

# NATIONWIDE TRAILS SYSTEM

---

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**SUBCOMMITTEE ON**  
**NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEE ON**  
**INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS HOUSE OF**  
**REPRESENTATIVES**  
NINETIETH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION ON  
**H.R. 4865, and Related Bills**  
TO ESTABLISH A NATIONWIDE SYSTEM OF TRAILS

---

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C. MARCH 6 AND  
7, 1967

---

**Serial No. 90-4**

---

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

Now with respect to the other types of trails, Federal and State trails the Federal agency involved would administer those on Federal properties, the State on the State property, and on the municipal trails, the counties or the local governments would administer those.

Mr. SAYLOR. Can this committee or the Congress expect a high degree of cooperation from the Federal agencies with the State and local government agencies?

Dr. CRAFTS. I can answer that unequivocally yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. The reason I ask this question, Mr. Crafts, is that the objection that I have heard voiced by anyone is a fear by certain State and county and local authorities that if the Federal Government is included, they would be controlling this entire matter.

Dr. CRAFTS. Well, this is understandable. I mean, you would expect this concern, and I know in our discussions with the Appalachian Trail Conference, and they will be testifying before you, I believe, and can speak for themselves, this was a very real concern.

There is provision in here that the various sections of that conference be represented on the advisory council. There are six districts of that conference. I think in our discussions with the groups that we have, to a very considerable degree, allayed these fears, but I fully realize that they exist and I think they are understandable.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Crafts, thank you very much. You have been very helpful.

Now we have Mr. John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, accompanied by Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service.

Mr. Baker and Mr. Cliff, in case we are unable to finish by 12, and I am sure that will be the situation, can you come back at 2?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will continue on, then, until about 12 and reconvene at 2.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BAKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD P. CLIFF, CHIEF OF THE FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, Secretary Freeman had hoped to be present to testify. He regrets he is unable to be here. I am here on his behalf to join with Secretary Udall in supporting H.R. 4865 and related bills.

I have with me Forest Service Chief Edward Cliff, who will supplement my brief statement.

President Johnson has repeatedly expressed the public need for and his personal interest in expanding and improving a nationwide system of trails. In response to this need, our departments, working in full partnership, have completed the nationwide trail study aimed at preserving and enjoying our natural heritage. This proposed legislation is based on that study. Its enactment would enable the Nation to build a trail system to serve 300 million Americans in the future—a future in which any American should and if this program is enacted, would be able to enjoy a rustling stream, a towering multicolored cliff, a singing bird, or a flock of sheep grazing under a fluff-dotted sky. A would like to be associated, Mr. Chairman, if I may, with the re-

marks and the statement and answers to questions by Secretary Udall who appeared before me and with Dr. Crafts, who appeared earlier.

We have made great strides in the last few years toward meeting the conservation crisis precipitated by this technological age and environment. Much remains to be done to assure the full conservation of our natural resources for meeting the needs of the future. But this is a twofold mission involving not only the conservation of these resources but also the need to assure that every American can enjoy the beauty, the majesty, the solitude, and the soul-lifting influence of a personal, living contact with the great heritage nature has given us. The nationwide system of trails which this bill would establish would help provide this assurance.

All of us here have known the benefits of a walk through a bit of unspoiled woods, or dawdling barefooted along a farm lane, or seeing a robin feed its young, or just sitting on a rocky ledge, or a stream-bank, or against a towering tree trunk at daybreak or in the quiet of the evening. Yet, there are and will be millions of our people who will not receive these benefits unless we take action now to provide a way for them to make this refreshing contact with nature.

Secretary Udall has described the bill and its importance as another piece of landmark legislation for the conservation and enjoyment of our natural resources. I would also like to comment briefly on the Department of Agriculture's contribution to the development of a nationwide system of trails. Chief Cliff will go into more detail in a few minutes in his statement. The idea of a nationwide system of trails is not a new idea. The program established by this bill would build upon long and successful experience in the development and use of the trails which now exist in the national forests and other areas. These opportunities must be maintained and expanded. It is important that you know what is now available and the relationship to the proposed national system of the existing trails.

The Department of Agriculture now maintains over 100,000 miles of trails within the national forests. The development and use of these trails began with the establishment of the national forest system over 60 years ago. These trails, or portions of them, are suitable for hiking or for riding. They offer opportunities for short walks of an hour or an afternoon or for overnight long-distance treks.

There are several ways in which we need to improve the existing system. This proposed legislation would enable us to do this. Some of these involve geographical distribution, standard of construction, trail continuity, and provision for a variety of uses—needs that reflect a change in public purpose since the existing trails were located. This fiscal year we are spending over \$4 million on constructing and reconstructing trails in the national forests to make these improvements. The proposed act leaves enough administrative flexibility, particularly as it concerns the existing trail system, so that we can further adjust our program to meet the future needs and desires of the people.

A nationwide system of trails is a relatively inexpensive program. We already have an extensive basic network of park and forest trails which can be incorporated into the nationwide system. More important, it will provide facilities for a type of recreation which everyone can afford and which will be available to millions of people who

have neither the time nor the money to seek other more exotic communication with nature's wonders. Walking or riding horseback along an open trail can be enjoyed by the richest and the poorest.

Furthermore, the development and management of the system will benefit from the extensive knowledge and experience gained over the years in building and administering our national forest trails. We have an extensive field organization. We have had years of contact and association with ranchers, farmers, woodland owners, timber operators and other rural residents, and State and local forestry and agricultural organizations. This affords us a unique opportunity and a common ground for cooperating in the selection and development of trails involving lands administered by the Department of Agriculture in the vast areas of the eastern and midwestern portions of our country where Federal ownership is small and widely separated.

We believe the proposed establishment of a nationwide system of trails will greatly enhance the usefulness of our existing trails. More importantly, it will identify those routes where a continuity of travel by trail is possible. This legislation is necessary to set forth the intent of Congress that certain outstanding routes will be established and marked and will remain available for us, our children, and grandchildren.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may at this time, I would ask Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff to supplement my statement with some more specific detail.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Cliff, go ahead.

Mr. CLIFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. As Mr. Baker said, I will expand on the contribution that the Forest Service can make to the development of a nationwide system of trails. I am pleased to have an opportunity to do this.

We already have a going program that can contribute to the trail system this legislation would establish. For example, it is now possible—it has been possible since 1937 to hike along a route which is 11 identical or roughly parallel to what we propose as the Pacific Crest Trail. To a degree, this is true of the Continental Divide Trail. The Appalachian Trail is practically all in place and with modifications will meet national scenic trail criteria. Approximately 500 miles of this is within national forests.

H.R. 4865 would establish a nationwide system of trails made up of four general categories. The Forest Service would be directly involved in two of these: the national scenic trails and the Federal park, forest, and other recreation trails.

The bill would designate four national scenic trails and two of these would be the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. These are the Continental Divide Trail and the Pacific Crest Trail.

Of the overall 3,100-mile length of the Continental Divide Trail, approximately one-half would be within national forest boundaries. About one-third of the total length of the trail is substantially in place, and the bill would provide both for the improvement of this portion and the completion of the balance. This trail will run through five States. It will involve federally owned land administered by the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the National Park Service. As in the case of other national scenic trails, the portion within the boundaries of areas administered by other Federal agencies

will be administered in such manner as is agreed upon by that agency. For the approximately 300 miles outside of federally administered areas, the cooperation and active participation by the States will be sought.

The other designated national scenic trail that will be the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture is the 2,350-mile Pacific Crest Trail. It extends through three States. Approximately two-thirds of its total length is within national forest boundaries, about 300 miles is on other Federal lands, and slightly more than 400 miles on privately owned lands. Although nearly all of the length of this trail is roughly in existence and use today, this legislation will assure that the needed improvements will be made, that the trail will be maintained, and its natural environment protected for all future generations.

Over one-half of the Pacific Crest Trail is in the State of California. Experience we have had in trail administration in California is another demonstration of the soundness of the manner in which this bill proposes that national scenic trails will be handled cooperatively. Over 16 years ago, we entered into a formal agreement with the State of California under which trails in interrelated State, private, and national forest lands would be developed. We will expect to continue our fine cooperation with the State with respect to the Pacific Crest Trail and I might say with the other two States as well.

H.R. 4865 provides that the Secretary of the Interior will have primary responsibility for the Appalachian Trail, as has already been pointed out. For 30 years or more we have cooperated with the Park Service and with the Appalachian Trail Conference in developing and maintaining this well-known trail. This cooperation will continue under the provisions of the legislation we are considering.

Our long and continuing successful experience in cooperative work with the Park Service, with other Federal agencies, and with State and private organizations and individuals all over the Nation prove that a working team of Federal, State, and private groups can make an effective partnership. This kind of partnership is the foundation upon which H.R. 4865 will establish a nationwide system of trails.

Studies of additional trails for designation as national scenic trails will also be provided for under the bill. These studies will be made cooperatively. Many of the potential national scenic trails will pass through national forests and we will cooperate with the Department of the Interior in making the studies under the provisions of the bill.

In addition to national scenic trails, H.R. 4865 would include as a part of the nationwide system those trails on lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture designated by the appropriate Secretaries as a part of the nationwide system. These Federal park, forest, and other recreation trails will include in due time most of the permanent trail system within the national forests.

Although our existing system contains more than 100,000 miles of trails, many sections are inadequate to meet even today's recreation demands. Less than 10 percent of the trails are in the heavily populated, eastern portions of our country. Paradoxically, much of our heaviest trail use is in the West. I do not want to attempt to draw any conclusion from this. It does point up that factors other than

population are to be weighed in determining the appropriate geographical distribution of our trails. To help solve this problem, we have set up a new recreation management inventory system. It will provide us more accurate and useful information on the needs and desires of people for trails as a recreation facility.

Many existing trails need to be reconstructed on new locations to meet recreation needs. As we have changed our firefighting techniques in remote areas to aerial attack methods, trails as a means of access are not so important for that purpose as they used to be. Many of these firefighting trails need to be relocated to take advantage of scenic vistas, to provide access to points of special natural or historic interest, or to follow more leisurely routes.

We believe the necessary expertise and initial cooperative relationships have been developed to make a nationwide system of trails a practicable, obtainable reality. This soundly based legislation will allow us to proceed in an orderly and planned fashion to construct and assure the lasting protection of a nationwide system of trails.

Thank you very much.

Mr. TAYLOR. The House will be going into session now in about 10 minutes, so we will adjourn for this morning and we reconvene at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., this day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. TAYLOR. The committee will come to order.

Before we adjourned for lunch, the statements of Assistant Secretary John Baker and Mr. Edward P. Cliff were read, and now we are ready to ask questions.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BAKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD P. CLIFF, CHIEF OF THE FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Resumed"

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask this: What is the position of the Forest Service concerning the building of trails in areas that have been designated as wilderness?

Mr. BAKER. They will be built.

Mr. TAYLOR. There will be some trails?

Mr. BAKER. That is right.

Mr. CLIFF. Could I add to that?

We already have about 14,000 miles of trails in existing wilderness and primitive areas in the national forests. There will be some additional trails built to disperse the use and to make these areas available for public use in the wilderness areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. What kind of trails are you talking about?

Mr. CLIFF. We are talking about simple, single-track trails for horse and foot travel. The trails will be built only to a standard which is necessary to get people over them and to protect the land from washing, erosion. We will build them just as simply as we can.

Mr. Aspinall. But it wasn't the purpose of the wilderness bill, Mr. Cliff, to get people over the land. The purpose of the wilderness bill

was to allow people to get in. People who go to the wilderness area are supposed to have the stamina and the physique and everything necessary to carry them through the wilderness.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, there are places-----

Mr. ASPINALL. I am asking Mr. Cliff this question, because he is the one who answered directly. I want to be sure we understand whether we are going to enlarge upon the wilderness idea that we had, making it more available than what the legislative history indicates, or whether we are going to keep it, like it was supposed to be, as a part of the primitive area of the United States.

Mr. CLIFF. Well, of course, we intend to keep these areas primitive. The methods of travel will be primitive, but these trails are necessary to use the wilderness.

And the wilderness, as I understand it, was set up for the use of people.

Mr. ASPINALL. What people?

Mr. CLIFF. The kind of people that use the wilderness, and this -----

Mr. ASPINALL. People who are hardened; people who are strong; people who have the stamina to carry packs on their backs; and people who have the ability to find their way in a storm or in a fog—the people who have the ability to take care of themselves. These are the kinds of people who are supposed to enjoy the wilderness.

Mr. CLIFF. These are the kind of people that do enjoy the wilderness, but I have also witnessed families with children and elderly people—people of all ages use these wilderness areas.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, but Mr. Cliff-----

Mr. CLIFF. And I don't think the wilderness bill intended to exclude any of them.

Mr., ASPINALL. You have gotten to the place where you can't take an automotive piece of equipment into the wilderness.

Mr. Cliff? That's correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. All right. All you can do is build a road up to the wilderness and bring them up to it.

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the legislative history.

Now, do you mean you are going to provide, at the taxpayers' expense, some nice trails and shelters, and so forth, to take care of these hardened people and, at the same time, just let the other people—and the handicapped—go and walk in a few yards? This is all they are going to do. In some cases, that is the most they can do. Is that what we are going to do with this legislation?

Mr. CLIFF. NO, sir. We do not intend to build shelters in the wilderness areas, but we do have a trail system in the wilderness areas. Some of these trails are very heavily used. They are used by pack stock, by saddle stock, and by foot travelers.

In some places these trails are being so heavily used that the wilderness values are being damaged.

One of the things that we need to do in managing these areas is to disperse this use and relieve the congestion along some of the existing trails.

And I do not agree, Mr. Chairman, that wilderness use is restricted only to the robust and the hardy because I personally have witnessed youngsters from 1 year of age up using these areas. I know of families that go in and pack the kids in—the little ones in on their

backs. And we had a great deal of use of these wilderness areas by family groups.

Mr. ASPINALL. Surely, there is not anything wrong with that, but if it were not for a sturdy and healthy and strong father or a mother—

I hate to think about the mothers carrying the children, but that is neither here nor there—you would not have infants in there.

What I am trying to find out, now, is: Just how much development work do you expect in these wilderness areas?

We had difficulty even getting to shoot a gun in the wilderness areas when we were talking about that legislation. Now I suppose this legislation means exploding explosives in order to establish your trail and make steps over certain areas. This is a new concept of wilderness to me.

Mr. CLIFF. The trails that we are building in the wilderness are very simple, primitive trails.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, now that brings me to the question I was going to ask. I want to know what the difference is between the kind of trails that the Forest Service has built heretofore and the kind of trails that you expect to build under this authorization.

I may say that I happen to be one of those who has had the experience of going along about twilight and finding a little trail and then going 50 yards in either direction to find a slash on a tree—nothing was more gratifying to me. To me this was most helpful.

Mr. CLIFF. The trails that would be built under this authorization would be built to the standard that would take care of the traffic expected on the trails and would preserve the land against erosion.

In some places, outside of the wilderness on these trunk trails where there will be heavy traffic you need a higher standard of trail than you would in the back country. But all of the trails that we contemplate building are trails that would not be over 2 or 3 feet wide on the tread, and many of them less than that. The national scenic trails would be designed for foot and horse travel only.

On the national scenic trails the legislation as proposed does not permit Tote Gotes, but we do have trails in the national forest system where Tote Gotes and other mechanical devices are allowed.

We have about 23,000 miles of our trail system that are used by the trail scooters and other mechanical devices.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, this morning, there was some testimony to the effect that we should have an easement on a 200-foot strip of land to a man's farm to build the facilities that this bill calls for. Do you see any reason for a 200-foot easement other than where you are going to have a stopping place or a camping place?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, where the trail went through a farm, there would be no point. This 200 feet is an average width of the trail. The purpose of the additional corridors on either side of the trail itself is for preserving scenic and historic values that the trail goes past. And the 25 acres per mile or 200 feet is an average through.

And where it goes through a farm, for example, or through some other type of area, the 200-foot corridor that would be bound by two parallel lines running through.

And where it goes through a farm, for example, or through some other type of area, the 200-foot corridor would neither be necessary nor used.

Mr. CLIFF. I think the point is, Mr. Chairman, that it is desirable not to crowd the edge of the trail with undesirable developments that



would detract from use of the trail itself. And it would not necessarily need to be a fee acquisition. These rights-of-ways might be obtained just by getting a right-of-way for the trail itself, plus a scenic easement to protect the trail site from the types of developments that would detract from the main purpose of the trail. And we would hope on the trails that the Department of Agriculture would develop, that we could get these rights-of-way and easements with a minimum of acquisition in fee.

This would be our first objective: to try to go just as far as we could in getting scenic easements and agreements that would secure the use of the trail without purchase in fee. In some places it may be necessary and desirable to get the title in fee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, let's look at the map that we have up there—the national system of trails.

The Appalachian Trail, coming down, I understand, just west of Washington a little bit, skirts the mountains entirely. It does not have anything to do with the mountains. It apparently goes to the lowlands. Anybody who knows anything about this area knows that the beautiful part of it is on top of Skyline Drive—following the Blue Ridge Mountains all the way down. The farming country is in lowlands.

Mr. CLIFF. The Appalachian Trail would not be our responsibility, but I can comment on it, if you would like me to.

Mr. ASPINALL. If you know, that is fine. I did not have a chance to ask the Secretary.

Mr. CLIFF. It is not exactly as you have described it.

In this area here it looks like it might be going through farmland but it is actually going through mountains or along ridges. This is the Shenandoah National Park through here.

Mr. ASPINALL. "What is that green area to the west of it?"

Mr. CLIFF. That is the George Washington National Forest. The Appalachian Trail in A<sup>7</sup>irginia is east of the main body of the George Washington Forest, and it comes back into the George Washington and follows ridge tops through the George Washington and the Jefferson National Forests, and it is mountainous all the way to its terminus in Georgia.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is that not the Blue Ridge Parkway?

Mr. CLIFF. The Blue Ridge Parkway parallels it.

Here is the Shenandoah National Park right through here. I do not believe you can see it from there, Mr. Chairman, but this route, clear from Harper's Ferry, where it crosses the river at Harper's Ferry, generally follows ridge tops and forest areas, and that is true for its full length. It does have to cross a valley in places, too, but generally it is on ridge tops. And the same thing is true through Maryland and Pennsylvania. It follows ridges through New England. The White Mountains in New Hampshire are also encompassed in the trail.

Mr. ASPINALL. Do we have duplicatory facilities in the Shenandoah Park, the Skyline Drive, and the Blue Ridge Parkway? Are we to duplicate—are we to parallel that?

Mr. CLIFF. The trail and the parkway serves two different purposes. One is for hiking and the other is for driving. They do not coincide. The trail is away from the parkway.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I did not mean to take so much time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Cliff, the trail as it is mapped is now as it is located on the ground?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir; that is correct, as far as the Appalachian Trail is concerned. The Continental Divide Trail is diagrammatic except where the trail is in place. About a third of the length of the trail is in place. The rest of it is extremely diagrammatic.

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe you stated that 800 miles of the Appalachian Trail is on privately owned land.

Mr. CLIFF. I think that is correct, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. NOW, on this privately owned land, is the trail maintained and administered by private hiking clubs?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, not entirely. In Pennsylvania, the State has acquired rights-of-way along parts of this trail—a considerable part of it in Pennsylvania. In other places it is my understanding the clubs that make up the Appalachian Trail Conference have made arrangements with private landowners for the construction and maintenance of the trail on their lands. But some of this is just verbal agreement. There is no binding agreement on much of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am familiar with the problem that they have in being secure and not being pushed off.

Now, there are sections of the Appalachian Trail that are in national forests?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir; about 500 miles.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was constructed and is maintained and administered by the Forest Service %

Mr. CLIFF. We get good cooperation from the trail clubs. They do a great deal of maintenance on these trails where they go through the national forests.

Mr. TAYLOR. NOW, a section of the trail goes through the Smoky Mountain National Park and the National Park Service administers that section ?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. NOW, if this legislation is enacted, in your opinion will you continue to get the excellent cooperation from the Appalachian Trail Conference and the various hiking clubs that you have had in the past?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, they are here and can speak for themselves, but we will certainly solicit that kind of cooperation, and I am sure that we will get it.

Mr. TAYLOR. NOW, of the four national scenic trails, the Appalachian and the Potomac Heritage are to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior ?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, except the proposed legislation would provide that those sections which are in the national forests would continue to be administered by the Forest Service, and the Interior department would take over all leadership for coordination and management of the whole trail.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the Continental Divide and the Pacific Crest x rails would be administered primarily by the Forest Service?

Mr. Cliff. The Secretary of Agriculture would be responsible for taking the lead in the administration of those two trails, but each land

management agency would manage the portions that crossed their particular areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do those trails cross any national parks ?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir. The Continental Divide Trail crosses Glacier National Park in Montana. It crosses the Yellowstone National Park and Rocky Mountain National Park.

There is a small section of the Pacific Coast Trail that crosses through Mount Rainier National Park. It goes through Crater Lake National Park, Lassen Volcanic National Park, Yosemite National Park, Kings Canyon National Park, and Sequoia National Park. The great bulk of this trail, however, goes through the national forests. There are about 400 miles that are on private land out of the 2,300-mile total length.

Mr. TAYLOR. NOW, I was surprised this morning at your statement that, due to the fact that forest fires are fought now from the air, trails would not be of great use in fire prevention.

Mr. CLIFF. Well, that is actually happening. We started building trails in the national forests as soon as the national forests were created, and the primary reason was for fire control, to get access to the back country for firefighting and for administration. We are using other means of transportation to fires now. Roads have replaced some of the trails. The country is much more accessible, and we are using aerial transport, smoke jumpers, helicopters, and other means. So trails are not as essential—they are still necessary, but they are not as necessary as they were in the early days.

Mr. TAYLOR. They would still be very useful in many cases of fire-fighting, would they not?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Aspinall. Will one of you gentlemen go to the map and point out on the Continental Divide Trail the one-third area that is now in place?

Mr. CLIFF. The area from the Canadian boundary down through the Bob Marshall Wilderness area in the national forest is in place.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is this a regular forest trail, or is it constructed to the standards of this national system of trails ?

Mr. CLIFF. The part in the national park is a park service trail that was constructed to get people through the national park. And the part in the national forest is a regular forest trail. It just happens to follow or parallel the Continental Divide.

There is a stretch of trail constructed through this area in Montana, and there are small sections in other places. But there is a major section here through the Anaconda-Pintler Wilderness area.

There is a section of trail along the Idaho-Montana line in here following the divide. I am not acquainted with what trails there are in the national park here. But there are trails that parallel the divide and would tie into the system going through the Bridger Wilderness Area in this section.

There are trails through northern Colorado north of the Rocky Mountain National Park up to the Wyoming line. There is a trail from Empire north into the Rocky Mountain National Park. There are a few stretches of trail, broken stretches in this area, but nothing very continuous, Mr. Chairman.

In New Mexico there is a trail along the Sangre de Cristo, from about this point to this point. Now, there are trails down through the Black Range in New Mexico, but I am not acquainted as to just what the continuity of those trails is. But all told there is about 1,100 miles of trails which would tie into this system, which is about a third of the total mileage.

Mr. ASPINALL. How much of that mileage was constructed for the purpose of fitting into a Continental Divide Trail ?

Mr. CLIFF. None of it. This Continental Divide Trail was conceived after these segments of trails were built for other purposes, but these trails -----

Mr. ASPINALL. What were the other purposes?

Mr. CLIFF. For fire protection, for recreation use, for administration of the areas.

Mr. ASPINALL. And it is your opinion that most of that one-third will fit into a Continental Divide Trail without too much expense in making it fit up to other standards?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir. Some of it will have to be relocated and reconstructed to a better standard than it is now.

Mr. ASPINALL. How much of that part, that is already constructed, has been used or financed or developed as a part of any local trail organization's effort in that area ?

Mr. CLIFF. Very little of it. The -----

Mr. ASPINALL. That is all right. That answers my question.

I think that what we are doing is we are seeing the difference between where we need the trails at the present time, because of the public use, and where we can fashion a trail because it happens to fit into an area like the Continental Divide.

Now, how much of that trail—that 3,100-plus miles—will be on the crest of the Continental Divide; that is, within a mile or two of the crest itself?

Mr. CLIFF. Of the total 3,100 miles? Mr. Aspinall, I cannot say; but it is not intended, nor is it feasible, to build a trail right along the backbone of the mountains. For example, the Pacific Crest Trail follows the most logical routes that parallel the divide, and it switches back and forth across the divide. But in general it follows the location of the divide, within a few miles either way. A lot of it is on top where it is feasible, and then it will drop over into a valley.

Mr. ASPINALL. You have already, I think, thought what my next question is going to be. How many times does it cross the Continental Divide?

Mr. CLIFF. Of course, I cannot tell you that because the balance of this trail has not been surveyed or located, but it would follow the general route of the divide. It would follow terrain that would give you viewpoints and make use of the better terrain to build the trail on rather than try to go right along the crest itself.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me ask the question in another way. Now, we admit that you have good trails. I have seen some of them. I have been on some of them, and they serve a good purpose. What is the purpose of just locking up the whole thing and saying, "Now, we have a continuous trail all the way down from Canada to Silver City" ? And why stop at Silver City ? I do not know because you could have gone on to the New Mexico-Mexico boundary just as

well; but that is neither here nor there. What is the advantage of firming up a continuous trail in this area ?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, I think our experience on the Appalachian Trail has told us that there is a lot of interest in having a trail that goes along the mountains from New England to Georgia, and there are quite a few people who travel the full length of the trail. Most of that trail use is by people that just use segments of it, but they like *to* get from one segment to another. And to tie this thing up into one trail makes it more usable by more people and gives people that want to use it some alternative rather than just travel in a local area.

The same thing is true of the Pacific Crest Trail, which is mostly in place. It does need some improvement and relocation because we have some very substandard trail there. But there are people who travel from one section in one State to another along that trail, and it is a real recreation asset.

Now, I am sure the same thing would happen in the Continental Divide Trail, that there are people who would use long sections of the trail; others use shorter sections, but they want to travel from one area to another.

Mr. ASPINALL. This has been a part of the West for a long time. How many people do you think would annually travel the 3,100 miles of the Continental Divide Trail ?

What I am trying to figure out is: Is there any real necessity of having a continuous trail at the present time, or should we take care of those areas and build in those areas where the people want to use them ?

Mr. CLIFF. Mr. Aspinall, I am sure that the great majority of the people would never travel the entire 3,100 miles. I do know that the people who travel in Glacier Park would like to have a trail where they could go down into the Bob Marshall Wilderness; and there are people who travel in the country south of the Bob Marshall Wilderness that would make a trip through the Bob Marshall up to Glacier Park. There are people in your State who have promoted this Continental Divide Trail who would like to get on the trail and travel from Montezuma and Empire up into the Rocky Mountain National Park and then go on even further through the Routt Forest into Wyoming.

Mr. ASPINALL. They do so without a trail at the present time.

Mr. CLIFF. They can use this trail a great deal without having to travel the full length of it, but the full length of it will be traveled in the aggregate by people who travel different sections.

Mr. ASPINALL. YOU spoke about the wear and tear on the trails. It is true, is it not, that part of the trail here would be around the Denver area in Colorado, which is a part of the Continental Divide area? They have worn that down quite a little bit, have they not? They have destroyed some of the values of that area; haven't they ?

Mr. CLIFF. It gets very heavy use: yes, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. And if you have a single trail like that, don't you expect heavier use than if you use all the trails that you might have in the 10-plus different forests in my own congressional district?

Mr. CLIFF. We need to improve other trails in those 10 forests to take care of the use we are now getting. And part of this program is to promote and encourage the development of the other forest trails.

Mr. ASPINALL. But you know, Mr. Cliff, that what is going to happen is if we accent or give emphasis to important trails like this, your

programs are going to have to suffer; and the work that you do in the Forest Service will suffer, because there just is not money enough at the present time to do both of these jobs adequately.

Mr. CLIFF. We are working at both of them right now, sir. We are spending about \$4 million a year on trail construction. We intend next fiscal year to spend an additional \$1 1/2 million; that is, to increase the \$4 million by 1 1/2 million. We have a big trail maintenance and construction job on our hands, and this fits right into what this program proposes. It is not only to develop the national scenic trails, but to develop the other trails.

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not like the way you put that because you do not have to go to these trails in order to have scenic values. Some of your best scenic values are entirely off of the trail system that you have as far as Colorado is concerned.

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct. And we have trail systems that serve those, too. They are in the category of trails which the bill calls forest and park and other recreational trails.

Mr. ASPINALL. You do have, in the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, large mileage of trails that need rebuilding and attention at the present time, is that correct, or is it not %

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Areas where more people go, than there is any possibility of people going, insofar as some of these areas on the Continental Divide Trail in Colorado is concerned—at least for the next 10 years or so. Yet we are authorizing, or we will authorize by this legislation if it is enacted, that emphasis be placed upon a trail that will receive less use or the least use of these trails.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, in terms of emphasis, I think it would be fairer here to say that the emphasis is on four different kinds: The national scenic trails, the State park and forest trails, Federal park and forest trails, and the metropolitan trails.

Now, there is a priority -----

Mr. ASPINALL. That is all, Mr. Baker—just a minute. Just a minute.

Have you read the justification for authorization for appropriations that we got from the Secretary of Interior? If you have not, there is \$35 million and there is not a bit of it devoted to the other categories. That is what I am trying to emphasize here in this hearing.

Mr. BAKER. AS for the forest trails, we have requested an increased appropriation for fiscal year 1968, for further improvement, further development of forest trails that are not a part of the national scenic trails. This would be an addition—

Mr. ASPINALL. You do not have to have any authorization for any part of these four trails located in the national forests at the present time?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, for the areas which are in the national forests. We have ample authority now, and we have authorization for the appropriations.

We are using, Mr. Chairman, about 80 percent of our trail construction money on national forest trails other than these four national scenic trails. That is about the proportion we would continue with..

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Cliff, on page 4 of your statement you have the following phrase:

To help solve this problem we have set up a new recreation management inventory system.

Now, would you please explain that to us ?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, this is a system of collecting information on the use that is now being made of our recreation areas, the amount of use for each area, each unit, each trail, each campground. We are storing this information by electronic data processing so that we will have a better idea of where the recreation demand is, what the use is. This will give us the total amount of trail use, for example, versus use on other kinds of areas so we will have a better concept and can do better planning on where we put our effort.

Mr. ASPINALL. Now, as I understand it, you have it not only in the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture, but you have it in the Department of Interior, as well; is that correct ?

Mr. CLIFF. The system that I am describing is for the Forest Service. I cannot speak for the Department of Interior, but they are also making, I am sure, similar inventories of use.

Mr. ASPINALL. NOW, how will you be able to tell where to place your trail before you have it in existence to see what use is likely to be made of it?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, we have to make some kind of forecasts on new developments. We have an idea now, a pretty good idea of the use that we are getting on our trails. We have been keeping records for many years. This system is an intensification or a refinement of our data collecting system so that we can do a better job of planning.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, do your records show at the present time that you have more usage of this kind of an extended trail than of the other trails that you have in the Forest Service?

Mr. CLIFF. The most heavily used trails we have in the Forest Service are the trails that are of this nature, the Pacific Crest Trail and the Appalachian Trail, one in the West and one in the East. And these are tremendous recreation assets. I think a trail on the Continental Divide would be a tremendous recreation asset. It would be a great attraction to bring people to Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. YOU must have some idea in mind as to when you expect to complete the Continental Divide Trail. What number of years do you have in mind?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, obviously it is not all going to be built at once. We would build the segments first and improve the segments that are closest to population areas and to prime recreation attractions. In other words, we would try to build those parts where the demand and the use is the greatest.

I would estimate that it would probably take at least 10 years and possibly more to round out this system.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then why did the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation propose appropriations for the 5 fiscal years that they did ? Are these just half-way figures or estimates?

Mr. CLIFF. I think you are referring to the statement which came up with the administration's bill, and there is an attachment there on that statement that gives the estimated expenditures for 5 years.

Mr. ASPINALL. For the first 5 years.

Mr. CLIFF. For the first 5 years.

Mr. ASPINALL. But it does not say a thing about how much of the overall program will be accomplished by that time.

Mr. CLIFF. Secretary Udall's letter indicates that for the past 5 years cost of land acquisition would be about \$10 million and for development the costs would be about \$20 million. This is for the four national scenic trails.

It indicates that the acquisition should be completed in the first 5 years, and it would probably take twice that long to do the development work. So as I interpret it, this would indicate a total of \$10 million for acquisition and hopefully that could be reduced by State and private participation, and that would be \$40 million over 10 years for development.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. One more question.

Have corpsmen in the Job Corps camps been useful in trail construction?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, they have, Mr. Chairman, in those areas where we have Job Corps camps. Of course, the Job Corps camps are very widely dispersed, and they only would serve a very small part of the country. We have 47 Job Corps camps under our supervision, and there are over 800 ranger districts in the United States. So you see they are spread pretty thin. But we do use them on trail work. There is a limit to how far you can take them out from camp and get them back. For these sections of trail that would be adjacent to the camps, they can make contribution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you.

The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Prior to 1965 had there been any concerted drive by any particular groups or segments for Federal participation in these four trailways?

Mr. CLIFF. In which trails, sir?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Any one of these four, the Appalachian, the Continental, and Pacific Crest or Potomac area trails?

Mr. CLIFF. Certainly. The Pacific Crest Trail is primarily a federally constructed trail. But in my testimony I pointed out that years ago we entered into agreements with the State of California and the trail groups there for making the connecting links outside of the national forests.

The Appalachian Trail is a prime example of where private people have taken the leadership, but they have urged participation, encouraged participation by the Federal agencies, and we have participated. We have made the land for rights available. We have helped construct the trails and have done a certain amount of the maintenance work. Their interest is to make this trail, this Appalachian Trail secure so that it does not get pushed off the map by highways or some other development. They are urging participation of the Federal Government to try to get the necessary rights-of-way.

Mr. SKUBITZ. In other words, there have been groups through the years, prior to 1965 that wanted the Federal Government to get into this?

\*

Mr. CLIFF. Oh, yes; very much so.

Mr. SKUBITZ. That is all, Mr. Chairman.



Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. NO questions. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. RUPFERMAN. I am not so sure that it is a good idea to have this divided or joint jurisdiction between Agriculture and Interior, but at least if you have it, you should have guidelines. You do have guidelines in the section on development and administration of the first four trails. I find that in sections l(d) and l(j). I am just curious how you develop the guidelines and as to who controls what when you get to these other trails that would be considered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Kupferman, this would be on the basis of which land managing agency has the preponderance of already owned land that the trail would cross.

Mr. Kupferman. It is strictly territory that determines it.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, this would determine the basic or primary jurisdiction. Then both Departments would cooperate, where we have a special ability or capability of assisting on all trails.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Well, is it just territorial or is it that part of the territory that might have more application? For example, forest land might be more germane than simple agricultural land. I am not an expert here. I am just asking.

Mr. BAKER. This would be based mainly on the preponderant managing agency. If the preponderance goes through the national forests, it would be Department of Agriculture responsibility. If it is mainly through Bureau of Land Management land, it would be mainly a Department of Interior responsibility.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Congresswoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have one question.

I wonder if you would tell me in terms of the Department of Agriculture and their concerns with the forest reserves, What is the extent of the trails that now exist on land under your jurisdiction?

Mr. BAKER. A hundred thousand miles. Ed, you should say more about that.

Mr. CLIFF. We have just a little over a hundred thousand miles now. Much of it is very low standard and needs to be upgraded for recreation use. These trails, as we have discussed before, were originally built mostly for fire control and administration purposes with a very small amount of attention to recreation. Now we are thinking more in terms of the recreation and public use needs. There are about 73,000 miles that are used for recreation purposes. We do need to upgrade our total trail system at the national forest level.

Mrs. MINK. NOW, does the bill before this committee include the upgrading of existing trails that are already under the jurisdiction of your Department?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, ma'am, it does. The national scenic trails are only one category. There is a category of trails that is covered by this bill called Federal forest, park, and other recreation trails, which include the other trails in our system.

Mrs. MINK. And what are the funds required to upgrade these existing 73,000 miles that are now devoted to recreation?

Mr. CLIFF. I am sorry. I cannot give you that total figure now. I will be glad to supply that for the record. We are spending about \$4 million a year now for construction and reconstruction. Next year we

will be spending about \$5<sup>2</sup> million. I will have to supply for the record what the total estimated cost of the development of this whole system is.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, that will be put in the record at this point when furnished.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested appears on p. 78.)

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Continuing with that just a little bit, do you have any figures also concerning the average cost per mile in the development of those originally?

Mr. CLIFF. Originally?

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir; we can supply that for the record. I do not have it on the tip of my tongue now.

Mr. KYL. That is understandable, of course, with some realization that when we get this bill out on the floor, in whatever form it is at that time, these are the questions that are going to be asked: What might we expect to pay logically, and what would it cost to maintain them?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

(Subsequent to the hearing the following letter was received for the record:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

FOREST SERVICE,

*Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.* Hon. WAYNE N.

ASPINALL,

*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to Mr. Lee McElvain's telephone request of April 7, here is supplemental information for the record on H.R. 4865, "To establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes."

The average cost per mile of the original development of the National Forest trails system was approximately \$2,000.

Concerning the matter of liability of the Government for alleged negligence on the part of the administering agencies, any suit against the Government would have to be brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act. In the case of injury or damage to persons or private property resulting from the negligence or other actions of travelers on the trails, liability would rest with the person causing the injury or damage. In the absence of negligence on the part of the Government, there would be no liability insofar as it is concerned.

We are assembling the supplemental information requested on vandalism. We expect to submit this information in about 15 days. Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELEY, *Associate Chief.*

Mr. KYL. NOW, in regard to these longer stretches of trail, sir, that you already have in the forest system, can you tell us a little about how you manage or administer those trails? What personnel are involved, and so on.

Mr. CLIFF. The trails in the national forests are administered by our field personnel, primarily our district rangers. There are 154 national forests. They are divided into 820-some-odd ranger districts. The ranger is responsible for the maintenance and the administration of the trail system within his ranger district. The average ranger district would cover about a quarter of a million acres. The ranger has seasonal personnel, guards, trail crews, that do the maintenance and the cleanup on these trails.

We do get some cooperation from private groups, from the users of the trails.

The Appalachian Trail is a prime example of that, probably the outstanding example, but on the other parts of the trail system dude ranchers, packers, and others do some of the maintenance on the trails that they use.

Mr. KYL. NOW, sir, what experience have you had in regard to liability for injury and so on, on these trails? Are there any plaintiffs who have been successful in collecting damages from fire, from falling, from animals, or anything else?

Mr. CLIFF. The Tort Claims Act protects the users of the facilities that we build in the national forests, recreation facilities, or other facilities. If there is negligence on the part of the Government, they can claim damages under the Tort Claims Act.

Mr. Kyl. Is this the only -----

Mr. CLIFF. That is the only act that I know of. We have an attorney here. He might want to enlarge on this. I do not know of any claims that have been filed or that the Government has paid claims for trail use. We have had claims for injury at campgrounds and on bridges which have been sustained by the courts. There could be some on account of trail use, but I personally do not recall any.

(Additional information *on* this matter will be made a part of the file when received.)

Mr. KYL. NOW, has there been any different experience there in this regard relative to any part of the Appalachian Trail where the Government has acquired easements on private property %

Mr. CLIFF. I cannot answer that because we do not try to administer any part of the Appalachian Trail outside of the national forest. And I am not acquainted with what has happened *on* the private property. Perhaps there is someone here who could answer that.

Mr. KYL. DO you now have regulations governing the use of the trails, defacement, et cetera ? And if so, what kind of punishments are provided by the policy or law ?

Mr. CLIFF. The use of these trails are subject to the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture and, of course, we have regulations against vandalism and defacement. Violations of the regulations is a petty offense. There is a legal limit on the punishment that would be imposed by the Federal Commissioners or the district courts. I think the maximum fine is \$500.

Mr. KYL. The existing penalty is about the same as is prescribed by this bill; is that correct!

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. NO questions, Mr. Chairman. That last question answered what I was going to ask.\

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I notice on page 3 of your fluff-dotted prepared testimony you make mention of the fact that a nationwide system of trails is a relatively inexpensive program. Earlier you referred to the fact that this 100,000 miles of trails that you have is going to cost \$4 million to reconstruct and maintain.

I think you will agree this probably is inexpensive relative, as a matter of judgment, to what is expensive. But how do you justify the maintenance and construction of 100,000 miles of Forest Service trails at this time on a request of an appropriation of \$10 million for the construction and—for the new construction of somewhere around— of less than 200,000 miles. I find this not inexpensive under any standard.

Mr. BAKER. The major purpose for the nationwide system of trails is to preserve for all time, regardless of what the total population of our country might be, the opportunity for growing numbers of urban people to have the opportunity that you and I had as we grew up to participate closely with nature in healthful exercise, to somehow become closer to the natural world-----

Mr. STEIGER. May I interrupt just a minute ?

Mr. BAKER. That these trail systems will provide.

Mr. STEIGER. May I interrupt, Mr. Secretary ?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. It is obviously your feeling and the feeling of the administration that the hundred thousand miles of trails within the Forest Service now will not meet this need, is that correct ?

Mr. BAKER. They will not meet it as well as a coordinated system of trails, of which those are a part.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, Mr. Secretary, I think to get very specific, and perhaps you prefer that Chief Cliff answer some of these—well, I will have to come back to you because you mentioned a 200-foot wide average.

Now, I assume that maximum, but you did use the word "average."

Now, do you mean to imply that there are going to be areas which will have more than a 200-foot right-of-way ?

Mr. BAKER. I think the limit that we put on this was an average of about 25 acres per mile.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, Mr. Secretary, is this going to be preserved in some cases by fencing, for example?

Mr. BAKER. There is no intention to use any fencing on this trail system at all.

Mr. STEIGER. On that part of the Appalachian Trail which is in the Forest Service system, what is the average width of the right-of-way there?

Mr. BAKER. On that one—Ed?

Mr. CLIFF. Where the Appalachian Trail crosses through the national forests, we have an agreement with the Appalachian Trail Conference that we will manage the land on each side of the trail in a way that will protect the scenic values for a mile on each side.

How, this does not mean that we discontinue multiple use. It means that we would conduct our timber-cutting operations and any other developmental operations in this strip in a way to preserve the scenic values visible from the trail.

Mr. STEIGER. So you have conformed more or less to the terrain, specific terrain rather than an arbitrary footage?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir. The width that would be necessary to protect the trail side would be a variable width. Where there are places that you need shelters and some campgrounds, you may need more than 100 feet there. Much of this trail system will go through open range

country. I cannot conceive that you would need to modify management at all on the open range country to protect a range scene. The only thing we would be interested in there is to keep the hotdog stands, or some other undesirable development of that kind away from the immediate side of the trail.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, Chief Cliff, of this 100,000 existing miles, how much of it is unused lumber roads, fire roads, dual-purpose roads and trails? In other words-----

Mr. CLIFF. Essentially none of it is—let me say it this way.

This 100,000 miles that I spoke of is virtually all the trails that were constructed as trails.

Now, there is some of it—and I cannot say how much, but it is inconsequential—that may have been logging roads at one time and reverted to a trail after logging ceased. But most of it was constructed originally as a trail or a marked way through the country.

Mr. STEIGER. What you are saying is, in addition to the 100,000 miles of planned trails, you have got probably three or four times that much mileage in other access roads through the national forests.

Mr. CLIFF. We have around 150,000 miles of forest roads; yes, sir.

Mr. STEIGER. Yes. So we are talking about 250,000 m the national forests, and you are asking this committee to approve an additional trail or trails whose sole virtue seems to be based on continuity.

Now, I must admit I share the chairman of the full committee's concern of this obsession for the continuity of a trail that will appear on a map as a continuous line.

Some very hasty calculations, for example, indicate that a man who is able to travel at 5 miles per hour—which would be a pretty good man—in the Pacific Crest, it would take him 78 days to traverse the Pacific Crest Trail. I think you would be safe to say, as you indicated, that very few people will endeavor to traverse the entire route. There must be within responsible recreation perimeters of the population centers, there must be places where this money could be spent more intelligently to preserve, as the Secretary has indicated, as well as to meet the immediate needs, and it is entirely possible that what started out here as a motherhood bill could use some real reexamination. And I know—I'm not asking you to have second thoughts on the matter because I recognize your position, but I do think in fairness to those who might criticize the speed with which this bill is approved—I think the fact that the Forest Service alone has some 250,000 miles of access routes—and most of it that I am familiar with is very attractive, and I think the Forest Service does a very adequate "job"—I think that this must be taken into account when we talk about impressive need to preserve the fluff-dotted sky for the future.

Excuse me, Mr. Secretary, but that was a very romantic phrase, I will have to admit.

Mr. BAKER. I am glad you liked it, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. STEIGER. The content here seems to be a little overwhelming, as we examine it, and I think that with all the Forest Service responsibilities which they now have, to talk about building a trail on the Continental Divide where it would take more than a hardy adventurer to pursue a path on the Continental Divide—he would have to be a man of extreme endurance and ability, I think you will agree, to get anywhere near the Continental Divide—I think in that area alone a

series of small or short trails would be far more applicable and probably far more enjoyable and used a great deal more.

Now, again, I rambled on, but I do not expect you to retreat from your position. But I——

Mr. BAKER. If I could interrupt at that point, it seems that one of the important proposals in the bill in laying out the full length of these national scenic and historic trails is to set forth the long-range plan for putting together a trail as the Appalachian Trails Conference did. It is not that any one person will go the entire length, but the different families and different people may want to go different lengths.

Mr. STEIGER. But they can do that now in the forests more near their community or wherever they want to go.

Mr. BAKER. And if you do not block it out now while we have got an opportunity to obtain the corridors, then you are closed forever from having a continuous trail.

Mr. STEIGER. But you are blocking out wilderness area. You have got the forests certainly blocked out, which is self-serving protection.

Mr. BAKER. Not the entire length of any trail.

Mr. STEIGER. The only thing you are preserving is the continuity of the trail itself, and I seriously question the value of the simple continuity.

It does not mean anything except that the mapmaker will be able to draw an unbroken line.

Mr. CLIFF. I am sure that you will be interested in hearing the testimony of the people in the Appalachian Trail Conference—it is made up of a large number of local trail clubs; each one has a particular interest in a segment of this trail, and the club maintains it, and they actually built segments of this trail—as to how they feel about having a continuous Appalachian Trail. I think they can shed some light on this, and I am sure the people in the East consider this continuous trail as a terrific recreation asset. I know from experience that the Pacific Crest Trail, which has been usable for some years now, is a terrific recreation asset. People use different parts of it, just the same as I use different parts of the highway system. I do not travel clear to the west coast every time I get on one of the highways. I use segments of the highway. But if I want to go and use other segments, I want some sections so that I can do it.

Mr. STEIGER. I think you recognize the lack of validity of that analogy, though. Chief, because—in fact, this is exactly my point. I think we may be obsessed with the highway syndrome in preserving this line of continuity. I think the need is there. I think you have demonstrated the need. I wonder if this is the best way to attack it though.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken far too much time. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, you said—I would like to return a moment, if I can, to this question the gentleman from Arizona posed in regard to the average width, and your answer to him as I recall was that you had stated an average of 25 acres per mile.

Now, aside from the necessity of rest areas, or campgrounds, would 200 feet be the maximum amount that you are speaking of for right-of-way for a trail %

Mr. BAKER. The major purpose for the corridors on either side of the actual footpath itself is to preserve the historic and scenic values

that are observable by those who are traversing the trail. In some cases this would not have to be very wide. Outside of already federally owned land, we would hope to acquire this by scenic easement rather than by fee.

Mr. MCCLURE. How much area are you talking about. How much distance are you talking about?

Mr. BAKER. The average for the entire length for these trails would be about 25 acres per mile of trail.

Mr. MCCLURE. Maybe you are not prepared to answer it, I do not know, but are we talking about, as we do down here in Mount Vernon—and I am not opposed to what is going on down here, with the idea of acquiring scenic easements for that which lies across the Potomac, but out in my country you can see for miles. Are you talking about scenic easements that extend for miles?

What is the width of this easement you are talking about?

Mr. BAKER. Our main purpose, as Mr. Cliff has said in answer to the question, is to prevent the encroachment of such things as hot dog stands, the building of commercial, industrial, or residential property right up next to the trail—these sort of things.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, what is right up next to a trail?

Mr. BAKER. Ten feet away or 50 feet away.

Mr. MCCLURE. One hundred feet?

Mr. BAKER, Yes.

Mr. MCCLURE. 500 feet?

Mr. BAKER. If it happened at that particular place that there is a historic or scenic value that should be preserved, it might be that far, yes.

Mr. MCCLURE. A quarter of a mile

Mr. BAKER. YOU have to use the rule of reason on this, I would think.

Mr. MCCLURE. Whose reason?

Mr. BAKER. The land manager as supervised by his superiors in the managing agency and by the Congress.

Mr. MCCLURE. I think the thing that I am getting to is this, that the people want to know what standard is being applied and by what standard will we be "judging this. I think this is not just simply this piece of legislation, but many others, also. Who is to have the discretionary authority? Whose reason are we applying to these problems? And the bill does not state it.

Mr. BAKER. Well, you do have the maximum per mile that has been read and is now being read into the legislative history. It will not exceed that.

Mr. MCCLURE. Not to exceed 25 acres per mile?

Mr. BAKER. The bill provides that each trail would have a public advisory committee who would advise and consider this.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, I think it is a fair statement—I hope it is a fair statement—that the people that I represent here in the Congress do not have a very great faith in the administrative discretion of too many of the bureaus of Government. And I do not mean that as a personal thing. I mean that they are rather independent people that are inclined to make up their own mind as to whether these things are reasonable or not and are not willing to designate or delegate a rather unlimited discretion to people who are not elected by them.

Mr. BAKER. I would see no reason why appropriate guidelines could not be written in.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, do you have an idea or could you supply such appropriate guidelines ?

Mr. BAKER. I think there are some already written into the bill itself and some that have been suggested in the report of this joint departmental study committee.

Mr. STEIGER. Would the gentleman yields

Mr. MCCLURE. Yes, I would.

Mr. STEIGER. Excuse me on that question.

On this 100,000 miles of trails that are now in the Forest Service, what have you found to be the requirement as far as your own administration is concerned with the protecting of a 5-foot trail? Is there an average for the 100,000 miles?

Mr. CLIFF. I do not think there is anything proposed in this legislation that would be in conflict with our multiple-use principle. I think it is compatible with our multiple-use management of the national forests. We do not worry about livestock use along these trails where it goes through open range.

We do modify timber harvesting practices to protect scenic values, but we continue to manage timber right up to and over trails.

I think it is entirely compatible as far as the national forests are concerned with our multiple-use system of management.

Mr. STEIGER. I think it would be critical—excuse me again—I think it would be critical, Chief, because you have had the most experience in this area, except for the parks, and the parks have a unique situation because they do not have a multiple-use situation. It is obvious to me that we could apply whatever standards you have learned through the administration of the 100,000 miles to the lands that are to be acquired for this, the private lands that are to be acquired.

This is where you are going to run into a problem. This is where the whole conflict is going to erupt. And I think it was very appropriate for the gentleman from Idaho to pursue this because I can envision a lot of travel in this area particularly.

Mr. CLIFF. Let's talk about the Continental Divide Trail. There is just a little over 300 miles of this trail route that would be on private land. That is a pretty small percentage of the total—about 10 percent.

Most of that, to my knowledge—and I know this general country very well—is in open range country. There is a little of it that goes through timber country, but most of it is through open range country. And I do not see any reason in the world why the location of a trail through open range country would create any problems after striving to get some agreements that they would not build buildings and things of this kind right up against the trail.

I think the uses are compatible in that kind of country. You may have some different kinds of problems where you go through privately owned timberland, commercial timberland. And it is here where you maybe would need 100 feet on each side so that the cutting would not occur right up against the trail prism. Whatever the Government would have to acquire or the State, if they acquire the rights-of-way, the owners would be adequately recompensed for it.

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary indicated that there were some possible qualifications or standards that could be written into the legislation, and it seems to me that if there are some additional standards or some additional qualifications on this that could be sup-



plied, I would wish that they would be because I think this is a, very difficult point from your standpoint and ours. If you have such suggestions, I would hope that you would furnish them to us.

Mr. BAKER. We will supply that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, they will be placed in the record at this point.

(The information referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, *Washington, D.C., March 24, 1967.* Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, *Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the testimony of Chief Cliff and myself on H.R. 4863, March 7, 1967, before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, we promised to provide certain additional information for the record. That information follows.

The estimated cost of upgrading the 73,000 miles of National Forest trails for recreation use is \$80 million, based on current costs. We expect that this upgrading will extend over a period of 15-20 years.

In determining the need for scenic trail corridors and the criteria or standards for protection of these corridors, we must first consider how the trail routes are chosen initially. In the construction of trails, we do not have the restraints of topography that are associated with higher standards of transportation. As compared to other uses, we can select trail locations which offer a minimum of conflict with existing and foreseeable uses. Because of this flexibility, trails can generally be located in a way to minimize adverse effects on the uses of adjacent lands.

The width of the needed corridor along the various segments of the trails will be determined by those factors expected to affect operation and maintenance of the trail, safety, sanitation, protection of adjacent or nearby resources or developments, and protection of the trail character or aesthetics. Some of these factors are related to terrain, e.g., slope, aspect and soil type. Others are types of trail use, type of vegetation, access points, overnight camping or rest and sanitation facilities, stream and road crossings, and distance to and kind of uses on adjacent lands. These factors could result in the need for a trail corridor of only a few feet in some areas to several hundred in others.

As a means of further clarifying the language of the bill with respect to corridor and right-of-way width and protection, the Committee may want to consider the following changes in H.R. 4865. On page 6, line 5, delete the words "provide the maximum retention of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "protect." On page 6, line 15, change the period after the word "recreation" to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided*, that in selecting the location and width of the rights-of-way full consideration shall be given to minimizing the adverse effects upon the adjacent landowner and his operation."

In preparing this information and the alternative language for portions of the bill, we consulted with representatives of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BAKER, *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. MCCLURE. The reason I express this interest, is because it is not just on the scenic trails that we are plagued with this question. We have the same question coming up continually on the scenic rivers. How much is enough? How much scenic easement are you talking about, and what standards within that scenic easement?

This is a very critical point as far as the people in my area are concerned with respect to the proposed Sawtooth recreation area. What is the standard that shall be applied, and over what areas shall this standard be applied? And there are no definitions, absolutely none that I have been able to discover, that are sufficiently definite to allay the fears or the legitimate demands of the people who own the property.

Mr. BAKER. The guidelines, Mr. McClure, would not be in terms of feet or area, but the purpose for which they would be established. It seems to me the criteria is what you are striving for here

Mr. MCCLURE. The very great difficulty -----

Mr. BAKER (continuing). So that everyone could know what the purpose of the Congress was in saying—to have a corridor in addition to the footpath itself.

Mr. MCCLURE. The very great difficulty I see with that lies in the fact that it remains in the discretion of somebody, some person or body, to determine these standards.

Now, I know much of this back country, and an old trapper's cabin, old mining workings, and so forth, are not detracting from the interest, in my opinion.

But the Forest Service has been pursuing the policy in recent years of destroying these old habitations because in their opinion or in somebody else's opinion they detract from the scene instead of adding to it. This is the sort of thing that seems to me is difficult—for us to sit here and write out a blank check to someone who is ill-advised, if at all, as to what their discretion may be in the future as to what is or is not an acceptable standard.

So much for that, because I do not know that we are going to get to an answer on that this afternoon or in this decade.

But in that connection, you talked about acquiring scenic easements. How do you put a value on a scenic easement? How do you value the restriction on the land when you say to the man, "You shall not in any future year use this land for other than X."

Mr. CLIFF. Well, frankly, Mr. McClure, we have not had much experience with scenic easements, but I think we are going to get experience

Mr. MCCLURE. I am sure of that.

Mr. CLIFF (continuing). In this field very fast because some of these recreation demands we know are going to grow. I think to the extent that we can satisfy the requirements for rights-of-way and for such things as protecting the foreground of the Sawtooth range, if we can do this without acquiring the fee title of private property, we want to do so. So we are going to have to learn, I guess, by experience. We will draw on the best advice we can from commercial appraisers to help us assess the values and then in the final analysis I presume the courts will establish some of the values of the privileges that are foregone in granting a scenic easement.

But it is an area where we really do not have much experience.

Mr. MCCLURE. We do not have the answer though, do we, Mr. Cliff?

Mr. CLIFF. We will have to develop them, and we will have the help of the people, the private people we work with, the courts, the private appraisers. In the case of this trail system we had hoped to have the advisory committees in which the States and the local agencies of government are represented to help decide some of the very questions that you are raising.

Mr. MCCLURE. Is it possible that under the legislation this question of the reasonableness of the standards both for the width of the right-of-way and the necessity of scenic easements, be brought back to Congress for a determination from time to time rather than leaving it purely as an executive function ?

Mr. BAKER. Actually, Congress reviews it every year in terms of the review of the program plans and justification for appropriation.

Mr. MCCLURE. But this is an after-the-fact review.

Mr. BAKER. And you would have appropriation requests for certain segments of certain trails. The estimates would have been based on certain acquisitions, so that it would seem to me that Congress has an annual review of this.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, we are faced here with a bill that calls for an appropriation of quite a sizable sum of money, and we have no idea in terms of specifics exactly what you intend to buy.

Mr. BAKER. This is an authorization bill, and later if we are to get funds we have to justify each dollar.

Mr. MCCLURE. I recognize that.

Mr. BAKER. Then Congress would pass on that.

Mr. MCCLURE. It would be your intention then not to acquire any right-of-way or any scenic easements except those specifically authorized in the appropriation bill ?

Mr. BAKER. I am not quite sure I followed your exact words. The money would not be available to make the acquisition or to perform the development unless it had been appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, the point -----

Mr. BAKER. Congress could exercise whatever review it chose before it made that appropriation.

Mr. MCCLURE. The point I am getting at is this: That the review of Congress that you are implying here would be before the acquisition and not afterward ?

Mr. BAKER. The money would not be available to make the acquisition if Congress did not appropriate it.

Mr. MCCLURE. I am talking in terms of specifics and not generalities.

Mr. BAKER. Well, each dollar appropriated by the Congress -----

Mr. MCCLURE. I am not talking about specific dollars. I am talking about specific acquisitions, land and easements.

Mr. BAKER. Congress could require whatever justification is necessary to assure them that the money is going to be expended the way they want it expended before they appropriated it.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, the point that I would hope that you would take forward from this is that, at least in my view, if we are to get into an area which is, as Mr. Cliff says, without any guidelines, without any experience and, as you admit, has nothing other than a general statement of intent to guide us to what we intend, that then certainly before we are going out and doing these things in the field, acquiring rights-of-way, taking easements from people, that Congress should have a specific oversight in advance of the fact, not after the fact.

Now, that is just my own view, and I have no idea whether this committee or the Appropriations Committee would agree with me. But certainly it seems to me that in this rather nebulous area we need this kind of oversight.

Mr. Cliff, could you tell me how many of the total miles of these proposed trails, the one specifically authorized here, are on public domain ?

Mr. CLIFF. I think that is in the record some place. On the Pacific Crest Trail there is about 33 miles on public domain.

On the Continental Divide Trail I am not certain. But there is a considerable mileage as shown by the map. The areas shown in dark orange—or in orange—on the map there is public domain.

Could somebody help with that ?

Mr. HOLMES. We do not have it in mileage, but it is estimated, we think, somewhere around 800 to 1,000 miles. But we are not sure at all on that.

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, how much in aggregate, in all forms of Federal ownership?

Mr. CLIFF. The aggregate on Federal in the Continental Divide is about 2,750 miles. Now, part of that is national park. About half of that—more than half, about 1,500 miles—is national forest.

Mr. MCCLURE. And how much of this would be in presently designated wilderness areas ?

Mr. CLIFF. I would have to check that out. It crosses several wilderness areas. My guess—my offhand guess—would be that it would come out to about 250 miles.

Mr. MCCLURE. And then the balance of this land that lies within public ownership but not now within a wilderness area would be new land, new land which—excuse me. Let me phrase it this way.

The path or trailways that now exist in those areas, encompassed within this system would be a new exclusion of motor trail bikes under this legislation ?

Mr. CLIFF. Under this proposal the motorized trail bikes would not be permitted on any of these national scenic trails.

Mr. MCCLURE. And the only portions of these trails now where they are excluded are those that lie within the wilderness areas?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, and in the national parks.

Mr. MCCLURE. Yes. Thank you.

I believe it has been the experience of the Park Service that they get into a lot of problems when some of these tenderfeet get very far away from the edge of the highway, and enough so that they have made some rather drastic restrictions on the ability of people to get more than just a few miles from the edge of the highway.

Do you anticipate this kind of a problem on the scenic trailway ?

Mr. CLIFF. I do not think the problem would be any different than the problem that we have today. As a matter of fact, these trails will be well marked and signed and the purpose of delineating them and marking them is to prevent people from getting lost. Actually, we do not have much of a problem with that. We have about a hundred million incidents of trail use a year. We do have some lost people—but no real problem.

Mr. MCCLURE. I am not speaking of just lost. All kind of difficulties. The reason that I make this statement is that it has been a part of the Park Service criteria that you cannot go more than a half a day's walk from the edge of a highway. At least that is the effect of their restrictions. (Additional information on this matter appears at p. 82.)

Mr. CLIFF. We have no such restriction on the national forests.

Mr. MCCLURE. I think there has been in the past a need for additional funds for forest trails, has there not ?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCLURE. Have you in the past made such requests of this committee and of Congress ?

Mr. CLIFF. The authorization for trail work on the national forests is in the same authorizing legislation that covers our forest development roads. Over the years we have asked Congress to increase our authorization for roads and trails, and Congress has responded to that.

Last year Congress increased our authorization for forest development roads and trails very substantially, to \$170 million a year.

Mr. MCCLURE. This is a lump sum in which they are not segregated^

Mr. CLIFF. This is a lump sum in which the roads and the trails are not segregated. It is for both of them.

Mr. MCCLURE. The reason that I make that point is simply this, that I am sure that you are aware of the hunters' and fishermen's complaint that in recent years the Forest Service trails have not been maintained to the same standard that they had been in prior years. And that has been because of a shifting pattern of their own requirements, I am sure, the increased use of air drops and helicopters, parachute drops for firefighting, that you have not had the need for trails. Has there been an effort on the part of the Forest Service to increase—a concerted effort on the part of the Forest Service to increase the maintenance of trails for recreation purposes?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, there has. We have increased it substantially in the last 4 or 5 years? And as I testified earlier, we plan on increasing it more next year.

Mr. MCCLURE. Would the funds sought under this legislation supplement or replace that effort?

Mr. CLIFF. AS far as trails within the national forests are concerned, we will continue to operate under the authorities that we have and have had. The only new authority that this legislation would give us would be to acquire rights-of-way outside of the national forests and develop trails outside the national forests on these two main trails, which would be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. And there we would first try to get the States and the local participating groups to do the job.

Mr. MCCLURE. I suppose what I am really getting at is. Are you going to reduce the amount of requests for other trails because of the appropriations made here for trail development in the national forests?

Mr. BAKER. Maybe I better answer that. The answer is, "No."

Mr. MCCLURE. YOU would intend to continue pushing for appropriations for further development in addition to these trails?

Mr. BAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCLURE. I certainly wish to add support to that position because I think this network of trails that has been allowed, necessarily, perhaps, to deteriorate in recent years is a major deterrent to getting people out in the forests and the use of these forests on a multiple-use concept, which I further support.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

(The following was received for the record:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. *Washington, D.C., March 20, 1961.* Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE, *House of Representatives, Washington, B.C.*

DEAR MR. MCCLURE : During the hearings before the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on H.R. 4865, you spoke about restrictions limit-

ing park visitors to just a few miles from the edge of a highway (p. 129, transcript) and you indicated (p. 130) that it is "a part of the Park Service criteria that you cannot go more than a half a day's walk from the edge of a highway."

We are not, of course, familiar with your experience in this matter; however, the National Park Service does not have a policy of, or any rules or regulations, restricting use and enjoyment of the parks as you indicated. Such a policy would be contrary to the act of August 25, 1916, which established the National Park Service and which states, in part, "\* \* \* which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same." We are, in fact, encouraging back-country travel and use in an effort to better distribute overall area use.

We do have some restrictions on use of fires in certain back-country areas, and in some instances we require registration of mountain climbers and hikers when safety and knowledge of back-country use is essential to proper area management. National Park Superintendents have authority to close or restrict the public use of all or any portion of a park area, when necessary for the protection of the area or the safety and welfare of persons or property. This prerogative is, however, rarely exercised.

In order that the record of the hearing may reflect the true picture of National Park Service policy on trail use we are sending a copy of this letter to the Committee.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. Sincerely  
yours,

THEODORE R. SWEM,  
*Acting Director.*

Mr. TAYLOR. Chairman Aspinall has two questions.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions.

Mr. Secretary, would there be any special fee for the use of the trails or shelters ?

Mr. BAKER. NO special fee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. What ?

Mr. BAKER. NO special fee.

Mr. ASPINALL. And yet you are asking Uncle Sam for the moneys to go ahead and develop these recreation areas ?

Mr. BAKER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Explain to the committee once again, Mr. Cliff, why trails, improved to a high degree, are necessary to take care of the additional use of such trails ?

Mr. CLIFF. The recreational uses of the national forests have been growing very fast, as you know. It has been increasing at the rate of about 11 percent a year since the end of World War II. We anticipate that this increased use will continue, maybe at a slackened rate, but we anticipate that it will be three or four times as great by the end of this century. The pressure that is being put on the national forest recreation areas and the trail system is very great. Some of our trails are inadequate to meet this -----

Mr. ASPINALL. My question admitted that. I want to know why it is that the greater use of the trails calls for a better development, a higher degree of construction, and so forth.

Mr. CLIFF. Mr. Chairman, it is possible to design and build a simple trail which will take the impact. One of the main things that we have to do is to improve the gradient and the drainage. Drainage is exceedingly important on these trails, to get natural drainage built into them so that the water and the use does not erode them off the side of the mountain. It is possible to design and build these trails to take that kind of impact. Some of our trails now will not do it. We do not want to upgrade our trail standards. We want the trails to be

just as simple as we can and still accomplish the objective for which, they are built.

Mr. ASPINALL. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, you have a large trail you need to allow for passage or for different people to walk side by side ?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, we do not intend to build trails that will take two-way traffic or double traffic. Most of these trails are single-lane trails, and they will be built so that people can step off them or pass each other, except in our very heavily developed camp and picnic areas where sometimes a wider trail is needed to accommodate big crowds that accumulate. But the trails that go across the country will be very simple, single-track trails. I do not envision anything else in the national forests. The standard has been developed to meet the anticipated use, but generally these are not elaborate, wide trails such as you find in city parks.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, thank you, Chief Cliff and Secretary Baker, You have been very patient and given us much help.

We have 11 more witnesses on the list. You were told there would be hearings this morning and tomorrow morning and not this afternoon but if two or three of you wish to testify this afternoon, we will listen.

I was told that Mr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, would like to testify.

If one or two of you would like to be heard, you might give your name to Mr. Witmer here.

STATEMENT OF DR. SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY,  
CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with offices in Washington, D.C.

We support strongly H.R. 4865, 5493, S. 827 and related measures, which would establish a nationwide system of scenic trails.

This is another in the continuing efforts of the administration and the Congress to establish greater recreation opportunities and effect additional protection for our natural resources.

The committee has heard at great length and in meticulous detail, not only from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation but from many other bureaus and agencies that have a similar responsibility, as to the expanding population, the disappearance of resources for recreation purposes and the heightened and ever-increasing interest on the part of the American public for outdoor recreation. We do not plan to reiterate in any detail what has been established effectively as a primary need for the use of our land and water resources.

Not only is the need for recreation resources a quantitative one but it is also qualitative. In many instances, the qualitative aspects are even more difficult to evaluate because of their subjective nature and the wide ranges of difference such a criteria affords.

We have been supporting an increase in overall recreation opportunities but also we have endeavored throughout our existence to support a balanced recreation program. In short, a program that at-