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THE PLACE OF RECREATION ON OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

Introduction

There is probably no more important problem confronting the Forest Service in its administration of the National Forests than that of coordinated use and development of recreational resources. Less progress has been made in this direction than in any other important phase of forest use. For years foresters have argued that recreation has nothing to do with forestry, and for years Congress has looked upon recreation on the national forests with askance and even hostility, denying the Forest Service both support and funds for handling constructively the resource. In the meantime, the American public has discovered for itself that these forests, belonging to the public and open to the public, are rich in recreational opportunities to the first degree.

Failure of Congress to recognize the recreational values inherent in the national forests and to supply funds sufficient to enable the Forest Service properly to handle and develop these assets or even to handle the growing millions that are flocking to the forests in vacation time, has created a situation that must be speedily met; otherwise balanced use and protection of national forest resources sooner or later may be seriously embarrassed. Furthermore, the millions who went to use the national forests for their camping, hiking, hunting, and fishing outings...

* Refers to the reference number in literature cited.
and fishing outings are entitled to as much consideration as those who wish to use the economic forest values. Recreation must be adequately coordinated with other forest activities in an orderly manner and constructive way. It demands study and development of a comprehensive plan that will give recreation its proper economic and social position in the forest system.

Time was when foresters and the general public looked upon national forests pretty much as tree factories. All this has changed. Year by year the diverse resources have been standing out more clearly. The primary value and purpose, of course, is for trees and watershed, but along with these have emerged range, wildlife, and recreation values.

Therefore, there is every sound reason why forest recreation should be given the place it merits in national forest use and development. It is as subject to correlation with the major factors and purposes of the forests as any other secondary but important uses, and the theory that ignoring the recreational resources of the forests will protect their major purposes of forest growth and watershed protection really defeats its own end. The present situation and trends point to the fact that if the Forest Service is not provided with adequate authority and funds to control and plan the public's use of forests for recreation, then indeed the major forest objectives may soon be seriously embarrassed and disrupted by uncontrollable numbers and demands of the recreationists.
Relationship of forestry and recreation

"Forestry," says the official definition of the Society of American Foresters, "is the science and art of managing forests in continuity for forest purposes, i.e. for wood supplies and forest influences. What are forest influences? We are inclined to think too much of them as being only or having to do only with climate, streamflow, and erosion, but this is too narrow a view. Surely the influence of the forests on our health, comfort, and pleasure is much too important to overlook. Where better can one find mental, physical, and spiritual refreshment than in the forests? We may be justly proud of our seacoasts, of our myrids of beautiful lakes and streams, and of our many rugged mountains, but the charms of these are set off by our friendly forests.

Forests and recreation are joined together not only by the trees but by the wild life that they contain. Game, fish, birds, and the countless number of smaller animals which it harbors are all an integral part of the forest.

Generally speaking, the first reaction of the Forest Service, of foresters as a class, to this new phase of forest development, was negative. The swarming hoards were a menace; their careless campfires caused widespread forest destruction; their disregard for sanitary precautions menaced public health; they shot livestock or ran them off the range, if they camped along side of waterholes and thus prevented stock from securing needed water; they opposed logging, grazing, reservoir development or other utilitarian activities,
without regard as to whether they were or were not indispensable to economic security and growth. More than one old time forest ranger deliberately concealed the entrances to newly constructed trails, or refrained from posting directional signboards on roads, so as to avert or minimize the invasion of his district by this undesirable host.

**Classes of recreationists**

From the first the Forest Service had three major classes of recreationists with which to deal: (1) the nomad, (2) the seminomad, (3) and the summer resident. The nomad desired camp grounds and camping facilities; the seminomad desired a combination of camp grounds and resorts, and the third desired a place in which to build a summer home.

Camping at first was promiscuous, except where concentrated by limitations of water supply. But even where water was abundant, the gregarious instinct caused campers to concentrate in large measure on certain areas. Largely as a result of this process of concentration or natural selection, the national forests now contain over 1500 recognized public camp grounds, upon 1187 of which some facilities have been installed. In many cases a modern system of sanitation, a water distributing system, and numerous fireplaces, tables and benches, shelter houses, information booths, and other like facilities have been installed. The cost of this work up to the year 1930 has amounted to over $300,000 and an approximate cost of $400,000 more will fit the entire system adequately.
There is, however, a trend among some people that the joys of cooking over the glowing coals of a campfire and sleeping under the stars are unexcelled, but each year more and more campers grab every opportunity they can to rent a cabin with real bed-springs and at least a wood stove.

**Municipal playgrounds**

Perhaps the most interesting of all recreational developments on the National Forests is to be seen in the municipal playgrounds. One of the most fully developed of these has been established by the city of Los Angeles in the Angeles National Forest. Here the city has leased from the Forest Service a tract of some 23 acres of well-wooded mountain land beside a pleasant stream and lying at an elevation of 3500 feet. On this tract has been erected 61 small summer bungalows, each capable of accommodating from 2 to 6 persons. These are furnished with cot beds. A central club-house has been built; also a central kitchen with a pleasant outdoor dining room. Water supply, sanitary equipment, cement swimming pool, tennis courts, and other simple camp facilities have been provided. When in full swing the camp will take care of about 300 persons. This camp is under the management of the Los Angeles playground commission, and is run as a part of the city playground system. Several other cities have taken leases on other Forest tracts for similar use, so that this form of municipally directed recreation bids fair to reach considerable popularity.
Permanent camps

A great many people prefer to do their summer camping in comfortable cabins of their own building. These they like to own. Under special legislation designed to meet this need the Forest Service leases small tracts of \( \frac{1}{4} \) to one acre to such persons on terms which make it feasible for them to build and furnish their own houses. Naturally these camps are gregarious, both because most campers like a little society--even in the woods--and because the attractions of pleasant streams, lakes, and trails appeal to many persons alike. The obvious tendency, therefore, is to develop this important type of forest recreation in the form of small summer colonies, usually along streams or lakes.

There are 22 national forests within the states of Oregon and Washington, and each of these has the opportunities for supplying the summer-home demand. These forests are located almost entirely in mountainous country which varies from spectacular, rough, and rugged to friendly, gentle types of land. In the Pacific Northwest there is not only abundant timber and brush for shade and as a setting to frame the summer home picture, but there is abundance of water in different forms. Water of some kind is practically always a part of the picture and fulfills the greatest need of the vacationist. If the seeker of a mountain summer home desires to be near a lake, a river, a creek, a hot spring, a mineral spring, a cold spring, or a falls he can be satisfied within reason if he will but inquire.
The angler, the hunter, the hiker, the photographer, the mountain climber, the water sports lover has but to make inquiries and in all probability he will find a suitable place.

The Cascade Range, forming the backbone of Oregon and Washington, furnishes the principal vantage ground for the summer home-seeker. He may, if he wishes find space in the Olympics of far western Washington, in the Coast Range, in the Siskiyous of Oregon, or he may prefer the Pine country of the Blue Mountains.

There has been a steady increase in the use of the National Forest for summer home use. Many little nooks and coves are admirably adapted to such use but of no substantial use for other forms of recreational development.

As has been said there is a type of recreationist called the semi-nomad who desires a combination of camping grounds plus other attractions known as resorts. An excellent example of such a place is that known as the Mt. Hood area in Oregon. Camping and picnicking facilities in this area are excellent. Little restraint is placed on visitors, and the great effort and most of the financial government assistance goes into sanitation and fire-proofing improvements. The recreationist may go there summer or winter and enjoy conveniences comparable to those of the city.

The nomad type of recreationist would probably not desire such an elaborate place at which to spend a week or two of vacationing. His ideal camping place is one away from crowds with only the bare necessities for making camping comfortable. We have many examples of such places within the National
Forests of Oregon, and in order to take care of the steady increase in the number of such visitors to our forests each year we must enlarge such recreational developments.

Many motorists will travel a great distance simply to get away from their daily habitation and enjoy an afternoon lunching or an overnight stop at some quiet cool place in the woods. Such a move may seem to actually be harder physical labor than they are used to, but since it is a decided change from regular routine, they become very much refreshed.

Wild life and recreation in forest management

On the average very few trained men feel that they can afford to buy waste land and plant it, or wait for reproduction, and get a paying percentage from tree growth. So now we have the interesting problem of attempting to help out silviculture with recreation and wild life. As an example of wild life and recreation possibilities, let us consider the state of New York.

We may first study the private organized camps. New York rates third among the states in number of camps at the present time (1928). There are 141 private organized camps in New York. In 1924 there were but 97; so the increase is rapid. They vary in size, but the average one takes care of approximately 50 people. If this is the case, upwards of 7000 campers go to the woods each year, employing nearly 1550 counselors, besides as many laborers. These campers spend on an average of $3 each for camp fees alone, to say nothing of travel, uniforms, and all extras. The gross
income of these 141 camps would be more than $2,000,000 to say nothing of extras, which would bring the expense to the campers about to the $3,000,000 mark.

These are conservative figures, and the camp business has just started. The Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, and numerous other institutional camps have not been considered. Then, if one considers the woods, hotels, and the guiding business, another large source of income is disclosed. The exact numbers who spend money in woods recreation, or the amount they spend, is hard to determine, but probably the average New Yorker spends $5 for every day he goes to the woods or to the bank of a wooded stream or lake. Every one that buys a license spends more money, and he spends it to get into the woods or on the water protected by the woods.

Game on the National Forests

We may be able to capitalize the actual food value of game and game fish. As far as getting meat is concerned, most men could earn the money to buy more meat in the time they spend hunting. Hunting is considered recreation primarily, but the meat is an important by-product, and the land that produces the game would not produce much of any other human food. A forest fully stocked with game produces food and a lot of it.

Management should be such that the winter food supply of game is adequate and that stocking is up to the amount of game that the winter food supply will support. The aim of
game management is not always to increase the supply of game, but it is that of knowing when to stop the increase and to keep it permanently stopped. A little thought brings one to the realization that game animals differ but little from domestic species and that the fundamentals of management which apply to one are fairly applicable to the other. Just as a farmer may place too many cattle in a meadow for the amount of forage there, so may we permit game and wild life to become too numerous and thus become detrimental rather than beneficial.

An estimate of the actual value of the wild life of a state is arrived at through a consideration of various factors, some definite but others of which must be approximated. The basic elements are the flesh, fur, and feather value; the recreational value to hunters, tourists, and naturalists; and the commercial value as it affects expenditures for hunting licenses, clothing and camping equipment, weapons, ammunition, transportation, food and lodging, and a variety of personal services. For example, considering the area, topography, and other conditions in South Carolina, the wild life of the state, on its nearly 20,000,000 acres of land and water, is to be estimated as having a direct economic value of more than $8,000,000 and recreational values of probably $5,000,000. This income from recreational values is arrived at from hunters' license fees ($142,000), expenditures of more than 90,000 hunters averaging $25 each for equipment, transportation, lodging, and other expenses. Therefore, the drawing powers of wild life are great.
Thus, with the wild life of South Carolina approximating a value, as nearly as can be worked out, of more than $13,000,000 annually, we have a natural resource of no small magnitude, and one well worth conserving and enlarging. Sane administration of the wild life of forest, field, and stream will develop more fully an appreciation of their great economic value, and thus in turn will be reflected in the resulting values of the land and water areas on which the species make their temporary or permanent homes.

23 We may summarize the importance of wild life and recreational uses in forest management with the following conclusions:

1. The business of growing timber pays a low percentage on the investment, and is not attractive to the private owner.

2. Forest utilization includes the recreational, fur, educational, and sporting uses, as well as the use of tree products.

3. These forest products, other than the tree products, can be given a financial valuation, and may be so managed that what has been a financial loss on a given area may be turned into a profit.

4. The attitude of the profession of forestry has been one of mere toleration relative to sporting and recreational uses of the forests. This attitude must change if forestry is to reach its highest development. These uses must be recognized as even superior to wood production in some areas, where the public interest in wild life and recreation is very great.
5. Forest preserves, such as are in New York, are available for national emergencies. They are available for every use except wood. It may be a better policy to retain a preserve, uncut rather than cut in such a way that the result is bad economics, bad silviculture, or even results in the loss of popular favor from the tax-paying public that is still uninformed on technical forestry problems.

6. Recreation and wild life may produce an income as well as pay the taxes on forests at present containing no commercially valuable timber, and thus permit them to be held and improved.

7. Recreation and wild life are popular, where silviculture is little understood. Nearly everyone camps, hunts, fishes, is a bird enthusiast, or has some outdoor hobby. If forestry can be firmly tied to these popular pursuits, silviculture management may become easier.

8. It may be difficult to apply these uses in forest management, but they are of great economic importance, and the profession must consider them to get the greatest use from the forests, even where silviculture alone is now paying satisfactory dividends. Though we are primarily considering wild life and recreation as economic aids in silvicultural management their social and educational values may be such that their economic importance becomes a minor consideration. Forest use should always be translated into terms of human welfare, and the greatest use is not always limited to tree products.
The vanishing wilderness

Another very important phase of recreation in the National Forest is that of the development and conservation of wilderness or primitive areas. The next resource, the exhaustion of which is due for discovery is the wilderness. Can we not for once foresee and provide? Or must it always be hindsight?

Wild places are the rock-bottom foundation of a good many different kinds of outdoor play, including pack and canoe trips in which hunting, fishing, or just exploring may furnish the flavoring matter. By "wild places" we mean wild regions large enough to absorb the average man's two weeks vacation without getting him tangled up in his own back tracks. We also mean large areas wild enough to be free from motor roads, summer cottages, launches, or other manifestations of gasoline. Driving a pack train across or along a graded highway is distinctly not a pack trip—it in merely exercise, with about the same flavor as lifting dumbbells. Neither is canoeing in the wake of a motor launch or down a lane of summer cottages a canoe trip. That is simply paddling. Motor roads, cottages, and launches do not destroy hunting and fishing, but they destroy the wilderness, which to certain tastes is quite as important. Neither do we imply that motor, cottages, summer resorts, and dude ranches are not in themselves highly valuable recreational assets. As has been previously shown, they are valuable. Only they are different kind of recreation, and we need to preserve as many different kinds as possible. The civilized
kinds tend to preserve themselves through the automatic opera-
tion of economic laws, but wilderness travel is a kind that
tends to disappear under the automatic operation of economic
laws, just as the site for a city park tends to disappear
with the growth of the city. Unlike the city park, however,
the wilderness cannot be recreated when the need for it is
determined by hindsight. The need for it must be determined
by foresight. Wilderness is one kind of playground which
man cannot build to order. To those who do not object to
the crowded conditions and enjoy the more artificial forms
of outdoor life, the average large motor camp, with most of
the conveniences of civilization, offers everything that is
desired; but in contrast, the quiet and harmony, peace and
renewal so necessary to many is to be found only in such
spots as in the roadless ways far into the wilderness.

An important question in the development of wilderness
areas is that of fire. Obviously, the construction of trails,
phone lines, and towers necessary for fire control must
not be only allowed but encouraged. But how about roads?
Wherever the opponents of the idea can argue that unless the
country is opened up it will burn up, there is no chance for
the wilderness. The Forest Service with its system of look-
outs, telephone lines, and trails is successfully handling the
fires, even during bad years. There may be regions, however,
where fire control is impossible without roads, in which case
we must have roads in such a region, wilderness or no wilder-
ness.
One wilderness area could easily be fitted into the National Forest of each state without material sacrifice of other kinds of playgrounds or other kinds of uses. Additional wilderness areas could be fitted into the National Parks, and it seems that very little and possibly no new costs, laws, or extra work would be created.

The exceptance of the idea of wilderness areas entails a growth in the original conception of the National Forests. The original purposes were timber production and watershed protection, and these are and must always remain the primary purposes, but the whole subsequent history of these forests has been a history of the appearance and growth of new uses, which when skillfully adjusted to the primary uses and to each other, were one by one provided for and the net public benefit correspondingly increased. Public recreation was one of these.

**The two sides of Forest recreation**

36 The public use and enjoyment of National Forests for purposes of education, recreation, and inspiration, in common with every other human use of lands and their products, has both its favorable and unfavorable aspects. The determination of its proper place in the future administrative plans and programs of the Forest Service necessarily involves a careful weighing of both the affirmative and negative social values or consequences. The very process of public use, as it continues over the years, finally will establish the true position and rank of recreational use as an element of National Forest Service.
Favorable

The favorable part that Forest recreation plays has very largely been previously shown. Economically, it means additional funds from remote sources and consequent creation within regions tributary to National Forests of additional markets for supplies and services. It means the stimulation of the various phases of local community life of communities which otherwise would soon be lost and forgotten by the neighboring world.

Another favorable aspect of forest recreation is that of being educational. It is a maximum opportunity to the individual to appreciate and understand man's relationship to his environment by the direct observation, study and interpretation of the natural laws and phenomena. It gives a splendid opportunity to make the visiting public forest-minded and to teach them directly the values of our forests. Through recreation the public is shown the processes by which the natural resources are converted to the uses and benefits of society. It is true that there are other ways of educating the public concerning the values of forests, but through the recreation method the expense item is reduced to a minimum.

Outdoor recreation in the National Forests are inspirational to many. It means the creation of new concepts of natural forces, beauty, form, proportion, balance and integration; the stimulation and development of mental and physical qualities; relief from the trying and depressive intensity
of modern life and living; away from the continual hum and monotony of regular routine: increased appreciation of the potentialities, grandeur, beauty, extent and historical progress of the mother country, its institutions and its privileges. It gives sound justification for outlays of public resources to promote full social use and enjoyment.

The improvement of public health is an outstanding favorable feature of outdoor recreation. It means the creation of better conditions of public health and reduction of economic and industrial losses caused by sickness, through provision of additional opportunities for healthful outdoor recreation conducive to individual and collective physical betterment and greater resistance to disease.

In relation to forestry outdoor recreation is much more important than it appears to be. Through recreation we have the derivation of a current service and return from natural resources not economically ripe for other forms of utilization. As far as timber production is concerned the locality may be inaccessible. There is also a better individual and collective understanding and appreciation of the intimate and vital relationship between forestry and the public welfare; more intelligent appraisals of the requirements and compensations of sound principles of forest management.

Unfavorable

The unfavorable consequences of recreation within the National Forests are considerably outweighed by the favorable factors. Very often there is conflict with industrial and commercial forms of natural resource utilization and consequent
impairment of the financial self-sufficiency of the National Forests. There is impairment or possible destruction of the primeval biological balance of the original character of the forest, of the qualities of solitude, detachment, remoteness, which constitute the chief inspirational values; disruption of the harmonious elements and the introduction of vandalism and modernism.

There may be an impairment in relation to scenic elements due to the impairment by requirements of public accommodation, such as roads, trails, resorts, power plants and lines, or by the damage inevitably attendant upon extensive public use. In relation to forestry there may be a conflict with the sound principles of silvicultural management or other resource utilization due to recreation. Possibly there may be a diversion to recreational management of man-power and funds needed for other forest activities.

Increased hazards to public health and property necessitating heavier expenditures of public funds would be possible and hazards to large numbers of persons unskilled in woodcraft in situations of physical danger or in absence of adequate facilities for sanitation and disease control; also danger to remote populations because of possible contamination of domestic or municipal water supplies.

Increase fire hazards due to recreational development is a strong argument against such a move. The prevention of fire damage within the National Forest takes precedence over all other considerations and during periods or within areas of abnormal fire risk or hazard, public occupancy for
recreational purposes will be restricted to such a degree or for such periods of time as may be necessary to minimize the danger of fire; but aside from such cases the possibility that increased numbers of persons will result in proportionate increases in numbers of fires will not be grounds for the restriction, or prohibition of recreational use, unless it is clearly evident that the increased risk cannot be met by practical protective measures.

When fire sweeps through a forest, recreational values are bound to suffer. No other agency can so effectively wreck the beauty of the forest or create a scene of such desolation. A fire swept forest, where the burned skeletons of trees cast their ghostly shadows, holds no profit for the recreationalist, be he hiker, camper, fisherman, or hunter. For in addition to destroying forest vegetation, fire kills forest animals and birds outright. Even ground fires which apparently do little damage to the trees are a real menace to recreational values. Fish also are among the victims of forest fires. Destruction of the forests on watersheds tends to decrease the low and steady water flow of streams which is essential to fish life. Fish are killed by the complete drying up of streams and also by the increased temperature of the water in seasons when the runoff in the streams is small. Fish are also killed by raising the temperature of and by changing the chemical composition of the water due to forest fires.

According to the United States Forest Service estimates, nearly 187,000 forest fires occurred in the United States
during the calendar year 1931. Slightly over $1/3$ of these occurred on Federal, state, and private lands protected by some system of organized fire control. The remainder occurred on unprotected areas. Man's carelessness was responsible for about $9/10$ of the fires on protected areas. Careless smokers caused almost $1/3$ of them, and ranked second only to incendiaries as causes of forest fires. Campers rank sixth, being responsible for a little over $1/12$ of our forest fires. It is thus a fact that people who came to our forest for recreation were responsible for a substantial percentage of the fires. If this is so on protected areas, pleasure seekers must have been responsible for even a larger percentage of fires on unprotected forest lands where there are no regulations about care with fire.

7 When recreationists are careless with fire in the woods or forest they are simply destroying their own prize. Neither they themselves nor any others will seek pleasure among charred snags and burned stumps, and as long as people will be careless with fire it will be essential that provision be made during exceptionally dry and dangerous periods for keeping out of the wood those not having real business there. The object of prohibiting hunting or fishing during such periods is not, as some apparently have thought, to prevent the discharge of firearms or the casting of a fishing line, but rather to keep out of the woods entirely those going there for recreation only. When the forests are like tinder the fewer persons in them the safer they will be.
Conclusion

After 20 years of increasing effort the foresters of the United States thought they had reached a point where they could turn with a strange feeling of tranquillity to their real and only love, the practice of the gentle art of silviculture. After years of troubled discussion, public sentiment has turned from an attitude of indifference, verging on opposition, to one of favor and support. Hostile legislative bodies, both Federal and state, have been succeeded by more friendly ones. Pitifully inadequate appropriations have grown to sums of at least partial sufficiency. Inappropriate laws have given way to more enlightened statutes which, if not wholly satisfactory, at least mark long strides toward what is desirable. Hope dawned in each forester's mind that at last the work of growing timber to meet the nations needs could receive undivided attention.

But alas! man only proposes. The forests having been made reasonably safe for democracy, that same democracy now seems determined to dedicate them to a new form of service--that of outdoor recreation; so new problems confront the forester; new demands are being made upon his technique and practical judgment.

Our growing population is going to require an increasing degree of outdoor play for the preservation of its ideals and its social vitality. Our land resources are insufficient to permit the dedication to exclusive recreational use of anything like an acreage which will be needed. These needs, therefore, be satisfied, in a large measure, by a correlation of
recreation with other forms of land service. There is no other form of land service with which recreation can be so well combined as that of forestry, which by its very nature creates the elements essential for wholesome outdoor play. The most conspicuous and recent recognition of this fact was by the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, which met in Washington at the call of President Coolidge. A casual review of the proceedings of the conference rather convincingly demonstrates that the 312 delegates, who represented the 128 organizations participating in the conference, were practically of one mind in the thought that the forest of the country are destined largely to the supply of outdoor recreation needs of the future and should be managed accordingly. At the fourth National Conference on State Parks, which met immediately afterwards at Gettysburg, the same thought largely prevailed, and the conference adopted a resolution urging the forest schools of the country to include courses on recreational management in their curricula.

So it is now up to the foresters and the schools in which foresters secure their technical training. With the inevitability of a natural law the people of the United States are going to turn to the forests in numbers increasing progressively with each passing year, to share in the delights of the forest and to view with deploring eyes, or perhaps anger and active antagonism, forms of timber utilization which unnecessarily devastate the esthetic features of the forests. What will the foresters do about it? Will they stand pat on
time-honored principles of American timber production, or will they, like their European brothers, work with their public to bring about a reasonable balance between the spiritual and material forms of forest service and then shape their plans to the standards of established, even though to do so may compel the employment of the landscape architect and the park administrator side by side with the silviculturist?
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