

CRS Report for Congress

Recreation on Federal Lands

Updated February 12, 2008

Kori Calvert, Coordinator, and Sandra L. Johnson
Knowledge Services Group

Carol Hardy Vincent, Coordinator, Ross W. Gorte, Nicole T. Carter,
Nic Lane, David L. Whiteman, and M. Lynne Corn
Resources, Science, and Industry Division



**Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress**

Recreation on Federal Lands

Summary

The growing and diverse nature of recreation on federal lands has increased the challenge of balancing different types of recreation with each other and with other land uses. Motorized recreation has been particularly controversial, with issues centering on access and environmental impacts. The 110th Congress is considering legislation and conducting oversight on issues involving recreation on federal lands, including traditional recreational pursuits and newer forms of motorized recreation. The Administration continues to address these issues through budgetary, regulatory, and other actions. This report covers several prominent issues.

Motorized Recreation on NPS Land: Off-Highway Vehicles, Snowmobiles, and Personal Watercraft. Off-highway vehicle (OHV), snowmobile, and personal watercraft (PWC) use at National Park Service (NPS) units has fueled ongoing debates over the balance between recreation and the protection of parklands and waters. Several NPS units are conducting environmental studies and developing regulations for existing OHV use. The agency issued a Record of Decision and final rule governing winter use for snowmobiles at three Yellowstone area parks beginning with the 2007-2008 winter season. Since 2003, NPS has completed regulations to open designated areas at 13 units to PWC use.

Aircraft Overflights. Grand Canyon National Park is at the center of a conflict over whether or how to limit air tours over national parks to reduce noise. NPS and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) continue to work to implement a 1987 law that sought to reduce noise at Grand Canyon, and a 2000 law that regulates overflights at other park units. Recent regulations require air tour operators to seek authority to fly over park units; the agencies then must develop Air Tour Management Plans (ATMPs) at those park units. Provisions of legislation (H.R. 1356, H.R. 2881, S. 1076, and S. 1300) would affect commercial air tours over park units by expediting and streamlining agency actions, in part because of the delay in completing ATMPs. Further, the FAA has issued final safety regulations for commercial air tours nationally.

Motorized Recreation in the National Forests and on BLM Land. The use of OHVs on Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands has been controversial. Both agencies decide the extent of allowed OHV use through their planning processes. The FS finalized regulations (Nov. 9, 2005) governing OHV use that require designating roads, trails, and areas open for OHV use and prohibit OHV use outside the designated system. The BLM is addressing transportation issues through national strategies and other guidance.

National Trails System. While designation of trails is often popular, issues remain regarding the funding, expansion, and quality of trails. The 110th Congress is considering a variety of trail measures, including adding routes to the National Trails System, authorizing studies of routes for possible additions to the system, and authorizing land acquisitions from willing sellers. Legislation has been introduced to create a new category of trails, called National Discovery Trails.

Contents

Introduction	1
Current Issues	4
Motorized Recreation on NPS Land	4
Background	4
Administrative Actions	4
Legislative Activity	7
Snowmobiles on NPS Land	8
Background	8
Administrative Actions	8
Legislative Activity	10
Aircraft Overflights at NPS Sites	11
Background	11
Administrative Actions	11
Legislative Activity	13
Personal Watercraft (PWC) at NPS Sites	14
Background	14
Administrative Actions	14
Legislative Activity	15
Motorized Recreation on BLM Land	16
Background	16
Administrative Actions	16
Legislative Activity	18
Motorized Recreation in the National Forests	18
Background	18
Administrative Actions	19
Legislative Activity	20
The National Trails System	20
Background	20
Administrative Actions	21
Legislative Activity	21
Other Issues	23
Recreation in the National Wildlife Refuge System	23
Recreation at Federal Water Sites	24
Recreation Fees	25
Grand Canyon Colorado River Recreational Use Management	26

Recreation on Federal Lands

Introduction

Four federal agencies administer about 95% of the approximately 653 million acres of federally owned land in the United States: the National Park Service (NPS), the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Department of the Interior (DOI), and the Forest Service (FS) in the Department of Agriculture.¹ These agencies manage federal lands for a variety of purposes relating to the preservation, development, and use of the lands and natural resources. The NPS administers the National Park System for recreational use of parklands and preservation of park resources, a mission that can be contradictory. The FWS manages wildlife refuges primarily for protecting and improving fish and wildlife habitats, with other uses to the extent that they are compatible. The BLM manages public lands and the FS manages national forests for similar multiple uses, including grazing, recreation, timber, water, and fish and wildlife. Many forests and public lands also are available for mineral exploration and development. The National Trails System, administered by the FS, NPS, and BLM, often in cooperation with state and local authorities, permits many recreation uses, but motorized vehicles generally are prohibited.

This preservation/use dichotomy, while varying among agencies, is a focal point for debate over recreation on federal lands. Increased recreation, and allegations of overuse in some areas, contribute to disagreement on issues of access, regulation, integrity of natural and cultural resources, and motorized versus nonmotorized recreational activities. Recreation debates also arise in areas managed by other federal agencies, such as reservoirs and rivers managed by the Army Corps of Engineers (in the Department of Defense) and the DOI's Bureau of Reclamation, where decisions on water releases may affect recreation.

The growth and development of western states, proximity of many urban areas to public lands, and growing popularity of outdoor recreation have translated into high demand for a variety of recreational opportunities on federal lands and waters. BLM, for example, reports that over 22 million people live within 25 miles of public lands and that two-thirds of BLM-administered lands are within 50 miles of an urban area.² Agency figures indicate an overall increase in recreational visits to federal lands in recent decades. The FY2008 DOI budget documents cite 471 million recreational visits to agency-administered sites: 56 million visits to 3,496 BLM recreational sites; 273 million recreation visits to NPS units (then 390, now 391

¹ See the U.S. General Services Administration's *Federal Real Property Profile* (2004) at [http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?noc=T&contentType=GSA_DOCUMENT&contentId=13586]. Table 16 shows federally owned acreage by state.

² See [<http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/Recreation.1.html>].

units); 52 million visits to 547 FWS wildlife refuges; and 90 million visits to 308 Bureau of Reclamation recreation sites.³ The FS reports 211 million recreation visits to its national forests and grasslands, and the Corps 400 million visits for the most recent year available.

Over the last 40 years, forms of motorized recreation — snowmobiles, personal watercraft, other off-highway vehicles — and nonmotorized vehicles, such as mountain bikes, have evolved and gained in popularity. These new forms intersect with the many popular traditional forms of recreation. These include water-based activities (fishing, canoeing, kayaking, rafting, etc.) and a variety of land-based pursuits (birdwatching, camping, hiking, hunting, horseback riding, rock climbing, etc.).

The use of OHVs on federal lands and waters has been particularly contentious, and lawsuits have challenged their management. OHV supporters contend that these vehicles provide outdoor recreation opportunities for the disabled, senior citizens, and others with mobility limitations; visitor access to hard-to-reach natural areas; economic benefits to communities serving riders; and, for snowmobiles, increased access to sites during the winter season. They believe technological advances do and will continue to limit noise and pollution. Critics of OHVs raise environmental concerns, including potential damage to land and water ecosystems and wildlife habitat; noise, air, and water pollution; and a diminished experience for recreationists seeking quiet and solitude.

Two executive orders define and generally guide administering OHV use on federal lands. The first (E.O. 11644, February 8, 1972) defines an off-road vehicle (ORV), now commonly referred to as an off-highway vehicle, as “any motorized vehicle designed for or capable of cross country travel on or immediately over land, water, sand, snow, ice, marsh, swampland, or other natural terrain,” with exceptions for any registered motorboat or authorized or emergency vehicles. It was issued to “establish policies and provide for procedures that will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands.” The order directed each agency to develop and issue regulations to carry out this purpose and to provide for the designation of areas and trails on which OHVs may be permitted, and areas in which such vehicles would not be permitted. Agencies were to monitor the effects of OHV use and amend or rescind area designations or other actions taken pursuant to the order as needed to further the policy of the executive order.

A subsequent executive order (E.O. 11989, May 24, 1977) amended the 1972 order to exclude military, emergency, and law enforcement vehicles from the definition of off-road vehicles (to which restrictions would apply). It provided authority to immediately close areas or trails if OHVs were causing or would cause considerable damage on the soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, or cultural or historic resources of particular areas or trails. Areas could remain closed until the

³ For a graph depicting recreation visits to DOI sites, see p. DH-68 of the *FY2008 Interior Budget in Brief* at [<http://www.doi.gov/budget/2008/08Hilites/DH51.pdf>].

manager determined that “the adverse effects have been eliminated and that measures have been implemented to prevent future recurrence.” Also, each agency was authorized to adopt the policy that areas could be closed to OHV use except for those areas or trails that are specifically designated as open to such use. This meant that only open areas would have to be marked, a lesser burden on the agencies.

BLM and FS managers formulate guidance on the nature and extent of land uses, including OHV use, through regulations, national policies, land and resource management plans, and area-specific decisions. Legislation establishing NPS units may provide for specific OHV uses. In addition, NPS administers OHV use via unit-specific regulations, management plans, and the superintendent’s compendium. On August 31, 2006, the NPS released final revised management policies to guide management throughout the National Park System, in part to reflect changing recreational uses and evolving technologies.⁴ These management policies largely retain the 2001 edition’s emphasis on conserving park resources in conservation/use conflicts (§ 1.4.3).⁵

The 110th Congress is considering legislation and conducting oversight on issues pertaining to recreation on federal lands. Several major issues are covered in this report, particularly use of traditional OHVs, PWC, and snowmobiles in certain National Park System units; overflights of national park units; motorized recreation on BLM and FS lands; and expansion of the National Trails System. Other issues addressed cover recreation within the National Wildlife Refuge System; recreation at federal (Corps and Bureau) water sites; recreation fees; and Colorado River management within Grand Canyon National Park.

While this report focuses on recreation issues on federal lands, it does not cover additional issues affecting these lands comprehensively. For background on federal land management generally, see CRS Report RL32393, *Federal Land Management Agencies: Background on Land and Resources Management*, coordinated by Carol Hardy Vincent. Overview information on numerous natural resource use and protection issues is provided in CRS Report RL33806, *Natural Resources Policy: Management, Institutions, and Issues*, coordinated by Carol Hardy Vincent, Nicole T. Carter, and Julie Jennings. For information on NPS issues, see CRS Report RL33484, *National Park Management*, coordinated by Carol Hardy Vincent. Information on BLM and Forest Service lands is contained in CRS Report RL33792, *Federal Lands Managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service: Issues for the 110th Congress*, by Ross W. Gorte, Carol Hardy Vincent, Marc Humphries, and Kristina Alexander. For information on appropriations for federal land management agencies, see CRS Report RL34011, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2008 Appropriations*, coordinated by Carol Hardy Vincent.

⁴ For additional background information on NPS management policies, see CRS Report RL33484, *National Park Management*, coordinated by Carol Hardy Vincent. See also the NPS website at [<http://www.nps.gov/applications/npspolicy/index.cfm>].

⁵ The final version of the 2006 NPS management policies is available via the NPS website at [<http://www.nps.gov/policy/MP2006.pdf>].

Current Issues

Motorized Recreation on NPS Land (by Kori Calvert)

Background. National Park System units may comprise many different features, including historic, scenic, or scientific resources, outstanding natural and cultural attributes, and outdoor recreational opportunities. Balancing appropriate recreational use and parkland enjoyment with the protection and preservation of resources is a significant ongoing challenge to both NPS administrators and the congressional committees conducting agency oversight. Motorized recreation in particular, and the extent and effect of motorized access, can be contentious. Debate often focuses on a particular form of motorized recreation within an individual park unit or a small number of units. Such issues include snowmobiles at three Yellowstone area parks; Grand Canyon National Park airtour overflights; personal watercraft (PWC) at popular NPS-administered water sites; and other forms of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) — four-wheel drive vehicles, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), and dune, sand, and swamp buggies — at areas such as Big Cypress National Preserve. This section focuses primarily on these latter forms of OHVs.⁶

Currently, of the 391 NPS units covering over 84 million acres of land, 43 allow snowmobiles and 13 allow PWC. Also, excluding Alaska, NPS counts 12 park units allowing other types of OHV use by the general public. Some additional units permit OHV access to inholders, Native Americans, or others for specific limited purposes under a variety of authorizations.⁷ Manufacturers and various user groups contend that NPS limits on OHV use unfairly restrict access, establish a precedent for other federal land managers to impose or extend restrictions, and may be economically harmful to local communities and industries serving users. Opponents of motorized recreation in NPS units cite damage to the environment and cultural artifacts, safety concerns, conflicts with other forms of recreation, and inadequate NPS staff to effectively monitor motorized use and its impact on park resources. Opponents also cite the NPS statutory mandate to protect park resources and the availability of other federal lands (FS, BLM) where OHV use may be permitted.

Administrative Actions. As noted above, federal guidance on OHV use on NPS lands is provided in E.O. 11644 and E.O. 11989, in agency regulations and policies, and in other authorities. An NPS unit's enabling legislation may establish specific activities as an appropriate use — e.g., water-oriented recreation, snowmobiling for subsistence or recreational purposes, or OHV travel to reach hunting or fishing areas. Under NPS regulations (36 C.F.R. § 4.10), OHV use may be allowed in four types of NPS units whose primary purposes include outdoor recreational opportunities for their visitors — national recreation areas, national seashores, national lakeshores, and national preserves. Agency regulations also require special rulemaking, with environmental impact analysis and public comment,

⁶ A more detailed discussion of snowmobile, overflight, and PWC management issues at NPS units and related legislative and regulatory guidance may be found in the following sections of this report.

⁷ Figures confirmed with NPS via phone conversation, Jan. 30, 2008.

to designate routes and areas for off-road motor vehicles in park units. Additional unit-level direction for previously designated routes (such as temporary route closures) may be included in a park's general management plan and/or determined by the park superintendent (36 C.F.R. § 1.5).

As OHV use on federal lands grew in recent decades, particularly in western states, unauthorized use also is reported to have increased in some areas, including parklands. In 1999, the environmental organization Bluewater Network surveyed 108 NPS units and reported findings on the ecological effects of OHV use at those units. The organization determined that there was unauthorized use in 40 of them.⁸ Bluewater and other groups also petitioned NPS in December 1999 to take specific OHV actions: to ban OHV use in all NPS off-road areas, to define "off-road vehicle usage" as any use not on "pavement or high-standard gravel roads," and to develop procedures for monitoring OHV use and regulatory compliance. In 2004, the NPS met with Bluewater and agreed to conduct a service-wide survey to determine the extent of authorized and unauthorized OHV use, its impacts, and any OHV monitoring activity. Of the then 388 NPS park units, 256 initially responded.⁹ NPS asserts that the survey showed unauthorized OHV use in "several parks" and generally "less than significant" resource damage.¹⁰ Bluewater claims illegal OHV use in 92 (36%) of those reporting units and resource damage in 71 (28%). Meanwhile, on November 29, 2005, Bluewater, Wildlands Center for Preventing Roads, and the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) sued NPS and DOI in the District of Columbia U.S. District Court, alleging that OHVs constitute a "serious threat" to NPS resources which the agency failed to address. On March 21, 2007, Judge Royce Lamberth dismissed Bluewater from the case for lack of standing.¹¹ The remaining parties are reported to be working out final details of an out-of-court settlement.¹²

⁸ *Off-the-Track: America's National Parks under Siege* is available via the Bluewater Network website at [http://www.bluewaternet.org/reports/rep_pl_offroad_offtrack.pdf]. Bluewater's use of the term "off-road vehicle" (ORV) encompasses ATVs, four-wheel drive vehicles (jeeps, SUVs, etc.), and dune, sand, and swamp buggies. Two-wheeled vehicles (motorcycles) and snowmobiles are not included in Bluewater's definition. For purposes of this section, OHV and ORV are synonymous and have the same definition as used by Bluewater.

⁹ Park units continued to respond to the survey, with a final total of 310 NPS units completing it. (Phone conversation with Jerry Case, Regulations Program Manager, NPS, Jan. 30, 2008.)

¹⁰ Letter from Steve P. Martin, NPS Deputy Director of Operations, to Bluewater Network Executive Director Russell Long, May 3, 2005. Available via the Bluewater website at [<http://www.bluewaternet.org/npsorv/letterfromNPS.pdf>]. See also Bluewater's response to NPS, available at [<http://www.bluewaternet.org/npsorv/lettertoNPS.pdf>]. NPS provided copies of the initial 256 survey responses to Bluewater Network. (Phone conversation with NPS, Sept. 22, 2006.)

¹¹ See [https://ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2005cv2302-63] for the court Order and [https://ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2005cv2302-64] for Judge Lamberth's Memorandum Opinion.

¹² Phone conversation with Jerry Case, Regulations Program Manager, NPS, Jan. 30, 2008.

The NPS survey identified eight park units with authorized public OHV use and special regulations in place: Big Cypress National Preserve; Gateway and Lake Meredith National Recreation Areas (NRAs); and Assateague, Cape Cod, Fire Island, Gulf Islands, and Padre Island National Seashores. According to the agency, four additional units remain open to public OHV use while it conducts environmental studies and develops special regulations: Glen Canyon¹³ and Curecanti NRAs, and Cape Hatteras¹⁴ and Cape Lookout National Seashores.¹⁵ Special circumstances apply to two additional areas identified in the NPS survey, Little River Canyon National Preserve and Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area.¹⁶ Also, Lake Meredith NRA requires new regulations to expand current boundaries for OHV riders. NPS is encouraging OHV education via the websites of units permitting OHV use. The agency also is encouraging units with illegal OHV use to pursue enforcement actions. However, some believe NPS budgetary and staff constraints could limit enforcement effectiveness.¹⁷ Site-specific conflicts among various constituencies continue. For instance, there is ongoing disagreement at Big Cypress National Preserve over designated OHV trails within the Bear Island unit, the effects of OHV use on endangered Florida panthers and their habitat, and the representational composition of the advisory committee established to enable various stakeholders to put forth alternative approaches and recommendations for OHV management within the preserve. A coalition of conservation groups filed a lawsuit on December 21, 2007, in response to the opening of OHV trails in Bear Island. At Cape Hatteras National Seashore, environmental groups, represented on the advisory committee created to assist in the development of a long-term OHV management

¹³ 72 *Fed. Reg.* 50393 (Aug. 31, 2007). Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for an Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Arizona and Utah. See the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment website at [<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/projectHome.cfm?parkId=62&projectId=19520>] for details.

¹⁴ 72 *Fed. Reg.* 72316 (Dec. 20, 2007). Establishment of Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Off-Road Vehicle Management, Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The committee is to assist in the development of special regulations for off-road vehicle management at Cape Hatteras. On July 17, 2007, U.S. District Court Judge Terrance Boyle issued a Court Order indicating that off-road use at the Seashore does not comply with federal management requirements; however, the Order does not mandate restricting OHV access. See [<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/projectHome.cfm?parkId=358&projectId=10641>] for further information.

¹⁵ 72 *Fed. Reg.* 44178 (August 7, 2007). Notice of Intent to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for an Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan (ORV Management Plan) for Cape Lookout National Seashore, NC. For further information, see [<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/parkHome.cfm?parkId=359>].

¹⁶ NPS determined that Little River Canyon permits OHVs only on designated backcountry area multiple-use numbered roads serving hikers, horseback riders, ATVs, and four-wheel drive vehicles. This is not considered to be off-road use. For additional information, see [<http://www.nps.gov/liri/planyourvisit/atv.htm>]. Big South Fork is closed to recreational OHV riders and currently has no designated trails for them. For additional information, see [http://www.nps.gov/biso/upload/atv_use.pdf].

¹⁷ Letter to Steven P. Martin, NPS Deputy Director, from Robert D. Rosenbaum, Arnold & Porter LLP (on behalf of Bluewater Network et al.), June 13, 2005, available via the Bluewater website at [<http://www.bluewaternetwork.org/npsorv/lettertoNPS.pdf>].

plan, have sued NPS. In their complaint of October 18, 2007, the plaintiffs allege that the OHV use permitted under the existing interim NPS management plan fails to provide adequate protection for seashore resources, including rare turtle, avian, and plant species.¹⁸ Some have expressed concern that the lawsuit will disrupt the work of the advisory committee.

The NPS convened a workshop in March 2005 to discuss OHV management within two contexts — appropriate agency-wide OHV policies, and each park unit’s unique establishing purposes. Issues explored included what OHV management elements might best fit under a coordinated national management strategy; whether BLM and FS OHV strategies contain transferable elements; and what issues might be addressed via formal guidance from the NPS Director. The latter could include OHV monitoring protocols; consistent OHV incident reporting requirements; interim OHV use management guidelines for NPS units developing regulations; definitions of OHV, off-road, off-highway, routes, and areas; and clarifying regulations that define park roads. To date, no formal proposals have been issued.

Recreation was a key area of debate during an NPS rewrite of its management policies. On August 31, 2006, the NPS released the final version of its 2006 management policies, which guide management throughout the National Park System, including recreational uses. One much-discussed proposed change included in the initial draft would have required “balance” between conservation and enjoyment of park resources, although the final policy states that “conservation is to be predominant” in conservation/enjoyment conflicts (§ 1.4.3). NPS rewrote its draft policies extensively based on analysis of over 45,000 comments, ultimately retaining in large part the 2001 policy language and its emphasis on conservation. The 2006 document cites OHV language in 36 C.F.R. § 4.10(b) that limits OHV use to four specific types of NPS units, restrictive language not included in the 2001 edition. Park and environmental groups generally are supportive of the final management policies but cautious about future policy implementation and enforcement. Policy critics view the document as favoring conservation over recreation and are uncertain how the preservation and protection of natural soundscapes may affect motorized recreation. However, some critics point to new language that promotes public collaborative relationships between NPS and gateway communities, among other provisions, as a positive step for incorporating local views on the importance of recreation to the economy of these communities.

Legislative Activity. General legislation on OHV use in NPS units has not been introduced in the 110th Congress to date. One measure enacted in the 109th Congress (P.L. 109-362, §10) affects OHV use in a particular area and is illustrative of OHV controversies. The law seeks to guarantee truck access to designated beaches within California’s Redwood National and State Parks for traditional commercial surf fishing, overriding a park policy phasing out beach driving permits. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for authorized vehicle access, limits the number of permits to the total number of valid permits held on the act’s

¹⁸ See [http://www.southernenvironment.org/lawlibrary/coast/2007-10-18_hatteras.pdf] for a copy of the complaint. Information on current OHV policies at Cape Hatteras National Seashore is available at [<http://www.nps.gov/archive/caha/bdriv.htm>].

date of enactment, and provides that the permits “shall be perpetual.” Local commercial fishermen have opposed park policies restricting trucks on beaches where they traditionally netted and loaded catches of smelt. Some critics, however, assert that vehicular traffic can diminish visitor enjoyment of the park’s natural values, conflicts with establishing legislative language to preserve the park’s coastal redwood forests and associated streams and seashores for such enjoyment,¹⁹ and may contradict existing regulations.

Snowmobiles on NPS Land (by Kori Calvert)

Background. Proposals to regulate recreational snowmobile use in NPS units have been controversial, with debate often mirroring the preservation/use conflict within the NPS mission. On April 27, 2000, the NPS announced the strict enforcement of long-standing regulations on snowmobile use, which would have prohibited recreational snowmobiling throughout the National Park System. Limited exceptions to this enforcement policy included Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, park units in Alaska, Voyageurs National Park (MN), and access to private land within or adjacent to a park. By July 2000, the Interior Department had modified its strict enforcement stance: snowmobiles would not be banned in the 43 park units permitting such use prior to the April 2000 announcement, pending formal rulemaking and public comment. To date, NPS has taken no further action on a general policy for snowmobiles.

Administrative Actions. Since the summer of 2000, regulatory and judicial actions to restrict or allow snowmobile use have centered on Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and the connecting John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway. The Clinton Administration issued final rules to incrementally eliminate snowmobile use in these three park units, with limited exceptions, in favor of multi-passenger “snowcoaches” by the 2003-2004 winter season.²⁰ However, a June 2001 Bush Administration lawsuit settlement with the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association (ISMA) and the State of Wyoming required NPS to revisit the snowmobile ban and consider any additional information on “cleaner, quieter” snowmobile technology. The new NPS final rule reversed the snowmobile ban in favor of daily entry limits, use of trained guides, snowmobile emission standards, and an “adaptive management strategy” allowing park managers to take remedial action if monitoring indicates unacceptable impacts from air and noise pollution.²¹

Subsequent legal challenges effectively split the 2003-2004 winter season, with each sub-season managed under different rules with significantly different limits on daily snowmobile entries. These conflicting rulings created confusion for park visitors, local communities, and businesses, with many unsure whether they could visit the park in winter and what winter use rules were in effect. Subsequently, NPS issued a final rule to implement a temporary winter use management plan effective

¹⁹ P.L. 90-545, Oct. 2, 1968.

²⁰ 66 *Fed. Reg.* 7260 (Jan. 22, 2001).

²¹ 68 *Fed. Reg.* 69267 (Dec. 11, 2003).

for three winter seasons, through 2006-2007.²² The interim rule's intent was to provide certainty to gateway communities, businesses, and park visitors while NPS completed long-term environmental impact analyses of motorized oversnow vehicles on the three area parks and developed a new long-term plan to manage winter recreational use. The temporary rule expired at the conclusion of the 2006-2007 winter season. Without a new rule and winter use plan in place for the 2007-2008 winter season, snowmobiles and snowcoaches would be prohibited. However, on September 24, 2007, NPS released its Winter Use Plans Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) evaluating seven alternative plans for snowmobile and snowcoach winter use management.²³ A subsequent Record of Decision (ROD, signed November 20, 2007) and a final rule promulgated on December 13, 2007, provide long-term regulatory guidance for managing snowmobile and snowcoach use within the three area parks.²⁴

For the 2007-2008 winter season, the new NPS plan mirrors the interim rule it replaces, continuing with 720 guided best available technology (BAT) snowmobiles per day in Yellowstone, and combined daily access for 140 snowmobiles in Grand Teton and the Rockefeller Parkway — most with BAT emission and noise pollution standards but no guiding requirements. The plan caps daily Yellowstone snowcoach entries at 78 and maintains the requirement limiting all snowcoach and snowmobile travel to existing park roads groomed for their use. Avalanche control operations will continue, allowing motorized oversnow travel via Sylvan Pass near Yellowstone's East Entrance.

The final rule mandates more restrictive measures beginning with the 2008-2009 winter season, but also allows park management to use “adaptive management” to adjust snowmobile and snowcoach numbers up or down based on impact monitoring. It allows 540 BAT snowmobiles and 83 snowcoaches per day in Yellowstone, all commercially guided, with no more than 11 snowmobiles per group, including the guide. A combined 65 snowmobiles — 62% with BAT requirements but none with guiding requirements — may access Grand Teton and the Rockefeller Parkway daily. By the 2011-2012 season, all snowcoaches must meet BAT emission and sound level requirements. Sylvan Pass will continue to remain open to motorized oversnow travel within specified limitations. Beginning with the 2008-2009 season, avalanche hazard reduction operations will cease. The pass will be open or closed to oversnow travel, both motorized and non-motorized, based on avalanche forecasting safety/danger determinations. However, NPS agrees to work cooperatively with the state of Wyoming, Park County, and the town of Cody to reach consensus by June 1, 2008 (and promulgate new regulations, if necessary) on avalanche mitigation and

²² 69 *Fed. Reg.* 65348 (Nov. 10, 2004). Available via the NPS website at [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/planvisit/winteruse/fedregfinalrule11-10.pdf>].

²³ 72 *Fed. Reg.* 54456 (Sept 25, 2007). The FEIS and additional winter use documentation are available at [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/planvisit/winteruse/index.htm>]. The FEIS summary is at [http://www.nps.gov/yell/planyourvisit/upload/summary_updated9-12-07.pdf].

²⁴ See 72 *Fed. Reg.* 70892 (Dec. 13, 2007), available via the Yellowstone website at [http://www.nps.gov/yell/planyourvisit/upload/rod_final.pdf], and 72 *Fed. Reg.* 70781 (Dec. 13, 2007) at [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/parkmgmt/upload/finalrule13Dec2007.pdf>] for the ROD and final rule, respectively.

safe oversnow travel via Sylvan Pass. NPS also will conduct a five-year study on the effects of road grooming on bison movements within Yellowstone.²⁵

According to NPS, “[t]his rule strikes a balance between the use of snowmobiles and snowcoaches in the Parks and is designed to protect against the adverse impacts that occurred from the historical types and numbers of snowmobiles used.”²⁶ However, winter recreational use and its surrounding legal controversies remain contentious. For example, in an October 29, 2007, letter to NPS Director Mary Bomar, 86 Members of Congress called for a phase-out of snowmobiles in favor of multi-passenger snowcoaches.²⁷ Further, NPS once again is a defendant in three dueling lawsuits filed in two different federal district court jurisdictions by snowmobile advocates and opponents; none seek an emergency injunction. The State of Wyoming, filing in the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming on December 13, 2007, seeks to overturn and increase the reduced number of daily snowmobile entries, and contests the 100% commercial guiding requirement and the management plan for Sylvan Pass.²⁸ In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, two separate sets of environmental groups are challenging the new winter use plan, calling for reinstatement of the snowmobile ban set forth in the Clinton Administration rule.²⁹

The final NPS management policies released on August 31, 2006, added new language to cover both snowmobiles and oversnow vehicles (§ 8.2.3.2). They state that, outside Alaska, special regulations are required to designate snowmobile and oversnow vehicle routes after park planning determines such use to be appropriate. Designated routes are limited to those used by motorboats and motorized vehicles in other seasons.

Legislative Activity. The FY2008 Interior appropriations bill (S. 1696, § 116), as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (S.Rept. 110-91), directed NPS to keep Yellowstone’s interim snowmobile use rule in force throughout the 2007-2008 winter season. The stipulation assured continuity should implementation of a new NPS final winter use plan be delayed. However, the FY2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 110-161) did not include such language. NPS issued a Record of Decision (ROD) and final rule within the necessary time parameters. Lawsuits challenging the NPS ROD did not request preliminary injunctions, allowing local operations to continue uninterrupted throughout the 2007-2008 winter season. In their Explanatory Statement, the Appropriations Committees stated their belief

²⁵ For additional information, see the Yellowstone National Park Winter Planning website at [http://www.eenews.net/features/documents/2007/12/17/document_pm_01.pdf]. For background information on snowmobiles in NPS park units generally, see CRS Report RL31149, *Snowmobiles: Environmental Standards and Access to National Parks*, by James E. McCarthy.

²⁶ 72 *Fed. Reg.* 70781.

²⁷ See [http://holt.house.gov/pdf/Yellowstone_letter.pdf].

²⁸ *Wyoming v. U.S. Department of the Interior et al.*, D. Wyo., No. 07-CV-319B.

²⁹ *Greater Yellowstone Coalition et al. v. Kempthorne*, D.D.C., No. 07-CV-2111; and *National Parks Conservation Association v. U.S. Department of the Interior*, D.D.C.

that this was in the best interest of all parties.³⁰ The 110th Congress also included language in the FY2007 Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution (P.L. 110-5, § 20516) to keep the NPS Yellowstone interim rule in effect throughout the 2006-2007 winter use season. Such language was meant to ensure that judicial rulings could not deny snowmobiles entry. Earlier legislation contained similar provisions beginning with the 2004-2005 season.

Aircraft Overflights at NPS Sites (by Carol Hardy Vincent)

Background. The NPS is to provide for the public enjoyment of parklands while protecting resources, while the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls airspace and aircraft overflights. This has created a conflict between resource management and aviation access authorities and their constituencies. Grand Canyon National Park has been the focal point of a conflict between groups seeking to limit overflights of national parks due to concerns about noise and safety, and air tour operators whose economic stability, with ripple effects on local businesses, may depend on providing overflights. The National Parks Overflights Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-91) directed NPS to recommend a flight control plan for Grand Canyon that would provide a “substantial restoration of the natural quiet” and prohibited flights below the canyon’s rim. It required an NPS study of the effects of all aircraft overflights, which was submitted to Congress in 1994.³¹

The National Parks Air Tour Management Act of 2000 (Title VIII, P.L. 106-181, hereafter “Air Tour Act”) regulates commercial air tours at other park units. It requires the FAA and NPS to create management plans for air tours at individual park units and within a half-mile of their boundaries. Each plan could prohibit or limit air tours, such as by route and altitude restrictions. The act also required the FAA to establish “reasonably achievable” requirements for quiet aircraft technology for the Grand Canyon within one year and to designate, by rule, Grand Canyon routes or corridors for aircraft and helicopters using quiet technology. Quiet aircraft would not be subject to existing caps on canyon overflights.

Administrative Actions. Several actions have been taken to achieve the substantial restoration of natural quiet at Grand Canyon. First, a *limitations rule* capped the annual number of commercial air tour overflights at Grand Canyon.³² Second, the *airspace rule* expanded flight-free zones and restrictive routing over the canyon. East-end Special Flight Rules Area (SFRA) airspace changes were delayed until February 20, 2011.³³ Third, the FAA issued a final rule establishing a standard for quiet technology for certain aircraft in commercial air tour operations over Grand

³⁰ *Congressional Record*, Dec. 17, 2007, H16130-H16131.

³¹ U.S. Dept. of the Interior, National Park Service, *Report to Congress: Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System*, listed under the topic heading “NPS Documents” at [<http://www.nps.gov/archive/grca/overflights/documents/index.htm>].

³² 65 *Fed. Reg.* 17708 (April 4, 2000), effective May 4, 2000.

³³ 71 *Fed. Reg.* 9439 (Feb. 24, 2006).

Canyon.³⁴ The rule identifies which aircraft meet the standard. In future rulemaking, the FAA is expected to address the routes or corridors for commercial air tour operations that use the quiet technology. Fourth, data on natural ambient sound levels are being collected and used, together with air tour reported flight operations data and radar tracking data, to model air tour traffic and aircraft noise at Grand Canyon. The model is being used to measure success in restoring natural quiet.

The FAA and NPS published a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on options that could be taken to restore natural quiet at Grand Canyon.³⁵ The agencies are developing a draft EIS. They currently are considering seven alternatives, including the status quo, with a range of options for restoring natural quiet while allowing for a viable air tour industry. Changes under consideration include altered flight free zones, different altitudes and locations of air tour routes, quiet aircraft technology incentives, and limitations on the number and timing of flights.

Other regulatory actions affect commercial air tours at park units. The Air Tour Act final rule³⁶ requires air tour operators to apply for authority to fly over national park and abutting tribal lands. The FAA received applications for commercial air tours over 106 of the 391 park units, and has granted interim operating authority to all applicants. Application triggers development of an Air Tour Management Plan (ATMP) by the FAA and NPS for each unit where none exists.³⁷ The purpose of a plan is to mitigate or prevent any harm by commercial air tours to natural and cultural resources, visitor experiences, and tribal lands. Development of an ATMP requires an environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. §§4321-4370f). The FAA and NPS currently are developing their first ATMPs for five areas. On September 30, 2005, the FAA and NPS released an implementation plan for the development of the ATMPs that sets out the roles and responsibilities of the two agencies in developing ATMPs. The agencies have revised the implementation plan to make clarifications and incorporate information learned from ongoing development of ATMPs.

The Air Tour Act required the FAA and the NPS to establish an advisory group to provide continuing advice regarding commercial air tours over and near national parks. Accordingly, the agencies established the National Parks Overflights Advisory Group, composed of representatives of general aviation, air tour operations, environmental groups, and Native American tribes. The group is co-chaired by the FAA Administrator and the NPS Director or their designees. It meets one to three times per year, and notices of its meetings are published in the *Federal Register*. The group provides advice on a range of issues, including (1) implementation of the Air Tour Act, (2) quiet aircraft technology for use in commercial air tours over parks, (3) safety and environmental issues related to air tours.

³⁴ 70 *Fed. Reg.* 16084 (March 29, 2005).

³⁵ 71 *Fed. Reg.* 4192 (Jan. 25, 2006).

³⁶ 67 *Fed. Reg.* 65661 (Oct. 25, 2002).

³⁷ The FAA provides information on the National Parks Air Tour Management Program via their website at [<http://www.atmp.faa.gov/default.htm>].

A January 2006 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report addressed the impact of the delay in implementation of the Air Tour Act.³⁸ The report concluded that the delay has had little effect on park units, but has limited the ability of tour operators to make major business decisions. The agency identified four issues for Congress and the agencies to address to improve implementation, relating to the lack of flexibility for determining which parks need plans, an absence of NPS funding for plan development, limited ability to verify and enforce the number of air tours, and inadequate FAA guidance on the act's safety requirements.

The FAA issued a final rule to provide safety standards for commercial air tours nationally, including over Grand Canyon and other park units.³⁹ The rule seeks to increase air tour safety through measures including requirements for enhanced passenger briefings, provision of life preservers and helicopter floats for certain over-water flights, and development and compliance with a helicopter performance plan for each commercial air tour.

As part of an overall review of its management policies, the NPS has made some changes to policies on overflights and aviation uses (§ 8.4) and on soundscape management (§ 4.9). The new policies, issued August 31, 2006, replaced "adverse effects" of overflights with "unacceptable impacts" in a number of places. Some regard this change as potentially easing restrictions on overflights. One proposal would have deleted existing language stating that the NPS "will preserve, to the greatest extent possible, the natural soundscapes of parks," but the final policies retained this soundscape language.

Legislative Activity. Provisions of broad aviation legislation (H.R. 1356, H.R. 2881, S. 1076, and S. 1300) would affect commercial air tours over park units. They seek to expedite and streamline agency actions, in part because of the difficulty in completing ATMPs. H.R. 1356, H.R. 2881, and S. 1076 are similar. They include provisions allowing that in lieu of an ATMP, the NPS Director and FAA Administrator could enter into a voluntary agreement with a commercial air tour operator that would govern commercial air tours over a park unit. Another change would exempt park units with 50 or fewer annual air tour flights from the requirement for an ATMP or voluntary agreement, although the NPS Director could disallow an exemption. Other provisions would establish reporting requirements for commercial air tour operators, and provide for more interim operating authority because interim conditions have prevailed for longer than had been anticipated. H.R. 2881 passed the House and currently is on the Senate Calendar. S. 1300 also contains provisions on voluntary agreements, exemptions from air tour requirements, reporting requirements, and operating authority but the provisions differ from those in the other bills. Further, S. 1300 contains additional sections, such as those on fees and safety guidance. It was reported by committee on August 3, 2007, and is on the

³⁸ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *National Parks Air Tour Management Act: More Flexibility and Better Enforcement Needed*, GAO-06-263, (Washington, DC: GPO, Jan. 2006), 64 p. Available on the GAO website at [<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06263.pdf>].

³⁹ *72 Fed. Reg.* 6884 (Feb. 13, 2007). The rule was effective on March 15, 2007, except that certain provisions became effective on September 11, 2007.

Senate calendar. (For additional information, see “The Air Tour Management Program” section in CRS Report RL33920).

A May 2006 GAO report addressed NPS collection of air tour fees.⁴⁰ The report determined that some, but not all, fees have been collected from air tour operators at the three national parks where fees are charged: Grand Canyon, Haleakala, and Hawaii Volcanoes. It concluded that the ability of the NPS to collect fees is hindered because the agency cannot verify the number of tours over the parks, it cannot effectively enforce compliance, and the two key laws have different geographic applicability. The report stated that Congress should consider reconciling the geographic applicability of the relevant laws. It further recommended that the Secretary of Transportation direct the FAA to take certain actions to ensure that the NPS receives information on air tour operations at Grand Canyon, and report to Congress on the likely effects on air tour operators of air tour fees, as required under the Air Tour Act.

Personal Watercraft (PWC) at NPS Sites (by Kori Calvert)

Background. PWC are high-speed, very shallow-draft, and highly maneuverable watercraft “operated by a person or persons sitting, standing, or kneeling on the vessel rather than within the confines of the hull” (36 C.F.R. § 1.4). Often used to perform stunt-like maneuvers, PWC include watercraft known by their brand and generic names as Jet Ski®, Sea-Doo®, Surf-jet®, water sled, wet jet, Wavejammer, Wetbike, and WaveRunner®. While PWC represent a small segment of the recreational boat market — the National Marine Manufacturers Association (NMMA) estimates 1.22 million PWC in use in 2006⁴¹ — the number of PWC accidents has raised concerns. Critics of PWC use cite environmental issues, including noise, air, and water pollution; damage to land, plants, and wildlife; and public safety. Supporters of access for PWC contend that technological advances enable manufacturers to produce cleaner, more efficient machines, and point to the economic benefits to communities serving users. PWC users assert that in park units that allow motorized boating generally, PWC also should be allowed. Recent controversies have focused on regulatory actions that would restrict recreational use or “access” of these vehicles, often in specific park units.

Administrative Actions. The NPS currently is evaluating PWC use in several of its 391 units. That effort began in 2000 when the agency issued a rule prohibiting PWC use in 66 of the 87 units where motorized boats were allowed.⁴² The rule allowed PWC use to continue until April 22, 2002, at the remaining 21 units while the NPS evaluated whether to permanently authorize PWC use and develop

⁴⁰ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *National Parks Air Tour Fees: Effective Verification and Enforcement Are Needed to Improve Compliance*, GAO-06-468, (Washington, DC: GPO, May 2006), 37 p. Available on the GAO website at [<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06468.pdf>].

⁴¹ See [<http://www.nmma.org/facts/boatingstats/2006/files/populationstats3.asp>], Table 1.3, “Recreational Boats in Use by Type,” from the NNMA 2006 Recreational Boating Statistical Abstract.

⁴² 65 *Fed. Reg.* 15077 (March 21, 2000); effective April 20, 2000.

special regulations. The rule recognized that certain NRAs, such as Lake Mead and Glen Canyon, might choose to continue PWC use because their establishing legislation emphasized motorized water-based recreation as a primary purpose. An April 2001 negotiated settlement of a lawsuit by Bluewater Network and Earth Island Institute over the PWC rule prohibited PWC from the 21 areas unless the NPS initiated park-specific rules and environmental assessments. PWC could continue to operate during the rulemaking process, but only until specified “grace period” deadlines.

The NPS prohibited PWC use (effective April 22, 2002) in 5 of the 21 areas that completed an environmental review process and also favored PWC bans: the Cape Cod and Cumberland Island National Seashores, Delaware Water Gap and Whiskeytown NRAs, and Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. For 13 other units, NPS authorized PWC use in designated areas: in 2003, at Lake Mead and Glen Canyon (Lake Powell) NRAs, and Assateague National Seashore; in 2004, at Lake Meredith, Lake Roosevelt, Amistad, and Chickasaw NRAs; in 2005, at Bighorn Canyon NRA, Fire Island National Seashore, and Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore; and in 2006, at Gulf Islands and Cape Lookout National Seashores and Curecanti NRA. The NPS has proposed rules to allow PWC in one unit, Gateway NRA (February 24, 2006). Padre Island National Seashore and Big Thicket National Preserve have been closed to PWC pending completion of environmental assessments and rulemaking.⁴³ NPS believes it unlikely that either unit will pursue rulemaking to open to PWC.⁴⁴ Meanwhile, a coalition of environmental groups is seeking reinstatement of PWC bans at three units: Gulf Islands and Cape Lookout National Seashores and Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.⁴⁵

The 2006 NPS management policies (§ 8.2.3.3) state that personal watercraft use is generally prohibited (36 C.F.R. § 3.24) but may be allowed via special regulation *if* such use has been identified as “an appropriate use that will not result in unacceptable impacts.” This revised language could be regarded as a shift in emphasis from the 2001 management policies, which prohibited PWC use *unless* such use is confirmed “appropriate for a specific park.”

Legislative Activity. No general legislation on PWC use has been introduced in the 110th Congress. In the 109th Congress, the House Appropriations Committee included report language accompanying the FY2007 Interior appropriations bill (H.R. 5386) urging NPS to complete PWC rulemakings “in an efficient and timely

⁴³ Padre Island’s 2006 PWC environmental assessment evaluates three alternative courses of action and identifies the no-action alternative continuing the PWC ban as preferred. See [<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=86&projectId=12571&documentID=13889>].

⁴⁴ Phone conversation with Jerry Case, Regulations Program Manager, NPS, Jan. 30, 2008.

⁴⁵ A copy of the Notice of Intent to Sue (Dec. 5, 2007) is available online at [<http://wilderness.org/Library/Documents/upload/Notice-of-Intent-to-Sue-regarding-Jetsk-i-use-at-Gulf-Islands-and-Cape-Lookout-National-Seashores-and-Pictured-Rocks-National-Seashore.pdf>].

manner.”⁴⁶ This language, however, was not included in the FY2007 Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution (P.L. 110-5). A March 15, 2006, House Government Reform subcommittee hearing examined NPS rulemaking efforts governing PWC use, status of park-specific rules, and reasons for and impacts of rulemaking delays.⁴⁷

Motorized Recreation on BLM Land (by Carol Hardy Vincent)

Background. The proximity of BLM lands to many areas of population growth in the West has contributed to an increase in recreation on some BLM lands. BLM lands are used for diverse forms of recreation, including hunting, fishing, visiting cultural and natural sites, birdwatching, hiking, picnicking, camping, boating, mountain biking, and off-highway vehicle driving. The growing and diverse nature of recreation on BLM lands has increased the challenge of managing different types of recreation, such as low impact (e.g., hiking) and high impact (e.g., OHV) uses. It also has increased the challenge of managing recreation and other land uses. For instance, in some areas recreation and energy development have come in conflict, with hunters, fishermen, outfitters and guides, and other recreationists at odds with energy producing interests seeking to maintain or increase energy development on public lands. Overall, access to BLM lands for a variety of recreational purposes is viewed as important for fostering public health, public support for land management, and a stable economic base for communities that depend on recreation and tourism. Recreational access also has enhanced interest in protecting the ecological integrity of federal lands from environmental harm as a result of recreational use.

Motorized OHV use, including use of dirt bikes and all-terrain vehicles, is a major recreational use of BLM lands that has been controversial. Controversy exists in various areas throughout the West, such as the San Rafael Swell in Southern Utah, the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area in Southern California, and the Arizona Strip in Northern Arizona. While motorized user groups often have opposed restrictions on OHV use, many environmentalists have been concerned about harm to natural and cultural resources. In some areas, OHV use may conflict with other types of recreation, such as hiking, that seek quiet and solitude on agency lands. There are also differing views on how effectively OHV authorities are being enforced. While BLM employs a variety of means of enforcement, including monitoring, law enforcement, signing and mapping, and emergency closures of routes, enforcement may be impeded in some locations due to their remoteness, insufficient signs, inadequate staff and resources, and other factors.

Administrative Actions. Guidance on OHV use on BLM lands is provided in law, executive orders, and agency regulations and policies. Under agency

⁴⁶ See [[http://www.congress.gov/cgi-lis/cpquery/R?cp109:FLD010:@1\(hr465\)](http://www.congress.gov/cgi-lis/cpquery/R?cp109:FLD010:@1(hr465))], H.Rept. 109-465, p. 45.

⁴⁷ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, *Taking on Water: The National Park Service's Stalled Rulemaking Effort on Personal Watercraft*. Available via GPO at [http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/ufseftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.128&filename=27092.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/109_house_hearings].

regulations (43 C.F.R. § 8340), BLM has been designating public lands as open, limited, or closed to OHV use. As of October 31, 2006, the following designations had been made: open, where OHV use is permitted anywhere, 80.9 million acres (37% of designated area); limited, where OHV use is in some way restricted, 127.0 million acres (58%); and closed, where OHV use is prohibited, 11.6 million acres (5%). The remaining 41.2 million acres of BLM land (mostly in Alaska) are not currently designated. Other regulations govern OHV use in particular areas. For instance, on August 18, 2005, BLM issued final supplementary rules for its lands in Oregon and Washington, which include guidance on OHV use.

BLM manages transportation on its lands through a process described as Comprehensive Travel and Transportation Management.⁴⁸ Goals include providing varied transportation routes for access to BLM lands and providing areas for a variety of motorized and non-motorized forms of recreation. Travel and transportation management plans are developed for particular areas. In addition, BLM has issued two national strategies dealing with transportation on its lands. The *National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands*⁴⁹ has multiple purposes, including to guide land managers in resolving OHV issues; to promote consistency of OHV decision-making; to highlight needed staff and funding for OHV management; to reduce conflicts among land users; to promote responsible OHV use and reduce habitat degradation; and to lead to an update of OHV regulations (which has not occurred to date). The *National Mountain Bicycling Strategic Action Plan*⁵⁰ addresses mountain bicycling and other muscle-powered mechanical transport.

BLM revised its land use planning handbook in 2005 regarding motorized and non-motorized recreation.⁵¹ The agency makes OHV designations during the planning process, on an area-by-area basis, and such designations often have been contentious and complex. The agency is in the midst of a multi-year effort to develop and update land use plans, because many plans do not currently address OHV use and other relatively recent issues. For instance, six of the eleven BLM field offices in Utah are developing land use plans for lands in those areas. OHVs are a major issue being addressed as part of that process, and the efforts are expected to reduce the acreage open to cross-country travel, according to BLM. In some cases, the BLM and FS jointly address OHV use on their lands. For instance, an interagency plan governs OHV use on lands in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Joint management approaches, where federal lands are intermingled, can promote consistency and public understanding of OHV guidance. However, BLM and FS lands are different, and they are governed by separate authorities, making complete consistency on vehicular travel management difficult to achieve.

⁴⁸ Information on BLM's travel management program is on the agency's website at [http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/Recreation/recreation_national/travel_management.html].

⁴⁹ The BLM Strategy and related documents are available at [<http://www.blm.gov/ohv/>].

⁵⁰ Available at [http://www.blm.gov/mountain_biking/].

⁵¹ Available at [http://www.blm.gov/nhp/200/wo210/landuse_hb.pdf].

Legislative Activity. The BLM appropriation for recreation management generally for FY2008 was \$67.9 million. A focus of the recreation program in FY2008 is developing and implementing travel management plans, which identify and designate roads and trails for motorized use. The FY2008 appropriation was a \$4.2 million (7%) increase over the FY2007 level of \$63.7 million and a \$2.8 million (4%) increase over BLM's request of \$65.1 million for FY2008. Both the full House and the Senate Appropriations Committee had originally approved increases for recreation management over the President's request. Specifically, the House-passed bill included \$69.1 million, while the Senate Appropriations Committee reported a bill containing \$70.2 million.

Some pending measures would affect OHV use in particular areas. For instance, H.R. 222 contains provisions related to OHV use in central Idaho. They include conveying BLM land to the State of Idaho to establish a motorized recreation park, establishing a special management area on certain BLM and FS lands to provide opportunities for motorized and other recreation (together with other uses), and authorizing up to \$1.0 million for the Secretary of Agriculture to grant to the State of Idaho for the off-road motor vehicle program.

Other legislation seeks to establish the Sacramento River National Recreation Area, consisting of 17,000 acres of BLM land in California. H.R. 1241 seeks to preserve and enhance recreational opportunities and to promote local economic development through recreation. S. 811, and provisions of S. 493 and H.R. 860, seek to conserve, protect, and enhance resources in the area. All four bills call for the development of a management plan for the area within three years of enactment. BLM currently has one national recreation area in Alaska.

A March 27, 2007 hearing of the House Natural Resources Committee explored the conflict between recreation and energy development on federal lands. The hearing focused on how to balance fishing and hunting with energy development in the West. Several witnesses expressed concern that the extent of energy development is having negative impacts on wildlife and habitat and access to federal lands for hunting and fishing. One witness described energy industry efforts to make development more compatible with sportsmen's interests.

Motorized Recreation in the National Forests (by Ross W. Gorte)

Background. The national forests are managed by the USDA Forest Service (FS) for a variety of uses, including many types of recreation — sightseeing, OHV use, backpacking, etc. — while preserving the productivity of the lands. Recreation use continues to grow, with OHV use among the fastest growing uses.⁵²

The various uses and values of the national forests sometimes conflict with one another. For example, timber harvesting and OHV use may affect birdwatching and sightseeing, and can degrade water quality in certain settings. Decisions about what uses are allowed, and when and where, are made in comprehensive land and resource

⁵² *Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation in the United States, Regions and States* (USDA-FS Southern Research Station, June 2005), at [<http://www.treearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/21307>].

management plans prepared for each unit of the National Forest System, and at the project level. Because of multiple efforts to modify the planning regulations, many plan revisions have been delayed. Much of the attention has been focused on motorized recreation, because of the potentially significant impacts of motorized recreation on other values. Another issue involves conflicts between recreation uses (notably hunting and fishing) and other activities, such as energy extraction.

Administrative Actions. Federal guidance on OHV use in E.O. 11644 and E.O. 11989 was incorporated into FS regulations, at 36 C.F.R. Part 295. Despite this guidance, not all forest plans have identified areas as open or closed to OHVs, and local practices as to OHV use vary. In 2004, the FS Chief identified *unmanaged recreation* — “increasing use of the national forests for outdoor activities ... , including the use of off-highway vehicles” — as a threat to the nation’s forests and grasslands. In particular, OHV use has created many unauthorized roads and trails, which can be unsafe and harmful to other resources, according to the FS. The FS finalized regulations to *require* forest plans to identify a system of roads, trails, and areas for motorized vehicle use and prohibit the use of OHVs and other motorized vehicles outside the designated system.⁵³ The FS has proposed a revision to the *FS Manual* on travel management and travel planning to be consistent with these regulations.

Opinions are divided over the importance and impact of the regulations. Some assert that the regulations do not go far enough, preferring that all OHV uses be prohibited in the national forests, because OHVs can (and sometimes do) damage national forest lands and resources. Others counter that the regulations penalize the majority of OHV users that obey the current rules and restrict off-highway uses at a time when other landowners and other federal and state agencies are reducing recreational access to their lands. The conflict between interests may be escalating; the FS cancelled a public meeting on the Bitterroot National Forest (MT) travel plan after a threat of violence at one meeting.⁵⁴

Conflicts have arisen between hunting, fishing, and other types of recreation and energy development on federal lands. For instance, environmental and wildlife and fish groups have challenged various efforts to lease federal areas for oil and gas exploration and development.⁵⁵ Concerns typically focus on the impacts of oil and gas development on wildlife-related recreation, and the difficulties for interests other than the energy industry to provide input regarding the location, timing, and stipulations for development. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58) expanded the opportunities for energy development on federal lands, which could increase potential conflicts. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has

⁵³ 70 *Fed. Reg.* 68264-68291 (Nov. 9, 2005). See also the FS Travel Management & Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Program at [<http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/ohv/>].

⁵⁴ “Forest Service cancels meeting on Bitterroot,” *Missoulian.com* (Jan. 11, 2008), available at [<http://www.missoulian.com/articles/2008/01/11/news/local/znews03.txt>].

⁵⁵ See, for example, Trout Unlimited, *Fact Sheet: Gas and Oil Development on Western Public Lands*, at [<http://www.tu.org/site/pp.asp?c=7dJEKTNuFmG&b=295729>]; and Natural Resources Defense Council, *Broad Coalition Sends Message to BLM: Do Oil & Gas Right*, at [<http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/040204.asp>].

noted that the public has opportunities to comment on and to challenge leasing decisions, but that the agencies do not maintain data to assess the impact of these challenges.⁵⁶

The FY2009 FS budget again proposed cutting recreation funds. Recreation management would be funded at \$237.0 million, a \$25.6 million (10%) reduction from the FY2008 level of \$262.6 million. Trails funding would be \$50.0 million, \$26.3 million (34%) below the FY2008 level of \$76.4 million.

Legislative Activity. The FY2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 110-161) largely restored FS recreation and trails funding compared to the Administration's FY2008 request. Recreation management was funded at \$262.6 million, below the House- and Senate-passed levels (after the 1.56% across-the-board cut), but above FY2007 and \$31.6 million (14%) above the request. For trails in the National Forest System, the act provided \$76.4 million, again below the House- and Senate-passed levels, but above FY2007 and \$10.0 million (15%) above the request. The conference agreement reduced trail maintenance funding from FY2007 by \$4.7 million (9%) and increased trail construction funding by \$7.7 million (33%).

No general legislation on recreational activities in national forests has been introduced. Various bills address recreation in specific areas. For example, H.R. 222 (Central Idaho Economic Development and Recreation Act of 2007) would establish the Boulder-White Clouds Management Area. H.R. 707 (Chattahoochee National Forest Act of 2007) would create the Mountaintown National Scenic Area. S. 647 (Lewis and Clark Mount Hood Wilderness Act of 2007) would designate the Mount Hood National Recreation Area, and Title IX addresses recreational use, fees, and oversight for the region. Most such area-specific provisions are included in bills that would designate wilderness areas; such bills are identified in a table in the "Wilderness" section of CRS Report RL33792, *Federal Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service: Issues for the 110th Congress*.

The National Trails System (by Sandra L. Johnson)

Background. The National Trails System Act (P.L. 90-543), authorizing the National Trails System (NTS), became law on October 2, 1968.⁵⁷ The federal portion of the trails system consists of 25 national trails (8 scenic and 17 historic trails, both of which must be designated by Congress) covering more than 50,000 miles, over 1,000 recreation trails, and 2 connecting and side trails. Issues involve the funding, quality, and quantity of trails; land acquisition for trails; and the creation of a new category of trails.

⁵⁶ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Oil and Gas Development: Challenges to Agency Decisions and Opportunities for BLM to Standardize Data Collection*, GAO-05-124 (Washington, DC: Nov. 2004).

⁵⁷ See [<http://www.nps.gov/nts/legislation.html>] for establishing legislation (P.L. 90-543, as amended through P.L. 109-418, Dec. 21, 2006). For additional background information on the National Trails System, see [<http://www.nps.gov/nts/>].

Administrative Actions. On June 2, 2007, the Secretary of the Interior announced the designation of 40 new National Recreation Trails (NRTs).⁵⁸ Since 2001, the Bush Administration has designated 204 National Recreation Trails, totaling more than 7,800 miles. These designations do not require an act of Congress and are part of an ongoing effort to promote community partnerships and to foster innovative ways to encourage physical fitness.

BLM manages more miles of National Historic Trails than any other federal agency. On February 13, 2006, BLM released its first National Scenic and Historic Trails Strategy and Work Plan for congressionally-designated trails under its jurisdiction.⁵⁹ The 10-year plan provides guidance to establish a coordinated and consistent trails-focused administrative infrastructure; develop national policies to protect and sustain trail resources within BLM’s multiple-use mandate; manage trail resources to enhance visitor experiences and promote “appropriate public access”; and maintain and advance BLM’s partnerships with trail organizations and other agencies.

Legislative Activity. H.R. 74 has been introduced to add National Discovery Trails as a new category of long-distance trails within the National Trails System, and designate the American Discovery Trail (ADT) as the nation’s first coast-to-coast National Discovery Trail. The ADT would connect several national scenic, historic, and recreation trails, as well as many other local and regional trails. The 104th through the 109th Congresses considered, but did not enact, similar legislation. Two *willing seller* bills (S. 169, H.R. 1847) reintroduced in the 110th Congress would provide federal authority to acquire land from willing sellers to complete nine national scenic and historic trails. This proposal does not commit the federal government to purchase any land or spend any money, but seeks to allow managers to purchase land to protect the national trails as opportunities arise and funds are appropriated. S. 169 was placed on the Senate Calendar (No. 365) on September 17, 2007. Also, the Trails Act Technical Corrections Act (H.R. 3157) was introduced on July 24, 2007, to amend the National Trails System Act relating to the statute of limitations that applies to certain claims.

Measures introduced in the 110th Congress to designate, study, or extend specific components of the National Trails System are shown in the following table. The table includes bills that could involve management by the NPS or other agencies. Bills related to the system more generally are not included in the table.

Title	Bill Number	Type	Status
Amends the National Trails System Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to update the feasibility and suitability studies of four national historic trails, and for other purposes	H.R. 1336	Study Extension	Introduced
	S. 580		Reported (S.Rept. 110-95)

⁵⁸ Additional information on National Recreation Trails, including access to the NRT database, is available at [<http://www.americantrails.org/nationalrecreationtrails/>].

⁵⁹ See [<http://www.blm.gov/nlcs/nsht/NSHTSWfinalSig.pdf>].

Title	Bill Number	Type	Status
Arizona Trail Feasibility National Scenic Trail Act	H.R. 2297 S. 1304	Desig.	Introduced Ordered reported
Butterfield Overland Trail Study Act	H.R. 1266	Study	Hearing held
Chisholm and Great Western Cattle Trails Act	H.R. 2849 S. 2255	Study	Introduced Introduced
Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail Designation Act	H.R. 450 S. 268	Desig.	Introduced Reported (S.Rept. 110-15)
Lewis and Clark Mt. Hood Wilderness Act of 2007	S. 647	Desig.	Reported (S.Rept. 110-172)
Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Amendments Act of 2007	H.R. 3460	Extension	Introduced
Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Extension Study Act of 2007	H.R. 3616 S. 1991	Study	Hearing held Ordered reported
Mississippi River Special Resource Study Act	H.R. 2482	Study	Introduced
National Forests, Parks, Public Land, and Reclamation Projects Authorization Act of 2007	S. 2483	Study Extension	Introduced
Natural Resource Projects and Programs Authorization Act of 2007	S. 2180	Desig.	Introduced
New England National Scenic Trail Designation Act	H.R. 1528 S. 923	Desig.	Passed House Introduced
North Country National Scenic Trail Route Adjustment Act of 2007	H.R. 4291	Extension	Introduced
Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Act	H.R. 1388 S. 797	Desig.	Passed House Reported (S.Rept. 110-98)
Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designating Act	H.R. 1286 S. 686	Desig.	Hearing held Reported (S.Rept. 110-96)

The 109th Congress established the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (P.L. 109-418, H.R. 5466), the nation's first all-water national historic trail. Beginning at Jamestown, Virginia, the new trail will trace Captain Smith's 1607-1609 voyages of exploration in the Chesapeake Bay region. The 109th Congress also authorized the National Park Service to study additional routes and associated campgrounds for possible inclusion in the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail (P.L. 109-378).

Each agency with management authority over national trails has its own budget or funding system for carrying out activities related to trail administration and management. Federal land managing agencies have agreed, within the limits of agency authorities, to coordinate requests for and obligation of funds related to the National Trails System to eliminate duplication of effort and increase effectiveness. FY2007 funding for the National Trails System was \$23.5 million, and the FY2008

request was \$17.8 million. The funding approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, in FY2008 Interior appropriations legislation, is unclear. Also, funding other than for the National Trails System cannot be aggregated because of differences among agencies' budgeting practices.⁶⁰

Other Issues

The 110th Congress may evaluate several other recreation issues affecting federal land. These include recreation within the National Wildlife Refuge System, recreation at federal water sites (Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers), recreation fees, and Grand Canyon Colorado River management.

Recreation in the National Wildlife Refuge System. (by M. Lynne Corn) The National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS) is dedicated primarily to conserving animals and plants. Other uses — hunting, fishing, recreation, timber harvest, grazing, etc. — are permitted only to the extent compatible with the purposes for which the individual refuges were created. Some have characterized the NWRS as intermediate in protection between the BLM and FS lands on the one hand and NPS lands on the other, but this is not entirely accurate. The NWRS resembles the FS or BLM lands in allowing some commercial or extractive uses, but in certain cases, some uses (e.g., public access) can be substantially more restricted than for NPS lands. For example, some refuges (especially island refuges for nesting seabirds) may be closed to the public — more restrictive than for an NPS area, given the NPS mandate to provide for public enjoyment of park resources.

Recreational conflicts within the NWRS were more frequent before the 1997 enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (16 U.S.C. §668dd). A key provision of this law designates “compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation as priority public uses of the refuge system.” It also requires that priority public uses must “receive enhanced consideration over other general public uses in planning and management within the System.” The law continues the statutory policy that activities that are not wildlife-dependent (e.g., grazing, growing hay, etc.) may be permitted, provided they are wildlife-compatible. Final regulations for determining compatibility were published on October 18, 2000.⁶¹ Some interest groups contended that the regulations did not allow for sufficient public access for some forms of recreation, such as use of OHVs or PWC. Others felt that the regulations struck a proper balance among user groups.

An NWRS budget controversy may affect recreation, especially on less well-known refuges. Costs of operation have increased on many refuges, partly due

⁶⁰ Other trail projects may be eligible for federal highway funding under SAFETEA-LU (P.L. 109-59). For example, the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) provides funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail uses. P.L. 109-59 authorized \$370 million for the RTP over five years.

⁶¹ 65 *Fed. Reg.* 62457 (Oct. 18, 2000).

to specific problems such as hurricane damage and more aggressive border enforcement. Reductions in funding for operations in the NWRS, combined with the need to meet fixed costs such as rent, salaries, and utilities, have led to cuts in funding for programs to aid endangered species, reduce infestation by invasive species, protect water supplies, address habitat restoration, and ensure staffing at the less visited refuges. The Northeast Region (roughly Virginia to Maine, with 71 refuges) took the lead in addressing this issue by attempting to consolidate management at refuges, and increasing the number of refuges which are not staffed on a regular basis (termed “de-staffing”). This region also attempted to consolidate some services in order to spread resources more effectively. Implications for recreation could include reduced trash collection, fewer visitor services, less trail maintenance, and greater reliance on volunteers (if available). Other regions have begun their own plans to address reduced operating budgets.

Legislative Activity. For refuge operations and maintenance in FY2008, the President proposed \$394.8 million, a slight decrease from \$395.3 million in FY2007. The final figure was \$434.1 million (+10%). In the Joint Statement of Managers, FWS was directed to use the additional FY2008 funding to reestablish basic operations nationwide. FWS was further directed to report back to the Appropriations Committees on allocation of the increased funding within 60 days. However, on Jan. 29, 2008, President Bush signed E.O. 13457, directing federal agencies to ignore earmarks that are not in the language of the law itself.⁶² While the executive order will not affect the increase itself, statements concerning reestablishment of operations as well as a report to the two committees would be affected. For additional information on the NWRS budget for FY2008, see CRS Report RL34011, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2008 Appropriations*.

Recreation at Federal Water Sites. (by Nicole T. Carter and Nic Lane) Much of the recreation on federally owned or managed waters and adjacent lands occurs at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (in the Department of Defense) and Bureau of Reclamation (in DOI) sites, primarily at federal reservoirs and along rivers and other waterways. These agencies’ more than 4,000 recreation areas attract nearly 500 million visits per year (400 million at Corps-managed areas; 90 million at Bureau sites). While these federal reservoirs and federally maintained waterways often are operated primarily for navigation, hydropower, flood control and/or irrigation, they also provide recreation and other benefits. Reservoir and waterway operations can be contentious because decisions on water releases often represent tradeoffs among the multiple reservoir and river uses and among different types of recreation, such as birdwatching, boating, fishing, hunting, sightseeing, swimming, and whitewater activities.

Bureau of Reclamation. (by Nic Lane) The Bureau of Reclamation mission is not primarily related to recreation, and thus it has limited authority, funding, and staff to provide for recreation facilities. There are 289 Reclamation project areas with designated recreation facilities, but only 32 are managed solely by the agency. Because the reservoirs behind Reclamation dams create desirable recreation

⁶² 73 *Fed. Reg.* 6417 (Feb. 1, 2008).

opportunities, the agency works with 67 non-federal partners to manage and oversee recreation facilities at Reclamation projects. Reclamation sites, including those managed by non-federal partners, receive 90 million visits annually; this figure is increasing by 1.2 million annually. Recreation at these sites generates \$6 billion in visitor revenue and creates 27,000 non-federal jobs.⁶³ The agency endeavors to aid concessionaires through outreach programs aimed at helping them succeed in their management of sites, and Reclamation seeks to avoid the failure of a concessionaire or management partner which results in the site and facilities reverting to Reclamation's stewardship. Within the agency this is called turn back. Turn back has occurred 29 times since 1976 according to an August 2005 Reclamation-commissioned study, and places additional pressure on agency funding and staff resources.⁶⁴ Policies or decisions related to Reclamation's contracting with concessionaires may yet be an issue raised in the 110th Congress.

Corps of Engineers. (by Nicole T. Carter) The Corps is estimated to annually spend roughly \$270 million on recreation-related activities.⁶⁵ In the omnibus Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 (P.L. 110-114), the 110th Congress authorized the Corps to undertake construction activities for a number of water resource projects with recreational components; the legislation also added recreation as a project purpose for a number of existing Corps facilities. Recreation oversight may still arise during the 110th Congress in the context of Corps reservoir operations under the drought conditions facing a number of river basins, such as the Southeast drought's drawdown of Lake Lanier (GA) in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint basin. The consistency of Corps recreation fees and passes with those of other agencies may also receive attention. A broader policy issue facing the agency is its treatment of recreation's economic benefits under alternate management regimes for multipurpose federal facilities (e.g., reservoir management in the Missouri River basin).

Recreation Fees. (by Carol Hardy Vincent) DOI and the Department of Agriculture are in transition to a new recreation fee program, created by P.L. 108-447 (Division J, Title VIII; Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act). The law established the new recreation fee program for the four major federal land management agencies (NPS, BLM, FWS, and FS) as well as for the Bureau of Reclamation. The agencies have issued guidance on implementing the program, and have adjusted fees at sites to meet the criteria and prohibitions in the new law. In some areas fees have been eliminated, while in others they have increased. Congress is overseeing agency efforts to establish, collect, and spend recreation fees under the law.

⁶³ E-mail correspondence on Jan. 10, 2008, with Mr. Bruce Brown, Partnerships Coordinator, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, DC.

⁶⁴ Haas, Glenn E., and Robert Aukerman, *An Assessment of the Bureau of Reclamation's Non-Federal Recreation Management Partners*, August 2005. Available via Reclamation's website at [<http://www.usbr.gov/pmts/planning/recpubs/NonFedRecre.pdf>]. See also [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail.10002226.2005.html>].

⁶⁵ See [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail.10002002.2005.html>].

The recreation fee program is supported partly because it generates revenue that can be used for improvements at the sites where collected. Concerns remain over issues such as whether the public should be charged for recreating on public lands, and whether the establishment of higher fees in some areas could be a barrier to visitation. Debate continues over which agencies should be covered by the recreation fee program. H.R. 4304 seeks to extend the program to the Corps of Engineers. By contrast, S. 2438 seeks to repeal the program. However, it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish and collect entrance and use fees at units of the National Park System, under specified terms and conditions; provides for distribution of the receipts; and requires reports to Congress on this fee program at park units. The bill also seeks to reinstate recreation fee provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which in part provided for entrance fees, primarily at national park units, and daily recreation use fees for federal agencies generally.

P.L. 108-447 provided guidance to the five agencies on establishing entrance, standard, expanded, and special recreation permit fees. It outlined criteria for establishing fees, and prohibited charging fees for certain activities or services. Each agency can spend the revenue collected without further appropriation. In general, not less than 80% of the fees are to be spent at the collecting site, but that amount can be reduced to not less than 60%. The balance of the collections is available to be used agency-wide. The agencies (excluding the Bureau of Reclamation) anticipated collecting about \$240 million in fees in FY2007, with NPS collections accounting for about two-thirds of the total. The collections can be used for specified purposes, such as repair, maintenance, and facility enhancement. The agencies are to report to Congress on the program every three years, and the program is to terminate 10 years after enactment.

The law also authorized the creation of an interagency national recreation pass as well as regional multi-entity passes. To cover entrance and standard fees for the five agencies, in January 2007 a new interagency pass was established — the America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass. The cost of the general pass, at \$80 per year, the extent and convenience of its use, and the distribution of revenues from passes sold are issues of interest. Legislation has been introduced (H.R. 652 and S. 617) to make the pass available to veterans for a cost of \$10 annually, and hearings have been held on the Senate bill.

While the agencies have made progress in implementing the new law, a September 2006 GAO report determined that some issues had not been solved.⁶⁶ For instance, some agencies lacked accounting procedures and controls for collected fees, not all federal units were in compliance with the law, and the Bureau of Reclamation had not determined how the law applies to its operations.

Grand Canyon Colorado River Recreational Use Management. (by David L. Whiteman) As part of the management of Grand Canyon National Park

⁶⁶ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Agencies Can Better Implement the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act and Account for Fee Revenues*, GAO-06-1016 (Washington, DC: GPO, Sept. 2006), 111 p. Available via the GAO website at [<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d061016.pdf>].

(GCNP), the NPS regulates recreational use of the Colorado River corridor within park boundaries at the bottom of the Grand Canyon. A particular focus is the management of watercraft trips on the Colorado River inside GCNP to protect river corridor resources while fostering sustained high-quality visitor experience. The 277-mile river canyon is a popular destination for multi-day boating trips, long considered one of the most “iconic” of National Park experiences. Decades of conflict have ensued over the use of outboard motors on pontoon rafts on the river, helicopter flights used to ferry commercial boating passengers in and out of the canyon, and the proportion of river access for commercial outfitters versus noncommercial private boaters. Historically, about 70% of river access permits had gone to commercial concessioners, with about 30% to noncommercial self-guided private boaters. The motorized activities have long been opposed by groups favoring the preservation of wilderness-like values in the river corridor and those seeking wilderness status for some or all of the park. Commercial river trip outfitters assert that access for motorized watercraft does not harm resources and is the only practical way to offer popular short-duration trips.

In 2006, the NPS finalized a revised Colorado River Management Plan (CRMP) governing recreational river use for at least 10 years and establishing goals and objectives for a longer time frame.⁶⁷ This new management plan alters the allocation of river access between commercial and noncommercial users, with more access for the self-outfitted sector. The plan also shortens the season for commercial trips but expands both the number of commercial launches allowed and their group size. A “hybrid” weighted lottery system held each February for noncommercial users is being phased in, and the park plans to issue 252 noncommercial launch permits for calendar year 2009.⁶⁸ Some noncommercial users have expressed concern that while they have more overall access, they are largely relegated to off-season periods and are allowed less time on the river. In general, commercial users view the new plan favorably. The CRMP process took nearly 10 years to complete and implement. The new CRMP includes the development of a Visitor Experience Monitoring Plan (VEMP) to assess optimum visitor capacity levels and the quality of visitors’ river running experiences.

On February 16, 2006, a coalition of conservation groups filed suit in federal court to force Interior to re-evaluate its approach to dam-managed water flow and river canyon ecosystem recovery. They cited continuing damage to beaches, vegetation, unique species, and cultural resources from the operation of the upstream Glen Canyon Dam, and contended that the new CRMP did not adequately protect park resources from river user impacts. The parties settled their case in 2007 and, as a result, Interior is now working on a plan for long-term experimentation with release and flow volumes, temperature controls, and other measures to benefit downstream river resources. The Grand Canyon Trust, an environmental group, filed a new

⁶⁷ Background information and related documents are available on the NPS CRMP website at [<http://www.nps.gov/grca/parkmgmt/crmp.htm>].

⁶⁸ Information on Colorado River trips is available via the NPS CRMP website at [<http://www.nps.gov/grca/planyourvisit/whitewater-rafting.htm>]. For weighted lottery information, see [<http://www.nps.gov/grca/planyourvisit/weightedlottery.htm>] and the link for associated FAQs at [<http://www.nps.gov/grca/planyourvisit/river-faq.htm>].

lawsuit on December 7, 2007, seeking to force the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct “seasonally adjusted” dam releases in low water years.

As called for in the CRMP, the NPS has implemented a site-specific restoration program to address user impacts, focusing on popular use areas and campsites. Another coalition of conservation and some boating groups filed a separate suit on March 28, 2006, over motorized use and perceived inequities of the new river use plan. This lawsuit seeks an injunction that would require the NPS to prepare another CRMP. An October 2006 court ruling allowed intervention in the case by two boater associations favoring the 2006 CRMP.