

11545

110469

REPORT BY THE

Comptroller General

OF THE UNITED STATES

How Should Alaska's Federal Recreational Lands Be Developed? Views Of Alaska Residents And Visitors

Millions of acres of Federal land in Alaska have been set aside for recreation, and the Congress is considering legislation to establish new national parks, preserves, wildlife refuges, and forests

What kind of recreational facilities should be developed? Where? GAO surveyed Alaska visitors and residents and presents their views in this report to help guide the Congress and the agencies which manage Alaska's Federal lands

As tourism grows, additional pressure will be placed on already crowded recreational areas. Federal agencies should keep new recreational facilities at a minimum in established areas, concentrating instead on developing lightly used areas



110469

007122 / 110469

CEG-79 116
SEPTEMBER 27, 1979



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D C 20548

B-125035

Chairman, Senate Committee
on Energy and Natural Resources *SEN06300*
Chairman House Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs *HSE01900*

This report presents our analysis of the views of a representative number of visitors to Federal recreation areas in Alaska, in order that their opinions be considered in plans being made for recreation on Alaska's Federal lands.

Copies of the report are being sent to the Director, Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of the Interior.

AGC00027

AGC00033C

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Luther B. Stacks".

Comptroller General
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CHAIRMEN
SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES AND THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HOW SHOULD ALASKA'S
FEDERAL RECREATIONAL
LANDS BE DEVELOPED?
VIEWS OF ALASKA RESIDENTS
AND VISITORS

D I G E S T

How should millions of acres of Federal land in Alaska, set aside for recreation, be developed? As tourism grows in Alaska, Federal and State agencies must decide how to meet the increasing demand for recreation facilities, while preserving Alaska's landscape and natural resources.

Policies and programs adopted by Federal land-managing agencies--Interior's Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Park Service; and Agriculture's Forest Service--will determine the type and quality of recreational facilities available in Alaska. To help the agencies make these decisions, GAO mailed a questionnaire to 1,291 recent visitors to and residents of Alaska. The poll asked them about

--their experiences in nine of Alaska's long-established Federal parks, wildlife refuges, forests, and public lands;

--the types, location, and amount of recreational development they would like to see on Alaska's Federal lands--both in established areas and in new national monuments; and

--their familiarity with recreational information published by Federal agencies and the usefulness of this information.

Responses were received from 1,081, or 84 percent, of those polled. GAO received 802 replies from Alaskan visitors and 279 from residents. The responses are representative of about 100,000

AGC00003

AGC00008

AGC00397

AGC00034

Alaskan visitors and residents. The high return rate, as well as the extent of the written comments, indicates the high degree of interest in Alaska's recreational facilities.

Development of recreational facilities

Visitors to established Federal recreational areas, such as Mt. McKinley National Park, were satisfied with their experiences. Support for further development of roads, cabins, and lodges in the nine established areas ranged from 4 to 49 percent. In contrast, support for development of the same facilities in Alaska's new national monuments and future national parks, preserves, wildlife refuges, and forests, ranged from 75 to 91 percent.

As tourism grows, additional pressure will be placed on already crowded recreational areas. Respondents to GAO's survey clearly favor Federal land-managing agencies developing lightly used areas. Agency officials agree with this approach.

Paying for future recreational facilities

The majority of those responding favored either a user-charge system (37 percent) or Federal funding (36 percent) to pay for future recreational development.

Currently, user charges are not used widely in Alaska. Expanding the user-fee system in existing recreational areas could help finance facilities to meet future recreational needs. The user-fee system would shift some of the costs from the taxpayer to the user. However, user fees may not be advisable for all recreation units, since the increased administrative costs may exceed the additional revenues.

Tourist information

Although Federal agencies in Alaska publish a great deal of recreational information, up to 72 percent of the visitors responding to GAO's questionnaire said they were not aware of the publications. Had they known, they would have used such information to plan their vacations.

Interagency Federal visitor information centers would make recreation information more readily available, as well as direct visitors to lesser known and less crowded areas. The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service could coordinate the development of such centers with the Federal land-managing agencies. This agency is responsible for coordinating recreation for Federal, State, and private lands.

- - - -

Agency officials were given an opportunity to comment on this report. They generally agreed with the report findings, and their views are included in the report where appropriate.

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		1
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Review scope and design	1
	Representativeness of sample	2
	The agencies	3
2	VISITOR'S EXPERIENCES AND OPINIONS OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT	6
	Visitor satisfaction and recreational development - established areas	6
	Recreational development - new areas	10
	Financing recreational develop- ment	11
	Public awareness of recreational opportunities on Federal land	13
	Conclusions	15
	Agency comments	16
APPENDIX		
I	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY AGENCY AND RECREATION AREA	17
	National Park Service	17
	ID Mt. McKinley National Park	18
	ID Katmai National Monument	21
	ID Glacier Bay National Monument	22
	Forest Service	25
	ID Tongass National Forest	25
	ID Chugach National Forest	26
	Fish and Wildlife Service	29
	ID Kenai National Moose Range	29
	CO Arctic National Wildlife Range	31
	IO Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	32
	Bureau of Land Management	35
	AGC000008 IO (Denali Highway) Area	35
II	REVIEW DESIGN AND STRUCTURE	38
	Sample selection	38
	Weighting of percentages	39
	Classifications of groups	42

APPENDIX

Page

III	QUESTIONNAIRE WITH TABULATED RESULTS	44
-----	--------------------------------------	----

ABBREVIATIONS

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
FWS	Fish and Wildlife Service
GAO	General Accounting Office
HCRS	Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
NPS	National Park Service

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Federal lands in Alaska attract tourists from the rest of the United States and from abroad. About 74 percent of the National Park System lands and 73 percent of Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) lands are in Alaska. The Federal lands are pressured by increasing numbers of recreational users. National park visitation in Alaska increased from about 138,000 visits in 1971 to about 725,000 visits in 1977, a 427-percent increase. The nationwide increase during those years was 31 percent.

Alaska's Federal domain has unique recreational and economic characteristics. The status of much of this land, including the activities that will be permitted, is being debated by the Congress. Pending legislative proposals would establish new national parks, preserves, wildlife refuges, and forests. In addition, new national monuments totaling approximately 56 million acres were established by Presidential proclamation in December 1978. 1/ Federal agencies expect the naming of the new areas to further accelerate tourism.

Thus, Federal lands are in a state of critical transition. The Congress and Federal agencies are making decisions which will determine the type and quality of recreation available. The agencies will be deciding how best to locate, fund, and publicize recreational facilities.

REVIEW SCOPE AND DESIGN

The purpose of this review was to obtain the views of a representative number of visitors to Alaska's Federal recreational lands to determine: satisfaction with current recreational management; preferred location type, and amount of recreational development; and familiarity with and utility of recreational information published by Federal agencies. This information would be used to provide direction to National Park Service (NPS), FWS, and other agencies in the management of existing agency lands, and in plans for new areas in Alaska. To accomplish this, questionnaires were mailed

1/The lands are referred to as "new areas" in this report. For contrast, the term "established areas" refers to Alaska's national parks, monuments, forests, and wildlife refuges which were established before December 1978.

to 1,291 people, representative of a total population of about 100,000, who were either living in Alaska 1/ or had visited the State 2/ in 1977 or 1978.

Additionally, officials were interviewed at each of the Federal land-managing agencies in Alaska to determine problems encountered in providing recreation and recommended solutions for those problems. Recreational budgets, staffing, and future plans were also ascertained.

The sample was selected in cooperation with several State, Federal, and private organizations. The questionnaire was mailed to persons selected randomly from several sources. These included persons listed in the telephone directories of seven Alaskan cities and listings of people who registered

- at the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce visitor's center,
- on the Alaska Marine Highway System,
- at concessionaire facilities in Mt. McKinley National Park or Katmai National Monument, or
- for cabins in the Chugach National Forest.

Responses were received from 1,081 of the 1,291 people selected from these populations. Usable responses totaled 1,046. Of the respondents, 55 and 45 percent were non-Alaskans and Alaskans, respectively. The respondents were mostly male, 40 years or older, with earnings below \$30,000. Alaskan respondents were generally younger and earned more money than non-Alaskans.

REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SAMPLE

The socioeconomic characteristics of the individuals in the review sample compare closely to the same characteristics of Alaskan residents in the U.S. Census Bureau data and to characteristics of visitors to Alaska in an extensive tourism study concluded recently by the State. Because of this, and

1/"Alaskans" as used in this report refers to residents who lived in the State in 1977 or 1978.

2/"Non-Alaskans" as used in this report refers to the respondents who visited the State in 1977 or 1978.

because the respondents substantially agreed on the questions asked, we believe that the results reasonably reflect the views of the universe of users of Alaska's Federal recreational facilities. However, the results may not represent the opinions of all residents of Alaska or all non-residents.

THE AGENCIES

Alaska's Federal land-managing agencies are responsible for the management of over 200 million of Alaska's 375 million acres. NPS administers 18 units totaling approximately 48 million acres in Alaska. The bulk, 13 national monuments totaling over 40 million acres, was established in December 1978 by Presidential proclamation. Similarly, FWS and Forest Service each gained two new Alaskan national monuments in December 1978. These two agencies are responsible for 33 million and 21 million Alaskan acres, respectively. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) now administers approximately 168 million acres--however, their total is declining as land transfers to the State, Alaskan Natives, and other Federal agencies are finalized. An Alaskan BLM official told us the agency expects to retain control of from 40 to 50 million acres after all transfers now being contemplated are completed.

The four agencies operate under three different land-managing philosophies, as listed below.

- NPS emphasizes preservation of significant natural and historic resources. Recreation is allowed to the extent that it does not conflict with this primary goal.
- FWS stresses protection of wildlife habitat on the lands they administer. Nonconflicting recreation is allowed.
- The Forest Service and BLM have multiple-use land management mandates. These agencies are to determine which use or combination of uses best suits the land segment. Recreation is one of several possibilities.

The questionnaire posed a set of questions dealing with Alaska's new recreation areas--the new national monuments established in December 1978 and other Federal lands being considered for reclassification as national parks, preserves, wildlife refuges, or forests. The questionnaire also focused on nine long-established recreational areas in Alaska, as shown in table 1. These areas were selected to provide coverage of

- all four Federal land-managing agencies;
- the major recreation areas in terms of visitor use;
and
- a multiplicity of recreational uses, including sight-seeing, hunting, and fishing.

Table 1

FEDERAL RECREATION AREAS

INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW

National Park Service

Mt. McKinley National Park
Katmai National Monument
Glacier Bay National Monument

Forest Service

Tongass National Forest
Chugach National Forest

Fish and Wildlife Service

Kenai National Moose Range
Arctic National Wildlife Range
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge

Bureau of Land Management

The Denali Highway

The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS) was also contacted during the review. Among the Service's responsibilities is the coordination of

"recreation-related activities of all levels of government and the private sector to conserve, develop and utilize outdoor recreation resources."

Since HCRS is not a land-managing agency, many sections of the review questionnaire did not apply to it. Since the Service does provide recreational information, it was covered in those parts of the questionnaire dealing with public awareness of Federal recreational opportunities.

Analysis of questionnaire results, as presented in the following chapters, addresses:

- Respondents' awareness of recreational information published by Federal agencies.

- Visitor satisfaction with the nine established Federal recreation areas.
- Visitor opinions about additional recreational development of those nine areas. These opinions are compared to
- respondents' opinions about future recreational development of Alaska's new Federal recreational areas.

CHAPTER 2

VISITORS' EXPERIENCES AND

OPINIONS ON FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Most respondents said they were satisfied with recreational facilities and services provided by the Federal agencies. Respondent support for further recreational development of roads, cabins, and lodges in established areas, such as Mt. McKinley National Park, ranged from 4 to 49 percent. 1/ In contrast, respondent support for recreational development of these items in new national monuments, and in any new national parks, preserves, wildlife refuges, and forests which may be established, ranged from 75 to 91 percent. 2/

Respondents preferred user fees (37 percent) and Federal funding (36 percent)--a total of 73 percent--as a means of financing recreational areas. User fees have been implemented on only a limited basis in Alaska.

Review results show that a range of from 23 to 72 percent of visitors were unaware of information published by Federal land-managing agencies, and that most of those who were unaware of the information would have found it useful.

VISITOR SATISFACTION AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT-ESTABLISHED AREAS

Since the primary objective of BLM, FWS, and the Forest Service is not recreation, their recreational budgets represent a much smaller percentage of their total budgets than is true for NPS. The following table demonstrates the relative importance each agency places on recreation in Alaska by showing the total budget, recreational budget, and the present relationship.

1/The percentages used in this report are "weighted" to allow calculation of a single percentage summarizing the responses of the six populations used in the study. (See App. II.)

2/The percentages should be interpreted with the realization that no space was provided for a "no opinion" answer. Thus, 4 percent favoring development does not necessarily mean 96 percent opposed. A portion of the 96 percent may be no opinion.

Table 2

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1979</u>		
	<u>Total budget</u>	<u>Recreational budget (note a)</u>	<u>Percent of recreational budget to total</u>
National Park Service	\$ 7,780,600	b/ \$4,682,200	60.17
Forest Service	83,507,000	2,250,000	2.69
Fish and Wildlife Service	10,255,000	488,000	4.76
Bureau of Land Management	33,996,000	366,000	1.08

a/The recreational budget does not cover all agency activities which affect recreation. It does, however, give a reasonably good indication of the emphasis each agency places on recreation.

b/Total funding for NPS and monument units in Alaska in fiscal year 1979. Funding for the area office in Anchorage is not included.

As expected, NPS's 60-percent figure dominates the table. FWS's primary land-management criterion is wildlife habitat preservation, and BLM and Forest Service have multiple-use mandates. Recreational funding is less than 5 percent of the total budget for each of these agencies. Review results show that visitors to Alaska Federal recreation areas have been generally satisfied with their recreational experiences as shown in table 3. The visitors did not support further recreational development of these lands--not even for FWS and BLM, with which they were less satisfied.

Table 4 shows that most respondents thought the amount of recreational development existing in the nine established areas included in the review was about right. Their responses, in combination with the many narrative comments made on the subject, indicate a fear of overdevelopment--much of which probably come from perceptions of overdevelopment in recreational areas in the rest of the United States. A range of from 54 to 79 percent of the respondents thought the areas "about right as is." Consistent with this attitude are the low percentages supporting specific additional facilities in the established areas, shown in table 5. Agency officials generally agreed that recreational use should be dispersed. Adding facilities

to already crowded areas would place additional destructive pressure on vegetation and wildlife. A more qualitative recreational experience could be maintained and destructive pressures minimized by building facilities on new, little-used areas.

Table 3

VISITOR SATISFACTION COMPARISON

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Percent satisfied with area's recreational facilities/services-lowest and highest percent satisfied (note a)</u>	<u>Fiscal year 1979 recreational funding (review areas only)</u>
National Park Service (3 areas)	53 - 91	\$3,803,600
Forest Service (2 areas)	46 - 83	1,536,000
Fish and Wildlife Service (3 areas)	32 - 80	287,400
Bureau of Land Management (1 area)	27 - 73	b/366,000

a/Represents the range of responses to questions asked about the following items, over which it was concluded the agency has the most control: facilities/services; sanitary facilities; well-kept; information; and level of development.

b/Agency was unable to break down recreational funding by area. Therefore, the recreational budget for the entire State was included.

Table 4

OPINIONS TOWARD RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Response: The area is about
right as is. (Is neither
over nor underdeveloped)

(percent)

National Park Service Areas

Glacier Bay National Monument	79
Katmai National Monument	54
Mt. McKinley National Park	69

Forest Service Areas

Chugach National Forest	70
Tongass National Forest	68

Fish and Wildlife Service Areas

Kenai National Moose Range	73
Arctic National Wildlife Range	70
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	65

Bureau of Land Management

The Denali Highway	67
--------------------	----

Table 5

OPINIONS TOWARD RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OF LODGES, CABINS, CAMPGROUNDS, ROADS, ETC.
IN ESTABLISHED AREAS

	Highest pro-development <u>response</u> (percent)
National Park Service Areas	
Mt. McKinley National Park	41 (campgrounds)
Katmai National Monument	38 (campgrounds)
Glacier Bay National Monument	30 (cabins)
Forest Service Areas	
Tongass National Forest	37 (campgrounds)
Chugach National Forest	35 (campgrounds)
Fish and Wildlife Service	
Kenai National Moose Range	40 (campgrounds)
Arctic National Wildlife Range	30 (access roads)
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	49 (cabins)
Bureau of Land Management Area	
The Denali Highway	38 (campgrounds)

RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT--NEW AREAS

Table 6 shows the attitudes of respondents toward development of new areas--millions of acres of undeveloped Federal lands which the President recently designated as national monuments or areas being considered for future park, preserve, forest, wildlife refuge, or wilderness area status. The positive attitudes expressed toward recreational development are in direct opposition to the attitudes expressed about the established areas.

Table 6

OPINIONS ABOUT DEVELOPMENT ON NEW AREAS

Permit on some or all areas

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Total</u> (percent)
Build public cabins	91
Build commercial lodges	75
Build roads	90

As seen in table 6, most respondents favor some form of recreational development for the new conservation units.

Table 7 further demonstrates the responses to questions pertaining to desired uses of undeveloped lands. As the table shows, the category "Allowed on specific areas" is the most commonly selected response for most activities. This is probably because most people believe sufficient land is available to preclude the necessity for totally allowing or absolutely banning activities. The extremes "Generally allowed" and "Banned altogether" permit little or no flexibility.

FINANCING RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Respondents were asked which method of financing recreational development they most prefer. Table 8 summarizes the results.

Table 7

Recently, the Federal Government reserved about 100 million acres of undeveloped Alaskan land, an area about the size of California, as National Monuments or areas for future study as parks, wildlife refuges, or national forests. On these lands should the activities listed below be:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Generally allowed</u>	<u>Allowed on specific areas</u>	<u>Banned altogether</u>
	------(percent)-----		
Land float and ski planes	61	36	3
Travel by snowmobile	37	50	13
Travel by off- the-road vehicle	27	54	19
Build public cabins	33	57	10
Build commer- cial lodges	21	54	25
Sport hunting	48	39	13
Hunting to pro- vide food	70	25	5
Oil and gas ex- ploration and development	35	48	17
Mining	34	51	15
Timber harvesting	27	60	13
Road building	31	59	10

Table 8

If you would like to see recreational development in Alaska, how should this be paid for?

<u>Pay with:</u>	<u>Total</u> (Percent)
Federal funds	36
State and local funds	6
User fees (entrance fees, etc.)	37
Private funds (hotel chains, etc.)	10
Other	<u>11</u>
Total	100

Table 8 shows that the most popular method of funding recreational development is user fees, with 37 percent of total responses, followed by Federal funding with 36 percent.

A combination of user fees and Federal funding appears to be the preferred way of financing recreational development in Alaska. User fees are implemented on a limited basis in Alaska. Some agencies charge for campsite use. However, NPS does not charge for entrance to its units nor for agency-provided park transportation. At the urging of the Office of Management and Budget, NPS has submitted a proposal to the Congress which would, if applied, expand the user-fee system in Alaska.

PUBLIC AWARENESS OF RECREATIONAL
OPPORTUNITIES ON FEDERAL LAND

Federal agencies in Alaska publish a great deal of recreational information. Modes of distribution range from NPS's visitor information center in Anchorage, to a looseleaf book describing Alaska river trips available on request from HCRS. All of the Federal land-managing agencies surveyed have maps and brochures describing recreational opportunities in Alaska.

In Anchorage, Alaska's largest city, some agencies are more easily located by tourists than others. The most accessible is NPS's information center in the downtown area. This center has displays, maps, brochures, movie and slide presentations, and a full-time staff to aid the public. In addition to NPS materials, the center also provides information from other agencies. For additional information, visitors must seek out the agency. Visitors who do not know which agency to contact or where the agency is located are at a disadvantage and, therefore, are less likely to visit some recreational areas. Even when the agency is located, the potential user must sometimes know precisely what information to ask for.

For example, at BLM's State office, recreation information is not on display; therefore, the visitor must request it.

To assess the availability of tourist information published by Federal agencies in Alaska, specific information on recreational areas was included in the questionnaire. Respondents were then asked if they were aware of the information. If they were unaware of it, they were asked if it would have been useful to them on the trips. Responses to these questions are summarized in table 9.

Table 9

The percent of respondents who were unaware of the information and, of those, the percent who would have found such information useful.

<u>Information</u>	<u>Unaware</u>	<u>Useful</u>
	- - - (percent)	- - -
Did you know that:		
Certain campgrounds in Mt. McKinley National Park require advance reservations?	23	66
The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service has descriptions of Alaskan river trips which are available to you?	72	74
The Bureau of Land Management has brochures describing such things as the Denali, Steese, and Elliot Highways, as well as brochures describing canoe trips and campgrounds?	50	79
The Fish and Wildlife Service has brochures describing canoe routes on the Kenai National Moose Range?	48	52
The National Forest Service has wilderness cabins which you can reserve?	25	74

Table 9 shows that awareness differed significantly by item. For example, only about 23 percent of the respondents were unaware that campground reservations were needed at Mt. McKinley National Park. At the other extreme, about 72 percent were unaware of HCRS's information on river trips. Most of the uninformed respondents indicated that such information

would have been useful. Table 9 shows that the percentage of the respondents who indicated this information would have been useful to them ranged from 52 to 79 percent for FWS and BLM brochures, respectively.

HCRS is responsible for the coordination of recreation-related activities at all levels of government and the private sector to conserve, develop, and utilize outdoor recreational resources.

HCRS officials told us that, although now prohibited by staff and fund limits, it would be beneficial for HCRS to assume responsibility for distributing visitor information in Alaska. The resulting system would be more balanced than if one of the land-managing agencies had responsibility. The fact that the agency is specifically charged with the coordination of recreation on State, local, and private sector lands is particularly important since the State has ownership rights to over 103 million acres and Alaskan Natives have 45 million acres, much of which has recreational potential.

CONCLUSIONS

Dispersing use

With the expected growth of tourism, additional pressure will be placed on already crowded recreational areas. The managing agencies will be faced with three alternatives if they are to maintain a high-quality recreational experience. First, the agencies could develop existing areas to meet the increasing demand. Review results show that this is not what Alaskans or non-Alaskans want. Second, the agencies could limit use--an unpopular alternative. The third alternative would be to encourage more use of other less used recreational areas.

The preferences expressed in this review show that the last alternative is the most satisfactory. Visitors believe agencies should minimize recreational facility additions in already crowded areas, concentrating instead on more lightly used areas. Agency officials agree that the dispersion of use is desirable.

Information distribution

A more efficient information distribution system could also be used to attract visitors to uncrowded areas and relieve some of the pressure on heavily used areas. Review results show that the public would find such information useful and might also be attracted to lesser-known areas.

Review results show that most of the respondents who were "unaware" of specific information about recreational areas would have found such information useful. It is reasonable to assume that some of these people would have made use of the information and visited the areas involved.

Interagency Federal visitor information centers in convenient locations would help relieve the growing visitation pressures on some areas, since less visited areas could be publicized. Such centers could be located in major cities and at access points so that tourists and residents could make use of the information available. The State Division of Parks and Alaskan Natives could be included as a participant, since their Alaskan lands total about 103 million acres. Since Interior's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service is responsible for coordinating recreation for Federal, State, and private lands, this agency could coordinate the development of visitor centers in Alaska and the publication of information about Alaskan recreational opportunities.

User fees

The majority of those responding favored either a user-charge system (37 percent) or Federal funding (36 percent) to pay for future recreational development. The user-charge method, however, is little used in Alaska. An expanded user-fee system in existing recreation units could help to finance facilities to meet the future recreational needs of the public. The user-fee system would shift some of the recreational costs from the general taxpayer to the user. User fees, however, may not be advisable for all recreation units, since the increased administrative costs may exceed the additional revenues obtained.

Agency comments

Officials of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, were given an opportunity to comment on this report. They generally agreed with the report findings, and their views are included in the report where appropriate.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY AGENCY AND RECREATION AREANATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NPS assigns top priority to protecting the ecological health and historic integrity of the lands it administers. Park uses are limited to those activities which protect the natural and historic values each park was established to preserve. The level, frequency, and duration of permitted uses are limited where necessary to protect park resources from alteration or loss.

The three Alaskan NPS units chosen for this study were Mt. McKinley National Park, Katmai National Monument, and Glacier Bay National Monument. These three NPS units have scenery, camping, wildlife viewing, and fishing among their primary attractions.

Until December 1, 1978, the NPS system in Alaska was composed of five units totaling about 7.5 million acres. On December 1, 1978, 13 national monuments totaling over 40 million acres were added in Alaska by Presidential proclamation. After these additions, Alaskan NPS lands totaled about 70 percent of the entire National Park System.

In fiscal year 1979, NPS had 102 full-time staff members in Alaska. Fifty-five of these were in the area office with the remainder in the units, as follows:

Mt. McKinley National Park	22
Glacier Bay National Monument	11
Sitka National Historical Park	6
Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park	5
Katmai National Monument	<u>3</u>
Total	<u>47</u>

Total authorized funds for NPS in Alaska were divided as follows:

Area office	\$3,098,400
McKinley	2,765,400
Glacier Bay	732,600
Klondike	547,500
Sitka	331,100
Katmai	<u>305,600</u>
Total	<u>\$7,780,600</u>

If monument designations by the President do not change substantially in the Congress, NPS investment in Alaska will increase significantly. NPS's Pacific Northwest region estimated a cost of \$11,767,700 to staff the new areas in fiscal year 1980.

MT. MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK

Mt. McKinley National Park was established in 1917. It was the most heavily used NPS unit in 1978, with 222,993 visitors. The park is composed of 1,939,493 acres and is particularly well known for its wildlife and scenery. On December 1, 1978, a 3,900,000-acre national monument adjacent to the park was established by Presidential proclamation.

Mt. McKinley National Park has a concessionaire-operated lodge and restaurant, a grocery store, and seven campsites. Private automobile access is limited to the first 15 miles on the 87-mile park road. NPS provides free bus transportation along the entire road.

Of the 805 Mt. McKinley Park visitors who responded to the questionnaire, 43 and 57 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Most of the respondents were male with annual incomes over \$20,000. They visited Mt. McKinley Park for sightseeing, hiking, and camping. Their attitudes toward some of the existing conditions at the park are expressed in table 10. (See p. 23.)

Table 10 shows that the overall impression the visitor has of Mt. McKinley National Park is quite favorable. Except for the answer "used by just enough people," a majority of respondents gave the most favorable response possible for each category.

Even though visitors were satisfied with their visit to the park, there were complaints. For example, 29 percent found the concessionaire-operated shuttle bus system inadequate and several of their narrative comments addressed this issue. Examples of these and other complaints include:

--"In many ways, the booklets describing the bus service at McKinley are misleading. They say that buses run regularly (true--but they don't emphasize that they run an hour apart, and that many times they're full and you can't get on for what may be several hours.) Then, they say you can get off a bus anywhere you want and hike--true, but they don't tell you when the buses come by full, you're just out of luck * * * for at least an hour. When we were in McKinley, we watched a driver turn away about 20 people who were

sitting along the road, unprotected, in a drenching rain, because all the buses returning * * * were full, and the buses going (the other direction) were also full * * * so they would have to wait at least three hours before getting a bus back to the lodge * * * While we had no objection to the use of buses instead of cars * * * we feel that if they don't want us to use cars they should provide us with better service."

--"The lodge accommodations are sorely inadequate and the food was very substandard. Many more shuttle buses needed to meet demand. You are really taking a chance on a return trip if you get off to hike."

--"* * * it is frustrating to visit the park and stand in line to wait for buses and be turned away from campgrounds."

--"* * * the sleeping accommodations in the railroad cars were deplorable. The compartments were dirty and noisy. (The) one bathroom * * * at the end of the car was old, dilapidated, filthy, and cold."

--"The accommodations at McKinley were described improperly by the travel agent * * * very expensive disappointment (particularly) for those who landed in the Pullman cars."

--"The National Park facilities should be modified to make easier access for handicapped people. For example, Mt. McKinley lodge entrance should be ramped, and the bus unloading area regraded to permit the bus floor and lodge front porch to be level. When NPS buses are replaced the buses should have wider, higher entrances and lower floors * * * Railroad cars should be returned to the railroad."

Opinions toward future recreational development of Mt. McKinley National Park are summarized in table 11. (See p. 24.) Since most visitors liked their trip, it might be expected that they would be conservative toward additional development of the park. Such is indeed the case. The highest pro-development response was 41 percent for additional campsites. Overall, a range of from 25 to 41 percent of the respondents favored the recreational development items asked about in the questionnaire. Some of the written comments added to the questionnaire articulate this preference for minimal recreational development in Alaska:

--"We don't need more showers, or hot dog stands, etc. - this is the last great wilderness - not a California Yosemite."

--"If necessary the parks such as Mt. McKinley should (require) * * * a reservation to enter--to be made in advance. It is so refreshing to be at McKinley as opposed to Yellowstone and Glacier. They are mutilated because of overpopulation. It would be a national disgrace if it happened at McKinley."

Shuttle bus system

The shuttle bus system was initiated at Mt. McKinley Park as a means of protecting the park environment from heavy traffic. Park visitors can use the bus system for sightseeing or travel to and from campgrounds or hiking areas. Private automobile traffic is limited to persons with prearranged campground space. Generally, this concept has been popular with park visitors.

NPS paid the concessionaire over \$1 million for operating the bus system in fiscal year 1979. In the case of Mt. McKinley Park, this amount represents 37 percent of the fiscal year 1979 budget.

NPS officials are presently considering initiating charges for the shuttle buses so that users could share more directly in this expense. Our questionnaire addressed this issue by asking respondents to indicate their preference in funding recreational development. Responses indicate the most popular method selected was "User fees" followed by "Federal funds." Therefore, it would seem to be both acceptable and reasonable to charge shuttle bus user fees, where practical, to help finance recreational development.

Mt. McKinley Park superintendent's views

The park superintendent stated that the demands of tourists and other recreation users were being met adequately. However, he added

"A variety of services could be upgraded to a better standard, i.e., comfort stations, road maintenance, campgrounds, public transportation, et al. This increase in standards has been addressed in full detail through our budgeting process. All the increases require a greater amount of funding and additional positions.'

Plans for the improvement or addition of facilities in Mt. McKinley National Park are not extensive. According to the park superintendent, some modifications to the hotel are planned in the next few years, and campground, sanitation, and other improvements will be made as funds are available.

KATMAI NATIONAL MONUMENT

Katmai National Monument was established in 1918. The monument is composed of 2,800,000 acres and is known for its Valley of the Ten-Thousand Smokes--which is remnant of a huge volcanic eruption in 1912. On December 1, 1978, a 1,400,000-acre addition to the monument was established by Presidential proclamation.

Katmai National Monument, unlike Mt. McKinley Park, is not accessible by road. Primary access is by air. The monument is 290 air miles southwest of Anchorage. It was the least visited of the three NPS units included in this review, with an estimated 11,348 visitors in 1978.

Katmai National Monument concessionaire operations included a lodge, cabin complex, tour bus, and tour boat. NPS operates a 10-space campground in the monument.

Of the 225 respondents who had visited Katmai National Monument, 36 and 64 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. They visited the monument for sightseeing, fishing, and hiking. Their attitudes about the conditions in the monument are expressed in table 10. (See p. 23.)

Responses indicate that visitors were not as favorably impressed with Katmai Monument as with other NPS areas. Less than a majority of respondents indicated satisfaction with the use by enough people, visitor facility/services, access to area, and information availability. However, most respondents thought the area was well-kept and were satisfied with the trails and sanitary facilities. A number of the written responses pertained to complaints about the undeveloped nature of the monument. However, most respondents opposed further recreational development items. (See table 11, p. 24.)

Katmai National Monument superintendent's views

The monument superintendent stated that present facilities are inadequate because visitors are crowded into one primary site. Further expansion of that site would adversely affect wildlife and increase problems such as vegetation trampling and noise pollution.

The solution, advised the park superintendent, would be to place facilities in different areas of the monument. While plans have been developed to accomplish this, lack of funding prevents relocation for at least the next few years.

GLACIER BAY NATIONAL MONUMENT

Glacier Bay National Monument was established in 1925. The monument is composed of 2.8 million acres and is known for its spectacular tidewater glacier scenery. On December 1, 1978, a 550,000-acre addition to the monument was established by Presidential proclamation.

Glacier Bay National Monument is located in southeast Alaska and is accessible by boat or air, but not by car. Its developed facilities are limited to a concessionaire-operated lodge and one NPS 14-space campground. The concessionaire operates a tour boat from the lodge to the glaciers.

Of the 318 respondents who had visited Glacier Bay, 28 and 72 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Their main reasons for visiting were sightseeing and hiking. Their attitudes about the conditions and plans for future development at Glacier Bay National Monument are expressed in tables 10 and 11. (See pp. 23 and 24.)

As with Mt. McKinley National park, visitors' responses indicate a general satisfaction with the visit and a clear preference that recreational facilities remain the same.

The opposition to recreational development was expressed by one respondent as follows:

--"Glacier Bay National Monument is best left as is. No construction should take place on shore. Float plane access should continue to be allowed. No open fires are needed. Aerial patrols by park rangers might be good * * * I have lived in Alaska for 22 years and intend to stay here. When I am no longer able to reach the wilderness under my own power I will still derive great satisfaction from the fact that my children can. Minimize construction."

Other comments about Glacier Bay include:

--"The Glacier Bay Lodge and airport should be modified to ease access for the physically handicapped. The trail from Glacier Bay Lodge to the boat dock should be regraded and perhaps paved because of the large number of users."

--"Glacier (Bay) National (Monument) is far too expensive for the average visitor. I do not believe the lodge and restaurant should be run on a concession basis * * * Visitors to (the lodge) are economic prisoners of the greedy concessionaire. There should be a small store for campers to purchase supplies."

Glacier Bay National Monument
superintendent's views

The monument superintendent stated that concentration of use in a few areas is a problem in Glacier Bay National Monument. There are also problems relating to road maintenance, power generation, accommodations, and resources protection.

There are plans for improving access to back-country areas, but NPS officials told us the likelihood of adding facilities in Glacier Bay National Monument is not practicable at this time.

Table 10

VISITOR SATISFACTION WITH

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE REVIEW AREAS

	<u>Mt. McKinley</u> <u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Katmai</u> <u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Glacier Bay</u> <u>Satisfied</u>
	----- (percent) -----		
Response:			
-is used by just enough people	41	42	58
-is well-kept	92	99	83
-has good visitor facility/services	54	44	55
-has just enough hiking trails	66	58	59
-has adequate sanitary facilities	78	72	80
-has good access to activity areas	53	36	52
-has good information available	74	46	60

Table 11

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AREAS

Further development is favored:	<u>Mt. McKinley</u>	<u>Katmai</u>	<u>Glacier Bay</u>
	----- (percent) -----		
-lodges/hotels/ motels	33	29	25
-cabins	30	7	30
-campgrounds	41	40	25
-campground facilities	33	23	20
-access roads	25	4	13

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service is required by law to administer its lands under multiple-use management principles. Legislation defines multiple-use as the management of the various renewable surface resources so that they are utilized in the combinations which will best meet the needs of the American people. One of these uses is recreation.

The Forest Service administers approximately 21 million Alaskan acres or approximately 11 percent of the total 188 million acres it manages nationwide. The 21 million acres make up the Nation's two largest national forests, the 16 million-acre Tongass and the 5 million-acre Chugach. On December 1, 1978, the Forest Service was given management responsibility for two national monuments in Alaska, totaling 3.4 million acres.

In fiscal year 1979, Forest Service staff included 630 permanent full-time positions in Alaska. Total fiscal year 1979 authorized funding for the National Forest Service in Alaska was as follows:

	<u>Total funding</u>	<u>Recreational funding</u>
Regional office	\$13,979,745	\$ 714,000
Tongass	64,868,527	992,000
Chugach	<u>4,658,728</u>	<u>544,000</u>
Total	<u>\$83,507,000</u>	<u>\$2,250,000</u>

The Tongass and Chugach National Forests were included in our review.

TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

The Tongass National Forest was created by Presidential proclamation in 1907. Its 16 million acres support the bulk of Alaska's commercial timber harvest, as well as considerable recreational use. The forest contains 145 public-use cabins, which are available on a reservation basis. Most of the cabins are accessible by airplane or boat only. Additional recreational facilities include 10 campgrounds, 26 picnic grounds, 2 visitor centers, and 377 miles of hiking trails. Recreational activities include hunting, fishing, backpacking, photography, and boating.

There were 422 respondents to the questionnaire who had visited the Tongass. Of these, 39 and 61 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. The respondents visited for sightseeing, hiking, camping, fishing, and hunting. Tables 12

and 13 summarize Tongass visitors' view toward recreational opportunities and future recreational development. (See pp. 27 and 28.)

Table 12 shows that most visitors were favorably impressed with the Tongass Forest. With the exception of facilities and services, which reaped 47 percent approval, the majority was satisfied with the items presented in the questionnaire.

Table 13 shows that future recreational development is again favored by a relatively small percentage of visitors. The highest pro-development response was 37 percent for campgrounds.

Tongass National Forest supervisor's views

Providing recreation in Tongass National Forest is a problem. The problems include difficult access, timber harvest conflicts, and safety of visitors in a harsh climate. Also, reduced funding in maintenance and operation of developed sites has resulted in both reduced service and closure of some facilities.

Ongoing Tongass Forest plans specify a variety of recreation-related improvements, including new trails and cabins, dispersed tent camps, and better visitor information services. The Forest Service area supervisor told us that the recreational budget is often the first to absorb budget cuts, so these improvements and additions are not guaranteed.

CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST

The Chugach National Forest was formally designated in 1907. Hiking, boating, fishing, and hunting are its main recreational activities. The Forest Service maintains 16 campgrounds, 15 picnic areas, and 37 remote recreation cabins. It staffs a visitors' recreation center at Portage Glacier, an area easily accessible from Anchorage.

There were 712 respondents to the questionnaire who had visited the Chugach. Of these, 52 and 48 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Most respondents visited for sightseeing, camping, fishing, and hunting.

The Chugach results in tables 12 and 13 closely parallel those of the Tongass; both show a general hesitancy toward recreational development.

Chugach National Forest supervisor's views

The Chugach National Forest recreation supervisor identified problems that included the low priority of funding for recreation, overcrowding of some areas, and the inability to keep facilities open for as long as the recreational demands exist.

The Chugach National Forest plans to add and improve a variety of facilities, including new cabins, trails, and rehabilitated campgrounds. These plans depend upon obtaining additional funding and staffing--by no means a certainty, given the low priority of recreational funding.

Table 12

VISITOR SATISFACTION WITH
NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE REVIEW AREAS

	<u>Tongass National Forest</u>	<u>Chugach National Forest</u>
	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>
Response:	----- (percent) -----	
-is used by just enough people	50	45
-is well-kept	88	81
-has good visitor facility/services	47	46
-has just enough hiking trails	57	63
-has adequate sanitary facilities	75	67
-has good access to activity areas	53	61
-has good information available	57	52

Table 13
FUTURE RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF
NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE AREAS
IN ALASKA

Further development is favored:	<u>Tongass</u>	<u>Chugach</u>
	----- (percent) -----	
-lodges/hotels/motels	19	17
-cabins	36	29
-campgrounds	37	35
-campground facilities	23	28
-access roads	22	23

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

FWS's refuge management policy is to allow recreation to the extent that it does not interfere with the main purpose of the refuge. In Alaska, primary purposes include protection of moose, bear, and migratory bird habitat.

FWS is responsible for 20 Alaskan wildlife refuges, ranges, and monuments, totaling 33 million acres. Alaskan lands constitute 73 percent of the agency's 45 million-acre total nationwide.

On December 1, 1978, FWS land-managing responsibilities significantly increased when two new national monuments, totaling 12 million acres, were established with the Fish and Wildlife as administering agency. The Alaskan area office of the agency estimates additional funding of \$1.9 million annually will be needed by 1980 for these new areas.

In fiscal year 1979, FWS wildlife refuge and range staff in Alaska included 68 full-time staff members. Total fiscal year 1979 authorized funding for Alaskan refuges and ranges was \$2,893,400. Of this amount, \$488,400 was for recreation. It was divided as follows:

Recreation Funding

Kenai National Moose Range	\$192,400
Arctic National Wildlife Range	55,000
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	40,000
Other refuges	59,000
Area office	<u>142,400</u>
 Total	 <u>\$488,800</u>

For purposes of this review, three FWS refuges were selected: The Kenai National Moose Range, the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the Arctic National Wildlife Range.

KENAI NATIONAL MOOSE RANGE

The Kenai National Moose Range was established in 1941 to protect moose, Dall sheep, and other wild game herds. The range is composed of 1,730,000 acres on the Kenai Peninsula. The area is easily accessible from Anchorage, Alaska's main population center, and consequently is popular for many types of outdoor recreation, such as hunting, fishing, boating, and hiking. The range is particularly well known as home of the giant Kenai moose, which weighs up to 1,400 pounds. It is also famous for king, red, and silver salmon fishing in the Kenai and Russian Rivers. An estimated 141,000 visitors used

the range in 1978, making it by far the most heavily visited Fish and Wildlife area in the review.

The range has over 100 miles of marked hiking trails and two established canoe routes. It has 14 developed campsites with a combined total of 138 spaces. It had 13 full-time staff members in fiscal year 1979, the most of any Fish and Wildlife refuge or range in Alaska. Funding totaled \$595,400 in 1979, of which \$192,400 was earmarked for recreation.

Of the 458 respondents who had visited the range, 65 and 35 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Most respondents visited for sightseeing, fishing, hunting, and camping. The attitudes of respondents toward conditions on the Kenai National Moose Range are expressed in table 14. (See p. 33.)

Visitors to the range leave with a less favorable impression than did visitors to some of the other units in our sample. Less than a majority thought the visitor facilities and services were "good." It should be pointed out, however, that good road access, via one of the State's major highways, and excellent salmon spawning runs contribute heavily to the range's use. This heavy use places corresponding demands on the facilities and the agency's ability to meet these demands.

Opinions toward future recreational development of the range are summarized in table 15. (See p. 34.) Even though respondents are relatively unsatisfied with some aspects of the range, most people did not favor additional recreational development.

Kenai Moose Range manager's views

User opinion is bolstered by the response from the Kenai Moose Range manager who perceived the range as overcrowded, in poor repair, and with inadequate sanitary facilities. The manager told us that the basic problem is facility maintenance during the summer months when tourist demand far exceeds staffing and financial capabilities. Specific problems include:

- Overcrowding on holiday weekends and during salmon runs.
- Increasing demands by hunters and fishermen on a limited wildlife resource.
- Protecting the ground cover on high-use trails.

The Kenai National Moose Range does not plan to increase the size of its facilities. However, there are plans to upgrade campground facilities and increase trail maintenance.

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE RANGE

This 8,900,000-acre range was established in 1960 in the northeastern corner of Alaska. Its purpose is to preserve an undisturbed portion of the arctic environment large enough to be biologically self-sufficient. Among its wildlife are caribou, Dall sheep, moose, wolverine, and three kinds of bear--grizzly, black, and polar. FWS's objective is to maintain natural conditions. No developed recreational facilities are in the range. Access other than aircraft is difficult.

The Arctic National Wildlife Range had nine full-time staff members in fiscal year 1979, and funding totaled \$352,000. Of this amount, \$55,000 was for recreation. The range was the least visited of FWS units reviewed, with an estimated 992 visitors in 1978.

Of the 74 respondents who had visited the Arctic National Wildlife Range, 57 and 43 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Most respondents visited for sight-seeing, fishing, and hunting. Tables 14 and 15 summarize responses to study questions on recreational use and development.

Less than a majority of respondents thought visitor facilities/services or access was good. This might indicate a higher degree of dissatisfaction with the Arctic National Wildlife Range than with some of the other units. An apparent inconsistency exists, however, since the highest response favoring development is 30 percent. The explanation may lie in the range manager's interpretation of the question. He stated that since this is a wilderness area, "poor" access and facilities are appropriate.

Arctic National Wildlife Range manager's views

The range manager told us that minor crowding occurs during the hunting season, and that the number of sheep and moose killed in some areas is excessive. Current funding is insufficient to conduct the patrols necessary to detect violations of regulations and adequately protect refuge visitors. There are no plans to add facilities--such facilities would be contrary to the range's objectives.

KODIAK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1941 to preserve the natural habitat of the famed Kodiak bear and other wildlife. The refuge, on Kodiak Island in the Gulf of Alaska, has 1,815,000 acres.

Refuge headquarters in the town of Kodiak is accessible by commercial aircraft. There are no roads, lodges, or developed campgrounds on the refuge. FWS refuge facilities consist of eight primitive public-use cabins. The agency plans to build a visitor center at refuge headquarters in 1979-80.

Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge had eight full-time staff members in fiscal year 1979. Authorized funding totaled \$285,000, ranking Kodiak last among FWS units studied. An estimated 1,200 visitors came to Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge in 1978.

Of the 98 respondents who had visited the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, 64 and 36 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Most respondents visited for sightseeing, fishing, and hunting. Tables 14 and 15 summarize the responses to study questions on recreational use and development.

Less than a majority of respondents thought visitor facilities, access, and available information were good. Overall, 67 percent of the visitors thought that the facilities and access were fair or poor; and 75 percent thought the information available was fair or poor. These opinions are bolstered by those of the refuge manager who thought information and visitor facilities poor and access fair.

Although still less than a majority, a higher percentage of respondents favor cabin and campground development than in most other review units: 49 and 37 percent, respectively. The prevalent opposition to recreational development remains, however, since none of the pro-development items received majority approval.

Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge manager's views

The refuge manager advised that:

"Extremely low budgets over the past 20 years have prevented the Station from ever reaching its mandated obligation of positive resource and habitat protection, and maintenance of supportive facilities. There have never been funds available to provide any quality recreational facilities or

carry on mandated environmental conservation education programs."

The refuge manager says that there are plans to build a visitor's center in municipal Kodiak or to rehabilitate or replace public-use cabins on refuge lands.

Table 14

VISITOR SATISFACTION WITH

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE REVIEW AREAS

	<u>Kenai National Moose Range</u>	<u>Arctic National Wildlife Range</u>	<u>Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge</u>
	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>
Response:	----- (percent) -----		
-is used by just enough people	52	27	45
-is well-kept	76	93	90
-has good visitor facility/services	33	20	33
-has just enough hiking trails	65	41	48
-has adequate sani- tary facilities	61	53	46
-has good access to activity areas	55	30	33
-has good informa- tion available	49	20	25

Table 15

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AREAS

IN ALASKA

Further development is favored:	<u>Kenai National Moose Range</u>	<u>Arctic National Wildlife Range</u>	<u>Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge</u>
	----- (percent) -----		
-lodges/hotels/motels	14	22	23
-cabins	29	26	49
-campgrounds	40	18	37
-campground facilities	30	14	24
-access roads	24	30	29

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

BLM is charged with managing its land on a multiple-use basis. One of the major uses is recreation, as specified in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The amount of land which the agency will ultimately be responsible for administering in Alaska is currently being decided by the Congress.

BLM estimates that approximately 65 million acres will be the final amount.

In Alaska, BLM has 11 full-time recreational management staff members. These include five outdoor recreational planners, three archeologists, and three landscape architects. Funding for recreation in fiscal year 1979 was \$366,000, which has been reduced to \$234,000 for fiscal year 1980.

DENALI HIGHWAY AREA

The Denali Highway recreation area is unique in that it is not a formal recreation area, but rather a road with adjacent land areas used by recreationalists. It is accessible to most of Alaska's population and was selected for review because of its popularity and because BLM expects the area to remain under its management.

Of the 440 respondents who had traveled to Denali, 56 and 44 percent were Alaskans and non-Alaskans, respectively. Respondents visited for sightseeing, fishing, hunting, and camping.

BLM estimated that 20,000 visitors traveled the Denali Highway for recreational purposes during the summer of 1978. The area supervisor was dissatisfied with the agency's recreational management of the area, attributing deficiencies to inadequate funding and lack of agency management direction.

A majority of respondents expressed satisfaction only in regard to the area being well kept. Table 16, which summarizes both agency and public response, shows that the visitors agree with the agency's assessment that facilities/services, hiking trails, sanitary facilities, and information are inadequate.

Table 17 shows that despite this relative dissatisfaction, as has been prevalent throughout the review, respondents opposed additional recreational development.

Table 16
VISITOR SATISFACTION WITH
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'S
DENALI HIGHWAY AREA

<u>The Denali Highway</u>	<u>All visitors</u> (percent)	<u>BLM supervisor</u>
-is used by just enough people	47	Underused/ littered
-is well-kept	73	Poor repair
-has good visitor facility/services	27	Poor
-has just enough hiking trails	46	Too few
-has adequate sanitary facilities	47	Inadequate
-has good access to activity areas	44	-
-has good information available	31	Poor

Table 17FUTURE RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF LANDBORDERING THE DENALI HIGHWAY

Further development is favored:	<u>All visitors</u> (percent)	<u>BLM supervisor</u>
-lodges/hotels/motels	20	No response
-cabins	24	Yes
-campgrounds	42	Upgrade existing
-campground facilities	27	Upgrade existing
-access roads	26	No response

REVIEW DESIGN AND STRUCTURESAMPLE SELECTION

To sample public opinion on Alaskan recreation land, we developed a questionnaire. (See App. III.) This questionnaire was designed to provide information about the

- users of Alaska's recreation areas,
- users' satisfaction with the areas and facilities,
and
- users' opinion on future recreational development.

Since no comprehensive list of all visitors to Alaskan recreation areas exists, our questionnaire was mailed to randomly selected persons from populations which could be readily used. These populations included persons who registered

- at the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce visitor center;
- on the Alaska Marine Highway System;
- at concessionaire facilities in Mt. McKinley National Park or Katmai National Monument;
- for cabins or persons listed in the Chugach National Forest; or
- in the telephone directories of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, Kodiak, Valdez, and Seward, Alaska.

These populations provided a usable universe of about 100,000 persons.

Response rates varied among the separate sources from a low of 78 percent to a high of 88 percent. The overall response rate, after adjustments, was 84 percent of 1,291 net potential respondents. (Table 18 on p. 40 provides more detail.)

Because we used several different sources to approximate the universe of recreational users, our sample sizes varied. Some of the sources contained names, addresses, or both, that eliminated them from our sample. For example, we eliminated names or addresses that were unreadable or from a foreign country. In one case, only non-Alaskans were included (Alaska Marine Highway System). In the case of telephone directories, business organizations and government listings were eliminated.

This elimination process resulted in our "Usable Population" as shown in table 18.

WEIGHTING OF PERCENTAGES

Each of the six samples was selected randomly. The six samples were then weighted to control for differing degrees of randomness and for the differing universe sizes being sampled. The weighting allowed calculation of a single percentage summarizing responses from all six populations. The following example illustrates the method used. (See table 19, p. 41.)

Table 18

<u>Category</u>	<u>Usable population size</u>	<u>Questionnaires mailed</u>	<u>Less bad addresses deceased & duplication</u>	<u>Net potential respondents</u>	<u>Responses</u>			<u>Percent of potential</u>
					<u>Usable</u>	<u>Unusable</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Anchorage Chamber of Commerce visitor logs	5,590	329	19	310	244	23	267	83
Alaska Marine Highway System reservations	3,640	153	12	141	105	5	110	78
Registrants at Mt. McKinley N.P. facilities	9,000	202	15	187	161	0	161	86
Registrants at Katmai N.M. facilities	298	149	3	146	128	1	129	88
Alaskan telephone directories	78,892	500	156	344	274	5	279	81
Anchorage	54,900	347						
Fairbanks	10,568	67						
Juneau	6,944	44						
Ketchikan	3,472	22						
Kodiak	1,516	10						
Valdez	728	5						
Seward	768	5						
Registrants for U.S. Forest Service cabins in Chugach National Forest	<u>1,558</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>.26</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>83</u>
Total	<u>98,982</u>	<u>1,522</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>1,291</u>	<u>1,046</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>1,081</u>	83

Table 19

QUESTION: Is the area (Glacier Bay National Monument)

RESPONSES (1) Too developed? (2) About right as is? (3) Not developed enough?

<u>Population Name</u>	<u>Population size</u>	<u>Usable response sample</u>	<u>Total number giving responses (1), (2), or (3)</u>		<u>Number giving specific response (2)</u>	
			<u>Total responses</u>	<u>Weighted total responses (Col 4 ÷ Col 3 x Col 2)</u>	<u>Total (2) Responses</u>	<u>Weighted (2) responses (Col 6 ÷ Col 4 x Col 5)</u>
<u>Column 1</u>	<u>Column 2</u>	<u>Column 3</u>	<u>Column 4</u>	<u>Column 5</u>	<u>Column 6</u>	<u>Column 7</u>
Visitor center Anchorage	5,590	244	74	1,695	64	1,466
Registrants at Katmai National Monument	298	128	84	196	73	170
Registrants at US Forest Service cabins	1,558	134	25	291	20	233
Alaska Marine Highway System reservations	3,640	105	31	1,075	28	971
Alaskan telephone directories (7 cities)	78,896	274	45	12,957	34	9,790
Registrants at Mt. McKinley National Park	9,000	161	40	<u>2,236</u>	34	<u>1,901</u>
Total				<u>18,450</u>		<u>14,531</u>

Weighted response "About right as is" FOR ALL POPULATIONS (Column 7 Total ÷ Column 5 Total) = 79% a/

a/As shown in table 4.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF GROUPS

To simplify the writing and understanding of this report, we classified various groups sampled in our review into seven categories. The following is a summary of these categories and the segment of each population sampled that was included in each.

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES

<u>Category</u>	<u>Populations Included</u>
Visitors to Alaska or non-Alaskans	-Registrants at the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce Visitor Center (non-Alaskan addresses). -Reservation holders on the Alaska Marine Highway System (non-Alaskan addresses). -Registrants at concessionaire facilities at Mt. McKinley National Park or Katmai National Monument (non-Alaskan addresses). -Registrants for Chugach National Forest cabins (non-Alaskan addresses).
Alaskans	-Persons listed in the telephone directories of: Anchorage Fairbanks Juneau Ketchikan Kodiak Valdez and Seward -Registrants at the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce sign-in log (Alaskan addresses). -Registrants for Chugach National Forest cabins (Alaskan addresses).
Visitors to Mt. McKinley National Park	-All persons listed in concessionaire's registration books

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | -All persons who indicated they visited Mt. McKinley National Park (on questionnaire). |
| Visitors to Katmai National Monument | -All persons listed in concessionaire's registration books at Katmai National Monument. |
| | -All persons who indicated they visited Katmai National Monument (on questionnaire). |
| Visitors to Chugach National Forest | -All persons who made reservations with the National Forest Service for cabins in the Chugach National Forest. |
| | -All persons who indicated they visited Chugach National Forest (on questionnaire). |
| Visitors to Denali Highway Area | -All persons who indicated they visited the Denali Highway Area (on questionnaire). |
| Visitors to "Other Areas" | -All persons who indicated they visited the area (i.e., park, refuge, monument, etc. on questionnaire). |

In some situations other groupings are used; however, when this is done the modified category is so described.

Case No _____
 (1 4)
 State _____
 (5 6)

I GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT ALASKAN FEDERAL LAND AREAS

1 We are trying to assess how well the following services are publicized Did you know that

	<u>1)Yes</u>		<u>2) No</u>		If no, would this information have been useful?	
					<u>1)Yes</u>	<u>2)Nu</u>
Certain campgrounds in Mt McKinley National Park require advance reservations	769	(7)	250		146	(8) 91
The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (Bureau of Outdoor Recreation) has descriptions of Alaskan river trips which are available to you	277	(9)	723		472	(10) 202
The Bureau of Land Management has brochures describing such things as the Denali Steese and Elliot highways as well as brochures describing canoe trips and camp grounds in Alaska	456	(11)	543		380	(11) 129
The U S Fish and Wildlife Service has brochures describing canoe routes on the Kenai National Moose Range	430	(13)	565		244	(14) 278
The National Forest Service has wilderness cabins in Alaska which you can reserve	642	(15)	358		212	(16) 127

NOTE Numbers in parenthesis will be used by keypunchers

2 Have you ever tried to reserve a National Forest Service cabin in Alaska?

- 1 234 Yes (17)
- 2 775 No (SKIP TO QUESTION 3)

If yes, what happened? (18)

- 1 150 I got the one I wanted
- 2 42 I didn't get my first choice
- 3 23 I didn't get a cabin

3 Have you ever tried to reserve accommodations at a National Park Service facility? (campground lodge/hotel)

	<u>CAMPGROUND</u>	<u>LODGE/HOTEL</u>
1 Yes	274	291
2 No (SKIP TO QUESTION 4)	484 (19)	285 (20)
If yes what happened?	(21)	(22)
1 I got the one I wanted	144	172
2 I didn't get my first choice	79	71
3 I didn't get anything	39	27

4 Recently the Federal government reserved about 100 million acres of undeveloped Alaskan land an area about the size of California as National Monuments or area for future study as parks, wildlife or National forests On these lands should the activities listed below be

<u>Activity</u>	Check one box per activity			
	GENERALLY 1) ALLOWED?	ALLOWED ON SPECIFIC 2) AREAS	BANNED 3) ALTOGETHER?	DON'T 4) KNOW
land float & ski planes	456	461	40	42 (23)
travel by snowmobile	257	543	175	32 (24)
travel by off road vehicle	170	515	267	50 (25)
building public cabins	248	580	131	43 (26)
building commercial lodges	124	545	272	60 (27)
sporthunting	313	430	223	34 (28)
hunting to provide food	524	347	80	49 (29)
oil and gas exploration and development	223	445	268	66 (30)
mining	202	465	267	64 (31)
timber harvesting	169	554	231	46 (32)
road building	226	613	131	29 (33)

- 5 In general what would you like to see done in the future with recreational lands in Alaska? (Check appropriate boxes)
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----|------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | leave undeveloped exactly as is
(SKIP TO QUESTION 7) | 127 | (34) |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | leave as is but provide access to border of area (roads landing strip etc) | 393 | (35) |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | in addition to access provide trails through the area | 398 | (36) |
| 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> | in addition provide campsites roads signs within area | 304 | (37) |
| 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> | provide recreational areas lodges cabins campgrounds within area | 389 | (38) |
| 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> | fully develop the area (additional lodges restaurants recreation/social facilities) | 111 | (39) |
| 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> | other (please specify) | 67 | (40) |
- 6 (a) If you would like to see recreational development of Federal land in Alaska how should this be paid for? (Check only one)
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Your Federal tax dollars | 238 | (41) |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Your State and local tax dollars | 31 | |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | User fees (entrance fees etc) | 308 | |
| 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Private funds (hotel chains etc) | 60 | |
| 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (please specify) _____ | 65 | |
-
- 6 (b) If you would like to see industrial development (timber mining oil etc) of Federal land in Alaska how should this be paid for? (Check only one)
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Your Federal tax dollars | 19 | (42) |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Your State and local tax dollars | 13 | |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | User fees (leases etc) | 321 | |
| 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Private funds | 266 | |
| 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (please specify) _____ | 33 | |
-

II INFORMATION ON SPECIFIC RECREATION AREAS

The questions which follow ask about specific recreation areas. Many may not apply to you, however for those areas you have visited please check the box(es) which best represent your experience/opinion.

If you have not visited any Alaskan recreation area please turn to page 8.

7 Please answer the following questions about each area you have visited.

	Glacier Bay National Monument	Katmai National Monument	Mt McKinley National Park	Tongass National Forest (SE Alaska, Mendenhall Glacier, etc)
A Did you visit (check one)				
1 Yes	318	225	805	422
2 No	325 (44)	352 (61)	84 (7)	240 (24)
B Is the area (check one)				
1) too developed?	6	5	49	18
2) About right as is?	253 (45)	164 (62)	584 (8)	308 (25)
3) Not developed enough?	40	47	137	72
C Why did you visit the area? (Check all that apply)				
1) Backpacking	18 (46)	21 (63)	130 (9)	46 (26)
2) Hiking	70 (47)	79 (64)	287 (10)	126 (27)
3) Camping	40 (48)	40 (65)	325 (11)	108 (28)
4) Fishing/hunting	33 (49)	95 (66)	58 (12)	88 (29)
5) Sightseeing/photography	282 (50)	174 (67)	731 (13)	379 (30)
6) Boating/canoeing	50 (51)	12 (68)	27 (14)	62 (31)
7) Stay in cabin	27 (52)	61 (69)	55 (15)	42 (32)
8) Other	32 (53)	30 (70)	86 (16)	49 (33)
D Where did you stay? (check all that apply)				
1) Outside the area	82 (54)	26 (71)	167 (17)	150 (34)
2) Lodge/motel	131 (55)	102 (72)	326 (18)	91 (35)
3) Cabin	13 (56)	66 (73)	31 (19)	39 (36)
4) RV campground	19 (57)	6 (74)	162 (20)	42 (37)
5) Tent campground	14 (58)	22 (75)	185 (21)	46 (38)
6) Campsite (back country or along highway)	33 (59)	21 (76)	154 (22)	73 (39)
7) Other	59 (60)	7 (77)	30 (23)	77 (40)

(1) in (80)

Dupl (1 6)

	Chugach National Forest (Portage Glacier Cordova Russian River Pr William Sound Afognak etc)	Arctic National Wildlife Range	Kenai Moose Range (Swanson River & Swan Lake Canoe Routes Skilak Loop Rd)	Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	Denali Highway	Other (Sitka and Klondike Historical Parks etc)
A 1 Yes	712	74	458	98	440	280
2 No	110 (41)	424 (58)	218 (7)	409 (24)	226 (41)	284 (58)
B 1	67	2	39	4	23	17
2	498	43	304	59	278	192
3	88 (42)	18 (59)	62 (8)	24 (25)	90 (42)	26 (59)
C 1	157 (4)	9 (60)	116 (9)	10 (26)	54 (43)	23 (60)
2	257 (44)	15 (61)	154 (10)	24 (27)	98 (44)	75 (61)
3	284 (45)	20 (62)	236 (11)	20 (28)	164 (45)	57 (62)
4	286 (46)	24 (63)	263 (12)	44 (29)	169 (46)	31 (63)
5	591 (47)	51 (64)	332 (13)	68 (30)	341 (47)	239 (64)
6	123 (48)	2 (65)	163 (14)	13 (31)	48 (48)	15 (65)
7	99 (49)	2 (66)	41 (15)	9 (32)	11 (49)	10 (66)
8	74 (50)	17 (67)	40 (16)	10 (33)	55 (50)	33 (67)
D 1	220 (51)	24 (68)	90 (17)	26 (34)	84 (51)	72 (68)
2	94 (52)	15 (69)	61 (18)	21 (35)	81 (52)	97 (69)
3	102 (53)	2 (70)	39 (19)	14 (36)	14 (53)	8 (70)
4	139 (54)	0 (71)	101 (20)	2 (37)	81 (54)	24 (71)
5	131 (55)	4 (72)	119 (21)	9 (38)	74 (55)	34 (72)
6	207 (56)	24 (73)	185 (22)	23 (39)	167 (56)	49 (73)
7	82 (57)	11 (74)	24 (23)	17 (40)	29 (57)	37 (74)
		(2) in (80) Dupl (1 6)				(3) in (80) Dupl (1 6)

	Glacier Bay National Monument	Katmai National Monument	Mt McKinley National Park	Tongass National Forest (SE Alaska, Mendenhall Glacier etc)
E Would you say the area				
1 is under used?	82	70	95	104
2 is used by just enough people?	178 (7)	126 (23)	353 (39)	215 (55)
3 is overcrowded?	22	11	289	32
1 is well kept?	260	192	702	319
2 is littered/in poor repair?	11 (8)	4 (24)	35 (40)	25 (56)
1 has good visitor facilities/services?	183	128	448	196
2 has fair visitor facilities/services?	58	52	215	105
3 has poor visitor facilities/services?	22 (9)	21 (25)	84 (41)	34 (57)
1 has too few hiking trails?	68	52	157	95
2 has just enough hiking trails?	126	118	434	174
3 has too many hiking trails?	2 (10)	2 (26)	15 (42)	3 (58)
1 facilities/services cost too little?	6	3	24	11
2 facilities/services are priced right?	142	116	476	214
3 facilities/services cost too much?	93 (11)	67 (27)	192 (43)	59 (59)
1 has adequate sanitary facilities?	201	171	570	239
2 has inadequate sanitary facilities?	33 (12)	15 (28)	134 (44)	58 (60)
1 has good access to activity areas?	133	102	442	177
2 has fair access to activity areas?	71	53	180	91
3 has poor access to activity areas?	36 (13)	40 (29)	75 (45)	34 (61)
1 has good information available (nature maps/signs)	185	137	577	213
2 has fair information available? (nature maps/signs)	63	47	124	85
3 has poor information available? (nature, maps/signs)	12 (14)	14 (30)	28 (46)	26 (62)
F For each area listed do you favor further development of Check if Yes				
1 lodges/hotels/motels?	68 (15)	41 (31)	230 (47)	59 (63)
2 cabins?	71 (16)	66 (32)	193 (48)	100 (64)
3 campgrounds?	67 (17)	58 (33)	290 (49)	112 (65)
4 campground facilities? (showers, etc)	54 (18)	37 (34)	208 (50)	82 (66)
5 more organized activities? (ranger talks films tours etc)	41 (19)	24 (35)	117 (51)	43 (67)
6 access roads?	32 (20)	32 (36)	141 (52)	58 (68)
7 publicity to attract more visitors?	34 (21)	27 (37)	72 (53)	43 (69)
8 other?	8 (22)	5 (38)	24 (54)	9 (70)

(4) in (80)
Dupl (1 6)

Chugach National Forest (Portage Glacier, Cordova, Russian River, Pr William Sound, Afognak, etc)		Arctic National Wildlife Range	Kenai Moose Range (Swanson River & Swan Lake Canoe Routes, Skilak Loop Rd)	Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	Denali Highway	Other (Sitka and Klondike Historical Parks, etc)
E 1	97	37	58	37	110	48
2	331 (7)	26 (23)	204 (39)	46 (56)	216 (7)	140 (23)
3	189	2	134	5	53	31
1	521	57	296	74	275	197
2	83 (8)	3 (24)	86 (40)	7 (56)	81 (8)	11 (24)
1	292	21	133	27	102	133
2	215	9	163	25	138	61
3	94 (9)	26 (25)	78 (41)	28 (57)	107 (9)	12 (25)
1	157	25	112	29	117	35
2	323	28	195	35	148	126
3	24 (10)	1 (26)	20 (42)	2 (58)	9 (10)	6 (26)
1	36	3	27	5	16	11
2	398	25	239	38	208	134
3	73 (11)	16 (27)	55 (43)	24 (59)	60 (11)	37 (27)
1	397	28	225	43	183	152
2	161 (12)	18 (28)	124 (44)	24 (60)	131 (12)	31 (28)
1	369	19	213	27	166	126
2	148	12	118	32	111	57
3	50 (13)	24 (29)	34 (45)	19 (61)	47 (13)	13 (29)
1	343	18	186	26	127	129
2	181	11	129	33	118	57
3	51 (14)	27 (30)	51 (46)	19 (62)	84 (14)	11 (30)
1	90 (15)	13 (31)	46 (47)	13 (63)	76 (15)	32 (31)
2	169 (16)	17 (32)	127 (48)	38 (64)	97 (16)	32 (32)
3	197 (17)	14 (33)	158 (49)	35 (65)	168 (17)	53 (33)
4	150 (18)	13 (34)	105 (50)	21 (66)	94 (18)	39 (34)
5	85 (19)	7 (35)	41 (51)	10 (67)	37 (19)	18 (35)
6	119 (20)	15 (36)	87 (52)	18 (68)	80 (20)	27 (36)
7	53 (21)	8 (37)	34 (53)	11 (69)	35 (21)	22 (37)
8	23 (22)	3 (38)	12 (54)	4 (70)	14 (22)	6 (38)

(5) in (80)
Dupl (16)

*

8 If you visited Mt McKinley, Please answer this question, otherwise skip to question 9

Did you use the shuttle bus system?

1	Yes	(39)	542
2	No		263

How would you describe it?

1	More than adequate	(40)	129
(SKIP TO QUESTION 9)			
2	Adequate (SKIP TO QUESTION 9)		288
3	Inadequate		140

If inadequate, why?
(Check all that apply)

1	Too crowded	(41)	62
2	Not enough buses to meet demand	(42)	72
3	Uncomfortable	(43)	59
4	Doesn't allow enough freedom to see the park	(44)	72
5	Hard to get on again, if you get off any any point	(45)	59
6	Other (please specify) _____	(46)	30

III Please supply the following information about yourself

9 AGE (47)

1	under 20	13
2	20 - 29	179
3	30 - 39	263
4	40 - 49	145
5	50 - 59	191
6	60 and over	236

10 SEX (48)

1	Male	748
2	Female	265

11 APPROXIMATE INCOME (yours and spouse's if married and both working) (49)

1	under \$10,000	100
2	10,000 - 19,999	216
3	20,000 - 29,999	228
4	30,000 - 39,999	189
5	40,000 - 49,999	99
6	50 000 and above	145

12 HIGHEST GRADE ATTENDED (Check one) (50)

1	Elementary School	21
2	High School	264
3	College/Technical School	727

13 LOCATION WHERE YOU LIVE(D)

1	Primarily lived (A) until age 18	Live (B) now
1	On a farm/ranch	150 33
2	Rural Community/ small town under 1,000 people)	101 58
3	Town (1,000 - 5 000)	139 82
4	Small City (5,000 - 50,000)	258 226
5	Medium city (50 000 - 1 million)	211 452
6	Large city (over 1 million)	115 87

(51) (52)

14 OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION

- a Are you retired? (53)
- 1 Yes 207
 - 2 No 821
- b Are you a full time student?
- 1 Yes (54) 32
 - 2 No part time 69
 - 3 Not a student 809
- c If you are now working is your job considered
- (Check one)
- 1 Professional/technical? 429
 - 2 Manager official proprietor ? 135
 - 3 Clerical worker ? 39
 - 4 Sales worker ? 27
 - 5 Skilled labor? 104
 - 6 Semi skilled labor? 27
 - 7 Unskilled? 3
 - 8 Other (please specify) 35

(55)

IF YOU ARE A RESIDENT OF ALASKA
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 18

15 How did you travel around Alaska on your visit? (Check all that apply)

- 1 Airplane (56)
- (Results not tabulated) 2 Car or RV
- 3 Ferry
- 4 Cruise ship
- 5 Bus
- 6 Other (please specify)

16 a) Did you come

- 1 Alone? (57) 78
- 2 With family only? 288
- How many? _____
(include yourself) (58 59)
- 3 With friends only? 73
- How many? _____
(include yourself)
- 4 With family and friends? 49
- How many? _____
(include yourself)
- 5 Other (please specify) 25
- How many? _____
(include yourself)

b) Were you with a tour group?

- 1 Yes 101 (60)
- 2 No 450

17 To help us assess the potential attractiveness of Alaska for future tourists please estimate the cost of your last visit to a recreation area (including transportation) (Results not tabulated)

- A As a member of a tour group \$ _____ (61 65)
- B Not as a tour group member \$ _____ (66 70)

IF YOU ARE NOT A RESIDENT OF ALASKA SKIP TO QUESTION 19

18 If you are a resident of Alaska how do you get to recreation areas? (Check all that apply)

- 1 Airplane (71)
- 2 Car or RV
- 3 Ferry (Results not tabulated)
- 4 Cruise ship
- 5 Bus
- 6 Other (please specify)

19 If you have any comments on topics covered by this questionnaire or related topics please use the space below Attach additional sheet(s) if necessary

If comment made
(1) in (77)
(6) in (80)

(148020)

Single copies of GAO reports are available free of charge. Requests (except by Members of Congress) for additional quantities should be accompanied by payment of \$1.00 per copy.

Requests for single copies (without charge) should be sent to

U S General Accounting Office
Distribution Section, Room 1518
441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20548

Requests for multiple copies should be sent with checks or money orders to

U S General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P O Box 1020
Washington, DC 20013

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the U S General Accounting Office. NOTE: Stamps or Superintendent of Documents coupons will not be accepted.

PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH

To expedite filling your order, use the report number and date in the lower right corner of the front cover.

GAO reports are now available on microfiche. If such copies will meet your needs, be sure to specify that you want microfiche copies.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

**UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D C 20548**

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300**

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U S GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**



THIRD CLASS