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ABSTRACT

As a result of the cumulative interaction of several forces the demand pressures on outdoor recreation space and facilities in North America are increasing rapidly. The forces at work are those of population growth and urbanization, rising levels of per-capita income, leisure and mobility, the use of space-consuming recreational equipment, and the rise of the tourist-recreation industry. The supply, in terms of outdoor space and amenities, with the range of requisite site facilities, is limited, and the necessity of careful planning for recreational land use becomes increasingly apparent. There are conflicts between public and private interests, between various adjacent or simultaneous uses of land for recreation, between the agencies which provide the facilities through which recreation land is used, and between recreation and non-recreation land uses.

On the assumption that the forces making for these conflicting pressures will continue, the hypothesis is proposed, that regional planning should provide an optimum balance between public, private-commercial, private-collective and private-individual types of recreation site development. This basically normative approach makes necessary a descriptive survey and evaluation of the four types of agency and their respective effects on the physical, economic, legal-administrative and social background of the
region in which they occur. It also requires a consideration of the public interest as a norm within which the goals of outdoor-recreation planning may be established, and an analysis of the optimizing processes which are or might be the methodological basis of planning.

Two basic approaches to the problem of defining the public interest are exposed: one seeking to define it substantively as a particular state of affairs; the other seeking procedural or operational conditions which will generate it. In the latter case the processes of decision-making are of prior importance in leading toward the public interest, a concept which is itself left undefined in terms of concrete value content. It appears that the conflict-solving process must be a process of balancing or harmonizing a wide range of values, including those of initiative in decision-making as well as those of concrete results. This balancing of values is called optimizing, since no single value must be maximized at the expense of others when each has a valid claim. The survey and analysis indicate that each of the four agencies for outdoor recreation site development in North America has a valid role to play in providing recreation and other benefits, given planning direction. The public interest in regional land-use planning, therefore, lies in optimizing recreation benefits, which in turn requires an optimum balance between public, private-commercial, private-collective and private individual types of site development.
The hypothesis, insofar as it implies that planning can optimize recreation land-use on the regional scale, is not valid, since, although the region seems, prima facie, to be the appropriate unit in scale, there are many publics, and many interests in outdoor recreation which transcend regional limits. A true optimum, therefore, even within a region, is more likely to be achieved by national and even international planning of recreation resources.

This limited investigation could be extended by further theoretical analysis and by field research, particularly in the form of attitude and other surveys of the impact of new recreation development on local communities.
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CHAPTER I

OUTDOOR - RECREATION SPACE DEMANDS
AND THE PLANNING PERSPECTIVE

I. OPEN SPACE, A PRE-REQUISITE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

The general area of investigation attempted in this paper is that of land use for outdoor recreation. It is an examination of the alternative agencies for developing sites for recreation, with particular attention to those conflicts of interest now apparent in the more affluent parts of the world where these alternative agencies are at work.

"Recreation" is here understood to mean all of those activities carried on in outdoor settings not as work for profit, but as voluntary activity during leisure time. The kind of outdoor places with which the paper is concerned are not the smaller, urban parks, but major parks and resort areas of regional, national or even international significance. "Recreation is a form of activity, or, more exactly, various forms of activity, undertaken for a specific purpose - that of enjoyment." ¹ "Site" means any piece of land or water which may constitute a unit, either in terms of boundaries or of central base, for one or more forms of outdoor

recreation. For example: a beach strip, a point of land, a small bay or island, stretches of lake or sea-shore, wooded valleys, stretches of river and stream, heights ideal for skiing, locations for boat mooring and launching, riding trails and ranches, etc. "Development" means any improvement, enclosure, form of controlling access to and use of site. Access and accommodation are the main parts of development, but there is an important class of developments which consist in holding exclusive rights alone, and using the site with minimal if any alteration to it. For example, a hunting lodge, a camp-site or a restricted-use frontage lot. The main examples in mind, however, are the resort hotel, the marina, the camping grounds, motels swimming pools and floats, boat rentals and wharfs, ski-resorts and private cottages.

II. INCREASING DEMAND - LIMITED SUPPLY

The existence and the nature of pressures on recreation sites can be fairly easily shown. Basically it is a matter of mounting demand acting against a limited supply. A few key statistics will readily establish that this demand is one of the most rapidly growing elements in the North American consumption pattern. The population of the United States stood at 181.6 millions in 1960; by the year 2000,

conservative estimates are that it will be about 310 millions.\textsuperscript{3} Fortune Magazine estimated (1955) that some $30,600,000,000 were spent by Americans on recreational pursuits in 1953, and there is considerable evidence that recreational expenditures per capita, and as a proportion of income, rise with rising incomes.\textsuperscript{4}

The forces at work are in part those affecting all forms of land use to-day, and in part those related to ways of living which have opened up over the past two generations only. In this sense there is continuity between past and present; there has always been some pressure for the choicest recreation sites. But in the past fifty years an expansion of the basic forces making for this pressure has taken place. The elements of this expansion may be described as follows:

1. The population has risen sharply and is still rising. While this has been accompanied by an equally sharp acceleration in the urban trend, which has thinned the rural population, it has intensified pressures on outdoor-recreation sites by obliterating or saturating many of those within easy reach of urban and suburban populations.\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[4] Ibid., p. 131.
\end{footnotes}
2. The increased population has gained many-fold in mobility through transport technology. The effects of mass use of the motor car have been especially prominent. This mobility has extended the range and speed of travellers to all recreation areas in quest of outdoor pleasures, and has set up a further pattern of conflict between method of access and the very existence of the attracting amenity.

3. This expanding, urbanized, mobilized population has acquired a general level of wealth which enables them to bid for recreation resort space ever more intensively; reaching out from the urban centres to wilderness areas no matter how remote.

4. With this affluence there has come a transformation in work spans. The latter, in terms of hours per day, days per week, weeks per year and years per life span, have shortened by 30% or more for the average person over the past fifty years. Work itself is less and less physically exhausting, owing to mechanization and automation, releasing more energy per person for recreational pursuits.

5. The ways in which modern, affluent, urbanized, mobilized, leisured man plays have become to a great extent motorized, and therefore more space consuming. Having

---

6. Clawson's estimate is that in the year 2000 the annual travel per capita will be 9000 miles in the U.S., compared with 5000 in 1956.

7. Figure 1, p. 5.

8. Ibid.
FIGURE 1, INCOME, TRAVEL, AND LEISURE FACTORS AFFECTING THE USE OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES, 1850-2000, From Clawson, Held and Stoddard, p. 130.
arrived at our recreation site we go water-skiing, scuba-diving, snow-skiing, houseboating, power-boating, riding, flying, or just "scenic driving." Each of these and many other pursuits requires many acres of land and water surface per participant.

6. The "selling" by resort operators, local chambers of commerce and others, of outdoor-recreation assets to tourists has become a major part of the tourist industry; and the tourist industry is increasingly a key factor in the economy of regions of sparse settlement and limited resources, other than recreation amenities, to support local populations.

III. THE PLANNING PERSPECTIVE

Hypothetically at least, a comprehensive plan of growth and land use for any regional community where there is a major resort potential is of the greatest importance. It is the best justification for controls which can otherwise seem only negative to those on whom they are imposed. This approach entails the view that conflicts can be reconciled or obviated through design, and controls allocating sites for various forms of development. The perspectives taken for this paper are that such planning in North America will take place in a context of competing demands acting against a limited supply, in a mixed socio-economic order where some of the decisions are made by public agencies in the public interest and the balance are made by private agencies in relation to a free-market equilibrium. In this context
recreation sites have two aspects: they are a commodity in a rising market, and they are a valued asset in the social and cultural life of any community.

In a democratic society any controls or designs of a comprehensive planning nature must be accepted by a majority of the public in the long run as being in the public interest, i.e., as benefiting a maximum number of people rather than a privileged few. The concept of the public interest is one which always confronts the planning profession, and which, from time to time, must be analyzed and re-defined at least provisionally. For in any decision regarding public controls, criteria for recreation land use and method of development are either expressed or implied. These criteria will vary with conditions, in both the micro and the macro sense, but the central problem for the planning profession will remain: to reach a satisfactory interpretation of the public interest in relation to land use in general and in relation to the distribution of power and initiative by which land is developed. The public interest must include, that is, not merely the fixed goal of good land use arrangements, but the human experiences entailed in the process of shaping and reaching those goals.

The general subject area of this paper, recreation land use, is one in which this problem is increasingly insistent for reasons, among others, indicated above. Within the problem are a number of other questions: for example, which public? When? Whose interest? What kind of interest?
In North America, the area in which this study is confined, these questions are both practically as well as theoretically important, because outdoor recreation is, or is becoming, a key factor in life on this continent.

IV. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS INVESTIGATION

Necessarily, some assumptions must be accepted in a limited study of this kind. In the first place a somewhat normative approach is taken, insofar as it is assumed that it is desirable to minimize destructive conflicts and to optimize recreation potential. It is also assumed that the concept of the public interest is valid and useful, though this is questioned by at least one serious writer on the subject. A further general assumption is that planning for recreation is both actual and possible in our society, and that an optimum can be held which does not wholly exclude either public or private power and initiative.

Some more particular assumptions may be listed as follows:

1. That the changes in demand, making for conflicting pressures on recreation sites, will continue into the foreseeable future.

2. That no technological or social breakthroughs will occur which will radically affect the supply of sites for outdoor recreation.

3. That technological advance will continue at its present rate.

4. That a high level of economic activity and employment will be maintained, with no serious or prolonged depression.

Within the assumptions made, it is not intended to focus on outdoor recreation in the more urban sense of local ball-parks, zoos or even scenic areas serving urban populations in an urban setting, but rather on sites within larger areas, where the whole region has recreation value in the form of forest, river, stream, lake, sea-shore, mountains, hills, valleys, special features, wild-life, fish and game, birds, hot springs, etc.

From a survey and analysis of our main patterns of recreation, this paper will proceed to examine the various implications which are carried by the recreation form itself, on one hand, and by the approach to site development on the other. In the latter category four main classifications will be considered, namely:

1. Public agency - public use.
2. Private agent - tourist-commercial use.
4. Private owner - private use.

Each of these will, of course, have sub-categories, and there will be combinations of one or more in the same site. But on the whole these are considered the most significant types of development of land for recreation now in
practice in North America.

V. HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis which the following investigation attempts to verify is that each of the common methods of making recreation sites available has a train of consequences or associated effects over the range of activities with which planning is concerned. The small communities located in regions of prime recreation value, for example, are increasingly faced with decisions as to the allocation of space for local people to use for themselves, or for local people to sell or develop for wider use. The use of beach for tourist-commercial development on the one hand, precludes its use through the peak season by the remainder of the local people on the other. But it enriches the community, supposedly, by enriching local residents who control access to the choicest sites. This is only one of a great many conflicts which must somehow be harmonized if land use for recreation is to be given an optimum place in the total scheme of land use for any area. Indeed there are conflicts of interest even where there is little if any settlement in the area. The protected catchment area for a city's water reservoir could be cited as an example, or the millions of acres in North America held in forest reserve.

That these conflicts will become a great deal more severe without an adequate planning approach is apparent from the pressures listed above. It is also part of the hypothesis to be examined that an adequate planning approach can
avoid most of the destructive conflicts, but only if controls 
are available in a positive form, with site potentials 
realized at a high level of use, both in quality and quantity 
of recreation enjoyment. There are ways of combining and 
separating, of arranging for accommodation, access, financing, 
provision of facilities, etc., which can make a very great 
difference to the total satisfaction gained from recreation 
sites. These ways include zoning instruments and design, 
methods of operation of neighbouring sites, standards of 
sanitation and construction, etc. Such techniques, well used, 
encourage investment and good development by unitary control 
of large areas which can then be proper subjects of inte­
grated design. The hypothesis may then be summarized as 
follows: that regional planning for outdoor-recreation land 
use in North America should provide an optimum balance 
between public, commercial, collective, and private types of 
recreation site development.

VI. SUMMARY

This paper is an examination of the effects of the 
four main forms of ownership by which outdoor recreation 
sites are developed in North America. Recreation is treated 
as a leisure activity, in this case requiring large areas of 
land and water, with a wide range of topographical and other 
features. The unit of land which is the basis of treatment 
is the site, which may be all or part of some outdoor 
attracting feature. Development of sites is the physical use 
and treatment given them by their respective owners.
The demand for outdoor space for recreation is increasing rapidly in North America with the increases in leisure, mobility and affluence of the population, added to the increase in population itself. Meeting this demand with developed sites is in part a government, and in part a private enterprise in a mixed economy. Planning in the public interest, it is argued, must recognize the implications of four basic types of site ownership and development, and must formulate an optimum balance between them. The four types are: public agency, tourist-commercial developer, collective owner, (i.e. clubs or other institutions) and private individual.

Success in reconciling or avoiding conflicts between these types of ownership and development in a comprehensive local, regional, state or provincial, national and even international scheme is increasingly important because, against the rising demand for outdoor-recreation space the supply is limited.
CHAPTER II

OUTDOOR - RECREATION VALUES AND THEIR FULFILMENT

1. THE BASIC NEED FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

The prophets of community and regional planning in this century: Geddes, Howard, Mumford and, before them, the Romantic and Classical traditions of our civilization, all recognize that man's need to experience outdoor settings is basic to his well-being. Outdoor recreation has been conceived of as an instrumental and an intrinsic value. As an instrumental value it is justified or recommended for its therapeutic effects on soul and/or body. The more ascetic

---

1 Sir Patrick Geddes, Cities in Evolution (London: Williams & Norgate, 1919).
2 cf. also Ebenezer Howard, Garden Cities of Tomorrow (London: Faber and Faber, 1946).
4 Wordsworth's poetry, perhaps, most completely expresses this need in its spiritual aspects; there were others who appealed directly to it. In classical literature the pastoral tradition places man in an idealized, rustic environment. The Arcadian genre as in the works of Spenser and Sydney, where archetypal forms of forest, river, sea and plain are the setting for man's struggle and re-creation, is a later expression of the power of nature in man's imaginative life.
tradition makes of the great outdoors a place to be experienced with due application and respect; the sensuous elements suppressed or transmuted into practical utility or idealized forms, poetic and mystical. As an intrinsic value it is an end in itself, sought for the sheer pleasure of moving through or quietly perceiving the world of nature.

The concept of the good life almost universally held in North America includes the experience of natural as distinct from man-made surroundings. This need appears to be increasing with the increase in urbanization of the population, creating two basic environmental pressures. One is the quest for escape from urban noise, dust, congestion, tension, and lack of open space and vegetation, into some atmosphere completely in contrast to the urban. (The suburban villa is some help, but the need overflows the villa's highly restrained and artificial bounds. The family takes its car and boat, and heads for the lakeshore or anywhere where streets, houses, and other people do not crowd the scene.) The second environmental pressure is that of leisure itself; the time must be filled. It must be lived at some optimum pitch of conscious pleasure, and outdoor recreation, replacing both outdoor and indoor "work", is one of the most satisfying ways of spending leisure time.

No doubt there are other pressures as well, making outdoor recreation a "must" for most people some of the time. The sheer need for exercise and for space in which to move swiftly, freely and safely, the need for clean and fresh air to breathe, and for sunshine, would justify treating the outdoor experience as a serious requirement for modern man and for future man. Geddes, Mumford, and others, have even stressed its survival value - for that balance of outlook which is essential to sanity, and therefore to the reason and goodwill by which man must find a civilized polity to avoid war. 7

What is it about the outdoor setting which gives these satisfactions? Any listing would include at least the following factors:

1. Remoteness of place and feeling, or atmosphere.

2. Wildness. The suggestion of danger and physical freedom; the proximity of wild-life.

3. Integrity of habitat; the "unspoiled" work of nature.

4. Accommodation oriented toward relaxation and pleasure.

5. Pleasant sensations: sight, sound, smell, taste, touch, and movement.

6. A sense of range and scope for activity.

7 Lewis Mumford, op. cit., p. 511 ff. Also discussion of plate 58. See also Geddes, op. cit., passim.
7. Scenic inspiration.
8. Contact with the primeval.
9. Quietness and stillness or elemental violence and excitement.

To sum up, in outdoor recreation we seek, in some sense, to restore or to make ourselves anew; we also seek to escape from the unease, if not the disease which is the increasing menace in city and suburb, and we seek the intrinsic pleasures of outdoor activity in itself. The emotional and sensuous impact of the outdoor environment may be broken down into the various components which, as listed above, describe the range of experience which that environment gives.

II. OUTDOOR - RECREATION SITE REQUIREMENTS

From this description of the more intrinsic needs and values, one could well deduce that there would be massive requirements for space in North America related to outdoor recreation. What is this "outdoors" in which so much recreation takes place? How is it made to serve the primary needs? What, in effect, are the instrumental needs or site requirements which arise directly from the deeper motivations expressed through demand? The basic requirements may be described as follows:

8

Lewis Mumford, op. cit., Chapter 17.
Units of Terrain

The platform for most recreation activities is the surface of the earth. The media for recreation may be of many kinds, such as:

1. Water; its surface; its depth; its flow; its quantity and quality; its boundaries.
2. Land forms, either independent of, or in close relation to, water.
3. Land cover: rock, sand, grass, forest, snow, tundra.
4. Climate and seasons, macro and micro, i.e. a varied atmosphere.

Any outdoor-recreation place derives its recreational value from these components. They are found as shorelines, hills and valleys, lakes, streams, oceans, rivers, islands, and all the other forms of nature. But, in nearly all cases, the components fall into spatial units: of area, elevation, contour, orientation and slope. Moreover, the outdoor-recreation space unit must have some degree of wildness; it must be truly non-urban; either unpopulated, unsettled, or sparsely settled. The farm scene does offer some of the elements of outdoor setting for recreation, but the distinction between recreational and agricultural land use is still important.

Units of Development

Provision for outdoor recreation also requires the division of outdoor places into measurable areal units. The
unit or site is a piece of land, measured and legally described for purposes of tenure, and containing or sharing one or more of the outdoor-place characteristics listed above. Larger units may encompass whole river valleys and mountain ranges, as with great public parks and wilderness areas. A development unit, or part of one, with the facilities which make its use possible, may be referred to as a development site.

Development Treatment

Every site requires in addition to a piece of land, three other main components, to make full-scale recreation use possible. These may be classified as:

1. The access facilities, that is, those facilities which enable people to get there. Roads are to-day the main form of access facility, but there are many others, such as trails, airports, ski-lifts, railways, docks, wharfs and quais for water vehicles, funicular railways, cable cars, chairlifts, bridges, etc. Each type of access facility has its own kind of impact as part of the site and is a factor of great importance to the ultimate character of the site.

2. The accommodation facilities, that is, those which enable people to stay where the access facilities enable them to go. These may be rudimentary and temporary, such as camp-sites, or elaborate and permanent, like the Banff Springs Hotel in Alberta, Canada. Development treatment is mainly concerned with accommodation at the site, because accommodation determines the intensity with which the site
can be used. Accommodation includes more than heat, light and shelter, however, for the whole range of consumer goods must often be supplied at or near the site, or at some point along the way to it. Accommodation may be dispersed about the site, even outside of it, but should be near enough for convenient and frequent use.

3. The inspiration facilities. These are basically the developer's interpretation of what the site can most appropriately be used for, and would include methods of attracting people to it, catering for special markets such as riding, skiing, water sports, and boat or fishing uses. It would also include actual recreation equipment.

Developers

Someone must act to mobilize the various means of development, and to carry a plan into a reality. One or more agencies must:

1. Recognize and acquire the site for recreation.
2. Design the site treatment; facilities, or improvements and services.
3. Provide site access.
5. Organize a staff.
6. Implement the design, for example, by letting construction contracts.
7. Operate the site.
8. Maintain, replace and expand facilities.
Public Planning

Every recreation site development entails some form of planning on national, state or provincial, regional and local levels. The need is increasingly for co-ordination between every agency planning for the development of recreation sites in order to obtain maximum benefit in meeting the demands.

III. DEMAND PRESSURES FOR RECREATION LAND IN NORTH AMERICA

General

The needs and the requirements outlined above give rise to a demand in all cases for open land in the broadest sense, including water areas. Because the demand is rising rapidly, while the basic supply, space, is fixed, and only development by man can change the intensity with which it can be used, there exists a pressure of demand on supply. Demand is here understood as the behaviour of large numbers of people who use or try to use recreation sites, who travel to them, who offer money or pay money to use them or own them. A secondary order of demands arises from individuals and agencies seeking to acquire and develop sites as a market commodity to sell, lease or otherwise make available to direct consumers of outdoor recreation, but the fundamental problem of land itself is an 'extra-market' problem.

Measurement and prediction of demand for outdoor recreation space is still at a very crude level, and theorists are working on various techniques which will improve
the accuracy of our information on this subject. That they have a long way to go is indicated by one of the foremost authorities on the subject, Marion Clawson, who says, for example:

Where it is estimated that total demand for all outdoor recreation may rise in the year 2000 to ten times its level in 1956, this should be interpreted as something between five and fifteen times. With information available at the time this study was written, no more precise estimate can be made.9

The main difficulty is that extrapolations are from very short periods of record in the past, relative to the length of time over which a projection from present conditions is made.

With this qualifications in mind, however, it is not difficult to establish the general character and the trends of demand for outdoor recreation land in North America, and to relate them to basic categories of supply. The three main sources of information used in this paper are: (1) the works of Marion Clawson, (see bibliography) (2) the study reports of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of the United States Federal Government, and (3) the papers on Recreation Resources in Canada, presented to the "Resources for Tomorrow" Conference held in October, 1961, at Montreal.

Causes of the Demand

Nearly all authorities on the subject of recreation space demands ascribe them to a set of circumstances which

have arisen on this continent at an accelerating rate since the turn of the century. Both assessment of present demand and prediction of future demand is based in part on indirect indices as well as on direct measures such as the actual attendances at parks and resorts. The indirect indices, or causes of direct demand will be treated for the United States and Canada under the following six headings: Population, Mobility, Income, Leisure, Recreation Equipment and the Tourist Industry.

**Population.** Three main aspects of population affect recreation land use most directly. These are the total numbers, their distribution, and the characteristics which affect rate of increase and types of demand. The actual numbers may be correlated with general per-capita demands and acreages; the distribution indicates degrees of urbanization as well as patterns of settlement as between one part of the country and another; and the characteristics are closely related to different types of recreation space demands, for example, that of older, as distinct from younger, populations.

The total population of the United States was about 180 millions in 1960. Growth rates fell from over 30 percent per decade before 1900 to only 7.2 percent in the decade 1930 to 1940. They rose to 15 percent in the next decade, and have continued to just over 1.5 percent per year to the present. The source from which these figures are taken indicates a continuing growth rate of 1.53 percent per year
from 1960 through 1976 to the year 2000. The absolute figures projected as most likely are for a total population of nearly 231 millions by 1976, and 351 millions by the year 2000. Another estimate places the 1980 figure at 240 millions and the most probable figure for the year 2000 at 310 millions.

The present population is distributed most densely in the New England, Middle Atlantic and East North Central states, (nearly 81 millions in 1960) and least densely in the Mountain states, (nearly 7 millions in 1960). The South Atlantic group had about 26 millions, and the Pacific group about 21 millions in 1960. Internal migration, rather than different fertility rates, is the main cause of different growth rates between states. (see Appendix) In 1960 63 percent of the American population lived in urbanized areas. The ORRRC projections were for 66.2 percent by 1976 and 71.1 percent by the year 2000.

The present age structure places about 80 millions under 25 years old, 58 millions from 25 to 49 years old, and


11 Marion Clawson, op. cit., p. 184.

## TABLE 1, URBAN AND METROPOLITAN POPULATION DISTRIBUTIONS, U.S.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976-1/</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total United States</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976-1/</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total United States</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Urban2/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976-1/</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total United States</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2/ Old definition.

### TABLE 2, PROJECTIONS OF U.S. POPULATION, 1976 AND 2000, FROM U.S. ORRRC STUDY

Report 23, p. 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Actual 1960</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>179,323</td>
<td>230,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>20,321</td>
<td>24,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>18,692</td>
<td>22,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>16,774</td>
<td>20,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>13,219</td>
<td>20,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>10,801</td>
<td>19,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79,807</td>
<td>108,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td>17,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11,949</td>
<td>14,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>12,481</td>
<td>12,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>11,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>11,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,778</td>
<td>67,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>9,606</td>
<td>11,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>10,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>9,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>7,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>6,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,175</td>
<td>46,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td>5,563</td>
<td>8,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Canadian population displays a higher growth rate; 2.7 percent per year in the past few years, with indications that this will continue. The 1956 population was about 16 millions; the 1961 population, over 18 millions. Projections to 1975 indicates a population of about 25 millions, or an increase of more than 55 percent in 20 years.

This population is concentrated in three main areas, with considerable dispersion at low densities over other areas. Sixty-two percent is in a corridor of land 700 miles long from Quebec City to Windsor. Other relative concentrations are around Winnipeg and in the Lower Mainland of B.C. Population in metropolitan areas in 1956 was over six-and-a-quarter millions. About 38 percent of the population lived in 15 metropolitan centres.

Age levels are decreasing. The median age, 30 years in 1960, is expected to be 27 years by the mid 1970's. Sex ratios are evening up, though more rural and remote areas show a heavy preponderance of males, and the higher urban centres a slight preponderance of females. 13

Mobility. Since 1940 total passenger miles per capita has doubled in the United States, from 2,230 to 4,170. Crude

projections are for about 6,800 by 1976 and 11,000 for the year 2000. Speeds are also rising, and distance-time-volume ratios changing rapidly.

Over 90 percent of future travel is expected to be by private vehicle. At present over 60 million passenger cars are owned in the United States, with projections for 100 million by 1976, and for 176 million by the year 2000. Road mileage is over 3,500,000 already, with 41,000 miles of inter-state super-highway scheduled for completion by 1972.

In Canada the ownership of cars was about 3.5 million in 1960;—only about 60 percent of American car ownership. The gap, however, is closing more rapidly than the income gap. Between 8 and 9 million passenger vehicles, as forecast for 1980, must be provided for on Canadian roads, with a further allowance for probably several times that number in spill-over from the U.S.A. In 1961 this spill-over accounted for the presence of about 9 million vehicles on Canadian roads, with 2 million remaining in Canada for more than 48 hours. Surfaced road mileage in Canada was about 300,000 in 1961, two fifths of which had been added since 1951.

Air travel by Canadians increased 30 times over between 1930 and 1955. Bus and even rail travel have

---

14 U.S. ORRRC, op. cit., p. 91.
15 Lloyd Brooks, op. cit., p. 963.
**TABLE 3, DOMESTIC INTERCITY TRAVEL, U.S.A.,**

From U.S. ORRRC Study Report 23, p. 112.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and bus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per capita</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Railway data exclude commutation traffic. Air travel data covers domestic scheduled airlines and thus excludes the relatively small volume travel in "business aircraft," domestic charter flights, and "pleasure flying." Because of these exclusions and other exclusions such as traffic on inland waterways, the data in the above table are less comprehensive than that published by the Interstate Commerce Commission. For sources of data, see respective projection model tables in chapters 3, 4, and 5. Auto data shown in column for 1940 relate to 1941. Data given for 1960 are estimates prepared for this report based on most cases on preliminary data. The population estimates cover the residents of 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. Estimates of the projected population are obtained from source cited in table C-6. Population estimates are as follows, in millions: 1940, 132; 1950, 151; 1960, 177; 1976, 229; and 2000, 348.
increased; rail for inter-city travel for distances over 200 miles.

The basic effects of mobility on recreation land use are, first, the increased access to recreation areas by people from greater distances, second, the space requirements of the media themselves and their impact on the landscape, and third, the service and space requirements of the vehicles used, and their demands at recreation sites.

**Income.** Real income per capita in the United States has been rising persistently for a century with productivity per man-hour. Clawson's figure for real per capita income in the United States in 1956 was $1630; projected to 1980, $2525; and to the year 2000, $3660; (1955 dollar values.) Studies by Clawson and others show that as family incomes rise the proportion spent on recreation also rises, giving a multiplying relationship between income growth rates and rates of rise in demand for, among other things, recreation assets and outdoor space. 16

In Canada incomes and productivity have been rising more slowly than in the United States, but rates of increase are nevertheless significant for recreational land use. Gross national expenditures on personal consumption rose in real terms by 51.5 percent from 1949 to 1959. The pattern of consumption closely follows that of the United States. 17

---

16 Clawson, op. cit.
17 Brooks, op. cit., p. 960.
**Leisure.** The average number of working hours per week in the United States is now about 38. An average reduction of 161 hours per year per employee is forecast for 1976, and of 406 hours per year, or about one day per week by the year 2000. Paid holidays will go from an average of two weeks per year in 1960 to over three weeks in the year 2000, at which time there will be a further 1½ days per year average of special holidays.

Leisure in Canada will follow a similar pattern. The average length of work week, reduced by 45 percent since 1870, will be halved by 1970, when leisure time after a 35 hour week will be three times that in 1860 after a 68 hour week;—from 16 to 49 hours for leisure. With free time as with income there is a rising proportion spent on recreation with each extra hour of leisure gained.

**Equipment.** Technological improvements have introduced a vast range of better and cheaper equipment for outdoor recreation. In general every improvement entails a greater demand on the basic resource - in space or in other terms such as stocks of fish and game. In the United States and Canada a few outstanding examples have been improved skiing equipment, popularizing a once esoteric sport; ski-lifts, tows and lodges; lightweight boats and engines at prices available to the masses, small air-craft, fishing tackle and

---

many other developments could be mentioned. The ORRRC indicates an "aspiration scale" which will probably lead to a great increase in the use of new equipment in the next few decades.

The tourist industry. Tourism, the attraction of foreigners (and their money) to an area, is for North America, and for Canada especially, a major and growing factor affecting demand for outdoor recreation space and amenities. The table below indicates something of the scale and distribution of this industry for Canada in recent years.

TABLE 4, EARNINGS FROM TOURISM, CANADA, 1959

From Crombie, p. 970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Million Dollars (U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>185.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Provinces</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>351.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For obvious reasons the business of catering for tourist-recreation demands, both as a commercial development and as a public service, is now taken very seriously by every province and state, and by most local communities.

**Total Demand Effects**

The actual and future demand effects of these six forces on outdoor recreation space are colossal. These effects, however, can only be assessed by way of standards, and of units of measurement which translate leisure time use into outdoor acreage use. Standards have been worked out in terms of acres per 1000 population for various kinds of park and open space. A figure of 7 acres of park per 1000 population is often quoted by planning authorities.\(^{21}\) This does not include major parks of regional, provincial or national significance, and in fact has been challenged as arbitrary and inadequate. Size must be related to more specialized functions and real needs. The U.S. Department of the Interior in 1959 analyzed some of the basic problems and arrived at a tentative per capita standard of 65 acres of public recreation lands for every 1000 people in a state, adding that, "... such lands should be properly distributed to serve local and statewide needs for various types of

\(^{21}\text{Land for Leisure (Report of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board. New Westminster, B.C., Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board. 1961).}\)
recreation areas." They also noted that areas for any single type of recreation need could vary from less than an acre to "... space enough to include the horizon within the park as seen from the main centers of interest within the park." Sessoms goes further and warns that recreation patterns change and standards become obsolete. Planning must conceive more of recreation lands as systems, comprehensive and adaptable to changing technology and needs.

Among the basic classifications of recreation land use those of Marion Clawson stand out as most adequate for analysing demand. Clawson's three categories are: (1) user oriented, (2) intermediate areas, and (3) resource based areas. The user-oriented area is intensively used, small in scale, generally close to dense population, and not very dependent on any special natural feature. The intermediate areas are "farther from home", larger in scale, typically the objective of an all day or overnight visit, with accessibility more important than feature amenities as such. The resource based areas are selected for some unique natural or man-made feature, and are not dependent in location relative to population centres, being based on a "resource". They

---


may be remote and have very limited access, and artificial developments such as reservoirs, but still attract millions of visitors.

Actual use for recreation land is generally measured in terms of three units, each of which has an acreage and site development requirement attached to it. The units are the number of separate visits, the number of visitor-days, and the number of separate visitors, all over a given time span. There are other measures of demand, such as the amounts of money paid for use of recreation land, but use itself is the most direct, since most access to outdoor recreation sites is free or at a nominal fee. The three units above may be generally called 'attendances'. Table 5, page 38, indicates recent and projected demand for the three categories of outdoor recreation space defined by Clawson. Roughly speaking America can expect something like a fourfold increase in attendances at user-oriented areas, a sixteen-fold increase at intermediate areas, and a fortyfold increase at resource-based areas by the year 2000. The second table also shows actual areas and "adequate" areas serving the demand or required to meet the demand for the first two categories in 1956.

The total attendance at national parks in Canada was 3,035,000 in the 1954-55 season and 3,788,500 in the 1959-60

---

season; an increase of about 4 percent per year over the five year interval. 26 At this rate the total demand would double every sixteen years, giving something like 8,000,000 attendances by 1976, and 24,000,000 by the year 2000. The proportion of visitors between 1955 and 1960 ran consistently at about 80 percent Canadian and 20 percent foreign.

This index is only one of many ways in which demand is expressed. The demand for the popular "all day" parks within 75 miles of urban centres in the United States is expected to increase 10 to 12 times between 1955 and 1985. The Canadian rate of increase is estimated to be 60 percent higher than the American rate, indicating an increase of 17 or 18 fold from 1955 to 1985. For more remote resource-based recreation areas the Canadian rate of increase is running at about 12 percent per year, compared with the American 8 percent. 27

IV. PRESENT AND FUTURE LAND SUPPLIES

The present supply position for outdoor recreation space in the United States is most succinctly stated in the Department of the Interior publication previously cited. (page 33) It reads in part as follows:

In 1956 there were approximately 31 acres in State parks per 1,000 population in the United States and 7.7 acres in municipal and county parks per 1,000 urban population. Approximately 33 million acres of Federal lands were used primarily

26 H.L. Crombie, loc. cit.
27 Lloyd Brooks, loc. cit.
for recreation purposes, or 201 acres per 1,000 population in the United States in 1955-56. This acreage was distributed as follows: National Park System (89), National Recreation Areas and Parkways (13), National Forest Wilderness Areas (814), National Forest recreation facilities and fishing lakes (15). In addition, recreation constitutes one of the uses of other Federal lands, such as National Wildlife Refuges, Reservoirs and other forest land, which total approximately 964 acres per 1,000 population. The total land in Federal ownership in 1955-56 was approximately 455 million acres or approximately 2,700 acres per 1,000 population.

These appear to be very generous figures. The ORRRC gives a figure of only 2,316,018 acres as the total land and water area designated for some form of public recreation in 1960. This was divided among 24,340 separate, designated areas managed for public recreation use. The report states that recreation lands comprise only about 12.2 percent of the nation's gross area (50 states) of 2.3 billion acres. This would indicate a gross recreation space supply potential of some 287,500,000 acres. Recreation also occurs on the other public lands totalling about 873 million acres. In addition, large areas could become available from Department of Defence holdings, from Indian Reserves, and from private estates.

Taking a gross requirement of 65 acres per 1,000 people, and a population of 350 millions in the year 2000, the total requirement for intermediate and resource-based recreation areas would be about 21,250,000 acres, or less than ten times the present total area designated. This figure is

---

much lower than that for total maximum potential (about 1,163,000,000 acres.)

It should be noted that Clawson's estimate of total requirement for adequate provision by the year 2000 for all 3 classes of outdoor recreation space is 135 million acres. (see Table 5, page 38)

The distribution of land set aside for recreation varies greatly over the nation. Noting the uneveness of State park acreages per capita, Clawson says:

For the nation as a whole in 1955 there were 3.1 acres of State parks per hundred of population. But ... only seven out of the 48 States had average acreage or above, but some of these parks were so extensive that they lifted the nation's average considerably. Three of the seven States were in the northeast and three were in the Far West; the only state in the center of the country which exceeded the average was South Dakota.

For the future the allocation of land in the right places for outdoor recreation must contend with and reconcile demands from industry, from military interests, from transportation facilities, from agriculture and from urban and suburban sprawl for residential and commercial use. The whole problem rises in acuteness with the proximity of various uses to one another in metropolitan regions, and the general pattern of existing distribution reflects this, with public outdoor recreation space per capita diminishing with proximity to other uses.

29 Clawson, op. cit., p. 175.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of recreation</th>
<th>Use and area</th>
<th>User-oriented</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Resource-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Million visits</td>
<td>1,000 plus</td>
<td>3,750 plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual area—million acres</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate area—million acres</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Million visits</td>
<td>1,000 plus</td>
<td>3,750 plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual area—million acres</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate area—million acres</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Using city and county parks as an index of this type.
2 Using state parks and federal reservoirs as a measure of this type.
3 Using the national park system, national forests, and federal wildlife refuges as a measure of this type.
4 State parks, 5.1 million acres; remainder, federal reservoirs.
5 Includes area of national park system, federal wildlife refuges, and national forests used primarily for recreation; additional areas are available for recreation and add value to specialized recreation areas.
6 See text for discussion.
7 Assuming area of state parks doubled and of federal reservoirs unchanged.
8 No estimate made.
9 Assuming reservoir areas of 20 million acres and state parks of 50 million acres.
10 Assuming some increase in federal areas used primarily or solely for recreation.
TABLE 6. AREA, OVERNIGHT CAPACITY AND ATTENDANCE BY MAJOR TYPES OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS, U.S.A.
From Clawson, Held and Stoddard, p. 150.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major type of outdoor recreation</th>
<th>Kind of areas representative of each type</th>
<th>Present area (mil. acres)</th>
<th>Primarily for recreation</th>
<th>Overnight capacity (1,000 persons)</th>
<th>Average annual increase</th>
<th>1955 or 1956</th>
<th>1955/1956 percentage increase in post-war years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. User-oriented</td>
<td>Municipal parks</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,000 plus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000 plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource-based</td>
<td>National park system</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National forests</td>
<td>188.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife refuges</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intermediate</td>
<td>State parks</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TVA reservoirs</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corps of Engineers reservoirs</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Most recent years of record; data are in terms of visits, except for wildlife refuges and TVA reservoirs, which are in terms of visitor days.
2 The chief attractions of these areas are their water resources; however, their use seems to be primarily of the single-day type typical of Intermediate areas.
3 Although some hunting and fishing is carried out on relatively distant areas, most of it is on a one-day basis, and is on areas conveniently located.
4 Not applicable.
5 Licenses; number of times hunted or fished may have been much greater.

The Canadian supply situation typifies this rule even more than the American. There has been a sharp decrease in the per capita acreage of highly accessible recreation areas especially. In 1901 the Canadian average was 34.9 acres per capita for this category of recreation land. The ratio has declined by 4.2 percent over the past 30 years. In Ontario the 1901 per capita figure was 20.1 acres; in 1961, 3.2 acres. In Quebec the ratio in 1961 was down to 3 acres per capita.

On a national scale, moreover, of the total area of national and provincial parks, (59,720 square miles in 1961) 59 percent was in the remote Wood Buffalo National Park on the boundary between Alberta and the North West Territories. Southern Ontario, with 90 percent of that province's population, has only about 5 percent of its park area. Point Pelee National Park on Lake Erie, six square miles in area, had in 1959-60, over 1,040,000 visitors, or 23 percent of the total attendance at all national parks.

With a man-space ratio of about 136 acres per capita, Canada appears to be well supplied with land. But over 80 percent of the total area is poor in quality and climate for recreation use. One-and-a-half percent is given over to national and provincial parks, or 2.1 acres of park land per capita. The estimated acreage of municipal parks, however, is only 215,000. Since 1950 (to 1961) provincial parks have

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province or Territory</th>
<th>&quot;000&quot;</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Provincial Wilderness Areas</th>
<th>National Parks and Major Sites</th>
<th>Historic Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prov. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,042</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13,163</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,041</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29,278</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>30,642</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) No information available.
increased by 240 percent in number, but only by 5 percent in area.

About 15 percent of the provincial parks examined in Baker's study were 15 acres or less, 14 percent were 16 to 50 acres, 42 percent were 51 to 100 acres, and only 11 percent were 5,000 acres or more in extent. In Canada there were, in 1961, 625 roadside camp and picnic grounds.

Taking the previous population figure of 25 millions as the projection for 1975, the requirements in national and provincial parks would be not less than about 53,760,000 acres, even to maintain present standards. This is more a problem in political decision-making than in meeting a demand from an acute shortage of supply; however, since the Wilderness areas already amount to 8,000 square miles, and Bird Sanctuaries, Game Reserves and Forest Reserves cover about 1,087,000 square miles, or 30 percent of Canada's area. The fore-going evidence suggests, however, that a fifty-fold increase in demand by the year 2000 is a not unreasonable projection, taking the likely American over-spill into account.

31 Ibid., p. 992.
32 Ibid.
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the basic needs for outdoor recreation, the site requirements which those needs entail, the actual and projected demand pressures, and the land supplies to meet them have been outlined. It is apparent that a deep and almost universal value is involved, that the requirements and demands are rising more rapidly than the population itself, and for the continent as a whole, more rapidly than provisions in terms of area and site development are rising. A review of the previous pages shows as well that (1) the present supply is deficient for a great many recreation needs at good standards - the right facility in the right location; (2) that, should this continue, some sort of crisis will occur or there will be a serious loss of recreation values.

The alarm, and the causes for it, have been expressed by many authorities. Brooks' apt description is representative:

When compounded the above factors indicate a demand for outdoor recreation space in the immediate future, which staggers the imagination. In nearly all cases this demand involves availability of special land and water areas in quantity and variety. There is a foreseeable limit to such land. There is no foreseeable limit to the presently burgeoning demand.

Brooks also describes one of the roots of the problem:

All outdoor areas have a definite capacity which, if consistently exceeded will result in a steady deterioration of the natural attractions.

---

33 Lloyd Brooks, op. cit., p. 957.
34 Ibid., p. 965.
Another part of the problem is described from various angles by three other noted sources. Baker states:

In the densely populated areas, where substantial public investment was required for land acquisition, and difficult decisions were necessary between alternatives competing for scarce land and water resources, public park development has lagged.

The ORRRC makes the point more generally:

Recreation is possible on only part of the Nation's 2.3 billion acres of land and water. The nature, location, accessibility, ownership and management of this vast area, in large part determine the recreation opportunities afforded.

Two final quotations will serve to show the direction of thinking on this continent toward a more balanced allocation of land. The report of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board of British Columbia previously cited suggests a picture that is perhaps typical of metropolitan or regional concentrations of people in both Canada and the United States:

Most of our usable coast-line within day-cruising range is now in private hands and there are very few spots on which the small boat sailor can land to relax and picnic.

The same problem is revealed by the ORRRC for American shores:

---

35 W.M. Baker, loc. cit.


But in many sections of the United States, most of the shoreline has been developed with vacation-time or year-round homes and thus is not available for public recreation. In others, hotels and motels have acquired relatively long stretches of private waterfront.

Competition for the little shoreline not already highly developed is keen, and the price of a lot and cottage is beyond the means of many people.

As with any increase in density and interaction between people, the design and operational control of certain elements of the environment becomes increasingly important. A one to one increase in actual recreation acreage for each increment in demand forecast would be impossible to continue indefinitely, since the total supply is not only limited but very uneven in quality. The solution to present and future inadequacies appears to lie partly in a leveling off of population itself, and partly in improvements in the organization, lay-out and use made of land for various purposes. This, for recreation, places the actual practices used on this continent to make outdoor recreation space available under critical scrutiny. In the next chapter something of the elements of that "system" as it exists, and the consequences in terms of recreation space allocation and development, are explored and evaluated.
CHAPTER III

MEETING THE OUTDOOR RECREATION
DEMAND IN NORTH AMERICA

I. THE FOUR COMMON PRACTICES
AND THEIR INTERACTIONS

How are sites and facilities for outdoor recreation use actually made available to people in North America? Who owns and controls the land and its use for recreation? The forms of control can be divided into four main categories, ranging from the most public and "free" to the most private. Respectively they are as follows:

1. Public Agency - Public Use
2. Private Agency - Tourist-Commercial Use
3. Collective Ownership - Restricted Use
4. Private Owner - Private Use

For each form of control there is a particular train of consequences for the site and its use, and for the surrounding area. It is the aim of this chapter to indicate and compare some of these consequences, and to evaluate the results of the total pattern from a planning perspective.
Public Agency - Public Use

By far the major part of outdoor recreation space in North America is provided by public agencies. The agency may be part of the national government, as with the national parks and many forest reserves; or it may be part of a city, metropolitan, county, regional, state or provincial government. In Canada the provinces and the federal government share the dominant role in providing outdoor recreation space. Nearly all large cities have a Parks Department, and provinces and states have recreation and conservation authorities within which are sections dealing with parks and various outdoor facilities for tourists.

The public agency, then, is a body exercising public authority to acquire, control, develop and/or otherwise administer an area for public recreation use. It may also include authorities whose primary function is not recreation, for example, forestry, but for whose land management the multiple use concept is applied, and recreation accepted as an important use.

Private Agency - Tourist-Commercial Use

In this category fall all the outdoor recreation resorts, hotels, motels, and other enterprises in the business of selling access and/or accommodation at or near a

---

recreation area. It includes the familiar types of direct or indirect catering for outdoor recreational demands. The direct catering is done by owners of sites such as beaches or game farms, who rent camp lots, cabins or rooms, or who charge fees for admission to the area and use of its facilities. Indirect catering is done by entrepreneurs in the general area of a recreation attraction who offer everything from souvenirs to overnight accommodation to people have come to make use of the recreation site itself.

Collective Ownership - Restricted Use

In this category are included co-operative and institutional holdings, for example by trade unions, service clubs, professional groups and others. A small but significant part of outdoor recreation land use is now in the control of such organizations. Land is acquired and developed collectively by and for the members. There is a trend toward increased direction of club funds to this kind of investment. 2

Private Owner - Private Use

A large part of the shore-line mileage in the United States is privately owned, and a good deal of that ownership is by the vast group of private cottage or summer home owners. 3 In Canada a similar pattern prevails. The summer


3 U.S. ORRRC, op. cit., p. 23.
cottage has been a traditional part of North American middle class family possessions for nearly three generations, and though land is fast disappearing within the required day's driving range, cottage settlement in recreation areas is still going on.

II. THE EFFECTS OF EACH PRACTICE ON RECREATION LAND USE

Physical Effects

Access and services. Arrival at a recreation destination today may be by land, water or air travel, using buses, cars, trains, horses or mules, boat and plane services, or even by walking. The relevant facilities are roads, railways, trails, docks and landing strips respectively, with all the ancillary services required. Internal services include roads, water supply, sanitation, power and gas and oil for fuel. In larger areas there may be air-strips, railway stations and docks within the area.⁴

Access can include passing through as well as arriving at a recreation site. The scenic drive, the trail, the cruise, are themselves ways of using or experiencing outdoor settings. Every facility takes up space and is in some way a feature of the outdoor scene in which it is used.

⁴ Banff and Jasper National Parks in Canada have railway stations and small aircraft landing facilities.
Within limits public agencies can command public resources to provide access to whole regions: (1) linking them with a general system; (2) extending special roads to develop sites; (3) creating infra-structure, making possible the opening of sites by private agencies.

While there is still considerable difficulty in co-ordinating public agencies to provide access to recreation areas, the public agency, with its near monopoly, is in a position to organize facilities in such a way that they serve a recreation area without intruding on it or damaging the amenity value which makes it worth getting to. The public agency can also take initiative in getting other public authorities to co-operate in developing access facilities to all recreation areas where they are needed. The various provincial and state highway authorities are the major example of such an authority to-day, but they are also committed to serve every land use, and therefore to connect major centers in the 'best' way according to their terms of efficiency. In the past, both private and government transport enterprises have often neglected the recreation potential of an area which lies along the right-of-way, and there is, in fact, a legacy of roads and railways over much of the continent, derived from an era of construction in which the recreation demands of to-day were unforeseen. Perhaps the most widespread example is that of the railway line extending for many miles around the level shoreline of lakes and seas, acting
as an inhibiting factor to local, active use of the shore for recreation.

The main effect of private-commercial control is to restrict use of a site to a paying clientele. However, the access in this case is usually to a particular building or piece of land or other facility which is part, but seldom the whole, of a recreation area. Such roads or other facilities provided by the commercial agency are usually short, except where the extent of the holding, or its location, requires longer roads. There is a natural reliance on some major, public access facility, such as a road or railway, to bring people within "striking distance" of the resort itself.

Internal services may cover the widest range, from those of minimum standard and quality to lavish provision of every comfort. Again the vast majority of enterprises are dependent on a network of roads, power lines, gas lines, transport and communication services connected to their own site. Where this network is inadequate, costs are greatly increased and development is discouraged.

The usual scale, concentration and intensity of use of these developments is such as to make sanitary services of particular importance, both for their own protection and that of the surrounding area.

Examples in British Columbia are the beaches at White Rock, near the border with the United States, and Salmon Arm in the interior of the province.
Because of sound financing the organized group can build good access facilities if necessary but still seeks public access facilities as near as possible for the site. The same general observations apply as for private-commercial development. Usually group-developed sites have adequate services, but, especially in such matters as sewage disposal, they need public standards, scrutiny and enforcement to prevent such arrangements as would create, for example, downstream pollution of watercourses. The tendency of this type of development to concentrate accommodation in a few large buildings makes it easier to supply services. The decision as to location of the site is usually made by general consensus of members, so that access costs remain reasonable.

Private owners and occupiers are dependent on public roads plus their own means of access. They tend to locate only where public access by car is available almost to the lot. Exceptions to this general rule are sites such as islands accessible only by boat, or remote valleys accessible by plane and pack trail. The majority of private owners choose sites with public roads nearby, and occasionally group together to build common access roads. Access by car has a direct effect on values of lots, thereby aggravating speculative turnover.

Services vary with the purse of the owners as well as with their inclinations. The piecemeal nature of development makes for a pattern of individual self-sufficiency in matters
of sanitation and water supply, though public controls are steadily raising the standard.

Raising the general level of services over a whole region can give that region a reputation for quality, affecting the demand for recreation facilities and increasing the profitability of any resort enterprise in the region. But such a reputation also restricts purchasers and developers to those who can meet good standards.

Desirable site features. Location is critical for most developers or users of recreation sites. The resource-based recreation area is least dependent, the user-oriented most dependent, on location. Public agencies control nearly all resource-based areas, although there are concessions to private developers and institutions (for example the Alpine Club of Canada has a lodge at Banff National Park in Canada) within many of them. The ideal location is as near as possible to the urban area where users live, without compromising its value as an outdoor resort or wilderness retreat.

An other desirable as well as essential feature is water, both for domestic use and for recreation use. Wilderness parks, dude ranches, hunting and skiing lodges also need water, at least in the form of streams and rivers or precipitation. A congenial climate, pleasant and/or

---

Marion Clawson, op. cit., p. 163.
dramatic topography and cover, the presence of fish and game, all have various significances depending on the demand catered for. The private cottage owner probably regards water as most essential for his site. The rest of the features are of equal importance to all agencies, though public recreation areas range from lake areas and rain forests to arid valleys and deserts.

**Scale and intensity of use.** The public agency is most able to acquire or to assemble the best size of area for adequate development over time. But, especially at the lower levels of government, it is limited by property rights, political pressures and its own pocket-book as to acquisition and rate of development. Almost all really large recreation areas are under public ownership and control, though intensity of use is higher, and variety of development greater near urban and metropolitan concentrations of people.

In scale the private-commercial treatment may be a tiny camp ground offered by some elderly couple eking out their pensions, or it may be an enormous spread covering many square miles and catering exclusively to a luxury trade. It will usually involve a larger site and a more intensive use of facilities than the private development, because the operator is dependent on intensity of use at a given price range for his profits. Again, the association with large areas of land and water that are public, is generally

---

indispensable to the private developer.

An important consideration related to scale and capacity in commercial development is the establishment of minimum entry standards. Unless these are set, there tends to be a large number of attempts made to start on too small a scale to maintain adequate standards of services and other facilities.

The collectively owned recreation site tends to reach a more deliberate level of size and site utilization. Starting from a pre-conceived idea of how many people at peak must be provided for, and at what standards of space, facility and amenity, it is usually well planned as to scale and intensity of use. A due regard is also felt for "saturation use" beyond which the purpose of the site is defeated. Neither private-commercial nor public agencies can be as sensitive in this regard, to the proper scale of development and intensity of use for a given recreation site.

The private owner and user usually controls only a small segment of land, and this type of development therefore tends to present an extended series of single, small scale units, none of which is adequate, for example, to accommodate public boat launching, or recreation facilities such as tennis courts, pools, golf courses, and riding trails. The "private" cottager relies for these things on access to public space and facilities around his lot.

Scale and capacity for development are usually minimal unless a group of cottagers collectively undertake to provide
services for mutual benefit. This form of co-operative effort in developing a site for private cottages is not, however, uncommon.

Types of site development. Public agencies have a concern to conserve the site for future generations. Therefore, they tend to treat it with respect, if not always with sensitive architectural insight. There is a great variation in taste between levels of government and between regions. Unfortunately many local governments in remote places, now opening up to tourist hordes, lack architectural guidance in making the most of sites, and damaging them least.

As an example of good site treatment the care taken in Banff and Jasper National Parks in Canada to restrict visitors to the alpine meadows to the trails provided may be cited. Were there no such restriction the amenity itself would probably soon disappear under thousands of trampling feet.

The private-commercial development will seek to fence off the area owned and "sold", but not necessarily to block the visibility, for this stands as an advertisement to the passerby to come and join the other patrons. Again, the commercial resort may have cabins set out in linear arrangements along the shore of a body of water, or may have a single large hotel set in the site, with ancillary buildings for various uses grouped around it.
Group organizations have tended to stress the privacy of the site, fencing and concealing much of it behind hedges and woods, and creating difficulties for trespassers and poachers. The well known metropolitan golf and country clubs exemplify this tradition. There will probably be careful designs of buildings and landscape, and careful maintenance and conservation. The site will not be obtrusive in relation to total surroundings. It may, however, constitute a fixed feature, dominating or influencing the development of the surrounding area. Buildings will be grouped closely, rather than sprawled out, and will be for multi-unit accommodation rather than single units under separate roofs.

The private owner-user type of site development shows much variety of structures on each lot, though the buildings are often set too close to the water line where the site is on a shoreline. When a long series of cottages are located in this way there is a loss of perspective and unbroken range of movement. The site as a whole is not recognized, and the development may lack architectural unity.

The earlier sites were opened in a piecemeal way, in single lots or small groups of lots, usually without a plan of subdivision, and without services. The initial idea of the cottage builder was that of a primitive but summer-comfortable retreat for himself and family, to a place with few other people around. To-day and for the future this is less possible, especially for the more populous parts of the continent.
FIGURE 2, ALTERNATIVE RECREATION SITE DEVELOPMENTS, PRIVATE COTTAGE LOTS, FROM ONTARIO DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS, COMMUNITY PLANNING BRANCH, "RESORT SUBDIVISIONS IN ONTARIO", ONTARIO PLANNING, 10: PP. 5-17.
Economic Effects

Financing methods. The public agency draws for its support from general funds or from a special part of general revenues set aside for recreation site acquisition and improvement. It is also able to draw on government financing resources, depending on the policy of the government(s) involved. It is thus in a strong but politically vulnerable position depending on the popularity of the recreation measures proposed. The main difficulty is the tension between local and larger levels of government as to who shall bear the costs of land acquisition etc. for a park which the whole region, province or nation may use, but which is also very convenient for local people.

The private-commercial developer of an outdoor recreation site has usually the resources of a promoting group or individual. His development is a business venture based on standard methods of finance, that is, borrowing against some form of security. Though he may be dependent on the market, he usually has some scope to cater to a breadth of demands, from "luxury" to "low-price", and on the basis of his expectations, to mobilize capital and pay for investment out of revenues. If the accounting takes into consideration the appreciation of assets in market value, the revenue and capital gains position in relation to specific investments.

can be fairly clearly seen. Market conditions are such that nearly all developments of outdoor-recreation sites for tourist-commercial use in North America enjoy a favourable finance and revenue position in the long run. However, except for larger ventures, they are not regarded by lending agencies as the best of short-term risks. The smaller ventures are the least secure, and have the highest casualty rate.

Collective ownership provides an efficient way of getting capital and developing fairly large sites for intensive use. The loan may be entirely subscribed in advance from members, and attached to the security of assets already possessed, for an organization is usually of some stature before it gets round to the acquisition of a recreation site, unless it has been formed for that purpose. Generally the collective development can draw from accumulated reserves, has a stable membership, a good credit rating and strong physical assets as partial security.

The private owner and user's financing is minimal; the structure being light and cheap, and the land often acquired by lease or claim on crown holdings. The lots are purchased for cash, or out of the personal resources of the buyer.

---

Costs. Costs are of three basic kinds; those for acquisition of land and construction of facilities for its use; those for operation and administration of the development; and those incurred as losses by withholding the land from some other use. The first group includes capital and interest charges, the second, overhead and labour charges, and the third, differentials between one set of benefits and another.

The public agency, like the others, encounters the first set of costs most severely where land must be acquired in a densely populated area. At the other extreme are the large recreation areas acquired for the public merely by government action setting them aside for that purpose. Operation and administration costs are directly variable with the intensity of development and use, though returns to scale would greatly affect the per capita costs for most facilities. Differentials between one set of benefits by one land use and another set by another land use are usually called opportunity costs. At the intermediate and user-oriented range of recreation areas these costs become most critical. The pressures for uses which rule out recreation become greater, and the value of the land for other purposes becomes very high, depending, of course, on topographical and immediate locational factors.

The interest charges are usually minimal for government borrowing - as low as 2 per cent for some American projects where multiple use is planned.
The profit-making purposes and the short-term pressures for returns on investment limit the larger private-commercial developer in several ways. He has to justify investment in terms of opportunity cost, which involves requirements for as much as 10 per cent per year or greater net profit. Thus, he will not expand before considerable certainty of market is established, nor unless money is available at a sufficiently low cost, unless competition forces him to do so. He is even more reluctant to open up a new site, unless the surrounding areas are safe from changes which would ruin his investment.

Neither the collective developer nor the private owner-user is as cost-conscious in the above sense, as the public and commercial agencies. For the group organization the operating and administration costs are part of a continuing budget. For the private owner-user the initial capital cost is the major consideration, and operating costs are negligible.

**Revenues.** The public recreation area may derive revenues from facilities which it operates directly, from park admission charges, and from rentals and license fees paid by concessions within the park. Revenues are not related to total costs, and are usually planned only to defray those costs more or less directly allocated to particular facilities and activities.
The revenue, as distinct from the capital, resources for commercial development are high. The earning power of the site is partly the result of its inherent appeal, partly the result of what the developer does with it, and partly the result of the sagacity of his pricing program. His position is most flexible and directly responsive to demand, in terms of prices charged.

Revenue is not so important to the collective and the private owners of outdoor recreation facilities. They are both, use-oriented, rather than profit oriented. The collective owners try to make revenues meet costs, and often subsidize the costs from general funds, membership dues etc., rather than collecting charges directly from users. The large unions which have acquired holiday resorts for members run them as social services. Some other institutions are open to the fee-paying public, for example private golf courses, under certain conditions, which give members and guests priority of use.

Private owners may be said to derive some revenue from sub-letting or renting their cottages, and from property value appreciation.

**Benefit-cost considerations.** Designed for a public service rather than for a profitable net return in dollars, the earning power of a public recreation site can only be gauged by some form of benefit-cost analysis which brings into account both the intangible benefits to users and the
widest extent of primary, secondary and tertiary dollar benefits. The basic justification for expenditures on public recreation areas to-day are twofold: the whole nation, province, state, region or city benefits directly by use of the area or by its availability for use, and a range of secondary economic benefits accrue from the tourist industry and through it to the whole economy at each areal level.

The private-commercial type of development may represent local investment and initiative entirely; the returns accruing immediately to residents of the locality along with the indirect benefits, while the larger 'market' buys the direct use benefits, or, as is often the case with larger scale undertakings, it may represent non-local investors who spend only a fraction of the total profits within the locality.

It may be said that the site itself, in attracting the initial investment and constant use by collective and private owners is producing revenue for the locality and the region, but the benefits are of a different order from those of the private-commercial development.

Legal and Administrative Effects

Site selection and acquisition. In the widest sense, under common law, in North America, all land is vested in the crown or the state, and is held only in fee simple, as a bundle of granted rights by any person. This means that public agencies, particularly the federal and provincial or
state governments, have a wide range of means of acquiring land for any public purpose. The power of Eminent Domain or Expropriation may be invoked at any time, though governments must have due regard for the political consequences of exercising this power. The usual methods of acquisition may be listed as follows:

1. Purchase
2. Default of taxes
3. Donation
4. Reservation of crown lands

Selection for public recreation areas is usually haphazard, the result of historical accident rather than policy. The national parks are more thoughtfully selected, though again, their designation and protection as national parks derives more from the past efforts than the present deliberations of governments.

Site selection by a private agency for tourist-commercial use is dictated primarily by realty-market considerations. Acquisition may be by purchase on the land market, and is now frequently acquisition of a site originally owned and operated for some other purpose; for example a farmer's field fronting on a new highway is converted into a


11 Most of the designated acreage in Canada was reserved before 1930.
motel site, or an orchard is sold to some developer for the same purpose. Acquisition may also be in the form of a lease or a concession license in a public area.

Consideration is given by the developer to the market situation for his resort accommodation, but very little systematic research appears to be done. The investor often relies on his personal observations plus a hunch about the events in the near or intermediate future.

Site selection for collective acquisition is usually most careful. The institution, unless it acquires tenure by charitable donation, commonly establishes a sub-committee to explore various possibilities and make recommendations on which the final decision is partially based. The site is usually acquired by purchase or lease from private owners or from the state, though donations also are frequent. It is treated much more as an end in itself than as a speculative market commodity. Nevertheless, many institutional holdings have come under pressures such as taxation, price offers, etc. due to the marked appreciation of land values in the surrounding area. Golf and Country Clubs, no longer in the country, are the most frequent example.

The private owner-user acquires a cottage lot, usually with water frontage (or access within a few hundred feet of the water) from other individuals, from real-estate brokers, or from the state. The sites were often originally selected by individuals exploring by boat, foot or car and were staked as claimed by the individual before surveys were done for
sub-division. Subsequently the lots passed from owner to owner until now they may be traded in a commodity market. The agency through which the cottage lot changes hands may thus be either a real-estate dealer or the present owners themselves.

The major effects of this kind of development are:

1. Sites are opened in a piecemeal way in single lots or in small groups of lots, often without a plan or sub-division or service installations.

2. As the buying and selling of lots is the main mode of acquisition, and is part of the general land market economy, a lot becomes a speculative investment as well as a family use holding.

3. Turnover increases rapidly due to the increasing mobility of breadwinners in their jobs, and to market speculation by owners, tempted to sell their assets for capital gains, rather than to use it.

Tenure. The public agency in North America may hold land directly as the national or provincial or state governments; or it may hold land as a corporation, as with special government agencies and local governments. In the former case its tenure is very secure, though its hold is vitiated by various pressure groups acting politically to change policy and release more land to non-recreational uses. Indian Reserves are a special case, being guaranteed by treaty, but even they are often induced to sell or lease choice parts of
their lands for industrial and residential development.

Tenure in commercial resort developments is the least secure, being subject to such claims as mortgages and debentures. They tend to have a higher turnover of operators, and consequently a lower continuity of operating policies. Lease is often preferred to free-hold in this type of operation, since it releases funds for development and enables the operator to be more flexible. However, where there are large and valuable fixed assets, ownership may be preferred unless a very long lease on favourable conditions can be secured.

Usually the collective form of control seeks a secure and continuous tenure, although it may revert to a more impermanent arrangement if its financial and membership position becomes unstable.

The private owner-user may either own his lot outright by purchase, or lease it from the crown or from another owner. Often cottage lots are leased for 15 year periods from the crown, from the local government owning the land, from Indian Reserves or from other private owners.

In some cases there are easements which allow public passage through the lot. In others such passage may be cut off for miles. In general, under common law, water frontage except on rivers and streams is public property for a certain distance back from high water mark. But access by the public to this public property is often blocked by private development.
Public controls. Recreation areas are subject to control by such legal and administrative devices as zoning by-laws, standards and special adjudicative bodies. Zoning legislation on a district or regional basis can protect recreation areas from destructive encroachment if it is well drawn and administered for that purpose. Standards are extremely important in controlling limits of safety, space and sanitation, recreation equipment and even architectural features, and parking or other accommodation for vehicles or animals. Food services at commercial, institutional and public resorts are also subject to control and inspection by independent public authorities.

In the matter of internal services the public recreation agency is in a special position. It has an obligation to demonstrate high standards, but the effects are sometimes at variance with the intentions of the standard makers. The larger government authorities appear to have the resources and the scale of control and development to meet high standards. But the smaller local governments are either less able or less willing to do so. Thus, one level of public agency sets a standard which another level fails to meet. National park camping areas, for example, are usually better serviced than state or provincial park camps, and the municipalities or counties affected sometimes object to location of such camps within their territory because of their competitive influence.
Without these various safe-guard controls provided by public authorities, however, all recreation area investments are vulnerable to loss in value. Private developments for tourist-commercial use especially need enforcement of standards, for they are under the severest temptation to squeeze as much as possible from the market by working to a minimum level. Moreover, only by the imposition of standards fairly on one and all can they be induced to make expenditures which would jeopardize their position with respect to competitors who do not have to meet these standards. A tourist-commercial operation is not always subject to the normal market controls, for several reasons: the operator has a monopoly with respect to the recreation site he holds; the demand for accommodation often reaches saturation limits throughout the high season giving no recourse to alternatives by dissatisfied customers; and his clientele are on the move from remote places, and are unlikely to affect his business by unfavourable references after they leave.

Social Effects

Degrees of exclusiveness and privacy. The social implications and consequences of each category of recreation site development are of the greatest importance, affecting the character of the surrounding community, and reflecting the range of tastes and demands emanating from distant urban centres.
The distinguishing feature of the public agency approach to the provision of outdoor-recreation space is its openness to the widest possible set of users. While this view of land as 'open to all' has merit it begets many problems and conflicts where demand pressures are rising, as they are for public recreation space. The basic question of which public should get priority is considered in following sections of this report.

In general the private-commercial developer excludes the non-paying customer as part of his attraction to the paying customer. Exclusiveness, or rather "uncrowdedness", is part of what his clients are buying, especially through the season of peak demand. There are, however, various degrees of exclusiveness or openness for local use, and various methods of excluding or discouraging public use even from expanses of public land and water beyond the limits of the private resort-owner's property. Often features of terrain are such that control over a few points of access to the shoreline by boat or vehicle are all that are necessary to command its use and entry. On the other side, the ORRRC report on private operators cites many cases of voluntary public service given by them. A pattern sometimes followed is for access to beach, for example, to be subject to a charge in July and August, but free before and after these months.

The collectively owned and developed outdoor recreation site is, in a sense, more exclusive and private
for its members than either the commercial or public development. Its use will be as restrictive as the membership entrance requirements. The local public may or may not be invited to share the space and facilities. On the other hand a real service is afforded to members by the guarantee that the facilities will not be over-crowded, and that the quality of their recreation experience will not be spoiled.

A characteristic of the private owner-user type of site development is its privateness and exclusiveness within a very small area. Each lot is private, though the total recreation area may be "open" to the separate development of hundreds of lots close together.

The pattern of development is for a family to acquire, in addition to its urban home, a lot in or near some recreation area, within a day's motoring or less of their home. This pattern apparently established itself on a mass scale with the transformation from urban to rural living for a majority of the population. In the early years before this transformation was completed many families had retained connections with the farm, and used the farm visit for recreation. As these connections were lost, often by urban sprawl, the family turned to its own cottage on the lake.

Alienation and exploitation. A social characteristic of each type of recreation site development is its impact on the social life of the surrounding community. Where recreation on large scale brings a seasonal influx of strangers into a community the pattern of community
relationships, attitudes and values is likely to undergo changes due to the new contacts and adjustments required. Where the influx is a long established part of the annual rhythm of local community life, the adjustment has been made, and a new social structure developed.

The public recreation site, if it is a large provincial or national recreation area, will attract tourists who will stay from a few hours to a few months. These people mingle with the local people with varying levels of acceptance and familiarity depending largely on the duration of their stay.

When an adjustment is poorly made by the local community, patterns of alienation and exploitation may be seen. The basic alienation is that between the community of visitors and the more permanent community who say good-bye to them so often through the season. There may also be a cleavage between one group of local inhabitants who are not connected with the tourist trade, and who dislike its disturbing influence, and another group who make all or a large part of their income from tourists.

There is also a real danger, exemplified in some areas of both Canada and the United States, of the exploitation of local people and local resources by private and collective developers who acquire the finest recreation areas in a community and hold them for use by wealthy patrons or members from the cities or from distant places. Advantage is taken of the willingness of some members of the local community to
sell their lands, and the community eventually finds itself with very little share of the amenity which is enjoyed by foreigners.

These shifting tensions tend to diminish the recreational, and therefore the social vitality of communities in the path of growing recreational demands. Places such as Revelstoke and Salmon Arm in British Columbia, which lie along the path of tourists from the south and west who are seeking outdoor recreation space via the new Trans-Canada highway, are currently experiencing these kinds of pressures.

**Local ambivalences.** The alienation and exploitation pattern indicated above arises from basic ambivalences on the part of the local people. On the one hand they are usually seeking economic status in competition with their neighbours in terms of income. On the other hand they are also seeking status as true sons of the local community who may stand aloof from tourist strangers. But the role of making money from the tourist trade is usually incompatible with that of standing for the historic integrity and unalterable character of a place. More generally, the ambivalence is expressed in an overt welcoming of recreationists and a covert resentment at their presence.

The recreationist, too, as guest may like his hosts, or he may feel an alien among them. The public agency at the higher levels is concerned with providing recreation space for a vast and growing demand which reaches out from urban
centres into the more or less remote communities where natural outdoor amenities are still preserved. But county and municipal governments in these communities face the problems of ambivalence between recreation use of their land as a service to their own people first and to all people second, and recreation use of their land as a business bringing in wealth to the community.

There is, of course, a balance to be found by most communities which goes a long way to make the best of both sides of the arrangement. Nevertheless, public and non-public interests find their most intractable differences over this issue.

**Gains and losses.** The social gains from public recreation development and control are that it is democratic and responsible. The whole array of moral overtones and values for character-building etc. of contact with the outdoors, exercise and sports, and of appreciation of nature and one's native soil can be brought to bear by using public parks for education in this way. This is, in fact, a part of the continuing program of the national park services of both Canada and the United States.

The social losses have been suggested as the tendency toward uniformity, the lack of variation in scene and activity which a standardized public approach seems to bring.

---

The private-commercial development loses something of the educational impetus and treats recreation as a commodity to be sold, more than as an enriching process to be offered to guests. The democratic sharing of a common asset is also missing from the resort environment.

Collective organizations may achieve some social values by providing shared recreation experience for a closed "in-group", but within the larger community their site is likely to remain an enclave not digested by the outside community.

The private cottager has more of a chance to build a community with his neighbouring cottagers but here again, the high turnover in owners works against deeper affiliations and makes for a narrowing of focus to the immediate family and friends who use the cottage but who do not know the neighbours. This kind of freedom may, of course, also be viewed as a gain by many recreationists.

Perhaps there is a gain in the growing community of recreationists themselves, who have in common their very mobility and impermanent attachment to any local scene.

III. SUMMARY

In this chapter an effort has been made to classify the types of agency by which outdoor recreation areas are developed within the mixed socio-economic order of public and private enterprise in North America, and to sketch briefly the salient characteristics and effects of each approach. The analysis has been carried into economic and social aspects as
well as the physical and legal-administrative.

It is apparent that there are many differences between the four approaches described in scale and scope, in intensity of use, treatment of site, purpose of development, methods of finance and operation, benefits and costs, forms of selection, acquisition and tenure of land, and degrees of exclusiveness and privacy. But a range of physical characteristics and problems is common to all four agencies, notably those of access and services.

A pattern of differentiation may be seen between the public agency and the other three which seems more important than differences between the other three themselves, though it is clear that each practice is serving a need, and that the total system covers the widest possible spectrum of tastes, demands and capacities for development. In a society where affluence is becoming universal (though it still has a long way to go) there may remain differences in wealth and ability to command the choicest heights of outdoor recreation space and facilities, but outdoor recreation is still open to nearly every purse, through public and philanthropic efforts, and through the cheap mobility which the motor car gives.

Two recurrent problems are suggested by the foregoing analysis. The first is that there are divergences of interest, both areally and functionally, between the higher and the lower levels of government. Large scale recreation provisions for localities which have not been wealthy or prudent enough in the past to secure land for their own outdoor recreation
needs at the user-oriented and intermediate levels of demand is the most serious gap in supply. But the higher levels of government are concerned with serving supra regional needs. The second, and related problem is that the distribution of outdoor recreation space in the hinterland and metropolitan areas where it would be most valuable is most uneven and generally inadequate to demand pressures even at present.

The variation between, and the separate validities of, the four types of development suggest that the total function of meeting recreation demands should continue to be shared between them. Unfortunately, as the previous descriptions indicate, the system is not as stable or as efficient as it should be, and unless it is made to work well the supply of outdoor recreation space will not be treated in such a way as to meet the growing demand with maximum efficiency. A proper arrangement would seem to be required, whereby each type of development gives maximum satisfaction to its own outdoor recreation space consumers without damaging the satisfactions of consumers using other means, and without damaging local community life. In particular the public initiative in providing, protecting and servicing large areas of land and water is vital to the health of the other initiatives; providing the framework of resources and basic facilities within which they can operate.

The question then arises as to the principles by which public management should optimize recreation land use for each region and over the whole continent in the public
interest. Some analysis of the concept of public interest may illuminate the more detailed problems of direction which government initiatives should take to overcome the gathering crisis between demand and supply of outdoor recreation space.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONCEPT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I. THE PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION; HISTORIC AND CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES

The chief task of political philosophy and the only task of political action has been and still remains that of making sense and application of the concept of the common good.1

... we should undertake deliberately to identify basic and secondary or instrumental values, the realization of which can be affected by the physical environment, and to shape a plan with appropriate sensitivity to those values.2

Systematic reasoning about the public interest began, in western civilization, with the Greeks, culminating in the works of Plato and Aristotle. In the Republic and the Laws, Plato sought to synthesize a concept of justice which embraces both private and public interests. He defined those interests as a static system in which every person has a life appropriate to his abilities and tastes, in a hierarchy of values; from the appetitive, through the emotional, to the intellectual. The total state is like a perpetual chord,

---

ever sounding in perfect harmony. Any individual variation spoils the orchestration and diminishes the lives of all within the state.

Aristotle's concept of the public interest was arrived at in a quest for more practical civic guidance. In individual ethics he considered that one should be guided by reason, which consisted of knowledge and contemplation, but which depended on physical and emotional satisfaction for its existence in personal consciousness. Aristotle gave us one of the earliest formulations of the optimum; the golden mean, or course always to be steered between extreme opposites in practical judgement. The public interest is to be determined largely by corporate decisions made by wise and temperate men, since many amateur heads are better than one expert head in making such judgements as to common ends and means. These corporate decisions require a strong constitutional framework for debate and for carrying out decisions. Aristotle did not, like Plato, attempt to define the public interest in a substantive way. His approach was distinctly functional and dynamic. The optimum is a process, not a final stage, of existence, though the activity of contemplation is the extreme pleasure to be sought.

The tradition of public interest theory is not continuous in western history. The various epochs of western civilization have each made great contributions, but these are not cumulative from Greek thought. The Stoics adopted a posture of indifference to set-backs in their efforts for
the common good inherent in civic order and action. Marcus Aurelius, the Roman emperor, advised a life of responsible remedial effort in public affairs, combined with an attitude of indifference to success or failure — a kind of quiet despair, relieved by attunement with a postulated universal order.

The Christian contribution began with St. Augustine's *City of God*, a theocratic utopia, with the public interest geared to the glorification of the Christian God. This theocratic conception was powerfully reinforced, though altered, by St. Thomas Aquinas, some 8 centuries later, (1225-74) whose *Summa* attempted to fuse Christian and Aristotelian thought on all subjects, including the common good. Divine inspiration was not and should not be without the backing of reason, though its authority was superior. Man's ultimate interest lay in salvation and eternal life for his own soul. His temporal interest lay in obedience to authority and acceptance of the ordering of affairs as found, provided these did not conflict with the prescriptions of Papal authority.

Thus far there was no "public" as we understand the term in democratic societies; that is, a public with prior and ascendent rights; a majority being the theoretically sought arbiter of decisions affecting the society's overall interests. Machiavelli accepted a system which identifies public with nation-state interest, and that in turn with the interest of a small ruling élite. With Rousseau the
declaration of all men's rights came, and with Locke, the rights, duties, and merits of men deliberating over their own interests were first explored. Marx emphasized the long tradition of conflict of interest, and the need for reconciliation in a unitary state. Bentham, and others, accepted the inevitable tensions, seeking only a balance and a balancing mechanism which avoids violence.

The political evolution has been from regimes of minimal responsibility by rulers, for the interest of any public, toward types of government consciously seeking to maximize their responsiveness to a public, and for serving the public interest. For every regime there have arisen theorists to sanction and to rationalize the prevailing system, and a few others to attack its ideological basis.

It is already evident that the tradition is long, and the literature large on the subject of the public interest. In this chapter, however, it is intended merely to survey the tradition of thought, and then to look at three contemporary attacks on the problem, with a view to relating some of the insights of theorists to the practical problems of decision-making with respect to recreation land use. There are, of course, many contemporary works on the subject, but those selected cover the general field, and represent both philosophical and practical approaches to the problem.
Glendon Schubert notes that Americans relate responsible decision making to the "public interest", and that different approaches to defining the concept have been used by other theorists: the historical, tracing definitions from Plato; and the behavioural, being based on social psychology. He finds that there is a cacophony of nations as to who should interpret the public interest, but the common questions are: "How is the public interest expressed?" and "How ought it to be expressed?" Schubert delineates three contemporary theoretical approaches to government in the public interest at the national level, namely the Rationalist, the Idealist, and the Realist. He finds that Rationalist theory is

... pro-public, pro-party and anti-interest groups. They [rationalists] postulate a common good which reflects the presumed existence of various common ... interests. The common good finds expression in a popular will ...; the common obligation of all public officials is faithfully to execute the popular will.

Idealist theory is "... pro-public, anti-party and anti-interest groups." "I mean", he says, "that Idealist support the true interests of the public, which do not necessarily coincide with the interests of the public as perceived by the public itself." He goes on to say that Idealists "... describe the public interest as a thing of substance.

---

4 Ibid., p. 199.
independent of the decisional process and absolute in its terms." The public official is to excogitate the true essence of the public interest, each official consulting his conscience. Democratic appurtenances for consensus are superfluous. The whole trend of Idealist theory is elitist and dogmatic.

Realist theory is "... pro-interest group", and defines "party" and "public" in special ways. Parties become special kinds of interest groups, the public becomes a plurality of publics. "The realists", Schubert states, "... do not oppose the public and political parties; they devour them."; the Due-Process-Equilibrium school of Realists sees the public interest as a balance brought about by official mediation; combining the forces of law and economics. They argue that "decisions that are the product of full consideration are most likely to be decisions in the public interest." Schubert himself concludes that "anyone who affirms any theory of the public interest, without first having defined the decision-making process, is putting the cart before the horse." No single theory is a panacea and in many cases the public official is involved in references to

\[5\] Ibid., p. 200.
\[6\] Ibid., p. 201
\[7\] Ibid., p. 205.
\[8\] Ibid., p. 209.
authority, to expediency, and to his own conscience for the same decision. No school of thought, Schubert finds, offers much promise as a guide to decision makers. Rationalist theory of "limited relevance to the empirical world ... speaks primarily of faithful execution of decisions that somebody other than the actor has made." Idealist theory offers a concept of the public interest that is irrelevant because "ultimate obligations and responsibilities are nonpolitical." They are referred to personal insights such as "justice". And Realist theory fails to "demonstrate how it is possible to bridge the hiatus between the ideal they posit and the empirical world." 1

In offering "A Conception of the Common Good", Mr. Rowan explores a great many ramifications and difficulties in a concept whose frequent use he nonetheless regards as an ineluctable part of social organization and administrative direction. The state, as, "the most important repository of man's hopes and devices", must be the object and expression of this concept. But, Mr. Rowan then asks, "Can Civil Purpose be Exploitative?" Can the state, that is, be run by
and for a minority at the expense of a majority? The first answer given is the generally accepted principle that "... civil society must never be allowed to become the instrument by which one person or interest exploits the citizenry at large."\textsuperscript{14} For civil society is not an instrument designed for that purpose. All the logical explanations of the state, such as the contract theory, the balance of forces theory, the blind evolution theory, are unacceptable, with the exception of the theory of rational voluntary agreement.

But interests may be seen as private or as public. Public interests are "artificial ... in the sense that they rest upon or have their origins in all those more intimate, individual, self-regarding values of which men are aware."\textsuperscript{15} Yet because these interests may provide benefit, they are of more than private concern. And when considerable general concern attaches to them they merit priority as matters of public interest, the criterion for assignment of priorities being based on a distinction between real and apparent interests. The two complicating factors here are conflicts between interests, apparent and real, and the ability to know the differences between real and apparent interests. The public interest rests, then, upon

\[ \ldots \text{two conditions which taken together are sufficient or satisfy it. It has to do with} \]

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 18.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 32.
those 1) real interests of the individual members, ... which 2) are common and can be served, hence, by a common, non-discriminatory public policy.16

Only ceaseless civil education and debate, then, can make people comprehend their real interest. The dangers of manipulation by an elite are allayed by the careful distinction made between education, as appeal to reason, and propaganda, as appeal to emotion.

Rowan does not skirt the substantive question. He says

With individuals in civil association ... what is involved in the notion of a people's interests, and thus, surely, in the notion of a public, long-range good, is some coherent picture of image of the kind of people and the mode of common living which, for certain good reasons, it is appropriate and necessary for them to discover and follow.17

However, it is still leaders, or some kind of elite, who must formulate and communicate the coherent image.

No civil society, apparently, can avoid conflicts of interest, and therefore sacrifice in the interests of some harmony which serves a higher order of interests. As with the means of securing the public's interest, reason is the best arbiter between clashing ends. Nevertheless, Rowan asserts that the only personal sacrifices consistent with the common good are those of apparent, not real interest. This is interpreted to mean that there can be no public interest

16 Ibid., p. 56.
17 Ibid., p. 80.
where there is a deep division on a substantive question: "one cannot sensibly speak of the public interest when in fact there exists a fundamental conflict of interest among the members..." [of that public.]

Dismissing the notion of national destiny as a touchstone for determining what is or is not in the public interest, Rowan concludes that "civil society, its purposes and procedures, and thus also the intentions and understandings of its human participants, should not be other than utilitarian in the last analysis." [19]

What, then, is the proper purpose of government, and of planning? "The fundamental ... function of any and all political procedures is to discover which interests are shared by the members and the degree of priority which each of these merits." [20]

The third work to be discussed [21] is oriented to public planning as a professional discipline. Defining a plan as "... a course of action which can be carried into effect, which can be expected to lead to the attainment of ends sought, and which someone intends to carry into effect", [22]

---

[18] Ibid., p. 108.
[19] Ibid., p. 125.
[20] Ibid.
[22] Ibid., p. 312.
the authors contend that "community planning is that special case of public planning in which the public is the whole community." 23

Two bases for public decision making are distinguished: the Unitary, in which a single set of ends are applied as equally relevant to all members of the society; and the Individualistic, in which "the relevant ends are those of individuals, whether shared or unshared." 24 The Unitary concept may be Organismic, subordinating the interests of parts to that of the whole, or Communalistic, in which the interests of the majority take priority over those of minorities. The Individualistic concept may be Utilitarian, making the relevant ends those uppermost in the minds of individuals, whether shared with other individuals or not; or it may be Quasi-Utilitarian, treating some men's "utility" as more significant than others; or it may be Qualified Individualistic, finding the common good in the aggregate of individual ends selected from certain classes of ends deemed most appropriate and relevant.

Recognizing that "... the question of which conception is to be regarded as the public interest, either in a specific situation or in general, may itself become a matter of controversy", 25 the authors admit that each conception implies

23 Ibid., p. 313.
24 Ibid., p. 324.
different decision-making mechanisms. The **Unitary** implies co-operative mechanisms for a single set of ends; the **Individualistic** implies competing ends and a mechanism of compromise between them. The **Unitary** would suggest a central body wise enough to perceive real, as distinct from apparent interests.

The main contribution of Meyerson and Banfield to public-interest theory is their demonstration of the relevance of, and inseparability between, civic means and ends. The way decisions are made and purposes fulfilled is part of both common and individual interests.

Since the nature of the choice mechanism employed, determines in part the content of the public interest, the question of which conception of the structure of the public interest is appropriate, in particular circumstances or in general, is suitably discussed in terms of which mechanism of choice is preferable.26

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PUBLIC-INTEREST CONCEPT FOR RECREATIONAL LAND-USE PLANNING

The foregoing sections suggest that the nature of any human organization is such that it generates problems which give rise to the concept of the public interest as a justification for decisions which entail some form of sacrifice, or some deployment of collective resources. With the emergence of the practice of quasi-judicial decision making by administrative authorities, this justification has

---

become more and more insistent. To the body of principle evolved by traditional jurisprudence is being added a body of quasi-judicial administrative principle; and figuring largely in administrative judgements are those arising from efforts to plan the use of land in the public interest. Hence the significance of this concept for planning. Indeed, for no other profession is it so important that this concept be used, but used with clarity, and a modest awareness of the complexities which it embraces.

The efforts of philosophers reveal that "public interest" has many levels of meaning, and that the substantive reality connected with the words is an elusive but necessary goal for responsible decision makers. A scrutiny of the philosophers' works helps the planner to perceive the nature of the conflicts which he is trying to reconcile, and the purposes of reconciling them. It also shows that the way in which decisions are made is itself part of the interest in question; optima must include the optimum process as well as the optimum end result.

The nature of planning land use for outdoor recreation is to seek to maximize the fulfillment of outdoor-recreation values insofar as an optimum arrangement of recreation land uses can be found. Planning proposes these arrangements for public scrutiny, and urges their acceptance by decision makers, including the publics affected.

The foregoing chapters have attempted to show that there are actual and potential conflicts in North American
society over recreation land use; conflicts associated with the variety of recreational values and the range of alternative ways of fulfilling them. From these values arise the demands, from the demands the pressures on supply of land and water, from these pressures the various ways of meeting demand, and from these various ways of meeting demand come the actual and potential conflicts. At least five types of conflict situation require some reference to the public-interest concept. The first conflict is between limited supply and, in a sense, unlimited demand for outdoor-recreation land and facilities. Here is a resource, the outdoors, which is presently divided amongst various uses and users in ways which often seem to maximize neither efficiency in achieving the ends of recreation, nor satisfaction in the means. The second conflict is that between recreation land uses occurring simultaneously in the same place. The active response to outdoor settings, for example, appears to be pushing out the passive, contemplative response. The powerized activist in particular destroys the quietness essential for any sensitive response to the setting as the engines associated with his pursuits emit sounds and smells which drown out the sounds of birds, wind and water, and smother the rich variety of fragrances generated by plants, animals, and the water itself. The powerized activist is by far the most space-demanding in his recreational activities because of his great range of movement, and this gives rise to a further order of conflicts reaching deeper into the
the supply of recreational land. The third is rivalry for power and jurisdiction. For example, *Land for Leisure*, the report of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board in British Columbia, Canada, stresses the problem of developing public, regional recreation areas where municipalities are concerned. Provision fails to be made because: (1) the municipal government has neither the taxing nor the capital-reserve resources to acquire or remove from taxation large areas of land for recreation, open to the public, and (2) the municipal government is reluctant to expend municipal taxpayers' money to maintain a recreation resource into which crowds from the whole region flow.

This pattern of conflict may be extended through regional, provincial and state, national and even international levels of authority and responsibility. The real problem is that outdoor-recreation assets have local, regional, provincial (or state), national and international markets. A great park cannot, therefore, be financed by a local community; it cannot be opened exclusively to a local community; nor can the additional costs and problems incurred by the local community because of its presence be ignored. Its costs and benefits are difficult to localize with respect to any particular public interests.
A fourth order of conflicts arises between the allocation of resources in the form of land, water, and locale for recreation and their allocation for other uses. This, again, is both an areal and a functional issue. Often public agencies allocate minimal resources to outdoor-recreation development in their community, arguing that the real responsibility is that of some wider jurisdiction; a jurisdiction which itself encompasses the market area of the recreation asset. The soundest reasoning so far developed appears to be that there is a public obligation and a public benefit, open to all, from recreation areas - which cannot be translated into monetary returns allocated to specific costs incurred.

Finally, there are, in North America, conflicts between various special interests: the big and the little operator; the commercial, the private, and the public developer; and the conservation versus the exploitation interests. Each, it is suggested, has legitimate claims; a fact which only necessitates a return to consideration of the public interest as a frame of reference within which a range of lesser interests can be subserved.

It is the public-recreation agencies which are in a position to develop the most reasonable organization of land for recreation, by selection and acquisition of special sites, and by multiple-use arrangements with other kinds of public agencies controlling vast areas of land. Only the public agency can: (1) work to a comprehensive land-use development
plan which allocates land for recreation in response to needs and demands projected for the future; (2) use powers of expropriation if necessary, and accumulate land for recreation continuously over time; (3) open new areas by developing access and accommodation facilities; (4) work with many private agencies to encourage investment at the right times and places, guaranteeing protection of amenity values for the entrepreneur and for the user.

The most general type of conflict is that between private and public interest, or, more accurately, between the interest of parts of the public and the interest of the whole. The contribution of the theoretical approaches previously described may be summarized in a series of questions which any planner or proposer of land uses may ask of himself and others. Mr. Fordham has urged planners to identify values, but they must also identify the holders of these values.

What groups avow them? What behaviour patterns express them? How compatible are they with other values? Mr. Rowan points out that the public interest is "a distinctly civil or political concept which extends over a broad range of other values not themselves distinctly civil or political in origin or nature."

---


28 Rowan, op. cit., pp. 11-12.
Other questions may be suggested, the list being itself unending. Will this plan cause or assist the government to exploit a majority of the public in the interests of a minority? Will anyone's real interests be crushed by the plan? What evidence is there that this planning proposal is in the real interests of the public, and that its opponents merely misunderstand that interest?

In arguing for this plan am I appealing to reason or emotion?

Is planning in this instance attempting to foist middle-class values on all classes?

Is there a coherent picture of where the plan is leading in the future? Can it be communicated? Is it responsible to future publics as well as present? Should it be so?

Is the procedure by which this plan was generated adequate to the claim that it has discovered the common good and the right order of priorities? Is it likely that such a common-good insight could be the product of such a procedure as was followed?

Has the plan expressed the general will?

Does the plan badly violate the planner's own concept of the public interest in the case?

Can a land-use decision be left to the present forces to reach an optimum equilibrium? Who are the most appropriate decision makers? For what decisions?
What decision-making processes are implied in my concept of the public interest? Which is the most preferable mechanism of choice?

The effect of raising these questions is to bring out both the theoretical and the practical value issues which require clarification if a planning proposal is to be justified in the public interest.

III. INTERPRETATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST FOR OUTDOOR-RECREATION LAND-USE PLANNING

An interpretation of the concept of the public interest for the direction of outdoor recreation land use and development in North America must begin with a recognition of the manifest values of North American society. The most relevant of these is outdoor recreation itself. The second most relevant is the possibility of choice between a number of undetermined alternatives as to which kind of recreation; where should it be pursued, for what length of time, how often, with what appurtenances, etc. And the next is a share in the power and the processes of decision-making which bring together the particular facilities and the particular users.

Since there are conflicting interests, the public interest must lie in some balance between them which does not sacrifice or exploit the real interest of any individual or group. The appropriate planning term for this balance is the "optimum". Land-use planning is an optimizing process,
focussing on land use, and thereby getting involved in almost every other aspect of human life. An optimum, in this context, is the simultaneous maximization of all relevant value elements by a balance which either makes elements reinforce each other, or, by compromise, protects them from destructive conflict.

It is important to understand that an optimum is itself a value term, but one which makes no sense without reference to other values. Why should we seek an optimum? The answer must come as an assertion out of the planner's will; an affirmation without qualification; a communicable intuition which he asserts, as one of the many assertions which contend with one another in civic decisions.

"Optimum" is also a term denoting a balance of many elements, both static and dynamic, in what must be itself conceived of as a static frame of reference. The situation which planners confront is one in which the maximization of any single value element could be achieved only at unwarranted loss to the others, such that the sum total of value fulfillment would be considerably less than that in which no one element is allowed to go to its limit. Two examples may make this clearer. A forest, or a biological species, might be extinguished by over-rapid cropping. The total gain in this case is like a single meal from which, no matter how one gorges, there can be no satisfaction comparable with the sustained content to be gained by having many moderate meals over time. A society in which most people are
very poor, and a few are very rich, may in fact be a society in which even the rich are poorer than the average in another society, where a more balanced distribution of wealth and power has been achieved.

An optimum plan is thus not a short-term or narrowly limited realization of values. Its tendency is toward ultimates over time and space; or rather toward a balance which recognizes, but works up to, the limits of present power and knowledge. Nor is an optimum a mere recipe for combining elements to achieve some particular end. (Although the notion of balancing values entails some substratum or common denominator to which all values can be reduced, and by which they can be compared.)

On the basis of demand and conflict in outdoor-recreation land use a number of other values may be set out in a schematic form which shows the progressive optimizing relationships from narrow to wide focus.
1. Assume all outdoor recreation values maximized:

   a) in quantity

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{(1) of persons enjoying} \\
   \text{Optimize} &\text{ (2) of duration of enjoyment} \\
   \end{align*}
   \]

   b) in quality

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{(1) intensity of enjoyment} \\
   \text{Optimize} &\text{ (2) what is enjoyed} \\
   \end{align*}
   \]

2. Assume values in decision-making process maximized:

   a) participation

   b) variety

   \[
   \text{Optimize} \]

   c) surprise and spontaneity

   d) individual expression

   e) collective expression

3. Assume values of other land uses maximized:

   a) residential

   b) commercial

   \[
   \text{Optimize} \]

   c) industrial

   d) agricultural

   e) natural resource

   f) institutional

4. Assume power claims; areal and functional:

   a) local

   b) regional

   \[
   \text{Optimize} \]

   c) state and provincial

   d) national

   e) international

5. Assume claims of the four types of development agency:

   a) Public

   \[
   \text{Optimize} \]

   b) Private-Commercial

   c) Collective-Restricted

   d) Private-Individual

FIGURE 3

PROGRESSIVE OPTIMIZATION OF OUTDOOR-RECREATION LAND-USE VALUES
The interpretation of the public interest as an optimum between the roles of the four types of agency in outdoor recreation site development is as follows:

Role of public agencies;
1. reserve and acquire open land
2. plan comprehensive land-use
3. set standards and enforce them
4. control actual uses - in time, i.e. daily, monthly, seasonally - in space, e.g. by zoning, fencing
5. participate directly in some development
6. build infra-structure of services

Role of private-commercial agencies;
1. cater to widest range of tastes and purses
2. open and develop sites imaginatively
3. operate and manage investment and income
4. share benefits with local community
5. share site-use with local community

Role of collective-restricted agencies;
1. cater to intensive and specialized interest amongst members
2. provide institutional privacy
3. open and develop new sites
4. share use with local community
5. provide social welfare to members

Role of private-individual agencies;
1. help themselves
2. respect site and surroundings
3. become part of local community
4. respect all standards and land-use regulations
5. develop sites imaginatively

FIGURE 4
OPTIMIZATION OF SITE DEVELOPMENT
BY FOUR TYPES OF AGENCY
The optimum balance will find its expression most clearly in regional units of area, but an optimum for one region is not transferrable to another. The optimum for the state or province might involve some sacrifices of apparent, but not real, interests at the regional level. For planning is not for the benefit of pieces of ground as such, but for the benefit of people who live on them, and to-day nearly all North Americans play two roles; that of recreation consumers in one area and of local community members in another area.

The contemporary refinements in analysis of the public interest appear to contain elements of both Platonic idealism and Aristotelian realism. It is Platonic to assert, out of one's intuition, that optima are desirable; to assert that the values which are optimized must be the perception by leaders, of some desirable "common mode of living", (as Rowan states); and to assert that those leaders must teach the public, by appeals to reason, to distinguish between their real and their apparent interests. It is Aristotelian to assert that optima are possible only as a balance between a plurality of inherently conflicting interests; to assert that this balance requires an effective mechanism of choice; and to assert that that mechanism and its working is part of the public interest.

Both approaches, it is suggested, must be combined in modern outdoor recreation land-use planning: the Platonic to provide the creative direction; the Aristotelian to reconcile the ideal vision with the contemporary progress toward it.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION: THE VALUES, INTERESTS AND OPTIMA FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION IN NORTH AMERICA

I. THE NATURE OF A PLANNING SOLUTION TO OUTDOOR RECREATION LAND-USE PROBLEMS

The hypothesis, as proposed at the beginning of this paper, is "that regional planning for outdoor-recreation land-use in North America should provide an optimum balance between public, commercial, collective and private types of recreation site development." This hypothesis was tested by an investigation of the needs, the demands, the supplies of land and facilities, the effectiveness of existing arrangements in allocating supplies to meet demands, and the nature of the criteria which might be used by planners to "optimize" values and interests in recreation land-use at a regional level. The hypothesis was based on two premises: that North American social and economic life would continue to expand, giving more people more affluence, leisure and mobility, part of which they would want to use for more outdoor recreation; and that planning was properly an effort to arrange and control land uses to the best advantage of present and future populations.
The validity of the hypothesis must now be assessed on grounds of internal significance as well as external relevance to concrete realities. In view of the evidence provided in the foregoing chapters it would seem to be the case that (1) there are alternative ways of developing recreation sites, which result in different emphases, scope and consequences for the region; (2) there are alternative criteria for assessing and balancing the claims of each practice; (3) there is a meaningful interpretation of the public interest which can be applied in the optimizing process.

A planning proposal for outdoor-recreation land-use, therefore, should meet several conditions. It should reconcile conflicting elements, (including groups and individuals competing for recreation space, the ways of developing sites, and the jurisdictional claims of private and public institutions). It should prevent conflicts wherever possible by physical and legal-administrative arrangements. It should recognize that the decision-making process itself must be reconciled with the initiatives, powers and responsibilities of the respective site-developing agencies. It should be argued and conceived in terms of a clear concept of the public interest. It should maximize recreation value fulfilment without the sacrifice of other real interests. It should be offered with the recognition that to some extent it reflects the value judgments of the planner himself. It should protect the interests of present
and future populations in future recreation assets, giving due place to recreation land-use for an increasingly demanding population likely to require maximum use of every square mile of available recreation space by the year 2000.

II. LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODS AND THE RESULTS OF THIS ANALYSIS

These observations and conclusions are drawn from the preceding investigation, which is itself limited. It is probable that powerful counter-arguments could be developed to prove that there are better approaches to outdoor-recreation land-use planning. Deeper research might show that drastic revisions may be necessary in the existing system of recreation site-development if it is to optimize any land-use arrangement. Perhaps an optimum solution would be to sacrifice one type of agency altogether. For example it is hypothetically the case that all private approaches to recreation land-use control should be stopped, and a completely public system developed as the only way to meet the demand for recreation space and facilities adequately. The reverse is also arguable; that North American values are generally such that they could be optimized only if recreation land-use were entirely free from public control.

The assumption by the writer that recreation development would continue to take place in a mixed economy of state and private enterprise led to a recognition of the importance of
the market aspects of recreation land values. Unfortunately this aspect was not sufficiently explored, owing largely to the lack of information on the private sector of recreation economics. The detailed information on current transactions in terms of acreages, prices paid, persons and groups investing, and totals under these various headings for the United States and Canada were not available. Even the ORRRC report on private facilities does not give a figure for the total acreage and valuation of land in commercial and private recreation use in the United States. In part this is due to the difficulty of defining a land use as purely recreational when it is in private control. But it is also due to the fact that privacy itself is a matter of not being known, counted, measured and labelled for the public eye, and the tendency of private operators is to guard this element of discreetness and independence.

The full economic consequences, and therefore the factors to be optimized in private recreation land-use and site development in a region cannot be drawn, however, without more information on private activities.

Outdoor recreation is a function which suggests the regional scale of control because of the demands which it makes on space and facilities for access and accommodation. But it may be a weakness in the initial hypothesis to imply that an evaluation can be confined to regional benefits and costs, publics and interests. There may be a need for regional units of planning for use of recreation resources,
but the investigation shows that the mobility of the recreation consumer is national and international. And the interests of local communities are obviously bound up with those of other regions, the state or province and the nation as a whole.

There are other limitations to this study which must modify the conclusions. Optimizing as a planning principle could become a means of evading or obscuring decisions. Whenever a decision is approached, in the form of a plan or policy a new extreme or parameter can be invoked to show that the "optimum" is not yet in sight. Moreover, it may not be possible to bring certain kinds of values into comparison with one another, such that they could be weighed and adjusted in favour of some deeper value. Balance is not an end in itself; nor does the balancing process free the planner from making value judgments himself, including the judgment that values should be balanced.

III. POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS IN RECREATION AND OTHER LAND RESOURCE ISSUES

Wherever land use for recreation is at issue in North America it should be possible to analyse the issues in terms of the agencies, interests and concepts used in this thesis. The relationship to most other planning problems is clear. Urban sprawl, for example, appears to be a failure in balancing land uses, resulting in a maximization of laissez-
faire values of unfettered economic entrepreneurship. The result is a general lowering of total value fulfilment, and ultimately, even the fulfilment of free-enterprise values themselves. For the waste of land forces everyone's costs up, and diminishes each person's scope for initiative in activities which require land; especially land for outdoor recreation.

Part of the crisis in outdoor-recreation land supplies is caused by the uneven distribution of recreation assets in relation to population centres. A perception of optima and public interest is essential to bringing about the controls and other measures necessary to meet the coming demand, and to avoid crowding, frustration and even destruction of sites by over-use. On the other hand, the recognition that public interest depends on processes of decision-making as well as results, should temper the idealist motivations and frustrations of planning in the ideal interests of the public.

There are many regions left in North America where the economic and social life is much less dynamic than that of the affluent and urbanized areas. These are the regions, with their legal communities, which remain rich in space; often in very attractive space for outdoor recreation. The chief application of the foregoing analysis is perhaps in guiding these localities and regions in making the best of the demand which is now reaching them from distant urban and even rural populations. For example, the Trans-Canada Highway, as it winds through the mountains and valleys of
British Columbia, is bringing many thousands of tourists into the south-central interior of the province from the wealthy (but less-well-endowed-for-recreation) provinces to the east. These regions of British Columbia are undergoing all the pressures on land and facilities, and are experiencing all the conflict problems previously indicated. They need to identify their own values and roles in this process, and to apply principles of optima between them for recreation land-use and control.

IV. FURTHER RESEARCH IN OUTDOOR-RECREATION LAND-USE

This limited study reveals the need for, and the possibilities of, several lines of further investigation and analysis. At least seven may be suggested.

1. The region as a unit of planning for recreation land use needs more careful study. The questions of exchange between regions, of movement and circulation within regions is basically one of sources of demand for land, and destinations of supply in the sense of developed sites. If the recreation resources of a region defined in terms of these resources are actually used, to, say, 75 percent of their capacity by people living in that region, does this mean that a proper unit of governmental jurisdiction has been indicated?
2. This leads to investigation of the possibilities of creating special recreation authorities within regions, analogous to river-valley, water resources and other types of authority.

3. The role of multiple-use authorities should also be examined. The cost-benefit economics of recreation are especially important, and in need of such approaches as that of optima, value identification, and public interest analysis developed above.

4. The need for more information on the private sector has already been stressed. Conclusions as to supply cannot be accurately drawn without this information, and therefore judgments as to optima for any given area for outdoor recreation in North America are difficult.

5. The actual consequences, in social and administrative terms, of the four types of development for surrounding communities could be studied and developed further; especially by field research such as attitude surveys of communities where recreation development is rapidly taking up land.

6. The interaction between the four agencies, or the lack of it, needs more detailed study.

7. The last word has yet to be said on the concept of the public interest, particularly as it is used in thinking about planning for outdoor-recreation land-use.
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In concluding this paper several final observations may be made. The hypothesis was that there is some obligation on the part of regional planners to share the function of recreation land-use development between the four types of agencies described. This required investigation of the recreation values motivating demand for recreation space, the demand and supply situation in North America in terms of space and facilities and their utilization, and the effects of the different agencies in meeting both recreation value requirements and other requirements which must figure in the public interest. The concept of the public interest itself was then analysed, and the process of optimizing recreation and other values in planning recreation land-use schematically applied.

Insofar as the validity of recreation values, the requirements to fulfil those values, the shortage of supply of sites in relation to demand, and the characteristics of the four agencies are concerned, the investigation tends to support the hypothesis. Insofar as the hypothesis implies that the region is the most appropriate unit for this kind of planning, and insofar as conflicting values can only be optimized by reference to some common denominator of values which are not identified, the evidence may be less in its favour.
The theory of the public interest as a guide in the process of making decisions for land-use allocation appears to be useful and applicable in many regions of North America where recreation is becoming an important factor in the land-use pattern.

The most warranted conclusion, therefore, appears to be that the hypothesis that regional planning for outdoor-recreation land-use in North America should provide an optimum balance between public, commercial, collective and private types of recreation site development, is largely, but not completely, valid.
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D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS


GENERAL

Lands and waters are needed to provide opportunities for many kinds of outdoor recreation located in relation to population numbers and distribution and to preserve significant natural areas of scenic and scientific interest, regardless of their location, for the benefit of present and future generations. On the basis of population, it should be possible to determine the minimum amount of land and facilities required for physical activities. But it is impossible to set a figure on the amount of land that should be set aside for educational, spiritual and aesthetic values. From the aesthetic point of view, the limit of an area is the horizon; all that can be seen becomes part of the recreation area. One of the benefits of recreation is relief from crowded conditions. Spiritual values of nature can be realized best when a person is alone with nature.

Parks and other recreation areas should be large enough to provide space for physical recreation, space for uncrowded areas, space for screening out distracting views, space enough to include the horizon within the park as seen from the main centers of interest within the park.

Limitations on the amount of land that can be set aside primarily for recreation are often set by the amount of land required for other essential uses: agriculture, housing, commerce and industry, mining and transportation. Recreation can be combined, in many cases, with timber production, watershed protection and grazing through provision of trails, wayside parks, and the use of farm land for hunting, winter sports, children's camps, etc.

We are planning for people, present and future. We are concerned with all types of nonurban recreation areas to serve local, State and national needs for workday, holiday, weekend and vacation use. Since the major portion of our population will be living in urbanized areas, determination of recreation area needs should start with urban areas as the center and work out.
STANDARDS

The following standards are suggested as tools to be used in conjunction with other factors to be considered in the determination of acreage requirements and the location of areas. They are suggested after careful consideration of the general inadequacy of existing areas, standards being recommended in recent urban, regional and State recreation area planning in various parts of the country, and the changing social and economic factors affecting future use and need for public space for recreation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Acreage per 1000 Population</th>
<th>Location in Relation to People to be Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKS--WILDERNESS--NATURE PRESERVES--SCIENTIFIC MONUMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (nonurban)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Within 25 miles or 1 hour travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Where suitable resources are available. Desirable to have as near population centers as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Where suitable resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION AREAS--BEACHES AND PARKWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (nonurban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Within 15 miles or 1/2 hour travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Within 25 miles or 1 hour travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Where suitable resources available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these standards, local, State and national refers to the significance of the area, or the primary drawing power of it, rather than the governmental level of administration.

In 1956, there were approximately 31 acres in State parks per 1,000 population in the United States and 7.7 acres in municipal and county parks per 1,000 urban population. Approximately 33 million acres of federal lands were used primarily for recreation purposes, or 201 acres per 1,000
population in the United States in 1955-56. This acreage was distributed as follows: National Park System (89), National Recreation Areas and Parkways (13), National Forest Wilderness Areas (84), National Forest recreation facilities and fishing lakes (15). In addition, recreation constitutes one of the uses of other Federal lands, such as National Wildlife Refuges, Reservoirs and other forest land, which total approximately 96½ acres per 1,000 population. The total land in Federal ownership in 1955-56 was approximately 455 million acres or approximately 2,700 acres per 1,000 population.

The acreage requirement for any one type of area is, to a large degree, dependent on the extent to which the other types of areas meet the needs. For example, the acreage requirement for recreation areas may be partially met in parks that provide for a variety of recreation activities or a State park may serve in place of a local or metropolitan park. In the heavily built up sections of the country, the State may assume part of the responsibility for providing areas to meet local needs.

These standards suggest that there should be 65 acres of public recreation lands for every 1,000 people in a State and that such lands should be properly distributed to serve local and Statewide needs for various types of recreation areas.

Use by nonresidents is another important factor to be considered in the determination of acreage requirement and recreation areas.

Selection of sites should not be based on the distance people are willing to travel, at present, to reach the type of recreation they desire. Parks and other natural areas as well as recreation areas should be as close as possible to the people they are intended to serve. In other words, while parks are where you find them, where there is a choice in the selection of potential sites, preference should be given to those closer to the population centers they are to serve.
APPENDIX B
Mr. W. S. Parker,
21b - Fort Camp,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, B.C.

Dear Mr. Parker:

From your letter of this March 13, I have a better idea of what you are trying to demonstrate in your Masters Degree thesis. However, for me, your questions still represent tall orders. Particularly, questions like 3(b) or 3(e) are good for a thesis length reply in themselves.

I agree with the differentiation in exclusiveness you have defined under 1(a). In Provincial Parks we recognize a scale of exclusiveness and, accordingly, in our park layout designs try to allocate the choicest recreation lands to the least exclusive uses. For this reason campsites, which are considered a semi-exclusive use of park land because of a low turnover of users, are placed well back in the upland portion of waterfront parks, while picnicking sites or "day-use areas" are frequently within sight of the water. Sunning areas or commonages, which are not at all exclusive, are placed right at shoreline. Summer cottages and cabins represent a highly exclusive use of land. Consequently we are establishing no private summer home colonies in Provincial parks. There is some argument that these might be placed in buffer areas of parks, i.e. an area not required for more general public use. However, the trick is to say with any certainty what will not be required for future public use and the administration of colonies of private cabins is hardly a good expenditure of public park funds. In Manitoba and Ontario parks, the situation is entirely different, and in Quebec you have a different situation again with millions of acres leased to private clubs for recreational use.

With respect to your point 1(b), I will only say that while monetary exchange through tourism and purchase of equipment and services for recreational purposes are often studied as economic benefits of parks and recreation areas, some of us in the park field feel that by far the major benefits from parks, our own field of endeavour, are social benefits. Consequently we do not accumulate detail of the type you are requesting. While you have indicated you are aware there is an abundance of information on the economics of recreation in the
United States, it is possible you may gain further useful material from articles listed in the bibliography p. 195 for Chapter 7 of Frank C. Brockman's book "Recreational Use of Wild Lands" (McGraw Hill 1959) which I am sure the University Library, or the Faculty of Forestry Library, has.

We don't know what development of a public park in a locale does for the local economy. We know that the development of Apex Mountain Park and Silver Star Park as winter sports areas has had a buoying effect on the accommodations, garage, and restaurant businesses of the nearest towns, in these cases Penticton and Vernon. Perhaps the local Boards of Trade could give you some idea of the extent of this. Incidentally, Study No. 5, "Some Economic Aspects of Recreational Resource Uses", published under Ref. No. AE-63-4/5, by the Department of Agriculture Economics, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ontario, might interest you although it deals with a relatively small district in Ontario.

With respect to your question 3(a) there are at this writing 6,388,000 acres of Provincial park land in British Columbia in 216 parks and another 1,070,000 (approx.) acres in 4 National Parks. This area has not been zoned and specifically committed to such purposes as wilderness enjoyment, camping development, beach zones, and so on. In fact we have wilderness in B.C. more by accident (lack of access) than by design. The acreage within all parks, actually in use for camping is about 1650 acres but much more will doubtless be used in this way.

Most Crown lands, and considerable private land is open to hunting even though it may not be committed primarily to that use. Perhaps the Fish and Game Branch, Department of Recreation and Conservation, Victoria, could elaborate on this and the monetary worth of hunting as a land use in B.C.

Regarding 3(b) -- I suppose one could place some sort of valuation on land used for non urban recreation but this would be an exceedingly big job. Just to compute the value of parks on the basis of what exploitation of other resources is foregone as one estimate of cost of holding this land would be a colossal time consuming job. As for the cost of making this land available to the public we can only say we have been spending about $1,000,000 per year for nearly 15 years on park development. Access into non park recreation lands, to pursue only one consideration, frequently comes about incidentally, with construction of industrial roads so that your "cost of making it open" is undetermined.
On the subject of 3(c) -- facilities in public developments -- we plan these for a multiplicity of purposes all predicated in Provincial parks, on facilitating public enjoyment of naturalistic environment -- trails, primitive shelters, campsites, picnicking units, with shelters, tables, fireplaces, water systems, sanitary facilities, beach facilities such as change houses, toilets, floats, docks, boat launching ramps, natural history museums and nature trails, skiing facilities, boat mooring facilities and so on. In Provincial parks the emphasis is on facilities serving basic needs and we try to avoid providing personalized services.

3(d) -- In Provincial Parks featuring summer recreations in B.C. the bulk of use takes place in a 66 day period from late June to early September, with peaking on long weekends and holidays. Winter sports parks such as Seymour Park have of course, a wider spread of heavy use. Heaviest used are those parks which lie within 60 miles of a centre of population which appears, for the present to be maximum day use distance. Good waterfrontage is, of course, the essential ingredient of the most favoured places. The heaviest used parks in B.C., as you might expect, are Mt. Seymour Park, Cultus Lake Park and Alouette Lake Park.

3(e) -- Major Problems: In my opinion fire and vandalism are not the major problems. We have not as yet had a major fire caused by a recreationist in a Provincial park. Vandalism seems always to be a factor we have to accept and cope with in public establishments. Some people feel there is a relationship between good quality facilities maintained to a high standard and reduction in vandalism. A major problem is trying to keep up with the demand for recreation facilities in face of available finances and at the same time to properly maintain a growing establishment, again in face of available finances. Other major problems lie in the field of policy -- e.g. what activities are admissible in the various types of Provincial park and what are not? How is basic protection from inadvisable activities to be provided to parks?

To get a meaningful answer to your 3(f), you would have to address your question to the Provincial cabinet itself. A possible mode of action is outlined in the attached statement.

I hope you will not find this shotgun treatment of your very broad questions too discouraging in your pursuit of your thesis.

Yours very truly,

R. H. Ahrens,
Chief, Planning Division.
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THE SCOPE OF THE PROVINCIAL PARK AUTHORITY
IN THE RECREATION RESOURCE FIELD.


The Basic Objectives of a Provincial Park System

Parks, in this paper, are thought of as tracts of public land (land being taken in its broadest sense) formally dedicated or otherwise set apart by a competent authority for public recreation. The recreation resource field encompasses more than park systems in that recreational opportunities are often available on land managed for purposes other than park. Areas under forest management and industrial water reservoirs are cases in point.

Most often parks will be managed for a single purpose - public recreational enjoyment. A provincial park system should be capable of accommodating those socially constructive activities which can best be enjoyed on such non-urban Crown lands as can not be maintained as national, municipal, or local parks.

A basic objective in provincial parks is to offer the public a change of environment from that in which most people spend much of their lives. Activities relating to association with nature and an appreciation of man's cultural heritage and place in the universe, are particularly appropriate in parks of the provincial system.

There are many forms of recreation. Those forms which provide change of landscape and those which provide for activity or rest in the natural environment of which man is a part are held to be of especial
The Basic Objectives of a Provincial Park System

Parks, in this paper, are thought of as tracts of public land (land being taken in its broadest sense) formally dedicated or otherwise set apart by a competent authority for public recreation. The recreation resource field encompasses more than park systems in that recreational opportunities are often available on land managed for purposes other than park. Areas under forest management and industrial water reservoirs are cases in point.

Most often parks will be managed for a single purpose - public recreational enjoyment. A provincial park system should be capable of accommodating those socially constructive activities which can best be enjoyed on such non-urban Crown lands as can not be maintained as national, municipal, or local parks.

A basic objective in provincial parks is to offer the public a change of environment from that in which most people spend much of their lives. Activities relating to association with nature and an appreciation of man's cultural heritage and place in the universe, are particularly appropriate in parks of the provincial system.

There are many forms of recreation. Those forms which provide change of landscape and those which provide for activity or rest in the natural environment of which man is a part are held to be of especial
entire Province.

Local parks fill local needs for recreation open space. Local park systems contain neighbourhood parks, playgrounds and playfields, and special purpose parks including parkways, ornamental areas and formally landscaped grounds. Included also in local park systems are greenbelts, and large city parks or municipal parks which may be natural areas within the city.

As a general observation it can be noted that, in instances, local parks are user-oriented while provincial parks wherever possible are resource-oriented. Local parks, especially the large ones, serve the valuable purposes of taking some of the user pressure off naturalistic parks of the provincial system which are susceptible to over-use. Large local parks can serve some of the uses which are perhaps best kept out of provincial parks.

Difficulty in differentiating between Provincial or local responsibility occurs not with small centres of population but when metropolitan areas formed by groups of cities and municipalities arise. Political boundaries alone do not serve to fix responsibility for provision and development of parks when these parks, within or on the edge of a metropolitan area, draw users from the entire metropolitan area including suburbs on provincial territory. Frequently the responsibility is closely associated with finance. One municipality alone cannot afford to acquire and develop parks for use by all comers. Frequently too, the best remaining park opportunities are in those district municipalities least able to afford acquisition. In these areas of
uncertain responsibility the provincial government can reasonably be expected to show leadership in guiding the formation of a regional park authority, representative of a group of cities and municipalities and empowered and financed to acquire, develop, operate, and administer parks of significance to the entire region. Such an agency may require financing not only by the member local governments but by the provincial government as well. The leadership in this field by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan is well worth study.

In respect of centres of population in unorganized provincial territory, responsibility for development is easy to determine on the basis of the type and the significance of the park to be developed. Moreover, the provincial government again can be expected to assist in organizing a local park authority, and to assist, as requested, with advisory assistance in planning or developing parks. Further the provincial government can be expected to provide necessary land for what in future will be city parks, and, to an extent, can be expected to assist with money.

The Division Between Federal and Provincial Responsibility In Public Parks.

The national park system contains natural and historic parks of significance to Canada as a whole. The national parks contain tracts of countryside outstandingly representative of Canada. The national park system seeks to take in the scenic and historic highlights of the nation.

The provincial park system too is concerned with areas of
great natural beauty. It is concerned with scenic and historic areas of significance to the province and seeks to do, in detail, on a Provincial scale what the National park system sets out to do on a National scale. As some of the large provincial parks, in supplementing the national parks, will be of national park calibre, it is to be expected that some parks will present a problem as to whether they should be under federal or provincial administration. In these cases a decision should be reached on the basis of how public needs are best served.

The existence of a well-planned, diversified, provincial park system is of importance to the national park system in that by satisfying park needs which would otherwise have to be met in national parks, the provincial parks will serve to protect national parks from over-use and loss of the atmosphere of spaciousness. Through financial assistance to provincial governments for provincial park improvement programs such as were carried out under the Trans-Canada Highway Campgrounds - Picnic Areas Program, and the Federal-Provincial Winter Works Aid Program, the federal government can assist, and has assisted, in the development of diversified provincial park systems. In passing, we may note too, that in fostering this Federal-Provincial Park Conference the federal government is contributing to a clarification of the division of responsibility between local, provincial and national governments in public parks by encouraging the provinces to clarify the scope of their parks functions.

Policy in Provincial Parks Regarding Utilization of Natural Resources in Parks for Purposes Other Than Public Recreation.

At the core of the philosophy and the principles that have
evolved over North America as a whole, on both the federal and state or provincial levels, in respect of use of parks, there stands out the concept that multiple use of natural resources has neither place nor application in national or state or provincial parks. Federal and state or provincial parks are heavily predicated on natural attractions and the preservation of the naturalistic environment and hence multiple use represents complete incompatibility.

That of course is not to say that multiple use is not applicable elsewhere, on other lands and waters. Within multiple use schemes some areas are capable of being used for several purposes simultaneously; one use will usually predominate and others will be subordinate. Forest reserve lands, for example, managed for the growing and harvesting of timber, can at the same time yield recreation benefits, admit mining operations and serve to protect watersheds.

Multiple use schemes, however, also have within them some areas which must be dedicated to one use only by reason of the nature of that use. A provincial park dedication covers one such use. When an area is dedicated to public recreation and the intended recreational benefits depend on natural resources being in place and intact as is the case with resource-oriented provincial parks, the utilization of certain of the components of the natural scene for purposes not directly related to public recreation is a violation of park use. For example, The Department of Recreation and Conservation Act of British Columbia states that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council constitutes Provincial parks, "for the pleasure and recreation of the public." It does not stipulate any other purpose for the park. If natural resources are to be utilized
within areas set apart as Provincial park, the park designation loses its meaning. Areas in which industrial exploitation is to be encouraged would best be left as forest reserves or as other designations in the public domain where public recreation is an incidental benefit of land use. It is a common error to believe that endorsement of multiple land use means that we must make every possible use, simultaneously, of each one of our acres. Some land uses are tolerant of other land uses. It is necessary, however, that land managers recognize that some uses of land are mutually exclusive.

Legislative Problems:

It is presumed that by "legislative problems" is meant administrative problems arising from possible inadequacies or ambiguities of park legislation. Comprehensive park legislation includes a clear statement of the purpose for which provincial parks are set aside, an expression of the responsibilities and obligations of the park agency administering the parks, an outline of the types of park to be included in the provincial park system, that is, a park classification, and a statement on the degree of protection to be accorded each class of park.

Problems arise when, for example, a provincial park is predicated on use of foreshores which are governed by the Navigable Waters Protection Act. In this case, it is necessary in the interest of public convenience and safety for the provincial park authority to develop and regulate the use of foreshore but these controls rest under federal authority.
A similar problem arises on the provincial level if legislation governing provincial parks does not clearly place the administration of all resources within parks under the jurisdiction of the provincial park agency. For example, legislation might preclude sale of land or timber, or minerals within parks but with respect to use of water the park agency, by reason of an omission in its own Act, and in face of another Act, may depend on sympathetic consideration from another agency not responsible for parks or necessarily interested in them. The same situation may exist with respect to game and wildlife or other resources in parks, or with respect to construction of highways through parks. Obviously, any legislative problems which may exist, need to be outlined for consideration by the executive arm of government.

Criteria For Selection of Provincial Parks

Before provincial parks can be selected, we need to know what activities the parks are going to have to accommodate. This points to evolution of a classification of the types of parks to be included in the provincial park system, a statement of their purpose, and a description of the physical characteristics and other attributes desired and believed attainable in the various types of park. With the park classification should go various standards: desirable minimum size for the different types of park, advocated locations of these parks with respect to people to be served, the area required by certain forms of development to serve a given number of people, and the specific requirements of parks and park developments of various types in terms of topography, aspect, water, soil conditions, vegetative cover, climate, and other essential features.
Where parks are predicated on cultural features the advice of experts is required in identification of significant values.

As a guide in selection of provincial park lands it is advisable to work in accordance with an overall plan for a park system. The plan will be concerned with additional standards not yet mentioned, namely, the number of the different kinds of parks which should be established not only to meet the present needs, wants, and capabilities of the public but, as well as can be estimated, those of the population as it will be distributed in the future. Population forecasts, knowledge of the characteristics, needs and desires, of both our own citizens and our visitors, are but a few of the subjects that require study as background information for planning.

Criteria for provincial parks will vary from province to province because natural conditions and political arrangements differ. Criteria must be realistic for the particular living conditions where they are to apply.

The only real criterion for selection of provincial parks is that the lands should be the best obtainable for serving the purposes we have in mind for the land. In this connection, as has already been indicated, we seek in provincial parks to offer a change of scene from that in which most of the population lives from day to day. Provincial parks should be spacious, be predicated on pleasing natural settings wherever possible, contain sufficient usable ground to accommodate necessary developments, and should be practical to maintain.
Parks should provide people with the opportunity to engage in pursuits related to enjoyment of nature in the out of doors. Among appropriate pursuits which provincial parks should be selected to serve are: sightseeing and viewing scenery; strolling, hiking and mountaineering; swimming and water sports; picnicking; camping; boating and canoeing; fishing; hunting (in some parks); nature study; study of cultural history; collecting (non-destructive), photography, other art hobbies; outdoor sports and games in certain types of park.

**Primary Source Of Visitors To, And Demand In, Provincial Parks.**

Provincial Parks will draw people both from within and outside the province. Primarily, however, they will serve the people of the province within which the parks are located. In British Columbia about 70% of park users are British Columbians. Where local parks may receive many visits annually from each visitor, many provincial parks will draw on the average only two or three visits per person. Provincial parks will serve mainly weekend and holiday visits.

Since the bulk of the population is urban dwellers one might expect most visitors to provincial parks to be city people. We have no conclusive evidence, however, to show that rural people make proportionately fewer visits to provincial parks than do urban dwellers.

There is some indication that different types of parks or pursuits, for example, wilderness enjoyment, appeal differently to people
of different educational and occupational levels. This observation and
the possible basis for it, merits additional study.

In British Columbia, in recent years, a large public demand
has existed for wayside parks, and multi-use parks rather intensively
developed with overnight camping accommodation, picnicking facilities,
and waterfront improvements including boat launching facilities. Skiing
facilities have also been in heavy demand. The great emphasis on
camping facilities which in most cases are intended merely an incidental
aid to enjoyment of park attractions, causes the provincial park agency
some chagrin since, in some eyes, it is exclusively associated with
campsites. We are pleased to observe a growing public demand for
development of access to the large natural area parks, and provision
of hikers trails and primitive shelters in them. The enthusiastic
reception given by the public to interpretation of natural history
through outdoor museums indicates that this desirable possibility of
provincial parks is meeting a demand which has long existed.

It has been said, as a limitation of provincial parks,
that a necessary qualification for their enjoyment is automobile owner­
ship. Car ownership has become so universal that this observation is
becoming increasingly less valid.

Facility Emphasis in Development of Provincial Parks.

Since a distinctive characteristic of provincial parks is that
they offer a spacious natural environment for recreational pursuits, it
is of great importance that developments which tend to urbanize provincial
park lands be avoided. Preservation of naturalistic park environment is a prime consideration in park development.

Developments to accommodate public use incorporate safety measures, including safe water supply, necessary sanitation, and prevention of defacement by focussing intensive use on localized areas specially treated to sustain such use.

When conveniences for the public are provided, only those essential to use and enjoyment of an area and in keeping with the purpose of the park should be installed. Provision of the ultimate in creature comforts is not intended; probably the most comfortable place to be is at home. Provincial park facilities should reflect the fact that participant rather than spectator enjoyment of recreation activities is intended, and that recreational opportunities should be provided for relatively large numbers of people and not special groups.

In this connection, summer home colonies are considered private developments which can be administered outside of provincial parks and, in fact, do not belong in public parks.

Where it is necessary, in enabling the intended use of a park, to provide buildings and improvements for accommodation and service of the public, the developments are best owned and operated by the Crown. Private investment is not desirable in public parks.

In summary, emphasis in development in provincial parks should be placed on those facilities which are for the protection of the user and for the protection of the site.