we operated the reservation system under the pilot program and as we hope to operate an expanded program, the reservations are guaranteed for at least the first night of the reserved period, eliminating the need for haste in arrival due to unforeseen delays. Reservations made last summer required advance payment of both the service charge and the camping fee, allowing the reservations to be held for arrival until 11 a.m. of the second day. Only this advance payment of fees can allow the operation of a system of guaranteed reservations. Without this advance payment, it would be necessary to establish a cutoff time of perhaps 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. for arrival, similar to the operation of unpaid hotel reservations. Such a system would not, in our opinion, offer enough service to the public to justify its operation. It was our experience, under the pilot program, that unpaid reservations made after camping fees were dropped had an extremely high incidence of no-shows since there was not financial incentive to cancel reservations. At Everglades during the past winter the no-show rate was, at times, as high as 50 percent.

Question. 2. Will you explain to what degree you plan to expand the campground reservation system in the future if you continue it. Would you give us a list, for the record, of the parks and campgrounds to be involved, and the percentage of campsites to be controlled by the reservation system.

¹ See news release on p. 133.

Answer. Our plans for expansion of the program call for making reservations available for 11,026 campsites in 63 campgrounds in 23 parks. These parks were chosen primarily due to their proximity to urban areas which could be expected to produce relatively high levels of campground use despite fuel shortages. The following is a listing of parks and campgrounds which are proposed for reservation operation at the present time. This list varies somewhat from earlier listings due to additions and deletions of campgrounds required by changing conditions within the parks.

Park	Campground and number of sites	Total campsites in park	Percent campsites in park subject to reservations
Acadia.....	Blackwoods (320).....	509	62
Assateague Island.....	Maryland section (130).....	130	100
Blue Ridge.....	Otter Creek (67).....	1,053	100
	Peaks of Otter (148).....		
	Roanoke Mountain (105).....		
	Rocky Knob (110).....		
	Doughton Park (124).....		
	Julian Price Park (196).....		
	Linville Falls (70).....		
	Crabtree Meadows (93).....		
	Mount Pisgah (140).....		
Cape Hatteras.....	Cape Point (203).....	701	85
	Frisco (136).....		
	Oregon Inlet (120).....		
	Salvo (142).....		
Catoctin.....	Owens Creek (51).....	51	100
Crater Lake.....	Mazama (200).....	266	95
	Rim (54).....		
Everglades.....	Flamingo (235).....	319	100
	Long Pine Key (108).....		
Glacier.....	Apgar (200).....	1,113	35
	Many Glacier (117).....		
	Rising Sun (82).....		
Grand Canyon.....	Mather (320).....	465	86
	Bright Angel Point (80).....		
Grand Teton.....	Colter Bay (520).....	967	70
	Jenny Lake (85).....		
	Signal Mountain (80).....		
Great Smoky Mountains.....	Elkmont (340).....	1,417	36
	Smokemont (181).....		
Greenbelt.....	Greenbelt Park (178).....	178	100
Gulf Islands.....	Fort Pickens (200).....	335	59
Joshua Tree.....	Indian Cove (114).....	434	56
	Jumbo Rocks (130).....		
Lassen Volcanic.....	Manzanita Lake (273).....	515	71
	Summit Lake (94).....		
Mammoth Cave.....	Headquarters (145).....	157	92
Platt/Arbuckle.....	Cold Springs (64).....	475	86
	Rock Creek (111).....		
	Buckhorn Rock (183).....		
	The Point (52).....		
Prince William Forest.....	Oak Ridge (120).....	120	100
Rocky Mountain.....	Moraine Park (260).....	800	45
	Timber Creek (100).....		
Sequoia and Kings Canyon.....	Dorst (257).....	1,325	34
	Lodgepole (200).....		
Shenandoah.....	Matthews Arm (186).....	709	100
	Big Meadow (260).....		
	Lewis Mountain (32).....		
	Loft Mountain (231).....		
Yellowstone.....	Bridge Bay (440).....	2,322	84
	Canyon (340).....		
	Fishing Bridge (317).....		
	Grant Village (433).....		
	Madison (292).....		
	Mammoth (91).....		
	Norris (116).....		
Yosemite.....	Lower River (154).....	2,314	46
	Upper River (212).....		
	Lower Pines (183).....		
	Upper Pines (239).....		
	North Pines (99).....		
	Wawona (187).....		

Question. 3. Will you continue to keep some percentage of campsites non-reservable so that there may continue to be a chance for some campers who come at the last minute without a reservation, to get a campsite on a first-come, first-served basis?

Answer. In some parks involved in the reservation system, some campgrounds will not be subject to reservation at all, but no firm rules have yet been set for the included campgrounds in terms of what percentage of campsites will be available for reservations. In each case, all sites in a campground will initially be included in the reservation inventory, but parks will have the power to withdraw campsites from the inventory, as necessary, in order to meet demonstrated needs for visitor use. Our experience under the pilot program indicated that an inflexible withholding of ten percent of the campsites in each campground was not the best solution to serve campers without reservations. Of course, all sites not reserved by the cutoff date and time automatically become available for first-come, first-served campers. Within the 23 parks participating in the reservation program, a maximum of 65 percent of the total number of campsites will be available for reservations.

Question. 4. I understand you have recently issued a new prospectus to obtain a new contractor to operate the reservation system. Was the past contractor satisfactory? Is he interested in continuing to operate the system in the future? Have you received many bids on the recent prospectus, and have you yet selected a new contractor?

Answer. The contractor for last year's pilot campsite reservation program was American Express Reservations, Inc. We found their service to be highly satisfactory and would have been most willing to continue with their operation, slightly modified, in an expanded program. In November, however, American Express informed us that, due to internal restructuring of their business emphasis, they did not wish to operate our campsite reservation system beyond the initial one-year contract period. This was a part of an extensive reduction in the scope of their total reservation operations.

We have received three proposals in response to our prospectus for an expanded campsite reservation system to be operated by a concessioner. We are still in the process of evaluating these proposals and have not yet made a selection from among them.

Question. 5. What was the cost to the contractor last summer to operate this reservation system? What was his profit margin?

Answer. We do not have this information from American Express but are making a request of them to determine if these figures are available. We have received general indications that American Express experienced a net loss on this contract, but we do not have solid information on this at the present time.

Question. 6. How was the \$1.50 figure arrived at as the reservation service fee? Would you expect this fee to be higher or lower in the future?

Answer. The \$1.50 service charge for each reservation under the pilot program was arrived at through contract negotiation between the National Park Service and American Express. This charge was, in part, based upon the fact that the prevailing reservation service charge for the only other operating reservation systems for public campgrounds, those operated for the State parks of California, Virginia and Florida by Ticketron, Inc., was \$1.50 in each case. It was felt that this charge was a reasonable one for the public and that, in the absence of experience data, it presented a reasonable opportunity for a possibly profitable operation for the contractor.

Based upon our experience with the pilot program and upon the proposals we have received, it appears that a somewhat higher service charge will be required in order to procure a concessioner to operate the system; probably in the area of \$2.00 per reservation. We should point out that even at this level, when the average length of a reserved camping stay of nearly three and one-half days is considered, the average daily cost is less than \$.60 per camping party.

Question. 7. How much did it cost the National Park Service to operate the reservation system last summer? How much are you requesting in the 1975 fiscal year budget for this activity?

Answer. The five parks involved in the summer portion of the pilot campsite reservation system expended a total of \$154,900 for activities directly attributable to the reservation system. A final evaluation, including costs, is not yet available for the winter operation which has just concluded at Everglades National Park. The level of additional funding required was directly related to the level of management which had been previously practiced in the campgrounds. Intensive management was required for reservation operations so that in those cases where management was already intensive, little additional funding was required.

Our 1975 budget request for the expanded campsite reservation program is for a total of \$865,400. This will be used primarily for increased operating costs in the parks which will be involved in the reservation system.

Question. 8. How much did it cost per reservation to operate the complete reservation system last summer, include all costs—for NPS and contractor)? Do you expect the per reservation cost to decline as the reservation system expands?

Answer. The average cost per reservation expended by the National Park Service during the pilot program was \$.29. The contractor's cost is not available at this time.

We anticipate that the average cost per reservation in the parks will probably decline substantially as reservation volume increases. This would take place because of improved operating procedures based upon experience and because some costs are relatively fixed and do not increase significantly with increased volume.

Question. 9. What publicity do you intend to give the reservation system? Will this be done primarily by the Park Service or by the contractor?

Answer. Publicity will be handled both through press releases by the National Park Service and paid advertising by the concessioner. Press releases will be handled on a nationwide scale and also on a local scale, principally for those parks anticipating a heavy volume of use from nearby locations. Proposals received from prospective concessioners include plans for such programs as magazine and newspaper ads, direct mailing through arrangements with firms allied with the recreation industry and posters or other visual materials in places frequented by the traveling public.

Question. 10. What problems do you have with "no-shows" (what percent of reservations made are not used)? Is there a need to have a higher monetary penalty for "no-shows" (only the \$1.50 reservation fee was lost last year) so as to deter people from casually making reservations and failing to cancel ahead of time?

Answer. "No-shows" were not a great problem during the first portion of the pilot program and averaged well under ten percent of the reservations made. However, the change in the reservation fee structure brought about by the enactment of Public Law 93-81 on August 1, 1973, created a serious no-show problem since there was no longer any financial incentive to cancel reservations. At times during the winter phase of the program at Everglades, operating without camping fees, the no-show rate was as high as 50 percent.

Under the pilot program there were actually three monetary penalties for the person who failed to notify us of his cancellation. He forfeited his \$1.50 reservation service charge, a \$1.00 cancellation charge, and the camping fee for the first night reserved, since that site had been held for him. Thus, for a park with a typical \$3.00 per night camping fee, the total no-show penalty was \$5.50. Of course, no refund of camping fees was made unless the camper who failed to appear applied for such a refund. We anticipate that similar procedures will be utilized under our expanded reservation program.

Question. 11. Could you give us a list of the daily camping fees charged by campground and park last year?

Answer. The following campground use fees were in effect during the portion of the 1973 season when camping fees were authorized. The fees stated are those which were charged per night for each camping party using an individual family-type campsite. Charges for organized group camps, where available, varied but were normally at the rate of approximately \$.50 per person.

Park	Campground	Fee
Acadia.....	Blackwoods.....	\$3.00
	Seawall.....	3.00
	Seawall—walk in.....	1.00
Arbuckle.....	Buckhorn.....	1.00
	Guy Sandy.....	1.00
	The Point.....	1.00
Arches.....	Devils Garden.....	3.00
Assateague.....	Maryland.....	1.50
Badlands.....	Cedar Pass.....	2.00
Bandelier.....	Juniper.....	2.00
Big Bend.....	Chisos Mountain Basin.....	2.00
	Rio Grande Village.....	2.00
	Cottonwood Grove.....	1.00
Bighorn Canyon.....	Horseshoe Bend.....	2.00
Black Canyon of Gunnison.....	South Rim.....	1.00

Park	Campground	Fee
Blue Ridge	Crabtree Meadows	2.00
	Doughton Park	2.00
	Linville Falls	2.00
	Otter Creek	2.00
	Peaks of Otter	2.00
	Mount Pisgah	2.00
	Julian Price Park	2.00
	Roanoke Mountain	2.00
	Rocky Knob	2.00
	North Campground	2.00
Bryce Canyon	Sunset Campground	2.00
	Buffalo River	3.00
Buffalo National River	Squaw Flat	2.00
	Cape Point	3.00
Cape Hatteras	Frisco	3.00
	Oregon Inlet	3.00
	Salvo	3.00
	Ocracoke Oceanside	1.00
	Ocracoke Soundside	1.00
	Capitol Reef	2.00
	Owens Creek	2.00
	Point Supreme	2.00
	Gallo Wash	2.00
	Bonita Canyon	2.00
Capitol Reef	Saddie Horn	2.00
Catoctin Mountain	Evans	2.00
Cedar Breaks	Fort Spokane	2.00
Chaco Canyon	Kettle Falls	2.00
Chiricahua	Porcupine Bay	2.00
Colorado National	Spring Canyon	2.00
Coulee Dam	Mazama	2.00
Crater Lake	Rim	2.00
	Lava Flow	2.00
	Wilderness	2.00
	Elk Creek	2.00
	Mesquite Springs	2.00
	Texas Springs	1.00
	Stovepipe Wells	1.00
	Sunset	1.00
	Furnace Creek	1.00
	Belle Fourche	2.00
Devils Tower	Green River	2.00
Dinosaur	Split Mountain	2.00
Everglades	Flamingo	2.00
	T-Loop	1.00
	Long Pine Key	2.00
	Watchill	1.00
	Apgar	2.00
	Avalanche	2.00
	Fish Creek	2.00
	Many Glacier	2.00
	Rising Sun	2.00
	Sprague Creek	2.00
Fire Island	St. Mary	2.00
	Two Medicine	2.00
	Bowman Creek	2.00
	Bowman Lake	2.00
	Cut Bank	1.00
	Kintla Lake	1.00
	Logging Lake	1.00
	Quartz Creek	1.00
	River	1.00
	Bullfrog	2.00
Glen Canyon	Halls Crossing	2.00
	Hite	1.00
	Lees Ferry	2.00
	Wahweap	2.00
	Bright Angel Point	2.00
	Mather	2.00
	Desert View	1.00
	Colter Bay	3.00
	Gros Ventre	3.00
	Jenny Lake	3.00
Grand Canyon	Lizard Creek	3.00
	Signal Mountain	3.00
	Pinyon Flats	2.00
	Balsam Mountain	3.00
	Cades Cove	3.00
	Cosby	3.00
	Deep Creek	3.00
	Elkmont	3.00
	Look Rock	3.00
	Smokemont	3.00
Great Sand Dunes		
Great Smoky Mountains		

Park	Campground	Fee
Greenbelt Park	Campground	2.00
Gulf Island	Fort Pickens	3.00
	Davis Bayou	3.50
Hot Springs	Gulpha Gorge	3.00
Isle Royale	Beaver Island	1.00
	Belle Isle	1.00
	Birch Island	1.00
	Caribou Island	1.00
	Chippewa Harbor	1.00
	Daisy Farm	1.00
	Duncan Bay	1.00
	Duncan Narrows	1.00
	Grace Island	1.00
	Hay Bay	1.00
	Haginnih Cove	1.00
	McCargo Cove	1.00
	Malone Bay	1.00
	Merritt Lane	1.00
	Moskey Basin	1.00
	Rock Harbor	1.00
	Siskiwit Bay	1.00
	Three-mile	1.00
	Todd Harbor	1.00
	Tookers Island	1.00
	Washington Creek	1.00
John D. Rockefeller	Big River	3.00
Joshua Tree	Cottonwood Spring	2.00
Kings Canyon	Crystal Springs	2.00
	Azalea	2.00
	Sheep Creek	2.00
	Sentinel	2.00
	Canyon View	2.00
Lake Mead	Sunset	2.00
	Boulder Beach	2.00
	Callville Bay	2.00
	Cottonwood Cove	2.00
	Echo Bay	2.00
	Katherine	2.00
	Hemenway	2.00
	Las Vegas Wash	2.00
	Temple Bar	2.00
Lassen Volcanic	Willow Beach	2.00
	Butte Lake	2.00
	Juniper Lake	1.00
	Manzanita Lake	2.00
	Sulphur Works	1.00
	Summit Lake	2.00
	Warner Valley	1.00
Lava Beds	Indian Wells	2.00
Mammoth Cave	Headquarters	3.00
Mesa Verde	Marfield Canyon	2.00
Mount McKinley	Wonder Lake	2.00
	Riley Creek	2.00
	Savage	2.00
Mount Rainier	Cougar Rock	2.00
	Longmire	2.00
	Ohanapecosh	2.00
	Paradise	2.00
	Sunrise	2.00
	Sunshine Point	1.00
	White River	2.00
Natchez Trace	Ipsut Creek	1.00
	Jeff Busby Park	2.00
	Little Swan	2.00
	Rocky Springs	2.00
Natural Bridges	Campground	1.00
North Cascades	Colonial Creek	2.00
	Goodell Creek	1.00
Olympic	Dose Wallips	1.00
	Graves Creek	1.00
	Staircase	1.00
	Altair	1.00
	Elwha	1.00
	Fairholm	2.00
	Heart O' the Hills	2.00
	Hoh	2.00
	Kalaloch	2.00
	Mora	2.00
	Soleduck	2.00
Organ Pipe Cactus	Headquarters	2.00
Ozark National Scenic Riverways	Alley Spring	2.00
	Big Spring	2.00
	Pulltite	2.00
	Round Spring	2.00

Park	Campground	Fee
Pinnacles.....	Chalone Creek.....	2.00
	Chaparral.....	2.00
Platt.....	Central.....	2.00
	Cold Springs.....	2.00
	Rock Creek.....	2.00
Prince William Forest.....	Oak Ridge.....	2.00
Rocky Mountain.....	Aspenglen.....	2.00
	Glacier Basin.....	2.00
	Longs Peak.....	2.00
	Moraine Park.....	2.00
	Timber Creek.....	2.00
Sequoia.....	Buckeye Flat.....	2.00
	Dorst.....	2.00
	Lodgepole.....	2.00
	Potwisha.....	2.00
Shadow Mountain.....	Arapahoe Bay.....	2.00
	Green Ridge.....	2.00
	Shadow Mountain.....	2.00
	Stillwater.....	2.00
Shenandoah.....	Big Meadows.....	2.00
	Lewis Mountain.....	2.00
	Loft Mountain.....	2.00
	Matthews Arm.....	2.00
Theodore Roosevelt.....	Cottonwood.....	2.00
	Squaw Creek.....	2.00
Whiskeytown.....	Oak Bottom.....	1.00
Wind Cave.....	Elk Mountain.....	2.00
Yellowstone.....	Bridge Bay.....	3.00
	Canyon.....	3.00
	Fishing Bridge.....	3.00
	Grant Village.....	3.00
	Indian Creek.....	3.00
	Lewis Lake.....	3.00
	Madison.....	3.00
	Mammoth.....	3.00
	Norris.....	3.00
	Pebble Creek.....	3.00
	Slough Creek.....	3.90
	Snake River.....	3.00
	Tower Falls.....	3.00
Yosemite.....	Sunnyside (summer/winter).....	4.00/
	Lower River.....	2.00
	North Pines.....	4.00/
	Upper River.....	2.00
	Bridal Veil Creek.....	4.00/
	Crane Flat.....	2.00
	Hodgdon Meadow.....	3.00
	Wawona.....	3.00
	White Wolf.....	3.00
	Tenaya Lake.....	2.00
	Tuolumne Meadows.....	2.00
	Harden Lake.....	1.00
	Porcupine Creek.....	1.00
	Porcupine Flat.....	1.00
	Smoky Jack.....	1.00
	Tamarack Flat.....	1.00
	Yosemite Creek.....	1.00
Zion.....	South.....	2.00
	Watchman.....	2.00

News Release

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

For Release February 25, 1974

CONCESSIONER SOUGHT TO RUN PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CAMPGROUND RESERVATION SYSTEM

Director Ronald H. Walker of the National Park Service today announced publication of a prospectus seeking bidders interested in operating a proposed National Park Service computerized campsite reservation system for the 1974 visitor season.

Walker noted that a pilot campground reservation system operated during 1973 at six national parks was highly successful. "American Express Reserva-

tions, Inc., which operated the pilot project, has, however, decided not to seek a renewal of its contract due to a restructuring of its business. The current contract expires on March 31, 1974," he said.

The success of the pilot project has led to expansion of the new proposal from campgrounds in six parks to those in 24 areas of the National Park System encompassing more than 11,000 individual campsites. The prospectus does not limit the duration of the contract under the new proposal, leaving its term open to negotiation.

Walker said the campsite reservation system greatly improved the operation of the campgrounds which used it last year, and was popular with users who, for the first time in National Park Service history, were able to reserve campsites in advance through a nationwide computerized system. "The traditional long waiting lines to enter park campgrounds were virtually eliminated and visitors were able to plan their trips with real assurance that space would be available for their overnight stays in the parks," he said.

"The greatest difficulty faced by the reservation system occurred when new legislation was enacted on August 1, 1973, which effectively prohibited the National Park Service from charging fees for campsite use," he added. "In fairness to new bidders for the reservation system," Walker said, "we will not reinstitute a reservation system unless pending legislation to restore the traditional camping fees is enacted by Congress. As long as the public has to pay to reserve free campsites the system will seem unfair," he said.

Potential bidders can obtain a copy of the prospectus by writing to the Assistant Director, Concessions Management, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. The deadline for applications for this concession is March 25, 1974.

Mr. CLAUSEN. It is my understanding that when you make reference to the pilot project, you are talking only about two projects: Yosemite and Shenandoah?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct, Sir.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Before you embark on a major national effort you want to gain experience from that program first?

Mr. DICKENSON. That is correct.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Hulett, I want to ask you some questions because of a situation that is involved in my own Congressional District in a Bureau of Reclamation project. Is there anything in the bill which would preclude or interfere with a contractual arrangement or arrangements between the Federal Agency and a State or local governmental unit to provide recreational facilities or to participate in? Say, if the Federal Government were to provide for the facility themselves and yet there was a requirement for the operation and maintenance of the facilities which the Federal Government does not handle, now could the State or local government charge user fees to recover some of these operation and maintenance charges?

Mr. HULETT. Yes, Mr. Clausen, there is specific provision in this legislation that would allow a non-Federal Governmental agency to charge fees and for those fees to stay with that nongovernmental Federal Agency rather than be recovered into the special fund.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, using as an example that there is a possibility that the State of California would be willing to enter into an agreement and operate and maintain some of the recreational facilities if they were provided under, shall we say, a State recreation area wherein it does not meet the criteria for a national recreation area, would there be anything in this legislation that would restrict them from being able to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government under this legislation?

Mr. HULETT. No sir, nothing that would prohibit and they would be able to keep whatever funds were collected in order to operate and maintain the area. By they, I mean the State.

Mr. CLAUSEN. And this would apply to the State and/or a political subdivision?

Mr. HULETT. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. CLAUSEN. And what if they were to decide to contract, say the State or the local political subdivision, they want to contract with established concessionaires, now could they do that?

Mr. HULETT. Yes, sir, they certainly could.

Mr. CLAUSEN. They could? OK, all right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would just say to the gentleman from California, I am glad that you asked Mr. Hulett some questions because I didn't want him to get by without having to answer some questions.

Mr. HULETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Dickenson, a letter was written to you recently concerning a concession operated campground and in the absence of objection a copy of that letter and of the response received will be placed in the record at this point.

[The letters referred to follow:]

MARCH 8, 1974.

Mr. RUSSELL E. DICKENSON,
Deputy Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DICKENSON: I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and the other National Park Service representatives last week to discuss the pilot project for contract operation of National Park campgrounds.

One area that I believe will be closely watched is that of the contract for such an operation. If your staff has prepared a draft contract for the Yosemite area, I would be interested in receiving a copy for review. Also, some explanation of the "cost plus profit" arrangement would be useful. In particular, what specific controls would be used to monitor the charges of the concessioner? Where concessioner employees or equipment are utilized in both the campground and other operations, how would you determine an actual cost to the concessioner for the campground only?

I have had the impression that campgrounds in some Parks have been kept open for longer seasons in recent years. Would you expect to continue to make these facilities available in other than peak use seasons under the concessioner operation arrangement?

Some statistical background would also be useful. How many potential fee campsites are in the National Park areas, and what annual expansion has there been over the past five years? How many employees have been involved directly with campground operations? What are the present personnel ceilings and how have they changed during the last few years? Do these ceilings apply to all employees, both in public contact and in maintenance, working in campgrounds? If the concessioner operation arrangement is implemented, what will be the minimum number of personnel reassigned to other duties and what specific functions would you expect them to perform? Perhaps some figures using Yosemite as a specific example would be helpful in weighing the effects of this change.

The pilot program and its evaluation will obviously be a crucial part of your decision to expand this arrangement throughout the Park System. What specific plans are you making to determine the effectiveness of the concession operation? Would you foresee some sampling of public response from the visitors who use the facility? At one point in our meeting with you, Clay Peters raised the specific concern that a fair test might be difficult if you provide some services, such as trash collection, for the concessioner during the

trial period. If the Yosemite area could be used again as an example, could you break down the parts of the campground operation which would be the responsibility of the concessioner and those which would remain a Park Service responsibility? This matter of ensuring an objective and comprehensive review of the pilot operation is a point that I believe will be looked at intently.

You also mentioned that the concessioner would have the right of "first refusal" in taking this contract. Since this would not be a concession operation in the usual sense, but instead would involve a "management contract" with a guaranteed profit, why would the concessioner be entitled to this priority treatment? Perhaps the solicitor's office could provide some clarification of this point for us. Would you expect that concession employees in the campground might also be involved in concessioner business operations as distinguished from management responsibilities, such as firewood sales or a camp store operation. I would be interested in your approach to the handling of federal receipts by concession employees. Are there any restrictions applicable to such an arrangement? What monitoring and audit function would you plan to perform?

Would it also be possible to make some estimate of the amount of continued direct involvement of Park Service personnel in monitoring and supervising the campground operation? What level of commitment would you see being made to continue to provide uniformed staff in the campground area for services such as first aid, interpretation, resource protection, and law enforcement?

Finally, would it be possible to detail the financial impact of this change on other activities in a given Park operation? My understanding is that no additional funding will be requested to implement this program. If you employ the same number of personnel under this plan, diverting those people formerly involved in campground operations to other activities, the payment made to the concessioner for campground management would be an additional expense to your area budget. What other specific areas would then receive a lower level of funding within the existing budget as a result of this change?

I realize this is a diverse group of concerns, but I think that this matter merits careful consideration before any action is taken. With the information I've requested, I should be able to accurately and fully present this matter to the Chairman for his consideration of the merits of your proposal.

Sincerely,

LEE McELVAIN,
General Counsel.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1974.

Mr. LEE McELVAIN,
General Counsel,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McELVAIN: Thank you for your letter regarding the pilot project for contract operations of national park campgrounds. We apologize for this late response.

As you know by now, we have decided to delay the start of this pilot project. We thought that it would be advisable to compile the necessary data and statistics on the National Park Service's operation of campgrounds prior to attempting a contract operation.

At this point we are surveying the possible parks, trying to determine the necessary information, and devising an accurate reporting system. We will keep you advised of our progress and will report our conclusions before taking any further action.

We appreciate your cooperation and assistance on this project.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. DICKENSON,
Deputy Director.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now this concludes the hearing.

Mr. STEELMAN. May I ask some questions on this matter of concessionaires?

Mr. TAYLOR. Go ahead.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Dickenson, the Department has, I know, suggested concessionaires as an alternative to park personnel. The Department has a Youth Conservation Corps, I believe, and there is also a Volunteers in the Parks program. I would like to ask this question getting to the broader question as to what extent students are used in the summertime? The idea being to try and harness a lot of the concern now of the young people for ecology, parks and wilderness. Also, to what extent is the Department utilizing students or young people of this sort and how about this as an alternative to concessionaire operation?

It would seem to me this would be a cheaper way to do it.

Mr. DICKENSON. The YCC is a very exciting program from the standpoint of the National Park Service, Mr. Steelman. We have a number of groups in various parts of the National Park System each summer in the Nation's capital and other parts of the system, but today's type A campground in the National Park Service is a very large and complex and sophisticated type of operation. The provision of sanitary facilities, the provision of public services, the collection of fees, is a type of operation that is just beyond the skills and the capability of the youngsters that we are dealing with in the YCC type of program. So there is just no way that you can blend these two concepts.

Mr. STEELMAN. Are these college students?

Mr. DICKENSON. The YCC tends to be in my experience mostly in the high school type of category. They mostly have not graduated. They are very fine people and we have had some great programs and projects oriented toward conservation, toward the repair of back country facilities. They are project oriented by and large.

It is great for the kids and it is great for the agency.

Mr. CAMP. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. STEELMAN. Yes.

Mr. CAMP. Are they volunteer?

Mr. DICKENSON. The YCC program is a volunteer program.

Mr. CAMP. Do you have any student programs that will be affected under the minimum wage?

Mr. DICKENSON. I don't believe so, Mr. Camp. I don't know of any.

Mr. HULETT. If I may add, Mr. Steelman, to Mr. Dickenson's comments on the volunteers in the park program?

Mr. STEELMAN. Yes.

Mr. HULETT. There is specific provision in the law which authorizes that program, which indicated that no one who worked under that program could do maintenance type work. This was an agreement with the unions at the time of passage of the act, and therefore the people under the volunteers' program in the parks are specifically precluded from going into maintenance type activities in the parks. That would include campgrounds.

Mr. STEELMAN. Have you given any thought to this as an alternative? It would seem that a certain level of learning and ability would exist among college-age people and, I would think, also high-school-age kids, and that with some minimal level of training by the ranger, that these young people would be able to perform these tasks. In other words, during the high use period of the summer in

the parks it would seem to me that would be an alternative that ought to be explored. It would require some new legislation or some existing legislation to be amended, I presume. And if it would, I would think we could certainly accomplish that because it would save money and could also harness and handle one of this energy that I think exists among the students in the ecology area.

Certainly it seems the cost is less than contracting with somebody, for example, a concessionaire, it seems to me.

Mr. DICKENSON. Certainly our present system, Mr. Steelman, provides for the use of that volunteer-type of person, the YCC, the VIP, and the use of them in all the appropriate type activities. But one of the things that we were trying to do is to free up our own uniformed and other personnel for other expanded types of park activities by using the concessionaire employees for certain routine recurring types of activities in the campgrounds. This would free up our own people in order to give more attention to the YCC and the other types of specialized-type activities that we are dealing with today.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, I may want to pursue this further with you, and I will do so either personally or with correspondence, but it does seem to have a great deal of promise maybe not necessarily in any existing form through the VIP or the YCC, but something could be worked out.

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, Sir; certainly we will be free to discuss it at your convenience.

Mr. STEELMAN. What is your time frame on this concessionaire-type arrangement? Your testimony says you scrapped it for this season and you are going to spend this season trying to come up with—

Mr. DICKENSON. With additional data.

Mr. STEELMAN [continuing]. With a method of operation, et cetera. So I would assume that the fuse on this thing is some time for the summer of 1975?

Mr. DICKENSON. That would be correct.

Mr. STEELMAN. You hope to have the program operationally in place by then?

Mr. DICKENSON. As a matter of fact, we are not even willing to make a statement that we have decided to do this even yet, but we will make the decision whether to proceed or not to proceed with the proposal in October of this year.

Mr. STEELMAN. OK., we have from 1965 through 1972 revenues in the form of user fees being paid into the fund. I wonder to what extent during that period did they cover operation and maintenance of the parks?

Mr. HULETT. Mr. Steelman, they cover to a very small extent the operation and maintenance activities throughout the Federal Establishment. They still do nothing more—that is to say, the amount of money that is now going into that special fund does nothing more than defray a portion of the operation and maintenance expenses of the Federal agencies. However, with the loss of the moneys last year, which was somewhere between \$7 million and \$8 million, it has made it difficult for many of the agencies to hold that level of services

where they were at the time they were charging fees. So rather than the agencies then seeking additional moneys through their own appropriations procedures, they instead dropped the level of services that they were providing to the visiting public.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well, if we put in concessionaires, wouldn't the cost be as great or greater than it has been.

Mr. DICKENSON. As I said earlier, Mr. Steelman, we believe that at this time there might be a savings in cost because of certain differentials between wages paid between government wages versus going wages paid by the concessionaires. We don't know yet. The time of trial will prove that to us one way or the other. We would just like to see it tried and see.

Mr. STEELMAN. I am only trying to get back to the question that I asked yesterday, which is why are you interested in user fees; is it for revenue as opposed to ration use?

It seems the recurring theme we keep getting from all of you during these past few days is that revenue, while it is of some minimal importance, really is not the true reason and that what you are trying to do is ration use.

Now, I am not passing judgment on that rationale. I am simply trying to find out how important revenue is in this whole thing.

Mr. HULETT. I don't think revenue would be number one in our list for urging the extension of what had been our existing program, Mr. Steelman. I think what we are talking about is the philosophical question here about the need for the individual to pay his share as it were for the use of certain activities. As Mr. Ketchum was telling you about his experiences as a pilot, I think this is a good analogy that we can use here that the public expects to and properly should in our estimation pay a portion of what it costs to develop, operate, and maintain specialized facilities and services. And what the legislation is, which is before the committee now, what it is and what it does is establish a minimal level of facilities for which there will be no charges whatsoever, but that any development beyond that point then would require that a user fee be paid. And certainly rationing of use is one example. I happened to be in Yosemite last summer after the enactment of Public Law 93-81. It was incredible. There were squatters all over the place. And even though the Park Service was limiting the use, and in some cases in the floor of the valley the use was limited to 7 days, these people would merely move from one campground to a campground 100 yards down the road. And because they weren't having to pay \$3 or \$4 a night to camp, they just stayed in there indefinitely. And Yosemite is not an isolated case. So I think rationing the use would be the next best thing in order of priorities.

The revenue I think is really a rather small part of what we are talking about and I think you rather correctly identified that in your comments yesterday.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the gentleman yield? Camping is a very big business and we have encouraged private campgrounds around the national parks. We have done this in order to have less intensive use of the national parks. In order to move forward with this idea we need some kind of fee policy in the parks.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Otherwise they wouldn't be competitive.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, otherwise they wouldn't be competitive and we won't be getting development in the future.

Mr. HULETT. The chairman makes a valid point, if I may pursue this, Mr. Steelman? We in talking to campground operators have found that the financiers are being reluctant to properly finance these types of operations on the peripheries of Federal areas for the very reasons you mentioned, that is, they go in and say, "What is your competition?" and they answer, "Well, it is the government." And they ask "What does the government charge?" And they must answer "Well, they don't charge anything."

And I think most of us know bankers well enough to know they are going to take a second look about loaning money for someone who is going to compete with a free program.

Mr. STEELMAN. Let me pursue this for a minute and then I will be happy to yield. I don't expect either of you to defend the Bureau of Reclamation or the corps, but let me just ask is this administration policy which says this user fee ought to apply to recreation and therefore, it is applied to recreation, or are we going to apply it to navigation and irrigation? Can we expect the departmental witnesses to come up and push for user fees on irrigation projects and canals and that sort of thing?

Mr. HULETT. You are correct that we don't have the answer.

Mr. STEELMAN. There is far less benefit to the public, you know, from some canal for an irrigation project than there is from some reservoir or whatever.

Mr. DICKENSON. Well, we would be glad to take your message to the Department, so they will be properly advised of your concern.

Mr. STEELMAN. Well I think they are already advised of my concern, but what I am really getting at is, that we all know that OMB these days sets general policy in these areas and I am sure you are more aware of that than I am. But can we expect it to be the administration's policy at least for the duration of this administration that user fees, their philosophy about user fees, will apply to all water projects and not just to recreation?

Mr. DICKENSON. Again, I can't answer that on behalf of the administration. Certainly the outlook for the recreation projects is that user fees would continue to be.

Mr. STEELMAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, I won't prolong the point either, other than to just state that if you are going to encourage facilities in the general area of parks by the private sector so as to avoid the crunch we had on Yosemite last year and so as to avoid the degradation of the park and the conditions in the park that we had, you are going to have to have something that is competitive. If you don't charge a fee to go into the National Park System, then the private interests are not going to be able to justify this kind of an expenditure of capital because there would be no enticement for the public to use their parks and there would be no anticipation of recovering the investment. I just wanted to make that point, Mr. Chairman. I think we should be moving along though.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the gentleman is correct. Just for the record I have two or three quick questions and hopefully quick answers.

Why do we need section 2 on page 6 of the bill dealing with the State providing single-family residences and the options to retain the right of use?

Mr. DICKENSON. Well—

Mr. TAYLOR. Why do we need that in the bill?

Mr. HULETT. This was put in the bill by the Senate committee because they felt that the same problem was existent in the States when they acquired properties for park purchases as was affecting the National Park Service. As you recall, in a bill passed last year by the Senate and I believe concurred in by this committee, there was provision that the same type of provision existed in that bill, which indicated that if a person accepted reserve use and occupancy, they would abrogate certain of their rights under title II of the Uniform—

Mr. TAYLOR. But my question was why place that in a Federal bill rather than having the State's place it in their legislation?

Mr. HULETT. Because it affects us in dealing with our grants program to the States under the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now section (f) on page 5, how much of that is new and how much is just a repetition of the present law? On page 5, section (f), the new part is under the "Provided" beginning at line 15, which would allow a concessionaire, such as the reservation system that Mr. Dickenson has been discussing, to keep his reservation fee and submit the camping user fees to the special fund to the Treasury.

As it is now, they would be required to submit the entire fee, including the reservation fee and then the Park Service would have to appropriate funds and pay them back for the reservation fee. This merely makes it a bookkeeping situation, correct?

Mr. HULETT. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. One more quick question. How urgent is House action on this bill?

Mr. HULETT. We consider it to be extremely urgent, Mr. Chairman. In order for an agency such as the Park Service or Forest Service or the corps to develop their programs for the coming season, which begins momentarily in some areas of the country, they simply have to have the proper leadtime to develop their signs, to develop their reservation system that Mr. Dickenson was discussing, and so on. We would hope that this committee would be able to have a bill to the floor and passed out of the House by the first of May.

Mr. TAYLOR. If there are no other questions, this finishes the hearing and we do want to give a little thought to marking up this bill at this time, so those of you who are leaving, I hope you will leave quietly.

First, in the absence of objection, a statement here by Billy Newbold will be made a part of the record at this point.

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

[The statement in full of Billy C. Newbold follows:]

STATEMENT OF BILLY C. NEWBOLD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL CAMPGROUND INSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman: Speaking for the National Campground Institute I wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to speak in favor of S-2844, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide once again for the collection of special recreation use fees at improved campgrounds.

We seek your approval for this bill not only because of the economic hardship the passage of Public Law 93-81 has caused private campgrounds all over America, but also because state and local governments are being deprived of expected revenue they require to maintain their public facilities.

We know from our own experience that the National Park Superintendents and the U.S. Forest Service officials cannot properly maintain their campgrounds under the existing conditions. The loss of revenue as a result of P.L. 93-81 makes it impossible for the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies to maintain necessary health and security standards to protect the camper.

The statement of Richard A. Ashworth, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture, regarding the increased vandalism in Forest Service operated campgrounds applies throughout the Federal establishment.

The elimination of campground fees in Federally operated areas has had an adverse effect on State and local government operated campgrounds. For the past several years these government bodies have invested heavily in new campground facilities expecting to regain their tax dollars through user fees. However, the financial strength of these park systems has now been undermined by P.L. 93-81, which as interpreted, has denied Federal Government agencies authority to collect campground user fees.

The effect of P.L. 93-81 on the 9,200 privately owned taxpaying campgrounds will be a disaster unless it is modified before the heavy summer season begins. These campgrounds, which employ 40,000 people full time and another 100,000 on a seasonal basis, represents millions of dollars in investment.

No one suggests that the visitors to our National Parks or National Forests be provided free motel accommodations at taxpayers' expense, nor do the 12,500,000 families who camp at least 14 days each year seek a free ride or a free campsite.

I have spent more than 25 years of my life camping, five of them as an employee of the National Park Service. During this time, I have had an opportunity to meet and talk with tens of thousands of campers. Some of them carry small tents on their backs, while others camp in Recreation Vehicles costing \$10,000 or more. But what all of them seek is a viable camping experience. If the small cost of a campsite will make a better National Park or a more useful National Forest, the camper is more than willing to pay.

Many of the private campground owners believe that the economic viability of Federally operated campgrounds is necessary to attract additional families to the outdoor experience that can only be had by camping. Our great National Parks and Forests are the first attraction to the new camper, attractions that must be maintained.

However, many of us support in some degree the recommendations contained in the Conservation Foundation's report, National Parks For The Future, which calls for every rational effort to be made to separate the visitor from his car once inside the park. While we cannot endorse the report's one-sided, biased attitude toward recreation vehicles, we do feel that strong measures should be taken to protect our national treasures from being loved to death.

In addition to the support of S-2844, the National Campground Institute would suggest that a government-industry study group be established to determine what policy and operational changes should be initiated to insure that the camper will have a campsite in or near a National Park and that his vehicle will not endanger the natural, historic and scientific treasures that he has journeyed so far with his family to behold.

Mr. TAYLOR. This concludes the hearing.

[Additional material for the record follows:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE
SIUSLAU NATIONAL FOREST,
OREGON DUNES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA,
Gardiner, Oreg., April 12, 1974.

Congressman JOHN DELLENBACK,
Room 1214,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLENBACK: This letter is in response to a telephone conversation I had with Dana Rasmussen of your staff. She asked that I confirm in writing our telecon held on April 12, 1974.

Her specific question was: "What were our observations on attendance in the National Recreation Area once the Land and Water Conservation Funds were discontinued, which was on August 1, 1973?" I responded by stating this was a most difficult question to address in specific numbers since we do not take actual visitor counts in the NRA. However, we did observe throughout the 1973 season, a reduction of total visitors to the NRA of approximately 15% over the previous years. We attribute this reduction primarily to the energy situation which was first noticed on the Oregon coast. Another observation we made was that the attendance in the private and state facilities, which were still charging, was reduced as the recreation users utilized our free facilities before they would turn to the charge facilities.

We also noted a change in our user clientele. Specifically, we observed more individuals hitchhiking in the area, using our free facilities. Once they used the free facilities, they had a tendency to extend their stay.

Our personnel, who were in daily contact with our recreation users, related numerous conversations they had with the vacationers using the NRA facilities. Most of the comments reflected a dissatisfaction of the fee removal and a concern that the quality of the developments would substantially drop. Most users felt comfortable in paying for the use of the facilities, knowing full well they would enjoy a well-maintained and administered recreation area.

I hope that the afore-mentioned items will assist you in your endeavor and if we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JERALD N. HUTCHINS,
Area Ranger.

NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1974.

Hon. ROY A. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, House Committee
on Interior and Insular Affairs, 1324 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR: I wish to express the support of the National Park and Conservation Association for the principles similarly contained within S. 2844 and H.R. 13913, bills "To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes."

The importance of these two bills now before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation is reflected by the need for more effective administration on the part of those federal facilities, equipment or services related to outdoor recreation. The funds which would be procured from reinstated user fees for the use of campgrounds are sorely needed for the operation and maintenance of existing areas as well as the acquisition of new ones. In this regard, I concur with the principle that those persons who use the sites, facilities, equipment, or services provided at significant public expense should also share in the necessary costs for operation and maintenance. The imposition of a nominal user fee should also help to correct the inconsiderate practice that has arisen on the part of some persons who would monopolize a camping site for an extended period, and thereby preclude the use and enjoyment of that site by others.

H.R. 13913 and S. 2844 also contain provisions that authorize the head of any Federal agency, under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, to contract with any public or private entity to provide visitor reservation services. It is my understanding that the pilot reservation programs for campgrounds in a limited number of our national parks and forests over the past year have proven successful as a worthwhile service to the camping public. Extending this pilot program to include more campground areas should facilitate the making of vacation plans and assure as well the camping opportunity for those individuals not within easy access to many of our Federal camping areas.

Those provisions which allow Golden Eagle and Golden Age passports to be used for entry by means other than private, non-commercial vehicles, and provide, as well, for the Golden Age passports to be issued as a lifetime passport, should prove to enhance the use of our Federal recreation areas by the public.

Thank you for inviting NPCA's comments on S. 2844 and H.R. 13913, and for the inclusion of these remarks in the official hearing record.

Cordially yours,

ANTHONY WAYNE SMITH,
President and General Counsel.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF RECREATIONAL VEHICLE USERS,
Monmouth, Ill., April 12, 1974.

HON. JAMES A. HALEY,
Chairman, and Committee Members, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: This organization would like to go on record as opposing the above bill which reimposes campground fees on sub-standard campgrounds on the public lands.

At the present time, our individual members number approximately 300,000, of which a good many are retirees on fixed incomes and lower income citizens. Total use of Recreational Vehicles will probably approach 5,000,000 family units by this time, all of which are affected to some degree.

We have a good many reasons for opposing this bill, not the least of which is the fact that our taxes have already, and are continuing to pay for these places and their services and unless we can use them, we will merely be setting up a museum for a select few who can hike or horseback into the more remote areas.

Certain elements of the Recreational Industry, primarily campground owners support this repealer because they feel that they will be robbed of their livelihood which they in turn might extract from us with a nicer and more plushy campsite. Many, on the other hand, recognize that there is actually no conflict, and agree with us.

Public Law 93-81 provided that the public agencies can charge fees if they offer services of some magnitude and we are willing to pay for these services but resent being the victims of a bureaucratic rip-off administered by those who are no more efficient than the Post Office Department and are primarily a part of a caretaking organization.

We resent the implications by the well financed, so-called "conservationists and environmentalists" who want to prevent the use of public lands by the public. Please refer to my earlier letter to each of you indicating that this element of park owners, which we deplore, considers the Congress a bunch of "bone heads" (their words) for passing PL 93-81 which we believe to be a fair law.

Again, let me thank you for passing PL 93-81 and ask that you defeat efforts to subvert the intent of it in the passage of SB 2844. It may interest you to know that one national park concession operator stated publicly on a TV program that the hikers and so-called conservationists left more garbage and offal than the RV users who are most of them in organized groups with high codes of ethics and a willingness to help clean up after the more careless and slovenly.

Your serious attention to this effort at reversal of justice will be appreciated.

ROBERT N. L. FORMAN,
Executive Director.

SIERRA CLUB,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1974.

Hon. ROY TAYLOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, House Interior Committee, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR: We are sorry that we are unable to testify at the hearings conducted on S. 2844, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide for users fees and certain federal facilities, at the hearings which you conducted on Monday, April 8th, and Tuesday, April 9th. However, because of our deep interest in and concern for the subject, we respectfully request that you make the following statement a part of the official record of those hearings.

The Sierra Club generally shares the viewpoint that appropriate, nondiscriminatory, fees for uses of at least some campgrounds and facilities are appropriate, if not prohibitive in cost for the average user. We are deeply disturbed that legislation passed by the Congress last summer, Public Law 93-81, eliminated such fees, especially in the national parks, and national forest campgrounds. As a result, we understand, these agencies and others have been required to close many campgrounds, because the loss of revenue has not been made up through other budgetary means. We strongly feel that these and other appropriate fees be reinstated, and we would support legislation which would call for this.

At the same time, we are concerned about certain aspects of possible future management of campgrounds, especially in the national parks, which were alluded to in the hearings. Specifically, the Park Service appears to have in mind a transference of all or part of the management of national park campgrounds in certain places to private concessionaires. While this may or may not be more efficient from a managerial standpoint, we are more deeply opposed to it on other grounds. We already have in our national parks, a situation where private concessionaires have too much influence and have been able in certain instances (for example Crater Lake National Park) to force Park Service policy changes which are to the public detriment, and operate only to the private interest of concessionaires.

We feel that if the Park Service proceeds further along this line, to transfer even more park facilities to the management and therefore the control of private concessionaires, the public interest can only continue to suffer. Therefore, we are at the present time opposed to such policies on the Park Service and hope that this Committee will exercise its jurisdiction over the Park Service to require them to fully consult both with the committee and with environmental organizations before they proceed with such plans.

We urge that if this committee takes action on this legislation, it does require the Park Service to cease from proceeding with plans that turn its campgrounds over to private concessionaires without full hearings before this body and full consultation with all interested groups.

Very truly yours,

BROCK EVANS,
Director, Washington Office.

[Whereupon at 11:30 a.m. the committee proceeded to other business.]



