

"We believe that a recreation environment can be maintained within parks or recreation areas without total federal ownership, so long as controls exist to assure compatible private uses." As previously pointed out, cooperative arrangements have been made in many areas. If sufficient effort and imagination were applied, it is quite possible that the supposed need for continued Federal land acquisition could be largely averted. But that is not the approach represented by the proposals before this distinguished Committee.

The possible alternatives to massive Federal land acquisition for recreational purposes have been recently illustrated in the Connecticut River Watershed in New England.

At hearings in January held by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Connecticut River Watershed Council testified that a proposed national recreation area was by no means a required or appropriate mechanism for coordinating recreational and related planning in the Valley.

The testimony of the Connecticut River Watershed Council pointed out that approximately 21 per cent of the total land area within the Connecticut River drainage basin was available for intensive, general, or limited recreational use by the public. The testimony went on to state as follows:

"If a count is also taken of the present availability of large tracts of timberland in the north country that is available for limited recreational use and the prospects of additional lands being opened for public use and more intensive use, it is not unreasonable to expect that within the very near future upwards of 3,600,000 acres of land in the Valley or over 50% of its total land area will be available for a great variety of public, quasi-public, and private recreational uses and environmental improvements.

"Substantially greater numbers of recreationists could be accommodated in present areas by relatively modest programs of facilities improvement, expansion, and quality control, and *without major acquisitions of additional lands.*" [Emphasis added.]

The testimony also pointed out that "Urbanization and industrialization take their toll on the natural environment but they also provide the economic base which is the source of much support, directly or indirectly, for preservation of the natural environment. Economic and esthetic values are mutually-improving. The Valley will continue to thrive by public and private programs that seek to maintain a reasonable balance of these values."

Additional testimony presented on behalf of the Connecticut River Watershed Council contained the following statements:

"The Connecticut Valley finds itself in a transitional phase of digestion, consolidation, and implementation of existing plans and programs. It needs time to transform them into reality. This should be borne in mind by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in weighing the effect of broad new proposals upon an already confused public."

"The task ahead of us is to coordinate the plans and programs in existence at the federal, state, regional and local levels. Perhaps the answer lies in an inter-state recreational compact that could be administered by the New England Governors or by the newly created New England River Basin Commission."

The Council testified that "existing programs, planning and tools such as easements and zoning coupled with our existing controls on the environment will eliminate the need for the traumatic experience of a Federal Recreation Area in Massachusetts."

The Council listed the following factors as making unnecessary the creation of a National Connecticut River Recreation Area:

"1. Expansive open land acreages owned by many schools and colleges in the Valley.

"2. Islands of natural and historic significance maintained by public and private interests.

"3. Public ownership of the higher ridges.

"4. Privately operated recreational areas.

"5. The proposed Northfield Mountain Project.

"6. More enlightened zoning and/or easement programs.

"7. Anticipated urban renewal.

"8. Water and air pollution abatement."

This is a vivid current illustration of the available alternatives to massive federal land acquisition for recreational purposes.

If there is any justification for earmarking revenues to be paid into special funds, it is as a means of coupling the benefits and costs of particular programs.