

live in the expanding metropolitan areas of our country and by the year 2000 predictions are that the era of the three-day weekend and two-month long vacations will have arrived. The combined pressures of a growing population and increased leisure time will create a demand for far more recreational areas to be available for the use of our people than are available today. Recreation areas where people living in metropolitan areas can spend their leisure time within short distances from their homes are those most needed.

People may travel long distances for once or twice yearly vacations, going as often to other cities as they do to the open spaces of the country, but for normal daily or weekend enjoyment, recreation areas close to home are preferred. Much of the value of recreation can be lost if the frustration of a long trip to and from the recreation area must be endured. A report by Urban American, Inc. notes, "the greatest pushes for recreation development are not in the wide open spaces, or even the medium open spaces, but in what could be called the fifty-mile 'day trip' zone".

The 50-mile radius or "day trip" zone around the metropolitan centers, where the need for recreation areas is the greatest, is also the territory where land costs are accelerating most rapidly and where open land is fast disappearing under the press of development. If we are to have enough land available for recreation in 1980 and the decades thereafter, we must accelerate efforts to acquire that land now, for costs will continue to rise rapidly and choice sites for recreation areas are being bulldozed daily by the crush of expanding urbanization.

Addition to the land and water conservation fund of revenues received under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act will permit the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, directly and through aid to the States, to accelerate efforts to acquire land both inside and outside the "day trip" zone. We believe that the most immediate need is to increase programs to provide recreational facilities within the "day trip" zone. For this reason, we are reluctant to accept any reduction in the state and local share of the fund, though we recognize the national need and the value of national facilities to all citizens.

Many State plans provide excellent programs for the development of new recreational facilities inside and outside of metropolitan areas. A few State plans have neglected the recreational needs of citizens living in urbanized areas. The original Ohio recreation plan made no provision for local recreation programs despite the heated objections of many Ohio cities, and some other plans make no specific commitment to aid local governments develop recreation areas. We understand also that in Tennessee, Federal funds have been spent to finance acquisition of facilities previously programmed for development at State expense, so that the money has not been spent on new facilities.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation must be in a position to exercise increased authority to review State plans to assure that Federal funds are being spent in accordance with the aims of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. We hope that the record will state that in reviewing state plans the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will assure that the immediate recreation needs of the great number of people living in our metropolitan areas are given equitable consideration. State plans should be found unacceptable if this has not been done. In this connection we note that the share of State funds allocated to local governments has grown from 23% to 38% in the last eighteen months, however, there are still inequities in some States.

We hope that any future analogy between the recreation program and the highway program will be avoided by assuring, at this early stage in the outdoor recreation program, that urban areas are given fair consideration in state plans to develop recreational areas. Problems arising because of past neglect of urban areas by Federal and State highway programs are noted in the 1968 National Highway Needs Report recently published by the Department of Transportation. Federal and State highway programs are now facing tremendous planning and financing problems because of the crying need to improve urban street and highway systems to deal with today's traffic. Many of the severest urban highway problems and a significant amount of the cost involved in correcting them could have been avoided if the States had given adequate consideration to urban needs in their earlier highway planning.

By insisting that States accelerate programs to preserve recreational areas in our country, particularly those fast disappearing areas in our urban centers, Congress can make a great contribution to the quality of urban living now and in the future. In this time of heavy demands upon our revenue to finance programs dealing with immediate domestic and international concerns, a long-range pro-