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ABSTRACT

Outdoor recreation facilities and services are provided by both the public and private sectors. The literature of recreation generally overemphasizes the role played by the public sector. However it is not fair to assert that the public sector has a greater role to play in meeting the recreational needs of the public. To date, it can only be stated that more attention has been paid to it.

This study is descriptive in nature and explores two general topics. First, three studies, two in the United States and one, among private campground operators in British Columbia, review the basic management characteristics and problems of the private recreation sector. A business enterprise operated solely as a campground will seldom earn a profit for the operator. A multiple recreation enterprise, offering boat rentals, fishing, groceries, children's playgrounds as well as camping facilities is more likely to be profitable. The majority of private recreation facilities cluster around public recreation facilities and around other private facilities. This complementary-competitive relationship between the public and private sector must be understood if properly planned and coordinated recreation developments are to make effective use of outdoor recreation resources.

The private sector is characterized by unused capacity and to attract more customers, private recreation entrepreneurs need capital to upgrade their facilities. The monopolistic-competition nature of the outdoor recreation market makes it necessary for private operators to differentiate their enterprise from their competitors. But, given the economic uncertainties of private recreation enterprises, expansion plans may require provincial government assistance, such as loan programs and technical advice and integration within a comprehensive recreation plan.

The second theme relates to the need to establish a rationale for a division of labor in the provision of recreation facilities between the various levels of government and between government and private enterprise. The market is large enough that no one sector alone could ever satisfy the demand.
Within the scope of outdoor recreation, government assumes three roles—promotional, regulatory and developmental. All can affect the private recreation sector. Unfortunately government often fails to recognize this and public recreation policies and programs often produce conflicting and unanticipated effects on the private sector. It is necessary for these government departments responsible for outdoor recreation to assume a leadership role for coordination of all aspects of outdoor recreation. Recreation plans must be comprehensive and include the supply of recreation facilities by the private sector.

An analysis of the departmental structures of government of the United States, Canada and British Columbia reveals that outdoor recreation has been generally assigned to resource management agencies such as parks, forestry and agriculture. The resource management agencies lack the legislative authority, finances, and personnel necessary to competently undertake a responsibility for coordination of all aspects of outdoor recreation. These agencies have confined their activities to their traditional areas of competency and therefore large gaps appear in government performance of comprehensive recreation planning and management. The private recreation sector often falls within these gaps. It would appear that a new institutional vehicle is necessary that is not functionally handicapped by preoccupation with policy for the management of public lands. It should then be possible to realize that outdoor recreation has other dimensions beyond the confines of public facilities and requires the establishment of guidelines to clarify the respective roles of government and private business. A survey of private campground operators in British Columbia indicates a readiness to accept government leadership.
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The topic of recreation and, more specifically, outdoor recreation is one which has several dimensions which have been controversial at various points in time. Whether attempting a definition of recreation, a motivational study of why recreationists participate, an assessment of the demand for recreation, a classification and inventory of recreation resources, a program of financing public recreation or formulation of a management practice for administering recreation resources and facilities, a variety of issues arise.

**Basic Characteristics of Outdoor Recreation**

There are several basic assumptions or postulates about the general character of outdoor recreation that can be asserted.

1. The demand for outdoor recreation has grown in the past, is growing rapidly today, and will grow greatly in the future.

2. The major socioeconomic factors underlying this shift in demand for outdoor recreation have been (a) population changes, particularly growth in total population but perhaps also changing age distribution and growing urbanization; (b) increased real income per capita; (c) improved travel facilities and increased travel; and (d) increased leisure, partly through a reduced work week but also through an increase in the number of retired persons and other persons not in the labor force, and growth of the paid vacation.

3. Of the growing leisure, only a part has been, or will be in the future, used for outdoor recreation.
4. Outdoor recreation is a highly popular and widely accepted use of some natural resources.

5. Outdoor recreation does and should involve both publicly and privately owned resources and both public and private effort.

6. Outdoor recreation includes many specific activities, appealing to people of different ages, incomes, and tastes. This in turn requires natural resources of different kinds and locations.

   (Clawson, 1964, pp. 3-4)

In Canada, participants at the 1962 Resources for Tomorrow Conference reached agreement on a similar set of basic assumptions relating to the nature of public recreation facilities:

   (a) There will be a substantial increase in total demand for public recreation facilities due to an increase in leisure time combined with sufficient disposable income for its enjoyment. Further, there will be a continually changing pattern of recreation; for example, changes which would come about with the establishment of a four-day work week.

   (b) A wide range of facilities is required to meet variations in individual tastes and in needs for cultural and physical activities.

   (c) There is a considerable degree of uniformity across Canada in the character of demand for recreation facilities.

   (d) Full utilization of the resource potential to meet recreation needs requires development of facilities on both a public and private basis.

   (e) Development of public facilities is a responsibility shared by all levels of government including municipal, county or regional, provincial and federal.

   (f) Demand for regional facilities within a 50 to 75 mile radius of large urban centers is and will continue to be intensive.

Note both sets of statements agree that both public and private resources will be needed to meet the increased demand for recreation.

**Issues Related to Outdoor Recreation**

From these basic assumptions on the nature of recreation, several issues of public policy arise.

1. How can we estimate future demand for outdoor recreation quantitatively and accurately?

2. How can we maintain, and if possible improve, the quality of the recreation experience?

3. How can we manage natural resources used for multiple-use purposes, so as to include and hopefully maximize the recreation values?

4. How can comprehensive plans to meet future demands for outdoor recreation be developed best?

5. How much of our natural resources should we allocate to outdoor recreation?

6. How can we best encourage the public use of privately owned areas for outdoor recreation?

7. Last, how are we going to pay for the public recreation areas that will be needed in the future?

   (Clawson, 1964, pp. 4-6)

Turning from issues of public policy, how are these related to planning? A similar set of issues arise.

1. For what forms of outdoor recreation have areas and facilities to be provided?

2. Where to provide areas for different recreational activities?

3. To establish standards for different outdoor recreational uses, taking into consideration specific local modifying factors, such as existing natural assets.
4. To coordinate the recreation area planning with planning for other uses.

5. To find legislative and administrative measures to acquire, establish and maintain outdoor recreational areas, and secure the recreational function of "multiple use" areas.

6. Establish a guiding policy for recreational uses to be provided by the various levels of government and private enterprises.

(Mattyasovszky, 1963, p. 126)

An attempt to examine the entire range of issues presented is beyond the scope of this paper. It is intended to focus on one particular aspect—that relating to public use of privately owned recreation enterprises. All four previous quotations have indicated agreement that this topic is significant in terms of providing easily accessible recreation space to meet predicted future demands.

**The Role of Private Facilities**

The inclusion of privately owned recreation resources in statements of issues arising from outdoor recreation would seem to imply that the public provision of facilities and resources for outdoor recreation is not sufficient now, or in the future, to meet the demand. This premise can be easily reinforced.

In my own value system, I feel that major expansions of publicly owned outdoor recreation areas are needed, and I have said so elsewhere; but it is highly doubtful if public areas either can or should supply the whole demand. There are vast areas of privately owned farm, forest, and range lands which can provide outdoor recreation in addition to their major use.

(Clawson, 1964, p. 6)

In Canada, similar opinions have been stated.
The indications from studies of recreational demand are that there is an almost insatiable market for outdoor recreation. . . . There is a large enough market that no one level of Government or any group of private operators will ever be able to satisfy the pressure.

(Taylor, 1965, p. 10)

Research Needs

To this point, it has been established that recreation on private lands is an integral part of outdoor recreation. Still to be established is what kind of research into outdoor recreation on private land is needed.

The role of private recreation has been generally ignored by researchers in the field of outdoor recreation.

Major attention focuses on public outdoor recreation, partly because so much better data are available for it, and partly because issues of public policy are raised which cannot be avoided. But public use of privately owned resources is highly important in the outdoor recreation field and should not be neglected.

(Clawson, 1964, p. 4)

Generally these issues arising from private recreation enterprises can be considered in two contexts.

a. In the first place, there needs to be a rationale established for the development of a hierarchy of park and recreation areas. It seems only logical to look into the possibility of some measure of division of labour in the provision of recreation facilities between the various levels of Government themselves and between Government and private business. It will have to be admitted from the start that no clear cut division will be possible nor would one be desirable. It is very likely, however, that some guidelines could be established to clarify the respective roles of Government and private business. Any such guidelines that were generally acceptable would enable much more effective park systems planning to be carried out.
b. A second context is to be found in the operation of a recreational facilities on private lands by private capital. There is a number of problems that arise immediately in connection with such use of private lands. Research on a variety of topics is needed to supply information to be used in the solution of these problems. First of all, we need to know the extent of recreational use on these lands now. . . .

A second area of study should be concerned with the legal position of the private landowner. . . .

A third area of interest to the land owner is the matter of economics. . . .

A fourth area of study should be that of the effect of location. . . .

A final area of required study in the field of private recreation enterprises is that of the role of entrepreneurship. What are the attributes of a successful operator, what special talents or skills, if any, should he possess?

(Taylor, 1965, pp. 10-12)

The 1962 Resources for Tomorrow Conference recommended:

To meet operational problems, the primary need is for establishment of criteria and standards; . . . .

(d) Criteria for determining the relative roles of private, commercial, voluntary and government agencies in recreation.

(Resources for Tomorrow Conference, Vol. Ill, p. 186)

The need for research in these areas is further reinforced.

Concerning the private provision of outdoor recreation on forest lands, we need answers to several questions. What outdoor recreation facilities can the private sector best provide? Having assessed this, what are the financial, legal and administrative aspects of private sector provision of outdoor recreation? These things are poorly understood in Western Canada.

(Dooling, 1969, p. 11)
b. A second context is to be found in the operation of a recreational facilities on private lands by private capital. There is a number of problems that arise immediately in connection with such use of private lands. Research on a variety of topics is needed to supply information to be used in the solution of these problems. First of all, we need to know the extent of recreational use on these lands now. . . .

A second area of study should be concerned with the legal position of the private landowner. . . .

A third area of interest to the land owner is the matter of economics. . . .

A fourth area of study should be that of the effect of location. . . .

A final area of required study in the field of private recreation enterprises is that of the role of entrepreneurship. What are the attributes of a successful operator, what special talents or skills, if any, should he possess?

(Taylor, 1965, pp. 10-12)

The 1962 Resources for Tomorrow Conference recommended:

To meet operational problems, the primary need is for establishment of criteria and standards; . . .

(d) Criteria for determining the relative roles of private, commercial, voluntary and government agencies in recreation.

(Resources for Tomorrow Conference, Vol. III, p. 186)

The need for research in these areas is further reinforced.

Concerning the private provision of outdoor recreation on forest lands, we need answers to several questions. What outdoor recreation facilities can the private sector best provide? Having assessed this, what are the financial, legal and administrative aspects of private sector provision of outdoor recreation? These things are poorly understood in Western Canada.

(Dooling, 1969, p. 11)
Purpose of this Study

The foregoing has been a brief overview of the research needs related to provision of recreation by the private sector. This study intends to take a broad perspective of this issue and as such is introductory in nature. No one specific issue relating to private provision of recreation is to be pursued.

Research may be thought of as an organized search for knowledge. This search for understanding can be done in two ways: first, a new understanding that comes from a rearrangement of old facts and ideas; and second, an organized search for new knowledge.

In terms of a rearrangement of old facts and ideas, this study will attempt to catalogue government policies that affect private recreation enterprises. The original intention was to study only commercial recreation enterprises, their characteristics, and management problems rather than include questions of public management and ownership. This aspect is covered in Chapter II. It becomes evident however that government policy towards private recreation cannot be studied in isolation from government policy towards outdoor recreation in general. A government decision to establish a provincial park probably includes no direct involvement by private recreation operators but it would have far ranging affects on private recreation enterprises in the vicinity of the new park. A decision to introduce user fees in provincial campgrounds would have tremendous significance for private campgrounds. In this respect, policies and programs towards private recreation enterprises must be viewed within the total perspective of all government policies towards outdoor recreation. These important complementary and competitive relationships between
public and private uses of recreational land will be studied in Chapter III.

Government policies relevant to the private outdoor recreation sector are of two general types—regulatory and promotional. Regulatory policies include such statutes as the Health Act, Innkeepers Act, Highways Act, etc., which state certain regulations with which private operators must comply in order to obtain a licence to operate their recreation enterprises. The second category of government policy relates to those types of programs designed to encourage the development and upgrading of private recreation enterprises. Included are programs of advertising and tourist promotion, financial assistance, liability insurance, technical, and management advice. The purpose of this investigation is not merely to list relevant policies and programs but to consider whether or not they have been formulated in a manner that considers the needs and desires of the private operators. Government policies by United States and Canadian federal governments will be compared in Chapters IV and V and, in addition, the policies of the British Columbia provincial government will be assessed in Chapter VI.

In terms of research for new knowledge, Chapter VII will go beyond the assessment of current government policies and will include the survey results of private campground operators in British Columbia. This survey will include tabulations of the size of the enterprise, nature of the services offered, volume of business, types of problems and management practices. Also included will be an evaluation by private operators of present government policies that affect their recreation enterprises.
CHAPTER II

CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIVATE OUTDOOR RECREATION ENTERPRISES

Definition

The use of private land for recreation can be categorized in two ways. First, the private land may be used exclusively for the enjoyment of the owners. This may range from a summer cottage, a church or youth camp, a yacht or golf club for members only, to an industrial recreation area available only to employees and their families. Second, the private land may be used by the public subject to an entrance fee or user charge. In this case, the recreational use of the natural resources and facilities as a commercial venture is the prime use of the land although not necessarily the sole source of income of the owner.

It is this second category of private recreation enterprises that will be the major focus of this study and the main emphasis will be on those private recreation enterprises that depend on an outdoor natural resource base. Bowling alleys, privately operated zoos, swimming pools, etc., will not be considered. Also excluded from the study will be the multiple use of private lands for hunting and fishing where those lands are primarily used for forestry or agriculture and the private operation of recreation enterprises on public lands via a "concession" arrangement.
The prime concern of this study will be with the operation of private campgrounds and all related services (boat rentals, showers, groceries, laundry rooms, automobile and marine supplies, propane-tank filling, etc.) that are supplied at the campsite. Many other private recreation enterprises however such as hunting and fishing resorts, dude ranches, vacation farms, waterfront resorts, hunting preserves, ski resorts and fish ponds exhibit similar characteristics and problems as campgrounds. The study then will deal with private recreation enterprises in general and limit itself to private campgrounds only when a particularly relevant issue makes a more specific discussion necessary. Chapter VII will restrict itself to the assessment of campground operator questionnaire returns and will omit other types of private recreation enterprises.

**Economics of Private Recreation Enterprises**

Generally the economic valuation of outdoor recreation is a subject which economists find conceptually difficult. This is particularly true with regard to the public provision of outdoor recreation since recreation is considered a non-market good and like education is financed mainly via general taxation, not user charges. Because of its non-market character, the traditional economic tools of price theory are not generally applicable. (Clawson and Knetsch, 1969; Davis, 1968; Hines, 1968; Pearse, 1968)

The conceptual and practical difficulties of placing a value on public provision of recreation are most obvious when choosing between recreation and some other alternate use of land (i.e. forestry, mining, hydro). It would appear that these conceptual economic issues that
plague public recreation are not as prevalent when one considers the
field of private recreation. For the private operator, the issue of al-
ternate uses of land is a simple one. His recreation enterprise must pro-
duce a profit or he will try alternative uses of the land until he faces
bankruptcy and must sell the property and business. Because of this
characteristic of private recreation enterprises, as opposed to public
recreation, it is possible to use standard terminology from the field of
economics to describe some of the major features of private recreation
enterprises.

In the context of micro-economic theory, the private outdoor
recreation enterprise operates in a market which the economists call
"monopolistic-competition". (Bowers, 1969; Lipsey and Steiner, 1969)
In the private recreation industry, product differentiation exists since
there are small differences in location, type of accommodations, and
prestige of resorts. Variations are found in the product and in the
advertising but competition is primarily non-price competition.

... a differentiated product is offered by many
sellers, each with his own variety of the product.
These businesses require comparatively small invest-
ment and little experience or knowledge. ... There is free entry and exit in the industry and no
individual firm can effectively alter the total
amount of the product on the market.

Differentiation of product is achieved by vari-
ation in the quality of cabins and furnishings,
boats, entertainment facilities at the resort. ... The prestige of the resort. ... The hospitality
of the host varies from resort to resort.

(Anderson, 1959, pp. 67-68)
While each resort is different from another, it is possible for a consumer to substitute one for another. One campground can probably be substituted for another even though it is not identical to any other campground. In perfect competition, it is difficult for a firm to raise its prices. If it does, the consumer will switch to other firms selling at the lower price. This is generally true for monopolistic competition except that a firm can differentiate its product. If a fishing lodge has a particularly magnificent setting, it could possibly charge a higher rate than a competitor who is not as well located. Quality variations in living facilities at resorts are necessary to satisfy the differences in tastes and preferences of consumers. Advertising is designed to some extent to lure customers into a particular resort rather than another but it can draw new customers.

These general features of the monopolistic-competition nature of private recreation market can be more easily understood if the concepts of time and distance are included. If a person is shopping in a supermarket and feels the prices of oranges are too high, he has the opportunity of substituting bananas or apples. Time and distance will probably not prevent his shopping at another store. On the other hand, if a family is camping in the Okanagan and finds conditions crowded, unsanitary and/or expensive, these factors of time and distance will probably restrict the possibility of substituting an alternative holiday site. An alternate choice such as a resort in the Gulf Islands would probably require reservations and additional economic considerations. Because each camper's decision to by-pass the Okanagan is independent of every other camper, it may take several seasons before a noticeable decrease of
customers is felt in that area and the market is forced to adapt to public demands.

From this rather general discussion of monopolistic-competition as typified by the private recreation market, several conclusions can be drawn. (Anderson, 1959)

1. No individual firm can significantly alter the total amount of the product on the market.
2. There is free entry and exit to the market.
3. Since there is little significant product differentiation, profits are depressed because consumers can switch from one resort to another if prices are raised.
4. Significant product differentiation can generally be achieved only with increased capital investments.
5. Private operators resort to non-price competition to obtain a larger share of the market (advertising, differentiation of services).
6. The differentiation of products results from attempts to improve the quality of the product (hospitality, cleanliness, prestige), not in creating new products.
7. There are too many firms in the market as evidenced by operation at less than full capacity.

The presence of excess capacity and the need for larger capital investments might at first appear contradictory. However, enterprises adequately differentiated and offering quality facilities require larger outlays of capital. Excess capacity is, in part, a result of too many small, underfinanced enterprises insufficiently differentiated and offering a service for which demand is not present or adequate.

(Bowers, 1969, p. 92)
Any discussion of private recreation is complicated by competition from the public parks system. A private fee charging trout pond competes with hundreds of lakes with free public access. Private campground and picnic sites compete with municipal, provincial and federal parks. In addition, regulations by non-recreation oriented government departments (Highways and/or Health) can affect the operation of private recreation enterprises. In this chapter, an effort will be made to deal with private recreation enterprises in isolation from public policies. Chapter III will further explore the relationships between the public and private recreation sectors.

**Canadian Research**

In Canada, it appears that no field research has been undertaken and hence little literature exists. The only two references discovered were related to rural development projects. A study by Baker under the Agricultural and Rural Development Act legislation was a general investigation into the possibility of commercial recreation as a means of overcoming rural poverty. (Baker, 1966) The other reference was a case study of the application of ARDA funds to develop recreation enterprises on Indian reserves. (England, 1968) Neither study was comprehensive in dealing with the issue of private recreation. The Baker report was written solely for the purpose of establishing criteria for rural assistance programs by a government agricultural agency. The England report assessed the location and site characteristics of several Indian reserves in Ontario to determine which sites should be developed as automobile campgrounds. In both cases, private recreation was to be the means of
achieving a goal. An improvement in the living standards of a particular group in society was the end point of the studies; consequently, neither study covered recreation in depth.

The purpose of Chapter II is to deal with the general nature of private recreation enterprises, their characteristics, economic viability, and problems of operation. For this purpose, it is necessary to turn to research from the United States. Canadian references will be dealt with more fully in Chapter V.

Case Studies

The first comprehensive attempt to survey the field of private recreation enterprises was by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. (ORRRC, Study Report No. 11, 1962) This study was hampered by the fact that no central listing of all private recreation enterprises in the United States existed. As a result, the sample of approximately 1,110 outdoor recreation facilities used by the study was not a fair representation of all regions of the United States or of all types of enterprises. The study summarized the general characteristics of all types of business enterprises comprising the private recreation industry.

1. A majority of the ranch, campground, shooting preserve, and hunting and fishing camp enterprises, as well as national park inholdings, and probably the farms offering vacation facilities, are owned by individuals or families. Companies or corporations own most resorts and resort hotels, beaches, ski area facilities, and industrial employee recreation areas.

2. Generally, the campgrounds, beaches, yacht and boat clubs, national park inholdings, industrial recreation areas, Izaak Walton League facilities, and Maine hunting and fishing camps tend toward small holdings and more intensive land uses. Conversely, dude ranches,
shooting preserves, and ski areas tend toward large holdings and extensive types of land uses. Of the 1,114 replies (excluding vacation farms) to the questionnaire, operators reported 23 percent of the sites are 9.9 acres or less, 18 percent have between 10 and 49 acres, 8 percent have sites of 50 to 99 acres, 10 percent have between 100 and 199 acres, 18 percent have between 200 and 499 acres, and 23 percent have 500 acres or more.

3. In recreation categories in which the ratio of improvement values to land values is high, the land is usually operator-owned. In those categories in which the ratio of land values to improvement values is high, greater proportions of land are leased. Exceptions to this general rule appear to be yacht and boat clubs, where leasing predominates, yet the ratio of improvement values to land values is high.

4. Recreation is the primary land use at most of the recreation facilities inventoried. Where recreation is not the primary use, ranching, farming, or a combination of these two were most frequently mentioned as the primary land use. Of the other primary uses, forestry was the next most frequently mentioned.

5. Swimming is the facility most frequently offered at these recreation units. Fishing facilities are next followed closely by boating. Of more than 20 types of recreation activities listed as first, second, or third in popularity, water sports account for 48 percent of the 2,570 total listings. Activities making extensive use of land, such as hunting, skiing, and picnicking, account for 41 percent of the listings. Intensive sports account for 6 percent, and miscellaneous activities, such as sightseeing and dancing, account for the remaining 5 percent.

6. Of the individual sports and activities, swimming is most popular, fishing is second, and boating and hunting tie for third most popular. These are followed by skiing, riding, picnicking, camping, and golf. Other activities frequently mentioned are sailing and racing, water skiing, hiking and mountain climbing, and tennis. Miscellaneous winter sports, rifle shooting, sightseeing, photography, parties and entertainment, dancing (including square dancing), and baseball were mentioned less frequently.
7. Fees of some type are charged by most of the recreation enterprises inventoried. These vary from all-inclusive fees at many resorts and ranches to entrance fees at commercial beaches and tent-site charges at campgrounds.

8. About 90 percent of the operators replying and many of the vacation farms are near public lands and waters used for recreation. Nearly half of them are also near other privately owned recreation facilities.

9. No problems were reported by 51 percent of the operators who responded to the question. Of the problems reported by the other 49 percent, 72 percent are guest-created; 19 percent are related to the business operations; 5 percent are related to policy at various levels of government; and human relations, acts of God, and legal problems account for the remaining 4 percent.

10. Intensive operations have a greater variety of guest-created problems than extensive ones because a greater number of people must be watched. Conversely, it is often easier to police crowds than it is to catch the vandals and other troublemakers on extensive holdings, such as shooting preserves and industrial forest lands.

11. Most of the problems are caused by antisocial actions of the guests—the most frequently being vandalism, trash and littering, and carelessness with fire.

12. Government-created problems of two types also occur—those caused by conflicting regulations in adjoining jurisdictions and those caused by inadequate understanding.

13. Many respondents plan to expand their present facilities within the next few years. Extensive sports (riding, hunting, and so forth) account for 54 percent of all new facilities planned, water sports for 34 percent, intensive sports for 4 percent, and miscellaneous sports and activities for the remaining 8 percent.

14. Of all recreation facilities planned, winter sports are mentioned most frequently; they account for 22 percent of the total. Boating, swimming, camping, picnicking and fishing are also high on the list of facilities planned. Hunting, hiking, and golf also
were mentioned by at least a dozen respondents as on their list of future facilities. Other planned recreation facilities includes those for putting greens and miniature golf; volleyball, softball, baseball, and football; social activities, amusements, and additional lodging.

15. Apparently, there is no single optimum size of business in any of the various recreation enterprises studied. The optimum size varies with the age and ability of the operators, the labor force's dependability, the location of the business, the seasonal fluctuations, the degree and quality of competition, and other factors. Enterprises catering to spectators rather than participants generally seem to be operating at less than capacity. Their grounds could serve larger numbers of visitors and their staffs could be expanded easily and quickly. Small and relatively inexpensive changes in facilities might be required in some instances to manage larger crowds and to protect facilities from damage related to greater concentrations in use.

16. High, relatively fixed costs that vary little in relation to number of guests are a burden on some types of recreation enterprises—those involving livestock feeding, advertising, and caretaking expenses are examples. Liability insurance is almost prohibitively expensive for beach and ski enterprises and those involving use of horses or wild animals. In several States, the burden of licenses, permits, fees, taxes, and miscellanea bears little relation to size of business, net returns, or ability to pay.

17. Private bankers and governmental lending agencies, alike, apparently consider outdoor recreation a risky enterprise for loans. This is especially true of small operations, new activities, and untried operators. Private sources of capital frequently can be utilized to support needed development programs.

18. The operator's personality pretty well sets the tone for his outdoor recreation enterprise. He must know the mechanics of good business management, be able to handle people, and be willing to provide his guests with satisfactory service so they will feel they have received their money's worth. . . . Many people trying to manage recreation enterprises are not adapted to the work. Personal attributes are important.
19. Owners of large holdings recognize the growing demands for multiple-purpose use of their lands. Although many of them make large portions of their lands available for public recreation use, others hesitate to do so because of the danger of fire and other damage to property, risk of liability claims, and the fear that public demand for additional privileges will hamper the business operations. Specific needs mentioned include proper safeguards for private property, standardized rates to be charged for recreational services provided and physical control of the mass of recreation seekers who are anticipated to descend on the holdings.

20. Owners of lands already utilized for hunting, fishing, hiking, picnicking, and so forth, anticipate increasing demands for more privileges. Many of the holders of large tracts whose lands and waters are still closed recognize that sooner or later they will be obliged to allow recreation where it can be practiced safely. Many would welcome sound standards, fair treatment relative to the governmental requirements, proper compensation, and a logical balance between publicly owned and developed resources and privately owned recreation facilities.

21. Numerous private enterprises are made available for public enjoyment at less than actual cost. These include formal gardens, special collections, and unique resources. In effect, the owners are subsidizing public recreation.

22. The remnants of our national antipathy toward play need to be overcome, and many problems typical of the growing pains of new types of enterprise need to be alleviated. The variety of mass-produced, economy-packaged recreation demanded today by vacationers was almost unknown a generation ago. Even government--National, State, and local--often looks askance at this rapidly growing business.

23. Many people want a variety of recreation experiences that are incompatible with the practical limitation of public facilities. Many of the expressed desires for recreation services are outside the traditional realm of public service. For maximum development, public recreation programs should complement rather than compete with private recreation enterprise; should be compatible rather than combatant; and each should operate in its own area of responsibility.

(ORRRC, Study Report No. 11, 1962, p. 145-47)
Table 1 summarizes operator problems as reported to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission study group on private recreation facilities.

In the five-year period following the publication of the report of the ORRRC, the United States Department of Agriculture through its agricultural extension stations undertook more localized studies of private recreation enterprises (either on a statewide or a regional scale). Several dozen case studies on the income potential in rural areas from outdoor recreation were completed. The data collected related to the volume of business, profitability, amount of capitalization, sources of financing, range of services offered, entrepreneurial skills of the operators, and common management problems. A preliminary investigation of several of these studies showed similar results to the ORRRC findings. (Bird, 1963; Callahan and Knudson, 1966; Holmes, 1964; Moore, 1964; Owens, 1964; Schmedemann, Wooten and Franklin, 1964)

Very recently some thirteen of these separate studies were collectively evaluated. (Bowers, 1969) This particular study placed particular emphasis on these four types of recreation enterprises: picnic grounds, campgrounds, fee fishing lakes, and multiple recreation areas (resorts, swimming, boat rentals, snack bars, camping, etc.). The major emphasis of the study by Bowers (1969) is placed on the income potential of the commercial recreation industry. Little regard was given to the relationship of the private operator to the public recreation sector and little attention was given to the factors of location and accessibility. The prime concern was whether or not each recreation enterprise was economically viable on its own merits under the present market conditions with little coordination by public recreation agencies.
### Table 1

**Problems Reported by Operators of 512 Recreation Enterprises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest-created:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poaching</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdiness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving gates open</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human relations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal help</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business-related:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded conditions</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guests</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High costs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acts of God:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of water or snow</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad weather</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government sector of the economy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and rules</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predator control</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor roads</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage disposal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach erosion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty lake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from public campgrounds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laws:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High taxes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ORRRC, Study Report No. 11, 1962, p. 140
No attention was given to the issue of what role the public and private sectors should play in meeting the overall demand for recreational services and facilities. This limitation of the studies must be kept in mind.

In particular, Bowers (1969) estimated that there were 2,970 outdoor recreation enterprises in the United States in 1965 that operated primarily as campgrounds. Over 22,037 of these outdoor recreation enterprises included camping. It appeared that the ratio of public to private campgrounds in the Northeastern states was 3:1 based on the number of campgrounds, not on the total number of sites.

The average area dedicated to private campground facilities was approximately 15 acres with about 43 sites per campground. On a national average only 28.5 per cent of campgrounds offered a primary source of income to the owner while 60 per cent offered a supplementary source. In New Hampshire, only six out of 108 operations provided the owner with full-time employment.

Most campground operations offer other activities besides the physical availability of campsites. Campgrounds characteristically combined facilities with day-use activities such as swimming, boating, picnicking, fishing and tennis.

(Bowers, 1969, pp. 46-47)

Bowers felt that an effort should be made to distinguish between vacation type campgrounds and transient campgrounds although none of the studies had done so.

The transient campground must be located near main highways. The travelers using it will insist on well-equipped campsites and clean sanitary facilities. These campers are not too concerned about having things to do near the campsite. Eight or more
campsites can usually be developed per acre, since facilities and accommodations tend to be simply and compactly arranged. Vacation campgrounds, unlike transient campgrounds, do not need to be near major highways, particularly if near unique natural attractions such as lakes, streams, and forest areas. More things-to-do activities, such as swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, game fields, horseback riding are required. Fewer campsites per unit of land, perhaps no more than four sites per acre, should be developed.

(Bowers, 1969, p. 48)

Studies indicate the majority of private campgrounds are used as vacation campgrounds.

All the studies seem to have had difficulty in standardizing some means of analyzing the cost and return figures used in determining the relative profit and loss statement for campground enterprises. Profit is a measure of success and indicates the firm's ability to earn enough reserve to pay annual depreciation, capital charges, and wages for unpaid family and management labor. The difficulty lies with placing a value on the labor contribution of the owner-operator and his family. Many operators consider only explicit costs and disregard either income for their own labor or implicit costs such as depreciation of facilities and the opportunity costs of their capital.

Table 2 summarizes costs and returns from a sample of 124 recreation enterprises that offered camping only and did not offer related services. From the table, it appears that the campground industry is not generally an economic success. Nearly all studies conclude that income from camping fees alone did not cover operating costs and depreciation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enterprises</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres (ave.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Invest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-land</td>
<td>15,075</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,625</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>25,720</td>
<td>26,140</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>34,900</td>
<td>25,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Income</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Upkeep</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes/License</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (Hired)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Equipment</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Income</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>(-)334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Charge</td>
<td>703(4½%)</td>
<td>495(4½%)</td>
<td>1,286(5%)</td>
<td>1,649(6%)</td>
<td>502(5%)</td>
<td>1,745(5%)</td>
<td>1,274(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Labor/Capital</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>(-)1,113</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>(-)724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Earnings&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>(-)2,399</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>(-)1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Earnings&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (Family &amp; Mgmt.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,344 hrs.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,473 hrs.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Labor earnings refer to returns to unpaid family labor and management.

<sup>b</sup> Capital earnings could not be computed since there was no opportunity cost for labor given. Only two studies gave the hours of management and family labor expended.

(Source: Bowers, 1969)
Fees for camping alone usually do not provide sufficient revenue to make a camping area pay. The most "successful" operators have provided additional services not usually found in public parks.

(Bird, 1963, p. 16)

Successful operations were characterized by providing facilities such as showers, electricity, laundries, ice dispensers, food concessions and camping supplies.

Bowers (1969) in a national study stated that 62 per cent of the total number of outdoor recreation enterprises reported underuse of facilities on typical weekends. In most studies, a common finding was dissatisfaction among outdoor recreation enterprise managers with the low amount of patronage.

Although overcapacity can be attributed in part to the large number of entrepreneurs finding entry into the industry relatively easy, a major contributor has to be the poorly planned investments guided by gross overestimations of demand.

(Bowers, 1969, p. 2)

A study in New Hampshire by Hancock, although cautioning against regarding campground operations such as a golf mine did state:

Even though the private campground market appears to be saturated in some regions, there is always room for the innovator and the man who takes an active interest in his clientele and is alert to their differences and needs. By the same token, owners not so inclined should be aware of the fact the campers are becoming more and more sophisticated in their demands.

(Bowers, 1969, p. 57)

Despite this reference to the increasingly sophisticated demands of campers none of the studies reviewed by Bowers indicated any concern for the trend away from tents towards recreational vehicles (tent trailers,
trailers, camper trucks, etc.). These new modes of camping generally demand water, sewer and electrical connections and such services as septic tank dumping and propane-tank filling.

The studies reviewed by Bowers made little effort to indicate the optimum size of operation for a profitable enterprise. A Maine study indicated the highest ratios of gross income to total investment for campgrounds were for those facilities with 40 to 59 sites and those with 100 to 199 sites. The ratio of operating costs to total investment was fairly constant over the range of campsites. It appears that the length of visit by campers was also related to the size of investment. Those campgrounds with larger capital investments (over $15,000) were generally able to keep their customers twice as long as those who had smaller investments. The smaller turnover of customers can increase profitability as the costs associated with maintaining the sites can be reduced. Still, the key to making a campground an economic success is quality, and larger campgrounds with higher investments offered better quality facilities so they were more attractive to campers.

Bowers (1969) concluded that a recreation enterprise that limits itself only to the provision of campsites is not likely to be an economic success. It is therefore meaningful to consider what he learned about multiple activity recreation areas where a diversified selection of activities (fishing, boating, picnicking, golfing and camping) is offered. For these enterprises, the purpose is to increase revenues by volume demand. Capital and labor do not sit idle because of varying demand for one type of recreational experience. Because of the extensive nature of the activities provided, the total area was larger than for campgrounds.
As a consequence, land comprised the greatest portion of the capital investment. All studies reviewed by Bowers (1969) seem unanimous in the estimation of the importance of water as a recreational focal point and should therefore be included within that site.

The diverse activities offered and the larger scale of operations call for different management than those enterprises which operate solely as a campground. In a large full time operation, unpaid family labor cannot provide for all labor input. In two studies, operators rated high labor costs as their major problems. The studies seem to show that a multiple recreation activity is considerably more successful than the single purpose areas (a picnic ground, fee-fishing pond). Despite the apparent possibility of a profit, this is subject to restrictions. A larger amount of capital is needed before the enterprise can even begin to operate and also, the diverse nature of the activities offered often requires specialized management techniques (i.e. golf courses, fish ponds, restaurants) which the operator may not initially recognize as being necessary.

The studies found that coverage of liability insurance was an issue. Very few enterprises were covered by policies despite the owners concern over the possibility of accidents. The prohibitive cost of premiums was the usual explanation.

Factors Influencing Successful Recreation Enterprises

The foregoing has been a review of the characteristics of campgrounds and multiple recreation areas as compiled by Bowers (1969) from several regional studies. In addition, Bowers attempted to summarize the
factors influencing the success of reaction enterprises. In his discussion of those factors which appear to have an influence on the success or failure of outdoor recreation enterprises, Bowers relied on four studies. In each case, multiple regression analysis was used to suggest the nature of the significant factors. The dependent variable was net cash income or that income remaining after explicit costs have been deducted. This was done to overcome the difficulty of determining implicit costs accurately (particularly cost of labor by owner-operators).

One study for fee fishing lakes in Pennsylvania showed that total receipts were highly correlated with the existence of additional services. Those lakes which also operated a concession (food, bait, etc.) were liable to earn twice as much as those fishing lakes and ponds without a concession. Another study in Southern Indiana attempted to analyze both internal and external variables which can affect income. Internal variables included size and capacity of the facility, capital inputs, labor inputs, fees, age of the enterprise, personal characteristics of the operator. External factors included location and accessibility, distance from major population centres. The analysis indicated that internal variables account for 74 per cent of the variation in income while external variables accounted for only 40 per cent (at .01 level). Thus, the manner in which an enterprise is developed and the way in which it appeals to the customer is more important than its location.

The inclusion of two other variables would further validate the conclusion that the quality of the resort is more important than its location. An internal variable, the amount spent on advertising, should be included. In addition, the external variable, location, should be
considered as determined by nearness to either a major public attraction (park, reservoir, etc.) or to a major recreation and holiday area. These two additional variables might significantly alter the conclusion.

The two other studies reviewed by Bowers (1969) those of McCurdy and Knudson, derived predictive models to evaluate the financial feasibility of a recreation area. Both included a combination of internal and external variables which accounted for approximately 70 per cent of the variability in net enterprise income. Both models showed two variables most significant in affecting the success of an enterprise—availability of water for swimming and boating, and the existence of a diversity of facilities and services.

Probably the two predictive models used would not be applicable in Canada due to the static nature of the data. The approach however has merit and should be attempted. This would entail a more sophisticated data collection instrument than the questionnaire used in Chapter VII.

Bowers (1969) has presented a summary of those factors found to be statistically significant in influencing net enterprise income.

1. Personal characteristics of the enterprise manager, including his verbal facility, imagination, promotional ability, organization and business ability, and recreation experience.

2. Quality, type, and availability of services and recreation activities.

3. Location and accessibility of enterprises with respect to population centers and concentration of outdoor recreation patrons.

4. Availability of water acreage and/or swimming facilities.

5. Total personal incomes of county in which enterprise is located. (This would apply primarily to day use activities.)
7. Total capital investment.
8. Amount spent on advertising.

(Bowers, 1969, p. 83-84)

To some extent, the first factor is related to all others. Beginning with the initial decision of when and where to invest, management is the crucial factor. The manager must recognize and provide for current demands. He must be able to differentiate his product from that offered by either public facilities or that easily obtainable at other private operations. This involves obtaining access to capital to initiate or expand his enterprise at the appropriate times. In addition, he must be able to meet and manage with tact and courtesy those people seeking recreational experiences. Most studies of marginal and sub-marginal enterprises showed they were the result of poor investment decisions. The inadequacy of financial records found in nearly all studies was a general indication of poor management.

Bowers' conclusions with regard to total capital investment are also very pertinent. It appeared that many operators entertained the false aspiration that a small investment for land, improvements, facilities, and operating equipment could realize a large income and high rate of return. The evidence indicates how wrong these aspirations can be. For those enterprises which provided a major source of income to the entrepreneur, the average capital investment was over $50,000 with substantial amounts available for continual maintenance and updating of facilities as consumer demands change.
Small, sideline recreation enterprises where investment is small and management is preoccupied with other major enterprises are likely to have disappointing results.  

(Bowers, 1969, p. 90)

In summary, Bowers concluded that private recreation enterprises do not generally return pure or normal profits after opportunity costs for capital and labor are deducted.

It was suggested that a monopolistic, competitive market structure was characteristic of the commercial outdoor recreation industry. It appears that there is at least some basis for this. A large number of sellers is present with apparent free entry possible. Product differentiation is necessary for any successful operation. In addition, the presence of low returns is evident. Combining this with a general lack of experience, poorly advised investment decisions, and a non-professional approach to enterprise development, the result is a large number of small marginal and submarginal enterprises contributing little to, and gaining little from a growing outdoor recreation market.

The opportunity for successful investment in commercial recreation is present, but must rely on further development of technical and management information in addition to better trained operators. Projects must be developed only after extensive study has indicated the desirability of such an investment. Enterprises should be of high quality, offer a variety of activities and services and be differentiated, in a positive respect, within the market area.

(Bowers, 1969, 104-105)

Characteristics of a Successful Private Campground

To this point, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report No. 11 (1962) and Bowers (1969) cover private recreation enterprises in general. It is useful to take these general features of private recreation enterprises and consider their implications for recreation area planning. How can this knowledge be applied to aid in the management of a successful commercial campground? Previously a variety
of studies have been used but in this section it is more useful to take one study and consider it in depth. The purpose of this review will be:

1. to exemplify information gathered in the studies already mentioned.
2. to aid operators in planning private recreation enterprises.
3. to provide useful information to those offering technical assistance to private recreation enterprises.
4. to serve as a model for a similar study undertaken in Chapter VII.

The studies by Wilbur La Page of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania, will be used since they are comprehensive and include not only the characteristics of private recreation enterprises, but behavioural studies of private recreation enterprise users. As such, La Page has concerned himself not only with describing the economic and management characteristics of commercial recreation enterprises but has attempted to explain how these factors are related to the type of customer who uses private facilities and how they influence the customer's behaviour.

The information that follows is taken from three papers presented by La Page. (1966, 1967, 1968) The concern is finding out the characteristics of successful campgrounds and campground management. A sample of 85 campgrounds was used. A "successful campground" was arbitrarily defined as one that had been used to more than 50 per cent of its capacity during the preceding year. According to this definition, 37 were successful and 48 were unsuccessful. The sample campgrounds were then analyzed to
understand the factors influencing success. Care must be taken not to
draw conclusions from one pair of relationships (i.e. success to size of
development) but to relate the full set of relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISES,(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY AGE OF CAMPGROUND DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Business</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Campgrounds that average more than 50 per cent of capacity use throughout the 1963 camping season.

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY SIZE OF CAMPGROUND DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Enterprise(^a)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Campgrounds containing 70 family units or more were classed as large; those containing fewer than 70 units were classed as small.

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 2)
**TABLE 5**
PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISES,  
BY TYPE OF ON-SITE ATTRACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-water</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All bodies of water irrespective of size, including farm ponds, were classed as lakes. Similarly the category of rivers includes small streams.*

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 3)

**TABLE 6**
PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISES,  
BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION WITHIN THE STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 3)
### TABLE 7

**PROPORTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL CAMPGROUNDS THAT HAD INVESTMENT OF MORE THAN $10,000, AND HAD 70 OR MORE DEVELOPED FAMILY UNITS ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF YEARS IN OPERATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campground Age (Years)</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion that had Investment of $10,000 or more</td>
<td>Proportion that had 70 or more Developed Family Units in 1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4 out of 8</td>
<td>8 out of 22</td>
<td>3 out of 7</td>
<td>2 out of 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>9 out of 13</td>
<td>5 out of 17</td>
<td>7 out of 12</td>
<td>2 out of 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6</td>
<td>10 out of 15</td>
<td>1 out of 5</td>
<td>9 out of 15</td>
<td>1 out of 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 4)

### TABLE 8

**NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL CAMPGROUNDS, ACCORDING TO THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF A WATER ATTRACTION, BY REGIONAL LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type of Attraction</th>
<th>Number Successful</th>
<th>Number Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Water-oriented</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-water-based</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Water-oriented</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-water-based</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Water-oriented</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-water-based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Water-oriented</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-water-based</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: La Page, 1966, p. 5)
From these tables, it is apparent that the size of campground development and the presence of water have substantial influence on campground success. (Tables 4 and 5) Further analysis shows that these two factors alone are not sufficient. From Table 7, it is evident that the effects of campground size can be tempered by the age of its development. Table 8 shows that even water-based campgrounds are unsuccessful in some regions.

Tables 6 and 8 "suggest that visit patterns are characteristics of the regional market, and are therefore not always subject to manipulation by campground owners". (La Page, 1966, p. 3) If this is true, then it is probably necessary to study the average length of visit for campers in one region compared to another. It might be that regions that are characterized by a demand for transient campsites, as opposed to those where campers stay for a longer duration, may not be suitable for large, expensively equipped, family-vacation type campgrounds.

Two other characteristics set successful campgrounds apart from their less successful competitors. First, camper visits averaged more than twice as long at the more successful enterprises (4½ days) and second, a majority of successful enterprises had a predominantly advance reservation clientele.

La Page cautions against using results of this initial survey to predict enterprise success. His differences in regional success rates can reflect not only variable market sizes and competitive conditions, but also differences in public policy. The fee or absence of a fee at a public campground and the geographic distribution of public camping areas, can undoubtedly have even more significant effects upon private campground
success than any of the factors included in his analysis. This cautioning reinforces a fundamental premise of this thesis—the role of private sector in providing for the recreation demands of the public cannot be studied in isolation from the policies of the public sector. To further review the research of La Page (1966) would take us into the realm of camper motivation and the techniques of successful campground management and both these are beyond the scope of this study.

To conclude this chapter, it is appropriate to summarize the pertinent findings from research into private campground enterprises. The validity of these conclusions is tempered by stating that the relationships are correlative and not causative. This is further emphasized by La Page in titling his findings, "What we think we know".

Direct increases in campground size (number of campsites), campground age (in years), and investment (in dollars), are accompanied by direct increases in visit length, visit frequency and percentage of visitors who plan to return in the future.

The presence of a swimming and boating attraction at or near the campground is associated with longer and more frequent visits, and more numerous plans to return.

An increase in the number of activities engaged in at the campground is accompanied by a slight increase in camper satisfaction.

An increase in campground crowding results in a drop in satisfaction to the level where campers stay only as long as planned.

The location of a campground is important to success. In a regional comparison, the less successful ventures were mostly in a region remote from major metropolitan centers, where lakes were scarce, competition (both public and private) was keen, and the camping season was shorter.
An increase in the variety of past camping experience accompanies an increase in camping satisfaction, but it also accompanies a more critical reaction to campground crowding.

A preference for private campgrounds, as well as a lack of preference for public campgrounds, accompanies longer and more frequent visits, and a greater incidence of intentions to return.

Highly mobile camping equipment was generally accompanied by shorter but more frequent visits; and the incidence of mobile equipment was 100 percent higher at private campgrounds than at public ones.

Trip plans are apparently fairly flexible, judging from the increase in actual over planned visit lengths. A surprising number of campers indicated that they had planned a 2- or 3-day visit and ended up staying a week or more.

It is apparently impossible to identify "primary reasons for camping" such as economy, enjoyment of nature, or social contacts. Camping is a mixed bag of interests, including some apparently contradictory ones like "peace and quiet" along with the "opportunity to meet and visit with other campers".

The incidence of past visits was almost invariably associated with longer current visits, and with a very high incidence of intentions to return. Past visits were also more common among private campground patrons.

Campers who belonged to camping organizations were found to be twice as prevalent at private campgrounds as at public areas.

The majority of successful campgrounds had well-developed advance-reservation systems. And visits were longer at campgrounds with reservation systems than at those without them.

The general finding that campground size accompanies success may indicate part-time management as well as fewer attractions and activities at many of the smaller enterprises.

Successful campground owners were more than twice as likely to belong to a campground owner's association.

(La Page, 1968, pp. 7-8)
Chapter VII will relate if similar conclusions can be drawn from the operations of private campground enterprises in British Columbia.
CHAPTER III

THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF PRIVATE RECREATION ENTERPRISE AND PUBLIC POLICY

Chapters I and II have frequently mentioned that the provision of recreation facilities and services to a fee paying public by private enterprise cannot be studied in isolation from public policy. This public policy may be in the form of legislation designed to regulate private facilities or it may be in the form of a program of constructing public facilities. In either case, the economic viability of private recreation enterprises is likely to be affected. The purpose of this chapter will be to explore this complex complementary-competitive nature of the relationship between private and public recreation.

It must be noted that this chapter, like the study as a whole, is exploratory in nature. No attempt will be made to state what role either the public or private recreation sector should play. It is merely intended to outline how these two sectors are related.

Baker (1964) outlined three roles that government serves when it attempts to meet the recreation demands of the public. These roles are termed as regulatory, promotional and developmental. This framework will be used to explore the relationship between the public and private recreation sectors.

The promotional role of government centres around the publicity of recreation potentials; the financial inducements for private development and the leasing of
crown owned resources to private entrepreneurs . . .

The regulatory role . . . involves the maintenance of the quality of the resources and the enforcement of adequate standards of safety, health, etc., in public and private developments . . .

Public investment associated with the development role of government in respect to the exploitation of tourist and outdoor recreation resource potentials can be grouped into two major classes . . .

One major class of investment is concerned with the provision of an essential range of services . . .

A second group of public investments associated with the development function are centred upon the establishment and operation of outdoor recreation facilities . . .

(Baker, 1964, pp. 134-137)

Developmental Role

As Baker (1964) stated, this role has two aspects--the provision of services, and the provision of public recreation facilities. The first of these is typified by the construction of highways and the extension of hydro services. The second relates to the creation and development of national and provincial parks. Each aspect will be dealt with separately.

It is certain that highway and road construction and maintenance have long been among the most important sources of income and general economic stimulation in marginal agricultural areas, particularly where alternative industrial and commercial employment opportunities are often weak. Occasionally, recreation and tourism have been an important, or even primary basis for highway development. This has long been recognized in programs sponsored by the federal and provincial governments. In the late 1930's, the federal government paid up to 50 percent of the cost of tourist highways and approach roads to National Parks.

(Baker, 1964, p. 137)
In British Columbia, many similar examples can be found. Consider the relocation and paving of the Alberni-Tofino highway. This road was not needed to provide access to any large population centres or new natural resource developments such as minerals. As long as the road was needed only to provide access to the forest resources, the design standards of a logging road were adequate. But public use of the restricted travel road became an issue as more and more people used the road to reach the previously remote beaches of the west coast of Vancouver Island. An improved highway was deemed necessary to provide suitable public access to Wickaninnish Provincial Park (now Long Beach National Park). Another example of this developmental aspect of the government recreation role can again be related to Vancouver Island if one considers the ferry service to it from the mainland. If ferry service is not increased, there is a limit on the number of recreationists who can visit the Island and enjoy its many recreational opportunities. The development and improvement of travelway facilities by public expenditures can play a crucial role in creating opportunities for the establishment of private recreation enterprises. Few of these involve sufficient investment capital to warrant the construction of more than a mile or two of road or the purchase of a ferry fleet.

The second aspect of the developmental role of government, provision of public recreation facilities (campgrounds, hiking trails, beaches, historic sites, botanical gardens, boat launching ramps, picnic sites, nature house, etc.), can also be crucial to private recreation. These facilities provide new recreational opportunities for the general
public. The new public facilities may compete with or complement the services offered by the private sector.

In Chapter II, it was stated that campgrounds can be of two types. One type serves the transient camper enroute to a location elsewhere along the highway. The other type is a resort type of campground which serves the camper for a period of from three days to two weeks. This typology can probably be used for all types of recreation facilities, not just campgrounds. The distinction then is between facilities which are used by a person for only a portion of the day and those which are used for a number of successive days. The dichotomy of "travelway" and "destination" could also apply to facilities offered by either the public or private sectors.

In terms of campgrounds only, it is in the provision of "transient" type campgrounds that the public sector competes directly with the private sector. Few campgrounds located in a provincial park and having popular natural resource features such as a beach, are large enough to meet public demand. The excess number of park visitors therefore wishing to use park facilities besides the campground provide a ready market for nearby private campgrounds. A travelway or roadside public campground however does not provide additional attractions and since there are no day use facilities, those campers unsuccessful in obtaining a campsite will drive farther along the highway for a campsite.

The provision of "destination" type campgrounds by the public sector can encourage the development of private recreation enterprises. This is particularly true if within the public facilities, the campground
is only one segment of the total recreational opportunities offered to the public.

It is important now to differentiate between the competitive positions of the small rural landowner versus the public sector and the large resort operator versus the public sector. There seems to be a paradox here in that the large-investment resort owner, who is generally in a better resource, management and financial position to withstand competition from the public sector, has little competition from the public tax dollar. On the other hand, the small recreation entrepreneur, who can least afford competition from anybody, is the one who is directly confronted by competitive interests.

(Twardzik, 1965, p. 95)

Still the construction of public facilities can often be an asset to the private sector. The "destination" type outdoor recreation area constructed by public funds which includes beaches, picnic sites, hiking trails, nature interpretation programs, etc., can be the "magnet" to attract potential customers for private recreation enterprises.

This mutualistic relationship results from the public outdoor recreation management objective of avoiding commercialism, while the private enterprises have attempted to furnish experiences not available on the public sites.

(Cornwell, 1963, p. 54)

Public facilities generally attempt to provide a uniform standard of facilities that will appeal to all groups of people. That portion of the public which is more discriminating often looks to the private sector to provide these specialized services. Because private areas are not fully comparable with public ones, users are willing to pay fees or charges. Whether or not the private campground has better natural resources, better improvements, better management, less crowding, more convenience, better
services, something induces people to patronize the private sector even when similar opportunities are available from the public sector.

The second aspect of the government's developmental role, provision of public recreation facilities, has other dimensions not fully explored by Baker. These other dimensions consider the role of the public sector not merely by placing the various government activities in categories but by attempting to see how these activities relate to the private sector. Put simply, both the public and private sectors provide recreation facilities and services and their efforts may compete with and/or complement each other.

It would be enlightening to enumerate how many of each type of recreation facility whether a campground, zoo or swimming pool, are provided by each sector. This would establish if either plays a distinct role in meeting public demand. To date, no such study has been done to determine the total role of either sector, and to do so for all of Canada or even British Columbia would be a major task well beyond the scope of this study. To complete such an inventory for even a small area such as Vancouver Island would require careful preparation and time-consuming collection and compilation of data. Hopefully the Canada Outdoor Recreational Demand Study presently being undertaken will provide some data on this issue. Obviously, there are some differences both in the type and quality of service each sector provides, but to pursue the issue any further would be of little value. It is enough to state that both public and private sectors are often in competition as they try to provide the same type of product.
The motivation in offering the product is probably more evident than any differences in the product being offered. The private sector offers facilities and services as a business enterprise attempting to earn a profit. The public sector provides similar facilities and services but as a service to the public. Although fees may be assessed in public campgrounds, they have traditionally been collected to cover costs and not to earn profits.

In conclusion, the developmental role of the public sector and the entrepreneurial role of the private sector are related since they both provide facilities and services to meet the leisure needs of the public.

The Regulatory Role

A second major way in which the public and private recreation sectors are related results from the regulatory power of government. Regulations are made regarding sanitary standards, highway access, directional signs, land-use zoning and sub-division. All these regulations can affect the economic viability of a private recreation enterprise. For example, the imposition of compulsory sewage treatment as opposed to the use of septic tanks can force a private operator into large capital expenditures. Unfortunately, these regulations are quite often applied in an uncoordinated manner which results from three circumstances.

The first circumstance is that regulations can arise from any of the three levels of government. The municipal government may set up zoning by-laws; the provincial government, access restrictions to public highways; and the federal government, wharf requirement on navigable waters. Given these separate areas of responsibility, the private recreation
enterprise may find himself in a battlefield of overlapping and conflicting jurisdictions or even worse, in a jurisdictional void.

The second circumstance is the regulation of private recreation enterprises done by government agencies and departments which may be non-recreation oriented. Although the result may be unintentional, the policies of these non-recreation agencies may conflict with each other and with those departments whose prime responsibility is recreation. This might occur when a Department of Tourism is spending thousands of dollars on tourist promotion and the Department of Highways begins to tighten regulations on roadside advertising and directional signs. Another example relates to the land taxation policies of government. Too often the property taxes assessed on land used primarily as a private recreation enterprise may be prohibitive.

Owners usually must pay agricultural land taxes, although like small woodlots; the lands do not produce the usual crop revenues. If they own lake-shore frontage, a footage tax may be charged. They may have to pay taxes on their developments, including picnic tables, fireplaces, etc. . . .the taxes increase and may become prohibitive. Thus, an important open space and recreational area becomes a new housing. . . development.

(Cornwell, 1963, p. 52)

Here is clear evidence of a non-recreation government agency administering policies that can be have widespread although unintentional affects on the supply of recreational opportunities.

The regulations of non-recreation public agencies may not have to be applied directly against private recreation enterprises to affect their operations. Consider that many people merely set up their tents, trailers and camper-trailers outside a public or private campground.
If police or Department of Highways officials do not discourage this "overnighting" in empty fields, on side roads or in picnic areas, then potential customers are not forced to use private public campgrounds. Nothing would be more discouraging to private campground operators than to have four or five potential customers spending the night along the shoulders of a nearby road.

The third circumstance in which the regulatory role of government and the private sector are related is difficult to label. Here, the concern is the indirect affect that the policy of public recreation agencies can have on private recreation enterprises. Rather than regulations to govern the operation of private enterprise, attention is placed on the management policies of public recreation agencies as they regulate their own facilities. A decision to delay the implementation of user-fees in public campgrounds can often place the private operator in a non-competitive position. A decision to create a system of public campgrounds can restrict opportunities for private enterprise. Another example refers to the level of services available in public campgrounds. If a policy decision is made to refrain from the installation of electricity, hot water, laundry facilities, boat rentals, etc., then the private sector has an opportunity to provide a more sophisticated level of service to the public.

Important as these issues are to resolve, the concern at this point, is to make clear how the public sector in its regulatory capacity is related to the private sector, not to offer solutions for new legislation.
The Promotional Role

In the introduction to this chapter, Baker (1964) stated that the promotional role of government has two aspects. The first deals with the publicizing of the recreational potential and the other with the provision of inducements to encourage the development of recreation resources by private entrepreneurs. Each aspect will be considered separately.

The publicizing of the recreation potential of a country, province or region generally has two components. First, there is advertising designed to attract people's attention to the recreational assets of the area whether a nation, province or region. Secondly, there is the information services needed to answer the particular inquiries once people have responded to the initial advertising program.

Obviously, those in charge of advertising programs wish to present their region in the best possible light and will stress the prime attractions which cater to large numbers of people. Unfortunately there is a paradox here since many of these attractions are capable of their own advertising programs. The small recreation attraction which can least afford its own promotion is often ignored by the government-sponsored advertising agencies. This is particularly true at the local level where in addition to being featured in brochures, maps, etc., the large recreation attractions are often given further advantages by the erection of directional signs. Even if potential customers overcome the barrage of "big-time" advertising and learn about some smaller attraction they might wish to patronize, they are often frustrated in their efforts to locate their destination.
Still, it can be stated that in this advertising aspect of the promotional role, government has recognized the contribution that the private sector offers in the provision of recreation opportunities. In British Columbia, the provincial government states as a matter of public record that the "tourist industry" ranks third amongst all industry.

In this regard, private recreation has in many cases by-passed the traditional emphasis on the philosophical interpretation of recreation based on intrinsic, personal values of aesthetic experiences that defy objective evaluation. The task of placing a value on a solitary walk in the wilderness or a view of Lake Louise has numerous pitfalls. Now, . . . when trying to make an objective claim for desired and usually much higher, appropriations for governmental agencies . . . The per family expenditures made enroute to and on the way home from parks now are cited frequently . . . .The expenditures from an annual average of two dozen tourists per day in a community is a tax-base equivalent of a one hundred thousand dollar a year industry payroll. . . . Recreation benefits now are considered a significant economic factor and are more easily distinguishable and more accurately measurable than the former elusive, aesthetic factor.

(Twardzik, 1965, p. 97)

This fundamental change in efforts to place values on recreation will do much to force government to increasingly recognize the role that the private sector has to offer.

Yet government, despite readily accepting its role in promoting the private sector via advertising, has been somewhat slower in accepting or even recognizing its role in encouraging the development of recreation resources by private enterprise. It would appear that government has just sat back and waited for private entrepreneurs to respond to opportunities without having any uniform policy as to the kind of opportunities these will be or should be.
Suggested Government Assistance Policies

At this point, it should be obvious that private recreation enterprises and the public sector in its role as a regulator or an alternative supplier of facilities and services, are related. Let us then assume two things. First, the private sector is necessary because the public sector alone cannot meet the ever-increasing demands of the public for recreation facilities and services. Given the free enterprise nature of our economy, the provision of recreation facilities and services by the private sector is to be expected. That governments admit the private sector has a role to play in meeting the recreational demands of the public should be evident from the large sums of money spent on tourist promotion of all recreational opportunities, whether public or private. That this assumption has in fact been accepted by public officials will be explored in Chapters IV, V, and VI. Second, the economic viability of private recreation enterprises, particularly campgrounds is sufficiently precarious to warrant implementation of public policies designed to provide some sort of "subsidy" for private operators. That the economic viability of many private recreation enterprises is marginal is substantiated in Chapter II. Implicit in this assumption is an acceptance that a small subsidy towards marginal private recreation enterprises is preferable and probably cheaper than a full-scale expansion of public facilities to replace substandard private facilities.

... a judgment will be made on how the total amount of public money allocated for recreation should be distributed. This determination may well be based on cost-benefit analyses designed to answer the question, Will the public welfare benefit more from investment of public funds in additional subsidization
of private development of the simple recreation activities or from continuing to almost wholly subsidize public development of the same type of recreation activities?

(Twardzik, 1965, p. 97)

Probably this position and the related issue of user-fees at public campgrounds should in fact be substantiated but again this is a project of a scale beyond the scope of this paper.

Given the two previous assumptions, the following outlines how public policies could assist private recreation enterprises. These government policies are presented as open-ended options of what could be done and not as what should be done. Further, any program of assisting private recreation enterprises will vary from area to area depending on the level of government, historical policy precedents, regional resident and tourist user demands, etc.

Initially, the legislative and executive branches either at federal or provincial levels must explicitly state that it is their policy to assist private recreation enterprises. For the Minister of Recreation and Tourism to establish a policy of aiding private recreation enterprise operators is futile if such an overall goal is not also being initiated by the Departments of Health, Highways, Finance, etc. All government departments must have the same goals if the numerous areas of overlapping jurisdictions are not going to be the focus of conflicting policies. Probably one government department should be assigned the task of directing and coordinating this new policy of assistance to the private recreation sector. All departments would have to acknowledge this goal however.

As a second step, it would be necessary to coordinate the roles of public recreation facilities with those of the private sector. This might
involve a statement of what facilities and services are to be provided and by whom. For example, it might be that public campgrounds will not provide laundromats, grocery stores, boat rentals, showers nor will water, sewer and electricity be available at each individual campsite. This type of statement would help to delineate what services a private operator could provide without entering into direct competition with the public sector. Another example pertaining to this category would be a policy of prohibiting roadside camping outside designated areas. This policy would serve to create more customers for both private and public campgrounds.

A similar issue to be included in this category is the definite collection of user fees at public campgrounds. Here again is a means of placing the private operator in a more competitive position. The location and size of future public sector campgrounds would be planned with reference to minimizing conflicts with private operators. In remote locations where seasons are short and business prospects slim, the public sector might be expected to construct needed facilities. In some major tourist areas however (i.e. Okanagan, Vancouver Island) where demand is high, the climate provides for a longer season and here the private sector should be encouraged to build campsites while the public sector could concentrate on day-use facilities.

A third type of government assistance to private recreation enterprises could be for public agencies to assume responsibility for all major advertising. This could be on a provincial scale as well as on a regional and local scale. A program of roadside directional signboards could be implemented.
A fourth type of government assistance to private operators could be a loan program to assist in the establishing, up-grading or expanding of facilities. Too often government loan programs such as the Industrial Development Bank are set up to supply several hundred thousand dollars to build a motel or resort, but they will ignore a private campground operator who needs only a few hundred dollars for building hot showers and a laundry room.

A fifth type of assistance could be a program of technical and management services offered to the private recreation operator. This information service would be initiated by the government department assigned prime responsibility for the assistance program. From this department, the private operator could obtain information to assist him in constructing campground sites, washrooms, playgrounds, marinas, breakwaters, picnic shelters, water and sewer systems, etc. Included could be sample layouts and designs, cost estimates, etc. Aside from this technical data, the operator could also obtain information on management problems, insurance, bookkeeping, advertising, public relations, etc.

In addition to these kinds of information services, full implementation of the program would probably require field personnel. These field officers could visit the private operators at the location of the proposed or existing enterprise and offer suggestions on the development of the site or the management of the enterprise.

The government department via its field officers could offer a sixth form of assistance by conducting a program of research designed to collect the data necessary to improve the present management of private
private recreation enterprises and plan future expansion by the private and public sectors.

A seventh form of assistance by government agencies to assist the private recreation sector could be in the field of insurance coverage. The premiums of liability insurance to protect the operator against claims arising from accidents involving paid guests can be prohibitive. To pay insurance premiums can substantially increase the operating expenses for a business enterprise and in fact be the difference between a profit and breaking even. Yet to operate without adequate protection might result in devastating financial losses.

An eighth point in the government program would be a review of taxation policies as they relate to private recreation enterprises. Traditional taxation methods where recreation enterprises are assessed as agricultural or commercial uses of land have proven inadequate and often force the operator to convert his land to other uses. If retaining recreation enterprises, particularly those adjacent to urbanized areas, is deemed to be in the best interests of society, alternative systems of taxation will be to be devised.

In review, it appears that no single one of these assistance programs offers a significant boost to a private recreation enterprise. We do know however that private recreation enterprises are often marginal economic operations and that some sort of assistance is necessary if they are to survive. Collectively the types of assistance outlined above, if jointly implemented, might reduce the costs, attract customers and enable more enterprises to prosper.
Public Issues Arising Out of the Role of the Private Sector

The foregoing attempted to show how the public and/or private provision of recreation services are related. Probably evident in that analysis was an implicit assertion that the public sector should coordinate and encourage the role of the private recreation sector in meeting the ever-increasing demands of recreationists. This assertion is based on a feeling that many actions by private recreation enterprise managers have implications beyond the profit or loss statement of his business. The following will attempt to relate several of these implications arising out of the role of the private sector when considering the general public welfare.

The first instance occurs under the heading of obsolescence. In modern society, technology, increased leisure, and more disposable income have created new demands for recreation that were unanticipated several years ago. What does the future hold? The only safe prediction is that things will change. Ever increasingly, government is forced to help some industrial concern, labor group or individuals whose resources and skills have become outmoded. Obviously in the area of recreation a physically attractive area with forest and water may retain its usefulness under changing conditions. Unfortunately, facilities become obsolete before their investment can be repaid. As an example, today most motels are comparable to hotels in class of service and the roadways are dotted with derelict "motor courts" which were in vogue during the 1950's. Given this factor, government must beware of a policy of formally encouraging capital investment by the private sector in recreation enterprises that might soon
be passed by because of new tastes acquired by sophisticated recreationists. Private operators can often make poor investment choices via their own management decisions without the added pitfall of shortsighted advice from well-meaning public officials.

A second area of public concern is environmental quality. This issue is one that should concern the recreation sector as much as the operators of pulp mills and the producers of insecticides. In many instances the user demand for a particular recreation site is in excess of the carrying capacity of that site. Examples of this include a surplus of hunters and fishermen within a limited area, erosion of alpine meadow trails, or a potpourri of fishermen, canoeists, swimmers, and water skiers all trying to use the same small lake.

Private enterprises which provide outdoor recreation to members of the public on a price or payment basis, in the expectation of a profit, are under constant pressure to increase the intensity of recreation use of their area. Such businesses often have relatively high fixed costs; a little more use may mean a much higher net income, in the short run. But a "little more" use may well mean a long-run deterioration of the area, physically or in terms of satisfactions per unit of use or both. . . .

... In each case, the situation is somewhat like that of a farmer considering soil conservation practices. Adoption of these latter may mean reduced income in the immediate future, or increased expenses, or possibly both; but neglect is likely to mean long-run losses in productive capacity of the land. Present and future costs and benefits must be balanced, as well as advantages and disadvantages of intensive as compared with extensive use of the resources. In the case of private outdoor recreation, the problem is made more difficult by the fact that losses in quality may be small and gradual, yet cumulative over periods of years until they can be overwhelming and nearly irreversible.

(Clawson and Knetsch, 1969, pp. 178-79)
Another issue which places the role of the private sector in limbo is user fees. Should users of recreation facilities be expected to pay or is recreation a social good which should be supported by society at large? Clarification of this question by the government will be a major step towards defining the role of the private sector.

The issue of "open space" and adequate recreation opportunities for the public will be one of increasing concern. If the total number of acres of public lands are deemed inadequate, it is essential that some private lands be maintained "green" and accessible to the public, even if only upon payment of fees. Incentives must be given to encourage some private lands to be kept for recreational use and not converted to high-density residential or industrial use, or subdivided into single-family cottage lots. The issue here is to create the financial mechanisms to make it possible for the private recreation operator to stay in business; otherwise at some time in the future, the public purse will be faced with the expensive task of buying back these private lands to create open space.

**Conclusion**

It is clear that a public policy designed to encourage development of private recreation enterprises will have numerous and far-reaching effects on future public recreation policy.

The most obvious effect of the increase in private form recreation developments is an increase in competition between the private recreation sector and the public recreation sector.

(Twardzik, 1965, p. 95)
Traditionally, private recreation investments were made in high-cost facilities and services generally associated with resorts. Public facilities were related to the provision of tent camping and the associated activities of picnicking, swimming, hiking and fishing. Today, the dividing line that keeps separate the efforts of the public and private sector in providing the simple type of recreation has disappeared. Now the private sector is still providing motels, hotels, resorts, etc., but it is also providing small roadside campgrounds.

Because of the emerging threat of unfair competition with private landowners, the public sector may be forced to provide leadership and institute a new era of cooperation between both sectors.

(Twardzik, 1965, p. 95)

Despite the fact that it is difficult to accurately assess the total roles played by either sector, it is generally true that the literature generally overemphasizes the role played by the public sector. This assertion holds true when considering either the developmental, regulatory, or promotional roles of the public sector. Data on the public sector is easier to obtain, primarily because of the centralized nature of their administrative structure. One central office whether federal, provincial or municipal, can generally provide user data on a larger number of facilities and sites. Because the private sector is segmented into thousands of independent business enterprises, data collection is obviously more difficult. The same problem is evident when collecting data on investment patterns by private entrepreneurs as opposed to public agencies.

Because of this centralized administrative pattern, it is much easier for the public sector to initiate research projects. Although
several specific studies of privately owned resources used for outdoor recreation have added to our knowledge

...without exception, these have been one-shot studies, not ones that lead to continuous data series. They have mostly focused on numbers and acreage of areas. Some of them have included additional information on investment, employment, and users. But what has been most notably lacking is information on numbers of visitors, their origin, costs of visits, and similar data.

(Clawson and Knetsch, 1969, p. 206)

So despite the overwhelming predominance of information on the public sector, it is not fair to assert that this sector has a greater role to play in meeting the recreation needs of the public. To date, it can only be stated that more attention has been paid to it.

If it is not possible, mainly because of incomplete data, to state that one sector has a quantitatively larger role to play, we might ask whether each offers a qualitatively different recreational experience. This question is not meant in the sense of asking whether or not one sector is better suited to provide recreation facilities and services. Rather it is intended to ask whether or not one sector provides a different type of facility or service. To answer the first question is to open a whole series of issues beyond the scope of this chapter. The issue of the relative merits of public versus private enterprise in the field of recreation is a study in itself. In any case, this chapter is concerned with how the two sectors are related but will not advocate either side. The second question asks whether one sector provides a different type of service or facility. This is not to ask whether one provides zoos and the other, a fishing resort. Rather it is more subtle differences we are looking
for--as a zoo compared to a game farm. More particularly this question asks: is camping at a privately-owned campground different from a public campground? This is asked not in the sense of one being cleaner, cheaper, larger or smaller. Instead the question might well be stated: does the campground operated by one sector offer a significantly different recreational experience than one offered by the other sector?

To date, the research conducted has failed to answer this question. A co-author of the ORRRC Study Report on Private Outdoor Recreation Facilities stated:

... we used a combination of mailed questionnaires and interviews. We asked the people completing the forms or being interviewed to list the first three recreation activities popular at their facilities... But the point is, we asked the managers of the facilities, not the users, to answer a question that only users should be asked to answer.

(Johnson, 1962, p. 5)

Where user-studies have been undertaken, they have been based on questionnaires completed by users at state or federal park or forest recreation sites. ORRRC Study Report No. 5, The Quality of Outdoor Recreation: As Evidenced by User Satisfaction, was based on questionnaires completed by users while at twenty-four public recreation areas. That portion of the Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study conducted in British Columbia during the summer of 1970 was based on samples at three sites, all of which were provincial parks.

... it becomes apparent that user samplings made at public facilities reflect a different universe of outdoor recreation interests from that served by private enterprise and evidently are not representative of the national universe. If this observation is valid, privately owned or operated facilities also can be said to
meet a need that public ones cannot or do not meet. The next analytical step is to determine the areas of interchangeability, competition, complementarity, and obvious superiority of one kind of ownership-management over the other.

(Johnson, 1962, p. 6)

In review of the chapter, it can be stated that because of the complexities of recreation, the public and private sectors are entwined by a complex set of relationships. To sort out the issue, two things are needed. One is more research as indicated in the previous paragraphs. The second is government acceptance of the challenge of leadership in the provision of the entire range of recreational opportunities and not just the management of its own facilities. The following statement while made to public recreation officials from municipal agencies can still apply to recreation leaders at the federal and provincial levels.

One specific way that local park and recreation agencies can expand their roles in this regard is to assume a leadership role for coordination of all recreation efforts in the community. . . . The park and recreation executive and staff and board should be working at expanding the commercial and private recreation sectors with the same vigor and enthusiasm as they do in gaining public support for the acquisition of additional park-lands.

. . . Envision, if you will, a community park and recreation master plan that extends beyond our present simplistic system of green spaces and community centres and playground programs to a truly comprehensive plan that includes commercial recreation developments and private recreation programs. Once we begin to plan for the community, instead of for our traditional areas of competency, then we are well on the way to providing a public service truly relevant to our clientele.

(Twardzik, 1969, p. 9)
CHAPTER IV

GOVERNMENT POLICY AND THE PRIVATE RECREATION SECTOR--

THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

The major reference point for all outdoor recreation research in the United States is the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This monumental facts finding commission was initiated by an act of the U. S. Congress, June 28, 1958. The fifteen member Commission consisted of four members from each of the Senate and the House of Representatives plus seven citizens representing recreation and conservation groups.

The Commission was assigned the task of investigating all aspects of outdoor recreation. As defined in the enabling legislation, outdoor recreation resources meant land and water areas irrespective of ownership, which provided opportunities for outdoor recreation. Not included were recreation facilities and programs usually associated with urban development (i.e. playgrounds, stadia, golf courses, zoos, etc.).

The Commission was aided by an advisory council of twenty-five citizens plus liaison members from those federal agencies with direct interest and responsibility for any phase of outdoor recreation. The legislation explicitly stated that representatives from private recreation organizations, both voluntary and commercial, were to be included on the advisory council.
In addition, the legislation made specific mention that the role of private recreation must be included within the scope of the study.

Section 6 (a) The Commission shall proceed as soon as practicable to set in motion a nationwide inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, directly and through the Federal agencies, the States, and private organizations and groups, . . .

(b) The Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation, and other factors shall determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976 and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should be best adopted and what programs be initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

Section 7 The Commission, in its inquiries, findings, and recommendations, shall recognize that present and future solutions to problems of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities are responsibilities at all levels of government, from local to Federal, and of individuals and private organizations as well. . . .

(United States Congress, Public Law 85-470, Approved June 28, 1958)

Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Recommendations

The Commission set up several sub-committees to investigate special topics such as hunting, fishing, water resources, user-demand, user-satisfaction, finances, open-space, wilderness, etc. Of 27 study reports submitted to the Commission, Volume 11 was entitled "Private Recreation Enterprises". Many of the conclusions of that report were used in Chapter II when outlining the major characteristics and problems of private recreation enterprises. The recommendations of the study group were:
1. Greater emphasis should be placed by all levels of government on the larger role that private enterprise can and needs to have in providing the facilities and services required for outdoor recreation. Programs for public information about the role of private enterprise in outdoor recreation need to be emphasized and strengthened.

2. Public relations programs need to be developed by private recreation enterprise to explain its position, its functions, and its problems to the public--its potential customers.

3. Both research and technical assistance programs need to be developed to help new recreation enterprises get started and to help established enterprises improve their operations. Research on possible new fields of outdoor recreation is needed. The assistance programs could well foster development of new fields of endeavor by private enterprise. Technical assistance including educational and informational services for owners, operators, and employees in this field is needed also.

4. Financial assistance, through simplified borrowing procedures, guaranteed loans, public loan programs, or other appropriate means, needs to be made available to competent persons developing privately owned recreation facilities of acceptable quality for public use.

5. Research is needed to determine the impact of laws, codes, regulations, policies, taxes, licenses, inspections, required reports, and other regulatory or administrative requirements of the various levels of government to learn where they impose undue hardship or discrimination. The results from this research (both positive and negative) could be translated into necessary reforms to alleviate unsatisfactory situations and to facilitate favorable ones.

6. Agencies at all levels of government might well initiate informational and educational programs to help improve the behavior of persons using recreation facilities. Private recreation, as an industry, could cooperate in this activity.

7. Law-enforcement programs need to be strengthened or extended to help private (and public) recreation-resource managers combat the vandal, the thief, the litterer, and others who carelessly or maliciously cause damage to recreation facilities.

If these guides are followed—if private operators, public agencies, and the people using recreation facilities work together toward the common goal—the total supply of
outdoor recreation resources available for use will be increased and the satisfactions the public gain from use of these resources will be multiplied.

(ORRRC Study Report No. 11, 1962, p. xvii)

The Commission used the study reports and their recommendations to compile their report to the President. This Report entitled, "Outdoor Recreation for America", contained a summary of all facts learned by the study groups and a list of recommendations of what government action was needed to meet the future recreation needs of America.

The section of the Report dealing with the private role began:

Because of the nature of the problems, much of this report has been devoted to recommendations for government action. This is necessary because so many facets of the subject must be considered in terms of the responsibilities and programs of government at all levels. The activities of private landowners and suppliers of food and services in meeting public needs for outdoor recreation will be governed chiefly by the prospect for broad scope and cover such a wide variety of situations as to make impracticable the framing of specific recommendations. Even this chapter, therefore, which is devoted to the private role, must deal largely in terms of the relationship of government to the private sector.

Outdoor recreation, unlike such a service as police protection, cannot be the responsibility of government alone. General access to the out-of-doors and simple facilities should be made available to everyone, but the more specialized activities are among the good things of life that must be paid for by the individual who wishes them. Government can help make opportunities available and can carry out projects in the public interest that cannot be done privately, but it does not, cannot, and should not provide for all the outdoor recreation needs of every citizen.

This individual responsibility in turn creates a market for private enterprises, and, as pointed out earlier, outdoor recreation is big business. The desire for
experience in the outdoors provides customers for automobiles and trailers, patrons for resorts, passengers for common carriers, and an important market for hundreds of goods and services, ranging from climbing boots to yachts, and from film developing to overnight accommodations.

With this in mind, the Report made the following recommendations:

Recommendation 11-1: Government agencies should stimulate diversified commercial recreation investments on private lands and waters.

Expansion plans appear to be limited by the availability of capital.

Another problem is the high cost of personal liability insurance, taxes, special government licenses, taxes, fees, and regulatory measures increase overhead costs and make operations difficult.

Technical assistance would be useful in helping new enterprises to start and established ones to improve their operations.

Recommendation 11-2: Government agencies should promote greater public recreation use of private lands and waters.

Greater public use of private lands and waters would provide significant quantities of additional recreation opportunities, particularly in parts of the country where population density is high and public resources are limited. There will be a growing need in the future to make greater use of this potential.

Public rights to use private lands and waters—as opposed to outright ownership—can be acquired through voluntary agreements reached with landowners, as well as through public leasing arrangements, tax concessions, and easements.

In addition to the specific section dealing with the private role, another portion of the Report is pertinent to our purposes. Note that under Recommendation 11:1, the Report states that "Even this chapter therefore,
which is devoted to the private role, must deal largely in terms of the relationship of government to the private sector." But as was stated in Chapter III, few government agencies are set up to coordinate all aspects of recreation including liaison with the private sector. The Report recognized this fact in a section entitled "Organizing for the Task." It recommended that a new agency be created within the Department of the Interior. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was to be assigned a coordinate rather than a management role. It was to have no lands or facilities to administer. The text of the Commission Report explaining why a new bureau was needed is included in Appendix A. Figure 1 shows where the new bureau would fit into the existing administrative framework.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

A recent publication in the Praeger Library of United States Government Departments and Agencies gives several insights into how the Report of the ORRRC was received. (Fitch and Shanklin, 1970, pp. 79-88) The Report was favourably received by the administration of the newly-elected President, J. F. Kennedy. Led by the efforts of Stewart K. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, many of the recommendations of the Report became accepted policies of the government and several resulted in new legislation.
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Within two months after Laurance Rockefeller had submitted his commission's report and within one month after President Kennedy had given it his blessing, Secretary Udall... on April 2, 1962, signed Secretarial Order 497, which created the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation... The BOR began its prestatutory life with authority to conduct outdoor recreation resource surveys, to initiate and promote research on a coordinated basis, to act as an information centre for outdoor recreation facts, and to begin work on a nationwide outdoor recreation plan.

(Fitch and Shanklin, 1970, p. 82)

On May 28, 1963, Congress passed the Outdoor Recreation Act; which, although it did not give statutory recognition to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, made the outdoor recreation authority and functions enumerated the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. The full text of this Act is included in Appendix B. An organizational chart of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is shown in Figure 2.

In addition to the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963, a second piece of legislation was very significant. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act became effective January 1, 1965, and

... authorized the Secretary of the Interior to grant matching funds to the states for the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation lands and facilities... The Secretary... as administrator of these grant programs, delegated his authority to the Bureau... which... acquired a powerful tool for the promotion of its outdoor recreation objectives...

(Fitch and Shanklin, 1970, p. 89)

In addition, certain funds were transferred to the BOR from appropriations for the National Park Service.

The foregoing has shown how the ORRRC led to the formation and funding of a new Bureau whose prime function was to coordinate government
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action towards outdoor recreation. Let us now examine how these new official policies affected private recreation. To date, opinion is still mixed with regards to the placing of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within the Department of the Interior. Some persons advocated that the BOR should have been an advisory agency reporting directly to the President. Still given that there are some thirty federal government departments and agencies, administering programs related to outdoor recreation, it is unlikely that the BOR, no matter where it was placed in the hierarchy, could ever achieve overall control of all aspects of federal policy making.

The BOR, by its very existence, has furthered the cause of coordination by serving not as a command post, but as a focal point for federal outdoor recreation activities. (Fitch and Shanklin, 1970, p. 119)

One aspect of the role assumed by the BOR has received nearly unanimous approval.

For the first time, there exists a central government source of outdoor recreation information that covers federal departments and agencies, state and local governments, and private organizations of both the profit and non-profit variety. The comprehensive collection of data begun by the ORRRC is thus kept up to date. (Fitch and Shanklin, 1970, p. 119)

**Department of Agriculture**

One effect of effort of the BOR to coordinate federal programs was that other government departments besides the Department of the Interior became committed to expanding their programs in the field of outdoor recreation. Aside from research programs and information services sponsored by the BOR, the major impetus for government outdoor recreation policies affecting private recreation operators has come from the Department
of Agriculture. Consider the following statement by O. L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture (1961-69).

Let me begin with this prediction: The outdoor recreation needs of the American people cannot now be met . . . nor will they ever be met . . . by the combined efforts of local, state, and federal governments alone. These needs . . . the unsatisfied appetite for open spaces and green areas which grows more rapidly than our population increases . . . will be met only as we turn to the three-fourths of our land area which is in private hands.

(Cornwell, 1963, p. 36)

The Secretary further stated the belief "that in resolving the crisis of abundance in agriculture, we will also resolve the crisis of scarcity in recreation."

The idea was to divert land from surplus crop production to recreational uses rather than let it remain idle. This was not only thought to be a means for orderly land use adjustment, but also a method of creating new jobs, increasing farm and rural income, and conserving natural resources. Such an adjustment could help stabilize local economies and strengthen social institutions without removing land from private ownership or reducing the tax base. (Kern and Driscoll, 1966)

Given this attitude as the basis for department policy, several programs designed to aid the private operator were developed. The main features were to include technical assistance, financial assistance, education, research, and rural areas development. To implement this program, all branches of the United States Department of Agriculture including the Forest Service, Cooperative Extension Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Farmers' Home Administration and the Office of Rural Areas Development, were utilized.
Other Agencies

In addition to the USDA, the United States Department of Commerce via its Area Redevelopment Administration provides Federal financial assistance in the form of loan programs. A specialized independent federal agency, the Small Business Administration, makes loans to individual small-business firms when they are unable to procure financing from private sources on reasonable terms. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior conducts research into forest-wildlife relationships. Private owners can request the consulting services of field officers with regard to woodland and wildlife management.

Effect of New Programs

The restructuring of federal government services and the implementation of new programs had three aspects related to the private recreation sector. One obvious result was a flood of literature on the subject of private recreation enterprises. Nearly every state in the United States carried out research on the income potential from outdoor recreation enterprises. The contents of many of these studies were reviewed in Chapter II. The studies served to develop an expertise among field staff of the USDA. Not only was literature made available for the government staff who served as technical advisors but information brochures were printed in quantities for distribution to the private operators. The topics ranged from "Private Campgrounds as an Alternate Use of Land" to "Managing Farm Fish Ponds for Bass and Trout." More practical topics included Manuals of Septic Tank Practices, Water Supply Systems, Bookkeeping Practices for Campground Operators, and Typical Design Layouts for Campgrounds.
A second result was that USDA field staff, particularly those of the Cooperative Extension Service at Agricultural Experimental Stations were assigned the task of giving on-site advice to individuals who contemplated developing or enlarging private recreation enterprises. Training seminars were held for private operator associations.

Thirdly, a complex often over-lapping program of loan assistance was developed. (Table 9) Millions of dollars of loans were made under these programs. (Tables 10 and 11)

Objectively, these were three tangible indications of an increased government emphasis on assisting private recreation enterprises. Subjectively there were many misgivings about the programs. As early as 1963, some observers were already issuing words of caution.

Failure of these first government sponsored and encouraged endeavors would be injurious to future assistance programs. Careful selection is required on the basis of nearby recreational demand, quality of recreational sites, capabilities of the owner to manage a recreational facility and its clientele, and the availability of expert consultive services for planning and management. The first two criteria for success can be readily evaluated, but the problems of management and planning are not as easily solved. First, operation of recreational facilities for profit depends . . . on the ability of the owner-manager to meet and work with people. Such traits are not particularly common among rural land owners. Secondly, there are very few technicians trained in the planning and operation of outdoor recreation facilities for profit. Most of our experience is derived from public projects where operation in the "red" is accepted as one of the facts of life, yet with this training, and often very little of it, we must help an individual plan a project that will not only earn his livelihood, but also retire a sizable loan, meet the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Agency</th>
<th>Types of Credit Aid</th>
<th>Use of Loan Proceeds</th>
<th>Eligible Borrowers</th>
<th>Maximum Interest Rate</th>
<th>Maximum Maturity</th>
<th>Maximum Loan Size</th>
<th>Maximum Loan to Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small Business Administration (SBA)</td>
<td>Direct loans, participation loans, and loan guarantee</td>
<td>To finance construction, expansion, and other business needs</td>
<td>Small businesses</td>
<td>5 1/2% (4% in distressed areas)</td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic Development Administration (EDA), Dept. of Commerce, formerly Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA).</td>
<td>Direct loans</td>
<td>To finance the purchase or development of land and facilities</td>
<td>Industrial or commercial firms located in designated areas</td>
<td>Depends on current U.S. Treasury rate</td>
<td>25 yrs.</td>
<td>No limitation</td>
<td>65% of project cost, 90% for loan guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers Home Administration (FHA) Department of Agriculture—Farm Ownership Loan Program</td>
<td>Direct loans or loan insurance</td>
<td>To buy or improve farms; produce fish; to finance recreational facilities</td>
<td>Farmers or ranchers operating not larger than family farms</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40 yrs.</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA—Farm Operating Loan Program</td>
<td>Direct loans or loan insurance</td>
<td>Short-term loans including financing recreational enterprises</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5 yrs. to 7 yrs.</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>No limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA—Soil and Water Conservation Loan Program</td>
<td>Direct loans or loan insurance</td>
<td>Acquire or improve water supply systems; shifts in land use for development of recreational facilities, grazing, and forestry</td>
<td>Non-profit rural organizations, farmowners</td>
<td>4 1/2%-5%</td>
<td>40 yrs.; 20 yrs.; with no real estate security</td>
<td>Individuals $60,000 Associations—$500,000; Direct Loans—$1,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Department of Interior</td>
<td>Direct loans</td>
<td>To finance projects promoting economic development among Indians</td>
<td>Indians and their organizations</td>
<td>2-5%, but no restriction</td>
<td>30 yrs.</td>
<td>No limitation</td>
<td>No limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rural Electrification Administration (REA)</td>
<td>Direct loans to cooperatives</td>
<td>To finance the construction and operation of electrical facilities and equipment</td>
<td>Corporations, including cooperatives, States, &amp; other public bodies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10 yrs. Equipment 35 yrs. facilities</td>
<td>No limitation</td>
<td>90% Equipment, 100% facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from information supplied by Federal agencies. (Source: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, 1967)
**TABLE 10**

DIRECT LOANS FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION OF PRINCIPAL FEDERAL CREDIT AGENCIES, 1962-64

(Value, in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (now EDA)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific, Alaska, and Hawaii</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico &amp; Virgin Islands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from data supplied by the Federal agencies.

*Also includes SBA's share of participation loans.

(Source: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, 1967)
TABLE 11
TYPES OF FACILITIES FINANCED THROUGH PRINCIPAL FEDERAL CREDIT AGENCIES, 1962-64
(In thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION FACILITY</th>
<th>EDA (ARA)</th>
<th>SBA2/</th>
<th>FHA1/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value %</td>
<td>Value %</td>
<td>Value %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$12,334 100</td>
<td>$30,221 100</td>
<td>$857 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Area</td>
<td>5,271 43</td>
<td>1,876 6</td>
<td>84 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3,869 13</td>
<td>84 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>1,015 8</td>
<td>2,362 8</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Attraction</td>
<td>524 4</td>
<td>na na</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort (Hotel-Motel)</td>
<td>4,702 38</td>
<td>11,032 36</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground picnicking</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>na na</td>
<td>293 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dude Ranch or Vacation Farm</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>na na</td>
<td>82 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Area &amp; Hunting Area</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>na na</td>
<td>113 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin or Cottage</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 na</td>
<td>193 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Stable</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>65 --</td>
<td>61 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>822 7</td>
<td>0 na</td>
<td>28 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from data supplied by the Federal agencies.
1/ Detailed FHA recreation reports were available for about two-thirds of the total outstanding recreation loans, mainly insured loans.
2/ 37% of SBA's recreation allocations could not be described under these facility descriptions since SBA uses the Bureau of the Budget's Standard Industrial Codes; a classification system too broad for this analysis. SBA and EDA data are for direct loans.

(Source: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation)
interest on the capital investment, and offset costly operating expenses. The prudent course, in encouraging new enterprises, is cautious progress, acquiring the needed know-how along the way.

(Cornwell, 1963, p. 38)

Hopefully field staff would not interpret literally the policies of Secretary of Agriculture O. L. Freeman which might be paraphrased "... agriculture once was expected to absorb the urban unemployed during depression, outdoor recreation apparently is being prescribed as a panacea for maladjustments in land uses." (Johnson and Tharp, 1963, p. 314)

The problem arises when the use of resources was shifted from agriculture to outdoor recreation. The new service oriented enterprises require different management techniques and operation practices. Underlying this was a feeling that recreation was different in nature and did not require the same economic considerations as the planning and development of economic activities in other sectors. Outdoor recreation activities face a variety of competitive demands for consumer expenditures. Whether a private owner can capture a portion of these expenditures depends on whether he can supply the services and facilities which possess the characteristics the customer desires. A misinterpretation of gross demand figures and the application of these figures to specific localities may lead to eventual low revenues. Not all government recreation consultants recognized that every rural setting is not a potential recreation bonanza.

Still overall the field officers responsible for conducting research, producing information services and advising farmers were very cautious. From the outset, they recognized the limitations of the management potential of rural area residents.
Recreation especially in rural areas, has long been considered a nonmarket good, and a change in value systems of individuals may be required if marketing of the services is to be profitably accomplished.  
(Kern and Driscoll, 1966, p. 142)

Many of the state-wide research reports on income potentials from outdoor recreation concluded that opportunities for adequate economic returns from investment in recreation facilities were limited. (Holmes, 1963; Owens, 1964; Bird, 1965)

Despite the efforts of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the President's Advisory Council, the policies of some government agencies were bound to conflict. One example occurred within the USDA where the greatest efforts were expended to encourage farmers to convert portions of their land to commercial recreation enterprises. At the same time, the Cropland Adjustment Program contained provisions for increasing farm rates of payment if a farmer agreed to make portions of land available without charge for hunting, fishing and hiking. (Kern and Driscoll, 1966, p. 142)

In fact, the entire program created some inter-agency competition. On the one hand were government agencies lobbying to obtain funds from a limited public purse to encourage the development of private facilities. On the other hand were those government agencies demanding funds to develop increased public facilities. A reconciliation of goals is in order.

To summarize, it appears that in the United States, government officials have made an effort to encourage the private recreation operator. Unfortunately, this program has only been directed to one segment of the diverse population that owns land in rural areas. Obviously private land with potential for outdoor recreation is being used for purposes other than sub-marginal farming. These lands have been ignored.
Even worse is the attempt to include the rural assistance programs outside the context of a comprehensive plan for recreation. It may not be that the shortcomings of any program to assist private recreation enterprises by means of financial aid, technical and management advisors, etc., are contained either within that program or even with the characteristics of the private recreation industry. The failure may still lie with the total inability of public officials to recognize the role of private sector within the total scope of recreation. Despite recommendations of the ORRRC, creation of the BOR and high level policy statements to the effect of acknowledging the role of the private sector, this concept has not been included in the implementation of policy.

Comprehensive Recreation Planning

One other function of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, in addition to its roles of coordination, research and information services, is that of planning which has not yet been reviewed. Within this additional function activities of the United States Department of Agriculture to promote private recreation enterprises should have been integrated. Since they were not, the efforts of the USDA are very fragmented within the total range of recreational opportunities for the private sector. A review of the programs instituted by the USDA is somewhat inconclusive given the perspective of the larger issues. To their credit, it must be acknowledged that the bulk of the literature available on the topic of private recreation enterprises is the result of the USDA and its various agencies, not the BOR. To this end, the USDA must be commended.
It is within the planning function of the BOR that any evaluation of federal programs to utilize the recreation resources of the private sector must occur. One of the main responsibilities of the BOR was to create and maintain a national recreation plan. Although the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963 stated that this plan was to be completed by 1968, the National Recreation Plan is not yet available. In addition, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963 authorized the Department of the Interior through the BOR to grant funds to the state for the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation lands and facilities. These grants were contingent on each state completing its own statewide recreation plan.

Each of those plans is supposed to include consideration of the private sector as a supplier of recreation. To my knowledge, this has not been followed by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in their various studies nor is it part of the proposed National Outdoor Recreation Plan and probably very few states, if any, have it incorporated in their state plans.

It still remains inconceivable to me that within this vast conglomeration of bureaucracies they could seriously discuss these various master plans, or comprehensive plans, as they are called, without taking into serious consideration, the private sector. But nevertheless, they do, and continue to do so.

... I would therefore suggest that the above lack of concern for the private sector specifically calls for an institutional arrangement to accommodate the private sector in comprehensive recreation planning. The framework, however, is not difficult to establish. It's the matter of getting the bureaucracy to accept private recreation as a most significant component in comprehensive planning.
Remember that in most instances, the present generation of recreation planners are educated in the natural resources and they are related almost exclusively to public policy.

(Twardzik, 1970)

It would appear then that despite the impetus of the ORRRC, creation of the BOR, a flood of literature and extensive loan programs, the role of the private sector in outdoor recreation has still to be defined.
CHAPTER V

GOVERNMENT POLICY AND THE PRIVATE RECREATION SECTOR--

THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

In Canada the focus of national attention on outdoor recreation did not come about via a single-purpose study group as was the experience in the United States. In fact Canada, to date, has had no counterpart to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) where the findings of that Commission and its report to the President was a public document designed to direct government action to meet the growing demands for outdoor recreation.

Resources for Tomorrow Conference

In Canada recreation has not been the subject of a single purpose study group. Instead, recreation was only one component of a national conference co-sponsored by the federal government and the ten provinces dealing with Canada's renewable resources. The topics of agriculture, fisheries, forestry, water, wildlife, recreation and regional development were discussed by government administrators, university scholars and representatives of private industry. This national conference, held in Montreal, October 23-28, 1961, was called the "Resources for Tomorrow Conference".
The general objectives of the Conference were (1) identification of the major problems requiring attention in the renewable resources field; (2) examination of what is being done to solve these problems; and (3) clarification of the impediments to further progress and possible courses to achieving solutions to these problems. (Resources for Tomorrow, 1961, Volume II, Foreword)

A series of eighty papers, nine dealing with recreation, were published in two volumes. A third volume contained the proceedings of the plenary and workshop sessions of the conference. While other resource topics such as forestry, fisheries, and agriculture were dealt with assuming a relationship between the public and private sectors, recreation was considered mainly in the light of its administration by public authorities. The issue of what role private enterprise would play in helping to meet the increasing demand for recreational opportunities received some attention but was never given a major emphasis.

A review of portions of the concluding statement by W. M. Baker, Research Coordinator of the Recreation Workshop, shows some concern for the private sector.

Guidelines: A comprehensive balanced research and inventoried program to include many other things.

1. Inventories of supply and demand factors, taking into consideration public and private leisure time activities, programs and facilities with due consideration for commercial and non-commercial aspects.

This inventoried program should include:
(a) Present land use inventory designed to reveal the extent, location and accessibility of public and private forms of development for recreation purposes on both private and Crown lands. Such a survey would include:
(i) In the private sector such items as cottages, summer camps, golf courses, tourist accommodation, commercial parks and picnic areas;

... 3. Operational research directed toward the establishment of criteria and standards for the planning, development and management of natural renewable resources for recreation to include among other things:

(a) Criteria for determining the relative roles of private, commercial, voluntary and government agencies in recreation planning. . . .


For recreation, the Conference produced some tangible results. Most notable was the institution of the Federal-Provincial Parks Conferences, the first of which was held in 1962. Their main function now is to explore possible areas for intergovernmental coordination and cooperation. A technical meeting is held annually, and subcommittees on park classification, outdoor recreation terminology, education, research, land classification, planning and policy hold promise for effective action.

A second result of the Conference was the creation of The Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, which includes representatives from each of the eleven senior governments. A permanent Secretariat was established. During its early years outdoor recreation was largely ignored but recently this topic has been recognized. Now, monthly bulletins from the Council are issued containing reference to all current development concerning natural resources and a considerable emphasis on issues relating to preservation of the environment has occurred. One major work of the Secretariat has been the compilation of a catalogue showing how the federal government and each province organize their departments and agencies to administer the diverse aspects of
outdoor recreation. This document shows how interdepartmental cooperation is essential if recreation resources are to be administered effectively.

A third result of the Conference was the implementation of federal programs designed to promote economic growth in those rural regions of Canada characterized by unemployment and low per capita incomes. Originally, these programs were administered by the Rural Programs Branch of the Department of Forestry and Rural Development. (In 1969, a new federal agency, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion absorbed these programs.) Elsewhere in this chapter, a more comprehensive review of these programs will be referred to under the enabling legislation, the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act (ARDA). Although unintended, these ARDA programs gradually become very important in the field of outdoor recreation resources.

A fourth outcome of the Conference was the recognition of a need to take stock of Canada's natural resources. The Canada Land Inventory has probably had more impact on encouraging intergovernment and intersector communication than any other federal-provincial undertaking. The Canada Land Inventory was conceived to map "the agriculturally settled parts of Canada, and adjoining areas which affect the income and employment opportunities of rural residents, and classify them according to their physical capability for use in agriculture, forestry, recreation and wildlife management and their present use." (Brown, 1968, p. 6) The CLI is administered as part of the ARDA program.

Participants of the Conference came to one general conclusion.

One fact which emerged clearly from the Conference was that the overriding gap in resource development,
administration and management has been the lack of coordination between governments, and between government departments within governments. It has resulted from inadequately defined goals coupled with ill-defined means to reach such goals as may have been enunciated.

(Resources for Tomorrow, 1961, Volume III, Introduction)

Federal Recreation Agencies

In terms of leadership in the area of federal outdoor recreation resource programs, two agencies—the National Parks Branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Rural Development Branch of the Department of Forestry and Rural Development—must be considered. When relating how these programs relate to the private recreation sector one other agency, the Industrial Development Bank must be added. The role of the Rural Development Branch and the Industrial Development Bank will be discussed first and then the National Parks Branch later.

The ARDA Program and Outdoor Recreation

Following the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act (1961) was implemented to relieve rural economic problems across Canada. Federal legislation provided for federal cost-sharing in a variety of rural development programs agreed upon after federal-provincial consultation. Early in this program, the inadequacy of land resource information became apparent and the Canada Land Inventory was conceived. In 1963, mapping of soil capability for agriculture was begun and by 1965, recreation and wildlife classifications were included.
At inception, the ARDA program (now known as the Agricultural and Rural Development Act) was designed primarily for agricultural communities. It was soon broadened however to apply to any rural area defined as disadvantaged according to such criteria as average annual family income and level of education. The ARDA agreement was to provide federal assistance with provincial programs directed towards rural social and economic development and conservation of natural resources. (Brown, 1968, p. 3)

In addition to the normal funding under ARDA legislation, the federal government provided supplementary funds under a program known as FRED (Fund for Rural Economic Development). The FRED program was designed to finance major development projects that would serve to assist in stimulating rural economies but might be beyond the scope of ordinary expenditures of ARDA.

Much like the policy of the United States Department of Agriculture, outdoor recreation was considered as a possible solution to poverty among rural land owners. The ARDA program funded a study by W. M. Baker entitled, The ARDA Program in Relation to Recreation and Tourism. This report, issued in late 1965, did much to direct how ARDA funds would be used.

The ARDA program has had more direct influence on the private recreation sector than any other federal government action. The report by Baker was the first and is still the only comprehensive study on private recreation enterprises ever completed in Canada. Although his frame of reference is very limited, many of his observations are pertinent.
It would be tragic, and indeed inexcusable, if the historic example of the submarginal farm situation, which is in part the result of the introduction of agricultural land settlement schemes formulated upon erroneous conclusions drawn from fragmentary evidence, should be repeated and the sub-marginal farmer be replaced by the sub-marginal recreational entrepreneur.

... Probably a very small percentage of sub-marginal farmers possess the skills required for the successful operation of commercial recreation enterprises. 

... The gradual build-up of capital assets of an enterprise with the use of personal labor for construction, a characteristic of much of the earlier commercial park and highway accommodation of the 1930's, is becoming an increasingly remote possibility. Large blocks of capital are now required to compete in the accommodation industry.

... Recreationists and public park supporters do not desire to see the development of outdoor recreation facilities by public agencies impeded or abandoned in the interest of submarginal farmers. As long as the growth of public facilities was not interfered with unduly, and government programs constituted only a secondary low-key approach to the satisfaction of public needs, no problem would likely emerge. However, it would be a national disaster if the evolution of the public park systems of Canada were undermined or seriously impaired in the interest of submarginal farmers. Past experience indicates that private development cannot provide that degree of permanency and stability that the public requires in the development of parks and outdoor recreation facilities.

... In fact, there is a distinct possibility that before the turn of the century, a program similar to ARDA could be required to rescue submarginal regions and tourist development entrepreneurs in some parts of North America, if care is not exercised in development procedures.

... The ultimate range of outdoor recreation developments and the facilities with which the ARDA program theoretically could become involved is grouped into two categories: (1) Travelway facilities such as scenic drives, roadside picnic and campsites, and (2) Destination area facilities comprising provincial and regional
parks, public hunting and fishing, nature reserves and preserves, historical sites, etc.

The latter category is probably most appropriate from the standpoint of the objectives of the ARDA program. . . .

(Baker, 1966, p. 2, 3, 7, 9, 19, 21)

A review of ARDA funds committed to research and development of recreation resources up to July, 1968, gives an indication of how some of Baker's recommendations were implemented.

TABLE 12

FEDERAL FUNDS COMMITTED TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF RECREATION AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES UNDER ARDA AND FRED FROM APRIL 1, 1965, TO JULY 1, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>ARDA Agreement</th>
<th>FRED Agreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td>258,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>6,300,000</td>
<td>6,533,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>9,225,000</td>
<td>9,967,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>1,838,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,838,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>1,067,000</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>2,837,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>1,008,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,008,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>293,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6,170,000</td>
<td>17,295,000</td>
<td>23,465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Brown, 1968, p. 4)
It is evident that large sums of money were allocated for recreation. New Brunswick, Manitoba and Quebec received the bulk of the funds because these provinces contained regions designated as Special Areas to receive the highest priority under the rural development program.

In general, few funds were directed to establish or expand private recreation enterprises. It was felt that rural residents generally did not have the management skills necessary to operate their own business enterprises. Instead, the bulk of the funds were used to construct major public facilities (i.e. national park in the Gaspe Bay region and a new provincial park in New Brunswick) Both were included within the FRED program. This act was to serve two purposes. The construction and later the management of these public facilities was to provide job opportunities for rural residents. Secondly, it was hoped that these large public facilities would serve as a magnet to draw large numbers of visitors to the areas. Hopefully, this potential market would encourage private capital to invest in commercial recreation facilities designed to supplement the public offerings.

The ARDA program to use recreation projects to stimulate rural economies can only have limited application. Not all regions of Canada have sufficiently attractive natural resources suitable for intensive use recreation. In addition, it is sometimes difficult to find large blocks of land still in Crown ownership. The expense of assembling land parcels large enough to warrant public investment is often too exhorbitant in places where private ownership of land is widespread. Because of these limitations the existing ARDA program alone is not sufficient to stimulate opportunities
in the private recreation sector. Other types of federal government programs are still needed. Whether the present ARDA programs were successful in meeting their goals is yet to be determined as the investment under these programs have not been in effect long enough for proper evaluation.

**Industrial Development Bank**

The Industrial Development Bank was established by Parliament in 1944. Its function is to supplement the services of other lending services such as chartered banks and finance companies. The IDB can provide financial assistance to almost every type of business, including manufacturing and commercial business, wholesale and retail trade construction trades, agriculture, transportation, professional services, secondary industry, etc. Funds may be obtained to establish new enterprises or to expand existing ones. Since inception, the IDB has loaned $1,400 million to some 20,800 businesses needing financial assistance. In the 1970 fiscal year, loans outstanding and committed to 12,283 businesses totalled over $555 million. Most loans are for less than $100,000.

In 1961, the Industrial Development Bank was authorized to include tourist and recreational enterprises as qualifying for financial assistance. In the 1969 fiscal year, the IDB had authorized some 300 loans to hotels and motels, and 175 loans to restaurants for an aggregate total of over $25 million. Near the end of 1970, over 400 loans totalling over $20 million had been granted to motels and restaurants in British Columbia. In 1969 and 1970, loans to the tourist industry accounted for 18% of all loans by the IDB. (I. D. B., 1970)
Due to the nature of the categories into which business enterprises are assigned, it is difficult to determine what types of private recreation enterprises are applying for and receiving financial assistance from the IDB. Still it is obvious that tourist facilities, motels and restaurants are receiving the bulk of the funds and that outdoor recreation facilities (campgrounds, marinas, ski lifts, etc.) are generally not included.

In any case, there are three faults in the management of the IDB as it relates to the private recreation sector. First, it assumes a passive stance and does not promote its role as a lending agency to those enterprises that operate outside of the normal business community. The name "Industrial" Development Bank alone would discourage smaller enterprises. In addition, the recreation and tourist sector is not allotted a certain portion of the funds but the total loans depend on how many businesses in all sectors apply. Secondly, the IDB does not offer field services to provide the businessmen with the technical and management advice often necessary to make the enterprise a financial success. Thirdly, the IDB probably acts more in isolation from other government departments involved in outdoor recreation than any other federal agency. Note that Figure 3 does not even include the IDB, although this may be because the IDB is considered as a crown corporation rather than a government department.

National Parks Branch

In terms of the administration of outdoor recreation in Canada at the federal level, no one department or agency has complete responsibility. Some seventeen federal agencies and departments play a role in the field of outdoor recreation. A sampling of their activities shows a range from
Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT OF CANADA</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>LEGAL INSTRUMENTS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION DIRECTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIRECT INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION INDIRECTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, Vol. 1, 1968)
travel promotion by the Department of Trade and Commerce, the building of
marinas and public wharves by the Department of Public Works, migratory
waterfowl management by the Canadian Wildlife Service to the collection of
user surveys by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Figure 3 gives an
overview of all federal departments and legislation related to outdoor
recreation.

Each of these agencies is making a useful contribution
to the understanding, development or use of Canada's
recreation resource base, and is increasing its scale
of operation to keep pace with the growing demand.
However, the scope of each is necessarily narrow. Prior
to 1965, no single federal agency other than National Parks
was involved in a broad way in outdoor recreation program­
ing.

(Brown, 1968, p. 2)

The situation in Canada is much like the one in the United States
prior to the ORRRC. There, the National Parks Service was the federal
agency most concerned with coordinating federal outdoor recreation pro­
grams. This role of coordinator between federal departments and between
federal and state agencies was in addition to its regular task of administer­
ing the lands contained within the National Parks. As a consequence of the
ORRRC, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was created which took over the
role as coordinator, educator and researcher from the National Parks
Service. The BOR could give sole attention to coordinating, etc., since
it had no lands or facilities to administer. In Canada, the National
Parks Branch of the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources
has been the federal agency most concerned with coordinating the role of
the federal and provincial governments in the administration of the outdoor
recreation resource base controlled by the public. In general, it has ignored
the issue of what role the private recreation sector will play.

Evidence of this can be found in the recently implemented Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study. This study as authored by well-known American recreation researcher, J. Knetsch, was administered by the National Parks Branch in conjunction with provincial parks branches. As indicated in the study design (Figure 4), steps 6 and 7 were to be an inventory of the supply of recreation resources. Although some attempt was made to include private recreation enterprises, the comprehensiveness varied greatly from province to province and the results will be inconclusive. Most emphasis will be placed on total acreage of federal, provincial and municipal parks and the facilities contained within them.

More disturbing is the total disregard for the private sector in the user-survey (steps 10, 11, 12) where questionnaires were handed out to a sample of persons in attendance at public facilities. The issue of whether or not users of private recreation facilities and those at public recreation facilities have different attitudes towards their own recreational experiences is ignored in the Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study (CORD). In one respect, this non-inclusion of the private sector in the CORD study is a puzzle. J. Knetsch, author of the study design, can be found elsewhere in the literature of recreation expounding the view that the private sector has a vital role to play in meeting the demand for recreation opportunities and must not be ignored in future research. (Clawson and Knetsch, 1967) Still the CORD Study despite its omission of the private sector will be a milestone in recreation research in Canada and will provide much needed data for administrators of public recreation agencies.
Figure 4

(Source: Knetsch, 1967)
It should be noted that concurrent with the CORD study, several federal departments have been reorganized to focus attention on those aspects of recreation that are related to their basic responsibilities. The most notable examples can be seen within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce where in 1968, the Office of Tourism was established. This office contains two branches: The Travel Industry Branch, whose function is to study and analyze the travel industry in Canada; and the Canadian Government Travel Bureau, whose function is to promote foreign travel to Canada. Information from both these branches is needed in various aspects of the CORD Study. In addition the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, administered by the Department of Trade and Commerce under the Statistics Act, has been revising its information definitions and categories to place more emphasis on facts relating to Canadian recreation habits. (Wolfe and Ellis, 1968)

**Summary and Conclusions**

It can be stated that in its role as coordinator of intergovernment outdoor recreation programs, the National Parks Branch in Canada via the Federal-Provincial Conferences and the CORD Study, has done creditable service. However, to acknowledge this fact is not to suggest that the present situation is adequate. At best, this is only a part of what needs to be done.

Even if we accept the present administrative structure of the federal recreation agencies, one problem is evident. If the CORD study did force various agencies to coordinate data collection, this cooperation
is not yet evident on topics outside the requirements of the CORD Study. Researchers have to probe the bureaucratic jungle not just trying to obtain specific titles but to find if relevant publications exist. If no effort is made to coordinate all aspects of federal government recreation programs beyond the requirements of specific projects at least a coordinated information system would be a substantial improvement. One agency could be assigned to collect and disseminate information on outdoor recreation and maintain a current listing of what literature is available from all sources.

Two other issues still remain—one, the inclusion of the private sector in the framework of a comprehensive approach to recreation resources; and two, the coordination of all recreation-oriented programs implemented by the various federal agencies. In terms of the second issue, the CORD Study has done much to correlate the efforts of the Travel Study and Promotion Service of the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and the ARDA division of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. This coordination however has been a single purpose effort and whether it will continue on topics of a broader scope or over a long period of time is yet to be determined. In the CORD Study, each agency was asked only to supply information, a contribution where there was little likelihood for controversy. Only when each separate agency is required to adjust their own management programs, financial contributions, etc., in response to a call for greater uniformity in directing federal government policies relating to outdoor recreation, will the present coordinating mechanisms be adequately tested.
It remains to be seen whether the National Parks will continue their present leadership role once the CORD Study is completed. As early as 1968, federal government administrators were expressing their doubts.

Considering these factors it would seem unthinkable that the federal government would not eventually expand its role, especially in the fields of research, resource surveys, technical assistance and possible financial assistance to parallel in kind and scale its roles in the management of the other great natural resources of Canada.

The initiative for greater federal participation must, I believe, come from the provinces, for the simple reason that management of the resources is a provincial responsibility. Also, the provincial authorities are much closer to the situation and can more clearly identify the problem areas requiring federal attention.

Most of us here I am sure have watched with some fascination the developments in the outdoor recreation field in the United States over the last few years. Here we see a massive series of programmes, mainly federal in nature, aimed at conserving outdoor recreation space while there is still time. Although historically United States federal agencies have had a far more direct involvement in actual resource management than have their Canadian counterparts, their newest agency in the business, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, has a primarily research and co-ordinating role with no lands under its jurisdiction. It serves very much as a catalytic agent, stimulating broad resource planning, acquisition and development programmes at state and federal levels. The considerable funds it dispenses are contingent on the acceptability of comprehensive state outdoor recreation plans. This is a very vital factor. The funds being administered by this new bureau in the U.S. simply are not available unless a state is prepared to draw up a comprehensive plan for its recreational resources. This is different from the Canadian situation, where the federal government's role to date has been mainly a sort of 'shot in the arm' assistance, as far as the outdoor recreation is concerned...
We have no parallel to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. It could be argued we have now reached this level of recognition of our nationwide outdoor recreation resources.

(Brooks, 1967, p. 19-20)

there is yet no one agency with a mandate to provide national leadership. The recognition given other renewable resources at the federal level, such as agriculture, forestry, water, fisheries and wildlife, is slow coming to outdoor recreation. However, the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the United States has set an example which Canada must inevitably examine.

(Brown, 1968, p. 11)

The federal government has a role to play in coordinating the use of recreation resources across Canada, as it is presently doing within the joint Federal-Provincial Parks Conferences. In addition, the federal government is attempting to create a national parks system, a task that should not be carried out in isolation of the intentions of other recreation agencies. Thirdly, the federal government have greater financial resources "vis-a-vis" its wider taxation powers than do the provinces. Proper placement of these funds for development of outdoor recreation resources will require careful integrated planning by all departments.

For these reasons, one federal agency, needs to be charged with responsibility for coordinating all federal and interprovincial recreation programs. It may be that no having direct responsibility for the major share of Canada's natural resources is an asset rather than a liability in the formulation of Canada's recreation resource policies.
CHAPTER VI

GOVERNMENT POLICY AND THE PRIVATE RECREATION SECTOR--

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA EXPERIENCE

In British Columbia as is the case with the federal government and most other Canadian provinces, the pattern of administration for outdoor recreation is non-integrated. No single government department has been assigned the task of coordinating a comprehensive program to provide a full range of recreation opportunities to meet the demands of the public. (Figure 5)

History

First, a brief chronological review of changes in the organization of the major government departments concerned with recreation. Prior to 1957, the administration of provincial parks was the responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Division of the Forest Service. The Department of Recreation Act (1957) created a new government department and the administration of provincial parks was transferred to this new department. At this time, the Travel Bureau was transferred from the Department of Trade and Industry to the new department. However, in 1967, the Travel Bureau was enlarged and a new Department of Travel Industry was created. In 1970, the Community Programs Branch of the Department of Education was transferred to the Department of Travel Industry to become the Community Recreation Branch. Also, in 1970, the Forest Service of the Department of Lands and
Forests re-entered the field of recreation with the creation of the Forest Recreation Division. This division is to be charged with the responsibility for recreation that occurs outside provincial parks but within the vast areas of land presently administered as provincial forests.

Recreation Administration and the Private Sector

The entire framework of the B. C. provincial government for administration of outdoor recreation can be seen in Figure 5. Reviewing this Figure, it can be seen that several departments have responsibility for regulating the private recreational developer. The Wildlife Act, Water Act, Pollution Control Act, Local Services Act, and Health Act contain sections "specific" to private recreation development. Yet not one of this series of legislation, except the Wildlife Act, is administered by a department that could even remotely be considered as having outdoor recreation as a prime responsibility of its regular activities. It is only when considering legislation where private recreation is an "ancilliary" concern do the two government departments most concerned with recreation and tourism become involved. From this, it is apprent that private recreation sector is not an integral part of the provincial government program of administering outdoor recreation. The private sector is recognized only in the promotional role of government involvement in outdoor recreation.

To understand why the private sector is not formally recognized in comprehensive outdoor recreation resource planning, the two government departments most concerned—Recreation and Conservation, and Travel Industry—with recreation and tourism will be discussed separately. But first, a brief review will be made of the new organizational plans for the Forest Service.
Forest Service

In British Columbia, over 60 per cent of the total area of the province is administered by the Forest Service. For the first several years, the emphasis of the new Forest Recreation Division will be on planning recreational use of these lands. (Marshall, 1971) Funds for development and operations will not be allotted for at least two years. For this reason plus the fact that a formal research program is not anticipated, the total inadequacy of the public administration of recreation on large areas of the province as indicated in Figure 6 is still evident. Also undecided is the issue of how the Forest Service will coordinate the development of recreation facilities on those forest lands being logged by private industry.

Department of Recreation and Conservation

The internal organization of the Department of Recreation and Conservation is shown in Figure 7. Evident is the fact that the four branches are concerned only with administrative activities in a public recreation setting. In simple terms, this department deals only with recreation on public lands. The responsibilities of the Department of Recreation and Conservation are defined by provincial statute:

The Department of Recreation and Conservation has charge of all matters relating to the administration of this Act and the administration of the Wildlife Act, the British Columbia Government Travel Bureau Act, the Fisheries Act, the Park Act, the Provincial Museum Act, and the Regional Parks Act.

(B. C. Provincial Statutes, Chapter 110, Department of Recreation and Conservation Act, 1967, Section 5)
## Administrative Activities of Provincial Departments of Forestry-Western Canada-1968

### Figure 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Activities</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RECREATION SETTINGS</td>
<td>MAN SASK ALTA BC</td>
<td>MAN SASK ALTA BC</td>
<td>MAN SASK ALTA BC</td>
<td>MAN SASK ALTA BC</td>
<td>MAN SASK ALTA BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Preserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Preserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Public Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable Streams, Riv &amp; Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Navigable Streams, Riv &amp; Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, *The Administration of*
The Department is responsible for outdoor recreation only as specified in other statutes. Excluding the management of fish and wildlife resources, the Department is responsible only for recreation that occurs within provincial parks. More correctly, the member of the cabinet heading the Department should be titled Minister of Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is Minister of Recreation in title only and not by the nature of his tasks as enumerated in the statutes.

The 1971 session of the Provincial Legislature was the scene of debate on this issue. Member of the Legislature, H. Capozzi, provoked both the legislative chairman and the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, K. Kiernan, when he wished to ask questions about "recreation" in British Columbia. To Capozzi, "recreation" was not just hunting and fishing, or hiking and camping in provincial parks. His concern was for swimming, physical fitness and community recreation facilities. On several occasions, the chairman attempted to rule Mr. Capozzi "out of order" because his questions did not relate to the existing responsibilities of the Minister. (Vancouver Sun, April 1, 1971, p. 16)

Since Capozzi was referring more to community recreation than to outdoor natural resource based recreation, his comments may appear inappropriate to this study. But it does add evidence to the claim that under the present framework, the Minister of Recreation and Conservation is "Minister of Recreation" in title only. Probably if Capozzi had asked questions about hiking outside of provincial parks, he would again have been ruled out of order.

However the public demands that the government, and thus the Minister and his department, be responsible for all aspects of recreation, not just
those defined by the legislation. Increasingly, the Minister is asked by his colleagues or the public to deal with problems and projects that may only indirectly relate to provincial parks. At such time, the Minister cannot plead he operates in a jurisdictional void but must turn to that section of the civil service which can provide him with answers to his queries or a skilled work force for the tasks he requires to be accomplished. In British Columbia, the Minister of Recreation turns to the Parks Branch.

Generally, three kinds of non-park issues are referred to the Parks Branch. First are those relating to recreational activities that will require regulations. Examples here include the use of motor boats, snowmobiles, recreational trailers, etc. In general, these regulations would not be administered by the Parks Branch but by the Department of Highways, Vehicles or Health. Second are those tasks carried out by other government departments but having a recreation context. Examples here include recreation development of Indian lands and ARDA projects, such as the Canada Land Inventory and the Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study. Another similar task that will have increasing significance will be the review of Regional Plans submitted to the Department of Municipal Affairs for approval. These plans are sure to make provision for recreational uses of land and the Parks Branch will be asked for comment. A third category of issue would include representations made by private individuals and groups. This may be a request for information regarding hiking or canoeing on lands outside of parks or it could be private operators of campgrounds, marinas, ski resorts seeking technical and management advice.
While it may be true that Parks Branch personnel have some "expertise" in the field of outdoor recreation, few of these tasks are defined within the Park Act. This problem occurs in nearly every province and has been recognized by the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers when compiling their catalogue of the Administration of Outdoor Recreation in Canada.

Parks are now recognized as only a part of the whole system of recreational opportunities. . . . In many instances, however, the Parks agency is the only agency currently designed to provide any recreational facilities, and therefore has become burdened with the responsibility of developing in other areas. This agency, however, is most often lacking the legislative authority, finances and personnel required to competently undertake this responsibility.

(Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, 1968, Vol.1, p. 2)

So the British Columbia Parks Branch, by default, not be design, and in obvious contravention of their duties as defined by legislation has become "the" recreation agency for the province.

The criticism that the Department of Recreation and Conservation is not set up to administer to the needs of recreation taking place outside provincial parks is generally valid. More damning however is the fact that the Department does not even attempt to find out what these needs are—whether inside or outside the park. Figure 8 shows that the British Columbia Parks Branch which as stated is "the" recreation agency of the province does not conduct research of any type. Figure 7 showed a Research Section within the Parks Branch but this has been vacant for a number of years.

In passing, it might be noted that only Manitoba has recognized this issue and formally reorganized its departmental structure.
## Administrative Activities of Provincial Departments of Parks - Western Canada, 1968

### Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Activities</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Recreation Settings</strong></td>
<td>MAN, SASK, ALTA, BC</td>
<td>MAN, SASK, ALTA, BC</td>
<td>MAN, SASK, ALTA, BC</td>
<td>MAN, SASK, ALTA, BC</td>
<td>MAN, SASK, ALTA, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Preserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Preserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Public Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable Streams, Riv &amp; Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Navigable Streams, Riv &amp; Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Regional Parks Considered*
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In the Province of Manitoba, the Department of Tourism and Recreation, consists of the Parks, Community Recreation, and Tourism Branches and has responsibilities spanning the full range of public recreation. In addition, the Department provides advisory and consultative services to municipal and local governments, and to private investors in recreation and tourism.


**Department of Travel Industry**

The organization of the Department of Travel Industry is shown in Figure 9. It can be seen that the major emphasis of this Department is on advertising and promotion. Note that research is not included among the assigned responsibilities. In terms of the development and operation of recreation facilities, the Department has no responsibilities.

Only indirectly does the Department have contact with private recreation enterprises for purposes other than coordinating the advertising program. In the compilation of the "Approved Tourist Accommodation" Directory or the "Green Book", it is necessary to inspect all private enterprises and list their facilities. Over 750,000 copies of this book are published annually for distribution to tourists. No effort is made to offer management or technical advice even if solicited by the operators. A team of six tourist accommodation counsellors working for three and one-half months is hard pressed to visit some 2,173 separate establishments without taking time to offer suggestions on how to better operate the enterprise. In addition, while one counsellor may be competent to advise on motel and hotel management, a campground is a different matter. Each is a specialized operation requiring a particular management approach.
It must be noted that the purpose of the visit by the "counsellor" is not to set standards or supervise operations but merely to see if the facilities meet requirements for inclusion in the "Green Book". Many establishments that are visited during the early part of the inspection period, of April 13 to July 31, are never seen while customers are present. During the inspection, it may appear that there are spaces for thirty camp-sites but on a busy weekend in August over forty trailers may be using the facilities. Under these conditions, would the operation still be approved?

The same criticism might be said of health regulations. When examining private campsites, the inspectors assess the water and sewer system according to the regulations of the Department of Health. These regulations include standards for water systems, septic tanks, washrooms, showers, road widths and open space. It is one thing to approve these services at the time of installation and yet another to approve their use under peak capacity. For these reasons, the present "approved tourist accommodation" designation of private enterprise facilities leaves much to be desired.

Another obvious shortcoming of the Department of Travel Industry is evident from several publications of that department. Considerable effort is made to show how much the province benefits from tourism. In 1968, an estimated $345 million was spent by visitors and it is proudly forecast that by 1984, this will amount to $1.5 billion. No effort however has been made to forecast what facilities will be needed to provide the services demanded by the ever-increasing influx of visitors. It would appear that no formal program for expanding facilities has been completed or ever felt needed and
the Department just assumes both the public and private sector will have expanded to meet the demand without any leadership or encouragement.

The annual report of the Department of 1970 under Advertising and Research gives little indication of any change in emphasis. The only reference to research was

This year the Dominion Bureau of Statistics broadened its field of research in the travel industry, and the resulting data enabled us to prepare a more detailed and accurate report on the value of the industry to our Province.

(Department of Travel Industry, 1970, p. 16)

The present $550,000 spent on tourist promotion is effective. An estimated 7,515,550 tourists including 4.3 million Americans visited British Columbia in 1970. Yet the Department should not continue its advertising in total isolation from planning and production of the services and facilities needed to satisfy the demands of the tourists.

No room at the park-in is a common complaint in peak months of the Island's tourist travel.

Travellers have reason to be upset when they can't find a campsite in a province consisting mainly of forest—particularly when many of these tourists have been lured by lavish advertising of natural resources; advertising supported by . . . government.

(Kent, 1970)

The Department does not operate in isolation from the private sector however. There is in fact considerable cooperation between the public and private sectors via two programs. The Provincial Tourist Advisory Council is a coordinating body consisting of representatives of private enterprises from eight regions of the province who meet with Department officials to discuss mutual problems. In addition, the Department grants
funds on the basis of $60 for every $40 raised locally in order to assist regional tourist organizations. Government tourist counsellors are being assigned to assist these regional organizations.

Unfortunately, these two programs are designed for only one purpose—-to help regional tourist organizations attracts visitors to their own region. Planning, research, technical, and management advice are not included. In addition, the members of the Provincial Tourist Advisory Council are not chosen by members of the tourist industry but appointed from their numbers by the government.

The ARDA Program

In Chapter V, it was stated that the federal recreation policies most affecting the private sector were those of the ARDA program. It would appear that this is not the case in British Columbia. In view of the overall goal of the ARDA program, that of stimulating the economy of depressed rural areas, British Columbia has not received a large share of federal funds. This province ranks second to Ontario (as measured by per capita incomes) and has received less federal assistance than Quebec and the Maritime provinces. Consequently, the scale of ARDA projects in British Columbia is smaller than in most other provinces. Lack of federal funds is not the only reason why the ARDA program in British Columbia has given little attention to recreation. British Columbia has not undertaken such major recreation projects as the "Interlake" in Manitoba, "Mactoquoc" in New Brunswick and "Gaspe Peninsula" in Quebec which qualified for additional assistance under the FRED program.
Under ARDA legislation, the initiative for federal participation must come from the provincial government who determine what type of projects will be undertaken. In British Columbia, ARDA programs have generally been coordinated by the Department of Agriculture and the emphasis has been on the rehabilitation and extension of irrigation and water supply systems primarily within the Okanagan region. Too, the province has participated in the nationwide programs of the Canada Land Inventory and the related Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study. Only the "Ksan" project has been related to recreation as it involved the construction of a museum, craft-centre, and campground on an Indian reserve near Hazelton.

Although British Columbia has participated within the ARDA program, there has not been a large investment of federal funds. In particular recreation and more important to this study, private recreation, has received little attention. Consequently, little or no research into recreation has been conducted under the ARDA program in comparison to the emphasis it has reached elsewhere. Given the total lack of recreation research conducted by the provincial departments, the ARDA program could have partially filled the void if the provincial authorities had chosen to direct the program to different objectives.

At present, a research study is being conducted to examine the potential role of recreation and agriculture for improving employment and income levels in the central Kootenay region. (B. C. Department of Agriculture, 1970) Hopefully, this project indicates a new direction in provincial government policy and a recognition of the need for coordinated planning and development of recreation as a prerequisite to the present overemphasis on promotion.
Illustrations of Jurisdictional Voids

The foregoing has attempted to show how the Departments of Recreation and Conservation and the Travel Industry are organized to cope with issues related to outdoor recreation. In general, it can be stated that the present administrative framework is not designed to cope with outdoor recreation in a comprehensive manner. The following four examples are presented to substantiate this claim.

First, consider an individual who wishes to regularly participate in "back-country hiking." Some of the trails he walks will traverse lands under a variety of jurisdictions. Portions of some trails will be within provincial forests, provincial parks or vacant crown lands. Other trails will pass through private land or through forest lands managed by private companies. Who is to build the trails, maintain them, place directional signs, and construct access roads and parking lots? Who is to record and map these trails and publish trail guides to encourage public use of the trails? At present, no government agency has the mandate to even begin coordinating the various aspects of the task.

Second, consider the problem of approving new ski resorts. Recently, British Columbia has seen the unsuccessful efforts of a series of poorly planned and financed ski areas. Examples include Powder Mountain near Garibaldi, Brohm Ridge near Squamish, and Cypress Bowl in West Vancouver. Already a proposal for Brent Mountain near Penticton has caused public protests. In each case, a private developer applied to the Department of Lands for permission to build a ski resort. The government position
seems to be if a private company wishes to construct ski lifts and their application complies with specified procedures, the company should be allowed to attempt their business venture. Little effort is made to examine if these proposed ventures are properly located and economically feasible. Only after the proposal meets difficulties does the government become forced into more careful scrutiny of the situation. Part of the problem is that the government has no staff of recreation and skiing experts who can inspect the site and then determine the viability of the proposals by the developer before giving approval to begin development. Required financing, land tenure, slope and snow conditions, market studies, forest values, and access roads would all be considered before giving approval. Hopefully valuable recreation resources would no longer be subject to the present trial and error development approach.

Third, consider a private operator who wishes to develop a campground, ski hill, marina, etc. Who can he contact to obtain information on design, construction estimates, possible economic returns, relevant government regulations? At present, no one government agency has been assigned this function. Yet if the private business were to be an industrial or commercial enterprise the provincial Department of Trade and Industry could provide a wealth of information and special consultants to encourage private investment. If, as the Department of Travel Industry claims, recreation and tourism is the third major industry in British Columbia, it is strange that no government department is charged with the responsibility for encouraging development.

Fourth, consider the issues of overall research, planning, and development of outdoor recreation facilities. This task requires the
compilation of an Outdoor Recreation Plan for British Columbia, a comprehensive document which would require the collection of statistics of present use and projected future demands. An inventory of all recreation resources, whether operated by public agencies, voluntary groups or private individuals would be needed. After all the facts had been collected, it would be necessary to determine the objectives for future recreation developments and outline the steps by which these goals and objectives could be achieved. The roles of the municipal, regional and provincial parks authorities, voluntary citizens groups and private enterprise would be outlined. At present, no government agency is equipped either by funds and manpower or legislative authority to perform such an assignment.

**Summary of the Problem**

In summary, the division of the British Columbia government in the administration of outdoor recreation can be traced to four general causes:

First, there does not seem to be a recognition of any difference between the two tasks of recreation resource management and recreation program planning. Failure to recognize this is the underlying cause for the lack of coordination of all government recreation policies. Traditionally, recreation resource management has been a task assigned to a department with responsibility for public lands. Thus, the management of recreation resources is carried out by the Forest Service and the Parks Branch. Unfortunately, when considering the second task, recreation program planning, these resource managers neglect the recreation resources not specifically assigned to them. Consequently, the recreation resources of municipalities,
voluntary citizen organizations, and private enterprise are neglected. The responsibility for recreation program planning must be assigned to some branch or agency of the government with wider concerns than the present narrowly focused resource management agencies.

A second cause is a general misconception of what is meant by recreation research. A surveillance of the annual report of the Department of Travel Industry gives indications that research is merely the compilation of facts and figures on tourist attendance and expenditures. Some effort is made to project present totals into future estimates but little else is done. There is no recognition of research as a prerequisite to planning. Without research, planning can never be more than short term to meet issues of the day.

A third cause is the separation of the functions of production and planning from promotion and advertising. While the Department of Travel Industry proudly projects expected increases in tourists' spending no attention is paid to determine how many more people this will involve and how many campsites, motel rooms, etc., will be needed to provide for the increase in visitors. Large scale tourist promotions, particularly directed towards residents of western United States, encourage visitors on a "come one, come all" basis. Quite possibly tourist promotion should be conducted with more specific aims in mind. It might be that provincial tourist promotion should not stress the "wilderness" traits of its natural resources in hopes of attracting more urban oriented visitors who would possibly demand hotel and motel accommodations instead of a campsite within a provincial park.
A fourth cause is a lack of recognition of the private sector in recreation planning. The Parks Branch when planning new developments does not consult with private operator associations to attempt to establish what facilities should be provided by either sector. For example, it would appear that in the Okanagan, the public sector (whether provincial, regional or municipal) intends to provide day-use recreation facilities to attract visitors but it will provide only a minimum of the needed campground facilities. Yet, if this is in fact the policy, the private sector has never been informed. If the private sector fills the gaps in the facilities not provided by the public sector, it is by default, not by design.

A Proposal

At this point, the material of the previous five chapters would be wasted if no effort was made to use this information to resolve the difficulties found within the administrative framework for outdoor recreation in British Columbia. The following is suggested not as a definitive solution but "... as insights into the perception of the whole problem area ... for reason of overall interest." (Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, 1968, Vol. I, p. 5)

Basically, there are two problems to deal with. First is the present overemphasis on promotion instead of research, planning, and development. Second is the necessity of overcoming the deficiencies of an administrative framework that does not take a comprehensive overview of all aspects of outdoor recreation.

The first problem can be overcome by scaling down the present promotion and advertising budget of the Department of Travel Industry. An
emphasis must be placed on proper research to produce market studies, facility inventories, and ultimately, a provincial Recreation Plan where guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of the public and private sectors could be set out. Then, keeping the goals of this Recreation Plan in mind, the promotional campaign could be restored but with more definite objectives.

The second problem could possibly be alleviated by one of two different approaches. The first alternative would be to maintain the present administrative framework. The Department of Travel Industry could broaden its activities beyond promotion to include research, and management, and technical consultant services for the private sector. The Parks Branch could be assigned additional funds and personnel to more adequately perform the "non-park" tasks now assigned to it. The Forest Service could increase the activities of the new Forest Recreation Division and speed up its intended participation in the construction and operation of public facilities on forest lands. Unfortunately, this alternative leaves many problems unresolved. There would be no comprehensive framework to encourage the coordination of efforts by the various departments. Responsibility for recreation on crown land outside provincial forests and provincial parks is left in limbo. The Parks Branch would still play a passive role in reviewing plans of regional districts, Indian bands, and private developers, instead of being a leader. Most discouraging would be the fact that the major responsibility for the leadership, coordination, and information services necessary for a comprehensive recreation program would be left with those departments that, no matter what other duties are assigned to them, still have a vested interest in a particular type of recreation resource management (i.e. forests and parks).
The second alternative to the dilemma would be to create a new "institutional vehicle" responsible for the broader aspects of outdoor recreation. Probably a "Recreation Service" or "Secretariat" or "Bureau" would be set up within the Department of Recreation and Conservation. This new "Recreation Service" would have no resources to administer. Its role would be research, information services, coordinator of government recreation programs and provide the task force to produce a Provincial Recreation Plan. The Parks Branch would confine itself to its responsibilities as defined in the Park Act. The Community Recreation Program section would be removed from the Department of Travel Industry and placed within the Department of Recreation and Conservation. Hopefully, this would change the emphasis of such events as the B.C. Festival of Sports from promotion of the event to development of the community recreation program. Probably the Department of Travel Industry would be reduced to Branch status.

Within the Department of Recreation would be three Deputy-Ministers, much like the present framework within the Department of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. One Deputy Minister would be responsible for Conservation and Outdoor Recreation including the present Fish and Wildlife, and Parks Branches. A second Deputy Minister would be responsible for a greatly expanded Community and Municipal Recreation Programs Branch to include those aspects of recreation of a more urban character and not dependent on an outdoor natural resource base. The third Deputy Minister would be the one heading the former Department of Travel Industry. This Travel Branch would also be charged with the responsibility to provide assistance
to the private recreation sector in accordance with guidelines formulated from a Provincial Recreation Plan. The Minister would now be known as the Minister of Recreation, Conservation and Travel Industry.

Note that none of the three Deputy Ministers would have jurisdiction over the proposed Recreation Secretariat. This Secretariat would not be placed in the bureaucratic hierarchy at the same level as the Parks, Travel, Fish and Wildlife, and Community Programs Branches, but would report directly to the Minister. The Secretariat would operate as a clearinghouse to coordinate the activities of the three branches. In addition, the Secretariat would serve as the coordinator between the Department and other Departments such as Lands, Forests, Water Resources, Highways, and Health who also have responsibility for limited aspects of recreation.

The new Secretariat could take a comprehensive view of outdoor recreation since it is not charged with managing specific resources or promoting these resources. The ultimate responsibility of the Secretariat would be to produce a Provincial Recreation Plan. It should then be possible to more fully realize that other dimensions of outdoor recreation exist beyond the confines of public facilities. The private sector might be given more recognition and their possible contribution would be considered when planning future recreation developments.

In Chapter III, Twardzik issued a challenge to public recreation administrators.

... Envision if you will, a community park and recreation master plan that extends beyond our present simplistic system of green spaces and community centres and playground programs to a truly comprehensive plan that includes commercial recreation developments and private
recreation programs. Once we begin to plan for the community, instead of for our traditional areas of competency, then we are well on the way to providing a public service truly relevant to our clientele.

(Twardzik, 1969, p. 9)

His is probably a faint hope unless the responsibility for comprehensive recreation resource planning is taken away from those government agencies with specific responsibilities (i.e. parks and forests) and placed with an agency charged with broader concerns.
CHAPTER VII

A SURVEY OF PRIVATE CAMPGROUNDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

This chapter will present the results of a mailed questionnaire distributed to private campground operators in British Columbia. It is intended that the data collected for the province will be similar to that obtained by researchers in the United States. (Bowers, 1969; La Page, 1966, 1967, 1968)

First, some background facts concerning campgrounds in British Columbia must be reviewed. Despite the government disregard for private campgrounds, when planning public outdoor recreation developments it is apparent that public campgrounds serve only a small portion of the demand. For the year 1970, there were approximately 3,000 campsites provided by the provincial parks system. (B. C. Parks Branch, 1970) A 1970 Canada Outdoor Recreation Facility Inventory by ARDA personnel as part of the Canada Outdoor Recreation Demand Study listed 544 private campgrounds providing 12,456 campsites. In 1970, the Department of Travel Industry listed 234 private campgrounds providing 13,469 campsites. If for no other reason than the fact that private campsites outnumber public campsites by better than a four to one margin, public officials responsible for outdoor recreation planning should not be ignoring the private sector.

From the foregoing, it is evident that the universe of private campground enterprises is probably somewhere between 200 and 600. The
ARDA inventory listed every enterprise that offered camping facilities which accounts for their total of 544 campgrounds. The Department of Travel Industry lists an establishment under the classification from which it appears to derive its greater revenue. Many enterprises offering campsites are categorized under motels and resorts which probably accounts for their lower total of 234 private campgrounds. Yet, even the Department of Travel Industry exhibits little consistency in their definitions as their 1969 report listed 494 campgrounds offering 13,847 campsites. The decrease of 260 campgrounds and 378 campsites from 1969 to 1970 would be difficult to explain if it, in fact, represents an actual decrease in the number of private recreation enterprises. Rather, the decrease probably reflects some change in tabulating procedures.

The Survey

Two problems emerged when organizing the mailed operator survey questionnaires. First, the listing of enterprises was incomplete as the only addresses obtainable were for those the Provincial Tourist Accommodation Directory or "Green Book". Over 750,000 copies of this book are published annually for distribution to tourists. Not all campgrounds in the province are contained within this book so there were an unknown number of private campgrounds not included on the mailing list for the survey. A second problem emerged when defining a private campground. Many private recreation enterprises listed in the "Green Book" are primarily a fishing resort or motel or farm, and provide campsites only as an associated service; consequently, questionnaires were sent to some 560 enterprises
whose listing in the directory indicated they provided campsites whether or not campsites was the major service of that enterprise.

Of the 560 questionnaires mailed, 240 were returned. For reasons of incomplete answers and "crank" returns, only 217 questionnaires were tabulated. This chapter will only summarize some basic facts as revealed by the survey about private campgrounds in British Columbia without attempting to generalize about the private recreation industry as a whole. No effort will be made to discriminate between various characteristics (i.e. size, location, services, etc.) or to use these to predict the economic success of an enterprise. The following is simply a profile of campground characteristics using univariate tables.

**Location**

The distribution of 216 respondents is shown on Figure 10. This distribution of survey returns would appear to approximate the actual distribution of private campgrounds in British Columbia. A comparison with the ARDA Facility Inventory would suggest that the totals for Region C, the Okanagan, and Region B, the Lower Mainland, should be slightly higher.

Survey results show that private campgrounds cluster around public campgrounds and other private competitors. Of 208 respondents, 61 per cent were less than ten miles from a public campground and of 205 respondents, 74 per cent were within five miles of private competitors. Thirty-three per cent were within one-half mile of a private competitor. Unfortunately, the survey only asked for proximity to another campground, and whether public or private. An additional question should have asked how close the
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enterprises were to public day-use attractions. Probably this question would have revealed a much higher percentage of private campgrounds clustering around public facilities than the 61 per cent which are within ten miles of a public campground. This is particularly true since most municipalities do not provide campgrounds but often provide popular day-use recreation features. The public beaches at Qualicum and Penticton are good examples of municipal facilities that provide major attractions that create a market for private campground operators.

Of 208 respondents, 70 per cent were located on sites where water, whether a lake, stream or ocean, was a feature. In addition, of 62 enterprises that did not have water as a feature of their site, 38 were within a five-minute walk from where their guests could have access to waterfrontage. This finding is in strong agreement with both La Page (1967, 1968) and Bowers (1969) who stressed the need for water-based attractions as a major criteria when locating a private recreation enterprise. Probably those 38 enterprises located within a five-minute walk from accessible waterfront are adjacent to either a provincial, regional or municipal park but this was not determined by the survey.

**Economic Considerations**

As stated earlier in the chapter, there is a problem in defining the nature of each recreation enterprise. Is the business operation primarily a motel or farm? and when is it a "resort" and not just a campground? Of 212 respondents, only 88 or 42 per cent operated solely as campgrounds. The remaining 58 per cent offered camping facilities in
conjunction with another business enterprise. Of 126 associated businesses, 66 were motels, 18 were mobile trailer courts, 7 were farms and orchards, 4 were service stations, 2 were restaurants, and 1 was a store. Obviously for these owners, operation of the campground provided only a portion of their income. Only 48 of 210 operators indicated that the campground was a major source of their income. The campground provided less than 50 per cent of the income for 146 of 155 operators. However, 116 of 177 operators indicated they earned their living from another business enterprise located on the same property as the campground. This finding reinforces those of Bowers (1969) who concluded that few entrepreneurs could earn a living from an enterprise operated solely as a campground.

During 1969, 101 of 205 operators surveyed earned a profit, 51 "broke-even" and 53 suffered a loss from operations of their campgrounds. Unfortunately, the questionnaire does not adequately define "profit". If the term were limited to meaning profit after opportunity costs of labor and capital were deducted, it is likely that fewer operations would be able to report a profit. Only 94 of 173 operators indicated that they could "break-even" by operating at less than 50 per cent of occupancy. Another 35 needed 50-60 per cent occupancy, 43 needed 61-75 per cent occupancy and 21 needed over 76 per cent occupancy.

The survey results indicate that the majority of private campgrounds tend to be small. Of 206 respondents, 47 per cent provided less than thirty campsites and 67 per cent less than fifty sites. Only 16 per cent reported having over seventy-five campsites. This tendency towards small operations can probably be accounted for by the finding that few campgrounds are the
full-time concern of the operator and most are associated with some other recreation facility and/or service. However, this trend in British Columbia towards smaller campgrounds is in contrast to findings in the United States where La Page (1968) found the minimum size for an economic return was seventy campsites.

One hundred fifty-seven of 198 enterprises reported that their number of customers had increased significantly over the past three years and 140 of 192 reported that revenues had increased significantly over the past three years. These tendencies are obviously related to the large increases in the numbers of recreational vehicles being used by the travelling public. Provincial government campgrounds also exhibit similar increases in usage over the past three years. Despite the fact that less than half of the respondents reported a profit, 166 of 210 operators plan to expand their facilities to meet the increased demand for campsites.

**Services Offered**

As indicated in the preceding section, few of the respondents operated their enterprises solely as a campground. Most enterprises are either a campground in association with another business enterprise or are a campground as part of a multiple recreation enterprise. Table 13 shows what facilities and services were available to those campers who patronized the private sector.
TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSOCIATED FACILITIES AND SERVICES
OFFERED BY 215 PRIVATE CAMPGROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities and Services</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat Rentals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Launching</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Beach</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Rentals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Playground</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Showers</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sani-Station</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Guide</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Guide</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Essentials (Milk, Ice, Bread, Butter, Soft Drinks, etc.)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Supplies</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and Oil</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Counter</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Meals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupancy

Tables 14 and 15 provide some insight into the previous finding that only 48 of 210 private campgrounds provided the major source of income for the operator. Table 14 shows that 136 campgrounds provided less than 2000 campsite nights per season. Using an average rate of $3 per site per night, this would mean a gross income less than $6,000—a figure that leaves little margin for a profit. Given the fact that Table 15 shows 110 of 168 campgrounds operating at less than 60 per cent of capacity, the intentions of many operators to expand are difficult to rationalize. This is particularly true when the findings of the previous section on economic considerations are reviewed.
TABLE 14

NUMBER OF OCCUPIED CAMPSITE NIGHTS REPORTED
BY 158 PRIVATE CAMPGROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campsite Nights</th>
<th>No. of Campgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 499</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1499</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 1999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2499</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 - 4999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] One campsite night = one campsite occupied by
one party for one evening. (This is not the
total number of guests in each party).

TABLE 15

PER CENT OF CAPACITY FILLED DURING 1969 OPERATING SEASON
AS REPORTED BY 168 PRIVATE CAMPGROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent Capacity</th>
<th>No. of Campgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 48 of 172 campgrounds reported that weekend and statuatory
holiday customers amounted to more than 60 per cent of their total. Given
the tremendous increases in highway and ferry traffic over weekends, it would
be expected that more campgrounds would report a greater dependency on week­
end business. This finding might indicate that a majority of weekend
recreationists are "day-users" rather than campers. Only 16 per cent of 214 campgrounds reported a major increase in weekend occupancy rates over mid-week totals. Forty-five per cent reported no change in occupancy rates from weekday to weekend.

**Management Features**

The survey results on the advertising methods used by private campgrounds have a built-in bias because all campgrounds which received a questionnaire are listed in the "Green Book". Survey results are given in Table 16.

**TABLE 16**

ADVERTISING PREFERENCES OF 205 PRIVATE CAMPGROUND OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Per Cent Used&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Per Cent Most Effective&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Per Cent Second Most Effective&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and folders</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist Association</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Motels and Resorts Association</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Green Book&quot;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups in Mail to Previous Customers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-Mouth from Satisfied Customers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Column indicates per cent of operators who use that method.

<sup>b</sup>Column indicates per cent of operators who feel that method is the most effective.

<sup>c</sup>Column indicates per cent of operators who feel that method is the second most effective.
One notable finding is that few private campground operators make use of the British Columbia Motels, Resorts and Trailer Court Association. Most operators prefer to work through their regional tourist associations. This is probably the means by which the bulk of the brochures and folders printed by each campground are distributed to the public.

Table 17 indicates that the major problems facing the operation of private campgrounds are two over which they have no control—the short season and the weather. The survey findings show two major differences from results of similar surveys in the United States. Both Bowers (1969) and the ORRRC Report revealed that people problems (i.e. vandalism, theft, etc.) and liability insurance were major concerns of private campground operators. Neither problem appears to be of great concern to operators in British Columbia.

No single aspect of public recreation policy and regulation is singled out as a major problem area of campground operators. However, collectively, 48 per cent of all major problems can be traced to public policy and regulation. Pollution, lack of services (i.e. hydro, water, sewer), taxation, zoning regulations, medical health regulations, highway regulations and competition from public facilities are all issues subject to municipal and provincial government control.
### TABLE 17

MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS AS REPORTED BY 205 PRIVATE CAMPGROUND OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Per Cent Reporting $^a$</th>
<th>Per Cent Main Problem $^b$</th>
<th>Per Cent Second Problem $^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and Theft</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Season</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility too Small</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Location</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Services</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from Public Campgrounds</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from Private Campgrounds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Regulations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Regulations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Regulations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Column indicates per cent of operators who reported this problem affects management.

$^b$ Column indicates per cent of operators who reported this was their main problem.

$^c$ Column indicates per cent of operators who reported this was their second most major problem.

---

**Attitudes Toward Government Policies**

In Chapter II, none of the studies of La Page (1966, 1967, 1968) or those reviewed by Bowers (1969) were concerned with operator attitudes toward government performance in the administration of outdoor recreation,
particularly as it relates to the private sector. Consequently, the follow­
ing findings cannot be evaluated in comparison to other studies.

The survey results indicate that government performance in finan­
cial assistance programs and technical advisory services is inadequate. (Table 18) The operators also exhibit some concern over the provision of essential services such as hydro, water, sewer, roads, telephone, and gar­bage collection. Over 73 per cent of 202 operators stated that supervision of private campgrounds should be a provincial rather than a municipal or federal responsibility. This is particularly evident from Table 19. Note that the present role of the province in the regulation of health standards and overcrowding is acceptable to a majority of private operators.

TABLE 18
CAMPGROUND OPERATOR ATTITUDES TOWARD GOVERNMENT RECREATION POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Policy</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Advertising and Promotion</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inspection</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (Hydro, Water, Telephone, Roads, Garbage)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19
OPERATOR PREFERENCE IN ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTED SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Provincial Government</th>
<th>Private Operator Association</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing Health Standards</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing Maximum Capacity Standards</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Fee Rates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Program</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advice</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Advice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sample size varied from 196 to 209)

The survey revealed that private operators are particularly strong in their desire for provincial government participation in the tasks of loan programs and technical assistance. However, it is interesting to note that the operators indicated a resistance to provincial government participation in management advice and instead turned to their own operator associations for that service. The results indicate a preference that control over fee structures of private campgrounds should be left to the individual operator.

Summary of Conclusions

In the foregoing section, the results of the survey were presented with little comment. Significant findings were highlighted and in some cases, a possible explanation was offered. No attempt however was made
to derive conclusions and predictions from the data. More sophisticated statistical techniques could have been performed from the data available but given the focus of the entire study, these additional procedures were not undertaken. In addition, certain weaknesses in the format and wording of the questionnaire were noted. An example of poor wording can be found in Question C-1 where the operator was asked how long he had been in business when the intent was to determine the age of the campground at that location. Format of the questionnaire made it difficult for bivariate analysis to be undertaken. It would have been useful to correlate occupancy rates of "resort" campgrounds with those of "transient" campgrounds. Additionally, a correlation of the economic success of campgrounds in one region with those in other regions would have been of value. Several similar bivariate correlations should have been explored but given weaknesses in the testing instrument, their validity would be somewhat questionable.

The questionnaire also failed to ask some questions that would have provided additional data necessary to more accurately assess the private campground industry. Particularly needed is an accurate assessment of the total use of private campgrounds to determine the present unused capacity. Too, a standardized format should be developed for determining the profitability of recreation enterprises. The simple statement of revenue exceeding expenses is an inadequate basis for comprehensive recreation planning. Opportunity costs of labor and capital must be included in the financial analysis of recreation enterprises.
In addition, the survey does not indicate how many campgrounds offer few or none of the associated facilities listed in Table 13. Consequently, it is not possible to adequately distinguish between travelway and resort type campgrounds. If this information were available, a meaningful correlation could be made to determine the effect provision of associated services has on the profitability of the enterprise. Probably evident would be a higher percentage of full capacity needed to be filled each night for the enterprise to break-even as opposed to those enterprises that operate solely as a campground.

In general, the survey results make it quite evident that few private recreation enterprises are operated solely as campgrounds. The majority offer multiple-recreation facilities and services. A diversity of well planned services appears to be a pre-requisite for economic success. The preoccupation of the operator with some other business concern may partially explain why campground size is generally less than fifty campsites. Less than half the private campgrounds reported they earned a profit. Given the small average size of a typical enterprise and their usage at less than full capacity, this finding is not surprising. Still to be determined is whether campgrounds are small because they are unprofitable or unprofitable because they operate below some optimum size.

A major feature of private campgrounds in British Columbia is their tendency to cluster near public recreation facilities and near their fellow competitors. This would indicate that if properly coordinated, public facilities can be an asset rather than competition to the private sector. In total capacity, private campsites outnumber public campsites by a ratio
of 4:1. However, there is a greater percentage of unused capacity within the private sector than within the public campground system.

Despite the fact that a minority of campground enterprises earn a profit and are used to capacity, it is notable that a majority plan to expand their facilities and services. At first, it might appear that this is an unwise investment. However, in Chapter II when relating the private recreation industry to the monopolistic-competition market, it was stated "Excess capacity is, in part, a result of too many small, underfinanced enterprises insufficiently differentiated and offering a service for which demand is not present or adequate." (Bowers, 1969, p. 92) It might be inferred that private campground operators have recognized this fact and their expansion plans are an effort to upgrade their present facilities to enable them to compete more effectively. If this is true, it may explain the strong demand by operators for government implementation of financial assistance and technical advice. This may also indicate that a review of taxation policies is necessary to make expansion plans more feasible.

Strongly evident was the fact that private campground operators felt that the inspection, supervision, and development assistance tasks are the responsibility of the provincial, rather than municipal or federal governments. The survey does not reveal a significant dissatisfaction with any particular government policy but when grouped together, those campground management problems related to public policies account for nearly half of all problems.

In general, two aspects of this issue emerge. First, the operators indicate some concern that policies toward taxation, zoning, subdivision,
highway regulations, health regulations, services, and public facilities should be reviewed as they relate to the private recreation industry. Second, there is strong indication that provincial government participation in the expansion of the private sector is warranted. A majority of private operators indicated that the provincial government should provide financial assistance via loan programs. In addition, operators voiced the need for technical advice to assist in the location, design and construction of facilities better suited to meet public demands.

Outdoor recreation both as a social activity and as a major industry is an accepted use of the natural resource base. It has been recognized that those recreation resources held under private ownership are required to meet a portion of the demand for recreation facilities and services. It may even be that the private sector, rather than government, will play the larger role in meeting the recreation needs of the public. Private operators recognize the need to expand and upgrade their facilities but the special nature of the economics of the outdoor recreation industry requires close coordination with government policies and recreation developments. Government recognition of the private sector must be more than just the inclusion of private recreation facilities in tourist promotion campaigns. The regulatory, promotional, and developmental roles of government responsibility for outdoor recreation must not be solely preoccupied with policy for the management of public facilities. It is necessary that the complementary-competitive relationship between the public and private sectors be understood so that comprehensively planned recreation developments can make the most effective use of the recreation resources available.
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APPENDIX A

The following is an excerpt from the final report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC). The text provides the rationale for creating the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

The broad function of the Bureau should be to consider the needs of the American people for all phases of outdoor recreation--within cities, in rural areas, and throughout the country. In the past, recreation planning and development have too often been controlled chiefly by the physical resources available. This orientation has largely determined not only the location but the nature and quality of the opportunities provided. But in view of the changing and expanding role of recreation and leisure in the years to come, it is important that planning for outdoor recreation emphasize more strongly the needs of people. Resource development programs that affect recreation opportunities, both directly and indirectly, should be modified to accommodate these needs. The basic purpose of a national Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would be to provide the leadership, coordination, and assistance required to realize this goal.

Why a New Bureau

There are now more than 20 Federal agencies with programs involving some aspect of outdoor recreation. A similar multiplicity is found among State agencies. While the programs of these agencies are generally well planned in themselves, little thought is given in any of them to the over-all development of outdoor recreation throughout the Nation.

Thus a complicated and difficult pattern of intergovernmental relations is created, as numerous Federal organizations seek to work individually and separately with a variety of State and local agencies. There is at present no focal point for coordination of recreation policy, planning, programs, or management. Over-all responsibility for initiating and guiding a national effort in outdoor recreation has never been explicitly assigned....
... It seems impracticable to charge an existing office with these new functions. The duties of the proposed Bureau, nationwide in scope and ranging from the coordination of planning to the administration of financial and technical assistance, could not be adequately carried out within the framework of any present agency.

These facts argue in favor of the establishment of a new bureau within an existing department. With authorizing legislation, such a bureau could, through the Secretary of its department, deal with agencies in other departments as well as with bureaus within the same department. The most effective location for the new Bureau is in the Department of the Interior. Its various programs of resource management, its general orientation, and the recreation experience of the National Park Service and other Interior bureaus make this the logical choice. Many other resource management agencies of the Federal Government are located within Interior, and much of the coordination function could be carried out within the Department.

The organizational change would not be a panacea for all the problems of outdoor recreation. There are difficulties inherent in placing responsibility for coordination of all Federal activities within a single bureau of any department.

The new Bureau's relations with Federal agencies that provide or affect outdoor recreation would be sensitive, at least at the outset. But the traditional organizational rivalries in this field must be overcome, and the creation of a new bureau would help, even though it is placed within the old competitive framework.

The Bureau would also work in close cooperation with non-Federal agencies and particularly with the States, in ways discussed later in this chapter. Without this new organization, the achievement of over-all national planning, Federal coordination, the administration of an aid program, and coordinated research will be most difficult... . . .

Its Creation and Composition

... The new Bureau should be headed by a director and should have a small, highly qualified planning and
administrative staff in Washington. Wherever possible, the Bureau should be staffed by transfer of experienced personnel from existing agencies. Regional offices should be located so as to provide effective assistance to other Federal and State agencies.

To assure that recreation policy and planning receive attention at a high level and to promote interdepartmental coordination, there should be established a Recreation Advisory Council, consisting of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Defense, with the Secretary of the Interior as chairman. These agencies are recommended for permanent membership on the Council since each has important and continuing responsibilities for the management and development of resources with major values for outdoor recreation. Other agencies, such as the Department of Commerce, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would be invited to participate on an ad hoc basis when matters affecting their interests are under consideration by the Council.

The Recreation Advisory Council would provide broad policy guidance on all matters affecting outdoor recreation activities and programs carried out by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The Secretary of the Interior should be required to seek such guidance in the administration of the Bureau. Acting within this policy, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, under the Secretary of the Interior, would work toward coordinating programs in the more than 20 Federal agencies and the 50 States.

The proposed Bureau would have six major functions: (1) coordinate related Federal programs; (2) stimulate and provide assistance in State planning; (3) administer grants-in-aid; (4) sponsor and conduct research; (5) encourage interstate and regional cooperation; and (6) formulate a nationwide recreation plan on the basis of State, regional, and Federal plans.

It is imperative that the Federal house be put in order. The goal is to assure coordinated and effective programs.

The role of the Bureau would be to review and coordinate the diverse Federal efforts. It would not engage in the management of any lands, waters, or facilities,
which would continue to be the responsibility of the Federal resource agencies that now have those duties. The Bureau would have no control over the administrative activities of any existing department or agency. It would, however, be responsible for reviewing recreation developments connected with Federal lands and programs, and its written comments would accompany plans of other agencies submitted to the Executive Office and to the Congress. The proposed Recreation Advisory Council would serve to achieve cooperation among departments, and between the several departments and the Bureau.

Stimulate and Provide Assistance in State Planning.

A basic function of the Bureau would be to encourage and stimulate comprehensive, statewide outdoor recreation planning. The achievement of this objective would depend largely upon the cooperation of the States. Each should charge an organization or official with responsibility and authority for carrying out statewide planning in the field of outdoor recreation. This center of State leadership would also serve as the focal point for working with the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Although major responsibility for the development of State plans must rest with the States, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would provide guidance and technical assistance and would assist in developing data and information upon which plans can be based. Both organizations (Federal and State) should be permanent agencies, in order to assure continuous planning and coordination. Plans would be developed in cooperation with other managerial agencies, both at State and local levels—not imposed upon them.

Parts of the planning job might be referred to appropriate Federal agencies by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. In other instances, the Bureau might organize planning teams, composed of specialists from other agencies, to work with the States. In no case would the Bureau undertake intensive site planning, such as would be involved in the design and layout of specific facilities.

(ORRRC, Report to the President, 1962, pp. 121-24)
Appendix B

Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963

Public Law 88-29
88th Congress, S.20
May 28, 1963

AN ACT

To promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.--Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.
(b) CLASSIFICATION.--Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.
(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.--Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and recommend desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private
interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.--Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including non-profit organizations, with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.--Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.--(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advances of funds when he considers such action in the public interest, (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 4154, title 39, United States Code, and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.--Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.--Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. In order further to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies having
administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall, either individually or as a group, (a) consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this Act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this Act.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term "United States" shall include the District of Columbia and the terms "United States" and "States" may, to the extent practicable, include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.
APPENDIX C

PRIVATE CAMPGROUND OPERATOR SURVEY

Included in this section are:

(a) Two letters of introduction
(b) Instructions for completing the questionnaire
(c) The questionnaire
January 26, 1970

The enclosed questionnaire is being mailed to some five hundred trailer court, campground and resort operators in this province.

This Association and your own enterprise will gain valuable information at no cost to ourselves. The entire cost of organizing the survey, printing and mailing the questionnaires and evaluating the returns is being borne by the University of British Columbia.

The results of the survey should be of use in many ways:

1. Help the industry improve the levels of services it offers to the public.

2. Improve the profitability of your business operations.

3. Help your Association know what kinds of services it should offer to its members.

4. Help the Association in its relations with the Provincial Government in order to obtain much needed changes in existing legislation and implementation of new policies and programs.

Many recipients of this survey are not members of this Association. In the past, the major emphasis of the accommodation industry has been with motels and hotels, but the rapid increase in the number of recreational vehicles travelling our highways has created demand for new facilities in our industry. Hopefully, this survey is an indication that this Association is taking steps to meet these new trends and offer additional services to its members.

Already, we have come into possession of several publications related to planning, construction and management of private recreation enterprises. It is our intention to make these materials available to our members. If you desire any of these materials, please write our office and we can tell you where to obtain them.

Travel by the Dogwood — Your host in British Columbia
Our Association would like to commend Mr. Anderson for his concern in providing for the recreational traveller and the amount of work put forth in organizing this survey.

Your careful consideration of the questionnaire and a prompt return are essential to the success of this project.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mrs. Jean Dann
Executive-Secretary
Dear Campground and Trailer Park Operator:

The enclosed questionnaire is an important part of a research project being carried out by the School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia. As part of a graduate student research requirement, I am involved in a study of "Public Policy Towards Private Recreation Facilities." Although private recreation facilities can include a range from ski resorts to marinas, I am concentrating on campground and trailer park operations. In this respect, I am requesting that all private business operators who provide any sites to tents, trailers, etc., cooperate in filling out the questionnaire.

The main purpose of this study is to investigate government policy towards private recreation facilities. By government policy, I am not referring to those policies that involve inspection, regulation, and taxation of private recreation enterprises. I am more concerned with those policies designed to promote and encourage the establishment and upgrading of private recreation businesses. In particular, I am concerned about investigating those government policies and programs that offer technical assistance, financial advice, and management advice to those private operators who desire these services.

I am inclined to believe that many present campgrounds and trailer parks are at best marginal business propositions. As such, either the businessman operates at a small profit margin or the travelling public does not obtain the level of services he desires or both.

In the United States through the Extension Department, U.S. Department of Agriculture, extensive programs are carried out to assist private recreation. Publications on how to build and manage campgrounds are made available to the public. Field Officers are employed to visit private businesses and offer advice. Workshops are held where campground operators meet together to learn new techniques of management, advertising, and to discuss common problems. In addition, programs of low-cost loans are available to finance the establishment and expansion of private recreation enterprises. My present research indicates any similar programs are very
scarce in Canada. Before any changes are made to correct this, much information is required to find out what problems exist and what policies are desired and needed.

This study is designed to gain three kinds of information:

1. Facts and figures about campgrounds in B. C. (size, facilities offered, rates, capacity, management practices, etc.)

2. An inventory of common management problems.

3. An assessment of what role the private operators would like to see played by the government.

A return of the majority of these questionnaires is essential for any meaningful information to result. The computer services here at U. B. C. will be used to compile your answers.

You are NOT asked to sign your name to the questionnaire. The replies of any particular questionnaire will remain confidential. Only the overall totals will be made public. The results of this survey will be included in my thesis and given to the B. C. Motels and Resorts Association.

I realize that the careful consideration needed to complete this questionnaire is an imposition on your time. Hopefully, you may gain a few ideas as you read the questionnaire, and the end result of your efforts should be a first step in providing better facilities for the travelling public, and increasing profitability for your business.

Thank you.

James D. Anderson

Enclosures
INSTRUCTIONS

In the following questions, the phrases, "campground" and "trailer park" refer to any privately operated business that provides space for customers that bring their own shelter. These customers may bring a tent, tent-trailer, trailer, camper-truck, etc., and usually stay only a few days at a time.

The questionnaire is not concerned with what may be termed a mobile home park where guests bring a large mobile home and intend to stay for periods of a month or more.

When reference is made to a "public" campground, this refers to those operated by the provincial, municipal or federal government.

1. Nearly all questions are answered by indicating with a check mark (✓) your choice.

2. In a few cases, a blank is provided where you are asked to write in a number. (example: no. of guests)

3. For some questions, rather than a YES or NO, you are given a variety of several answers from which you indicate your choice with a check. But, occasionally, the possible answers given are not suitable to you. In these cases, the answer OTHERS appears followed by a blank. Please write in any additional answers you feel appropriate to that question.

Please answer every question.

REMEMBER, YOUR NAME WILL NOT APPEAR ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ALL INDIVIDUAL RETURNS WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

When completed, fold the questionnaire and use the enclosed self-addressed envelope to mail your return.
A. TYPE AND LOCATION

Please give the following information about the type and location of your business.

1. In what general area of the province are you located? Check one.

- [ ] Vancouver Island
- [ ] Greater Vancouver, Fraser Valley, Sunshine Coast
- [ ] Okanagan-Similkameen
- [ ] Kootenay-Boundary

2. Can your business be seen from a major highway or are directional signs required? Check one.

- [ ] Frontage on highway
- [ ] Directional signs required

3. (a) In Column I, indicate how close you are to the nearest government (federal, provincial, municipal) campground. Check the distance as measured on the main road.

- [ ] Less than ½ mile
- [ ] ½ to 1 mile
- [ ] 1 to 5 miles
- [ ] 5 to 10 miles
- [ ] 10+ miles

(b) In Column II, indicate how close you are to the nearest privately-operated campground.

- [ ] Less than ½ mile
- [ ] ½ to 1 mile
- [ ] 1 to 5 miles
- [ ] 5 to 10 miles
- [ ] 10+ miles

4. (a) Does your business operate primarily for the purpose of serving campers and overnight trailers? YES [ ] NO [ ]

(b) If NO, is your campground and trailer park mainly in conjunction with which of the following: Check one.

- [ ] Motel or Auto Court
- [ ] Service Station
- [ ] Restaurant
- [ ] Farm
- [ ] Mobile Home Park
- [ ] General Store
- [ ] Other (please specify)

5. Indicate which of the following BEST describes your operating season:

- [ ] Year-round (12 mos.)
- [ ] June 1 to Oct. 1
- [ ] July to August

B. SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Indicate the approximate total area (individual tent and trailer sites, washrooms, parking, playgrounds, beach, etc.) of your campground and trailer park operation.

- [ ] 2 - 3 acres
- [ ] 4 - 5 acres
- [ ] 6 - 10 acres
- [ ] 11 - 25 acres
- [ ] 26 - 50 acres
- [ ] 50+ acres
2. What is your maximum capacity for one night in terms of total number of tent and/or trailer sites you can provide.

   No. of sites _______________

3. How many of these sites are serviced (water, sewer, electricity)?

4. (a) Does your campground or trailer park site include waterfront (owned by you as part of the site)?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

   (b) If YES, is it on
   ■ Lake?
   ■ Stream, River?
   ■ Ocean?

   (c) If NO, can your guests reach waterfront within a five-minute walk?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, YOUR ANSWERS SHOULD RELATE ONLY TO YOUR CAMPGROUND AND TRAILER PARK OPERATIONS. (Do NOT relate these to your motel, auto court, farm, mobile home park, etc.)

C. MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. How long have you been in business?

   ■ less than 1 year ☐ 4 to 5 years
   ■ 1 to 3 years ☐ more than 5 years

2. (a) Did you build your present facilities within 1 year? YES ☐ NO ☐

   (b) If NO, what period of time did it take to develop your present facilities?

   ■ up to 2 years ☐ 3 to 4 years ☐ 5+ years
   ■ 2 to 3 years ☐ 4 to 5 years

3. What is the approximate size of your investment?

   (a) Land value only $______________

   (b) Improvements to the land (i.e. clearing, sewer, water, fences, landscaping, picnic tables, lighting, roads, buildings, etc.). If you live on the same site, do not include value of your own residence. $______________

4. (a) Do you consider the operation of your campground and trailer park, your major source of income? YES ☐ NO ☐

   (b) If NO, what percentage of your income is obtained from the operation of your campground and trailer court?

   ■ Less than 10% ☐ 26 to 50% ☐ 75%+
   ■ 11 to 25% ☐ 51 to 75%
5. If your major source of income is not from the operation of your campground or trailer, is your main source of income from another business operated on the same piece of property? (i.e. such as a motel, store, farm, etc.)

6. Did you use credit to finance your development and expansion?

7. If low-cost government financing were made available for development and/or expansion of private recreation facilities, would you use such funds?

8. Do you feel financing for campgrounds and trailer parks is difficult to obtain?

9. In the next year or two, do you plan expansion of your campground and trailer park operations? (i.e. more sites or extra facilities to offer your guests)

10. Under existing municipal zoning and subdivision regulations, would you be allowed to expand?

D. SERVICES OFFERED

1. Do you provide: (Indicate with a check mark every service you offer.)

   (a) [ ] boat launching
       [ ] boat rentals for fishing
       [ ] boat rentals for water skiing
       [ ] sailboat, "aqua cat" rentals

   (b) [ ] beach for swimming
       [ ] horse-back riding
       [ ] children's playground

   (c) [ ] a store, and/or lunch counter and/or drive-in where you sell
       [ ] basic essentials (milk, bread, ice, soft drinks, etc.)
       [ ] auto-gas and oil
       [ ] grocery store

   (d) [ ] supervised hunting trips
       [ ] supervised fishing trips

   (e) [ ] laundry facilities (coinwash or free-of-charge)
       [ ] shower facilities

   (f) [ ] Others (please specify)

E. MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

1. What is your daily basic rate for a tent or trailer site?

   [ ] $2.00  [ ] $2.50  [ ] $3.00  [ ] $3.50  [ ] $4.00
2. What is your extra charge for additional services at each site?

- Water, sewer hook-ups?
- Water, sewer, electricity hook-ups?
- Waterfront location?

3. Do you allow discounts for guests who stay for periods longer than 1 or 2 nights? (eg. weekly rates?)  

4. Do you have an advance reservation system that is used regularly?

5. Do you allow lower rates for the mid-week or off-season?

6. Do you give discounts to guests to encourage them to return?

7. Do you keep records of your customers and follow-up with mailed advertising to encourage them to return (eg. brochures, Christmas cards, etc.)?

3. OCCUPANCY

1. In the 1969 season, did you operate at a

- Loss?
- Break-even?
- Profit?

2. What OVERALL occupancy rate (average of weekdays and weekends) for the entire season do you feel is necessary for you to break-even?

- 0-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-75%
- 76%+

3. Has your number of campers increased significantly over the last three years?

4. Has the profitability of your operation increased over the last three years?

5. In this last season, how many customers did you have? (Indicate only the number of sites rented, not the total number of guests.)

6. What percentage of your total capacity do you feel this was? (Refer to Question #5)

7. Approximately what percentage of your customers are

Weekend and Holiday?

Weekday?

8. What percentage of your guests come during

- May-June?
- July?
- August?
- September-October?
9. During the summer holiday season (July-August), not including statutory holidays, what are your occupancy rates? (i.e. volume of business) Check one.

☐ About the same weekends and weekdays
☐ Slightly higher on weekends
☐ Much higher on weekends

10. What percentage of your guests were from

☐ British Columbia? ☐ Other Provinces? ☐ United States

11. Do you consider your campground to be an "overflow"?

☐ travelllers come to you when your nearby competitors (government or private) are full.

YES ☐ NO ☐

12. Listed below are methods of advertising.

In Column I, indicate every method you use.
In Column II, indicate the one method you feel is most successful.
In Column III, indicate the one method you feel is the second most effective for your business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I (If you use)</th>
<th>II (Most Effective)</th>
<th>III (Second Most Effective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Camping and recreation and outdoor magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Printing your own folders, brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Local tourist associations and Chambers of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ B. C. Motels &amp; Resorts Provincial Directory (for which you pay $50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Listing in Provincial Government Tourist Directory (&quot;The Green Book&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Follow-ups via the mail to previous customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Others (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Below is a list of problems that may affect the profitability of your business and the level of service you offer.

In Column I, check ALL those problems which affect your business operations (both establishing it and operating it).

In Column II, check your ONE main problem.

In Column III, check what you feel is your SECOND MOST common problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I (All problems)</th>
<th>Column II (Main problem)</th>
<th>Column III (Second Most common problem)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility is too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of services (hydro, water, sewer too expensive, difficult to obtain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too much competition from other private campgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too much competition from other public campgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxation (property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning and subdivision regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfillment of medical health regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Governments directly or indirectly are involved in many activities affecting
the operation of your campground. From the following list of activities, indi­
cate whether you feel each activity has been adequately fulfilled by the
government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>ADEQUATE</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advertising and Tourist Promotion
Health Inspection
Financial Assistance
Providing services (hydro, phones, roads, water, garbage)
Technical Assistance to encourage good business practices (advice, information)

2. Which level of government do you feel should supervise private campgrounds?

- [ ] Local?
- [ ] Provincial?
- [ ] Federal?

3. (a) The following lists several services that could possibly help campground
operators improve the level of the services they provide to recreationists.

In Column I, indicate whether you feel the government should participate.
(Note: Government could act alone or in conjunction with your Association,
but leadership, funds and man power would be provided mainly by the
Government)

In Column II, indicate whether you feel the task should be done by
campground operator associations such as B. C. Motels, Resorts and Trailer
Park Association.

In Column III, indicate if you feel neither should be involved and the
matter should be left to each private operator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I (Government)</th>
<th>II (Associations)</th>
<th>III (Neither)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcing health and sanitary standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcing maximum capacity standards (preventing overcrowding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervise fee rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program of low-cost loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical advice (soil and drainage, campground design, water and sewer systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management advice (how to advertise, deal with guests, keep financial record)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liability insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISCELLANEOUS

In the following space, please write any additional comments:

1. Comments on additional problems you face.
2. Comments on the questionnaire.
3. Comments on the role of the government.