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My presentation today is not from the perspective of a site development specialist, although landscape architecture is my training. It is not from that of an interpreter, although I have been taught a lot about this field by my colleagues at Texas A&M. Rather, I am approaching interpretation from the perspective of a student of overall planning—especially of tourism and recreation. While I have the disadvantage of not being in practice, either of designing interpretive sites and services or of providing interpretation, I believe I have the advantage of a detachment where study, research and drawing conclusions is my main mission.

From this perspective, my main message is that of recognizing that the visitor, not the manager nor the resource base, is the only real reason for the interpreter to exist. By emphasizing the visitor, I mean that no one can design, build or manage without understandings of those who will use what is designed, built and managed. While this seems an obvious truth, I find it is not in general acceptance, especially in today's park and recreation management policy.

Instead, today's public policy is preoccupied with resource protection and jurisdictional quibbling over finance. Private recreation policy, if there is one, is preoccupied with profitmaking and antagonizing government. Even the dominant recreation issues of the day, such as capacity theories, regulation and land acquisition, are anti-visitor. Until there is a nationwide reversal of policy that sincerely and effectively recognizes the dominance
of visitors—their location, interests, habits and sensitivities—what we know as interpretation will continue to be relegated to the category of unnecessary frills.

Because our attention has been directed elsewhere, the body of research of visitors is comparatively small. However, for the next few minutes, I would like to use some slides to illustrate a few recent studies and to provide some insight concerning visitors and their importance in interpretation.

(Narrative presentation, illustrated with slides)

*Last year, a Texas A&M graduate student, Cindy Irwin, used observation and survey research methods in eight historic sites to determine visitor functions and reactions to interpretive facilities and programs. Seven of the sites were in Texas: Fort Lancaster, Mission Espiritu Santo, Eisenhower's Birthplace, The Alamo, Washington-on-the-Brazos, Bishop's Palace and Ashton Villa. Also included was the Hermitage at Nashville. These were selected because they represented four categories (two sites each) of historic sites: representative, documentary-person, documentary-event and event.

*Generally, visitors were well pleased with the interpretive programs. Some comments about the things that impressed them most were:

The historic atmosphere.
The opportunity to gain a personal glimpse of history; insight into an era.
The esthetic importance; the beauty of architecture.
The quality of reconstruction.
Specific features, such as the museum, the exhibits, the artifacts.

*Among other findings useful to interpreters were:

30 percent of visitors bring cameras and most want to use them.
50 percent take out literature and 16 percent buy souvenirs.
Time spent is modal: 34% less than 30 minutes
22% 61 to 90 minutes
20% 31 to 45 minutes
Dogs present a problem—must take turns dog-sitting
Distance traveled is bimodal: 27% 50 to 100 miles
46% more than 250 miles
Visitors are highly motivated: 75% have strong interest in history
95% usually stop at historic markers
All subscribe to a magazine with at least some space devoted to history.

*Even so, the study revealed many interpretive problems. Let me use the following illustrations to describe four categories of problems. Many people are very well satisfied with the interpretive programs of this historic site in West Texas--Fort Lancaster, established in 1855 by the 1st. U.S. Infantry which protected wagon trains from San Antonio to El Paso. This shows some of the ruins and the visitor center in the background.

*The visitor center contains a professionally designed exhibit maze, a model of the fort, some artifacts on display, an information desk and rest rooms. The exhibit maze is self contained and was designed to operate one-way. But, observation showed that it didn't work this way, at least for 60% of the visitors. About 40% did come in the entrance door and went into the exhibit maze as planned. However, 10% walked straight through the building or around outside to see the ruins. 2% headed straight for the restrooms. Of the other 48%, 6% went first to the model, 20% headed for the information desk where a ranger sat and 22% stopped by the artifact exhibit case. Once a visitor was in the room, he was closer to the exit of the exhibit maze. About 75% of these people entered the exhibit backwards, starting at the end of the story!

*Dissatisfactions registered at this site included comments such as:
"prefer to have at least one building restored."
"would like an interpretive tour of the site."
*A Spanish mission begun in 1755, The Alamo gains its primary fame as the stronghold of valiant defenders of the Texas Republic who died at the hands of the Mexicans in 1836.

*A main feature for visitors is a barracks building. The building is long and narrow and has only one entrance open. There is no logical sequence of exhibits and visitors tend to view everything in one section before going on. All the visitors have to turn around at the end and work their way back through incoming visitors, complicated by two audio-visual presentations in the first section. The shows are long and no seating is available. Therefore, crowds create traffic jams right in front of the door.

*The Hermitage, located at Nashville, is the protected home, tomb and site of the eighth president of the United States, Andrew Jackson. Most people begin with a tour of the building. The site is well organized for visitors and most are pleased with their visit.

*One problem was observed, however. The building tour quits at the top of the stairs and the visitor is left to find his way out. When exiting the building he faces a problem of three ways to go and there is no guidance to assist. If he goes toward the museum, he soon finds himself at the exit, skipping most of the site, very important to the total experience. If he goes straight out, he misses half the site. Only those with folders (and these were only a few) found their way correctly to the right around the remainder of the site. A common flow pattern has caused an unsightly path worn in the lawn as visitors return cross-lots to the original heritage building.
These research results highlight the problem of interpretation that visitor use is not always according to ideas of management and design.

*The next observations center on problems of controls. At The Alamo, visitors are prohibited from taking pictures inside the buildings. Visitors indicated that this was their major complaint. After all, tourists do want to use their cameras to obtain personal souvenirs of the places they have visited. These are very important to them after they return home for further reflection on the experience and retelling to friends and relatives. Furthermore, several areas were barred from the visitor. And, no explanations were offered.

*The Eisenhower Birthplace, located in Dennison, Texas, has been restored to 1890, the time of his birth. Visitors most enjoyed a personal glimpse of Eisenhower's early life. But visitors could not understand and were disturbed by the prohibition from going upstairs. Some commented that at least the management should have photographs of these rooms on display. It seems that visitors are willing to be controlled but want to know why.

*A third problem, identified through this research, was that of bias of the racial and ethnic interpretive messages and development. While there may be good reason for most historic sites to be representing white artifacts and events, this does present a problem for non-white visitors. This table shows the distribution by ethnic groups to these eight historic sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obviously non-whites are not participating. Furthermore, comments noted by non-white visitors included, "Why can't they tell history our way?" Interpretation, particularly of historic sites, may need to become more sensitive to non-white visitors.

*Research of these sites indicated that even though many people were satisfied with the interpretive programs, others felt they were being treated as children. It was evident that visitors are far more sophisticated than management and interpretation had assumed. Here are some comments:

"You didn't learn much you didn't already know"
"Too much trivia."
"Too much tourist junk in gift shop."
"Have the tour guides explain a little more."
"Make more interesting slide show."
"Slide show didn't go with the site."
"Landscape restoration doesn't fit buildings."

The survey provided another statistic that underscored these criticisms of management talking down to the visitors. 52 percent of the visitors had at least one college degree.

While this survey of only 8 sites truly represents only these sites, I am confident that they are typical of visitor problems of interpretation in many other areas.

*Another study of interest to interpretation was that made at Inks Lake State Park, Texas, this summer, by Texas A&M graduate student, Stephen Philipp. It produced some startling information, especially for the interpreters in the park. The site is a 2000-acre park in central Texas, along a major reservoir formed by a dam on the Colorado River. The area offers many recreational activities, such as picnicking, swimming, fishing, boating and 350 sites for camping.
The survey consisted of interviewing visitors at every eighth campsite in July on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. The major interpretive programs are a guided nature walk at 10 AM and a 9 PM nature interpretation talk, illustrated with slides and held in an outdoor amphitheater.

Here are some of the findings from the 42 indepth interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not know interpretive programs were going on</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know what interpretive programs are</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had never been to an interpretive program</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are some additional results. When asked whether arranging to or bringing children would interfere with their coming to interpretive programs,

64% answered YES
and 36% answered NO

When asked if there would be scheduling conflicts,

71% answered YES
and 29% answered NO

Obviously there was confirmation of the lack of information by their answering:

95% answered YES
5% answered NO

The visitors were asked what might keep them from attending interpretive programs. Here are some of the main answers. Several indicated more than one reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many activities going on</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program not interesting</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing what's going on</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just want to visit friends, relatives</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too tired; too much effort</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Another study in Texas—a cross-section of all our state parks by Valeen Silvy at Texas A&M—provides additional insight into the visitors. Interviews with interpreters and questionnaire surveys of visitors in 1976 showed the following:

1. The fact that visitors intentionally select certain park types has much to do with how they perceive interpretive programs.
2. Visitors seek entertainment, education, socializing or other activities and anticipate that interpretive programs will support their reasons for attending.
3. Visitors who have seen interpretive programs before view them differently from those who have not.
4. Interpreters include management as an objective; visitors do not. Visitors seek socializing; interpreters do not admit to socializing as a motivation.

*I would like now to draw from another study of visitors—this one by Gary Mullins, an experienced researcher and interpreter in National Parks. His survey included a sample of 778 respondents visiting ten national park areas in the southern Rockies, including two historical, two archeological, two recreational and four natural areas.

*The profile of the visitor suggests that family-oriented interpretive programs are necessary; that at least half of the programs should be geared to college-level audiences; that there may be opportunities for interpretive programs in lodging outside the park; and that each year new interpretation must be offered because of the number who have heard interpretive programs before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family groups</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed college</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed outside park</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have participated before</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other reasons included things like:
"didn't plan for it;"
"children would be bored and uncontrollable;"
"don't want to do anything—just sit."

Here are several challenges to the interpreter.

*Because information seemed to be an important issue, the visitors were asked where they would expect to receive information about interpretation. Here are the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranger station entrance</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards in park</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park store</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roving ranger</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted at campsite</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater signs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration packet</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order to obtain even further information, the visitors were allowed to make general comments, not structured. Here are some sample answers:

We stumbled into the program down at the store.
It's got to be something very important or I won't go.
I probably wouldn't go because I've lived up in this area.
We'd rather stay and play cards.
Teenagers aren't that wild about that sort of thing.
I only went to one and the ranger just talked about the park.
If our friends are visiting we probably wouldn't go.
We have ten kids and we more or less have our own program.
We just come up here to go swimming.
I'd just rather sleep.
I've got too many other things going: fishing, skiing, women.
We don't go to interpretive programs anymore; we're getting to the age where we come out here to sit and relax.
I might go if it was within walking distance, because once I park the car, that's it.

Again, these exact statistics only apply to these park visitors. However, I think all of us can relate to them in other areas as well.
Their activities show need for special emphasis from interpretive programs. What interpretive programs are needed for photography? What provision have we made to allow informal talking among visitors? What design provision, such as turnouts and overlooks, are we providing for the great majority to stop along drives to observe the flora and fauna?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take photos</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped to observe flora</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped to observe fauna</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, I would like to turn from these studies of visitors to interpretive programs to a field that seems very foreign to most park managers and interpreters—the field of tourism. I contend that, with the exception of neighborhood parks, virtually all park visitors are tourists.

While it cannot qualify as research, a documentary on CBS, IF IT'S TUESDAY IT MUST BE BELGIUM, showed that social rewards are often as important as the interpretive information about sites. After their 21-day, 11-country bus tour of Europe, the conclusion was that "... the tourists have met one another and have lived together intimately for three weeks. In the end, every one of them seems to feel that this, the making of new American friends, is one of the chief and lasting rewards of having taken the tour."

Canadian researchers, wanting to know more about Americans ran a survey here. Perhaps interpreters will be helped by their classification of Americans according to their characteristics as visitors.
1. 29% NON-ACTIVE VISITORS: seek familiar surroundings and places they can visit friends and relatives. Conventional and introverted persons who find it difficult to respond to new or strange interactions.

2. 26% FOREIGN TRAVEL VACATIONERS: look for exotic settings and enriching experiences. They also are gregarious and extroverted.

3. 19% OUTDOOR VACATIONERS: seek clean air, rest and quiet in beautiful scenery. Children's interests are important and they are more impulsive and unconventional, seeking less congestion.

4. 12% ACTIVE CITY VISITORS: seek familiar surroundings and friends and relatives. They are inclined to participate in urban activities—sightseeing, shopping, cultural and entertainment. They are dreamers rather than doers and tend to follow rather than lead.

5. 8% RESORT VACATIONERS: most interested in water sports and good weather. They seek gregariousness and big city atmosphere. They tend to be egocentric and domineering. They seek audiences upon whom they can impress their views.

6. 6% FAMILY SIGHTSEEERS: look for places which would be rewarding for children as well as adults. They tend to be rigid in their thinking and social behavior and generally lack emotional security.

Who is to say that these are not the types that interpreters may have to segregate their programs for?

*Another tourist-oriented situation. Last winter I had a student field trip to Padre Island National Seashore. Tourists milling around the beach center coming from Canada and Minnesota were pleased when our students began to tell them about the island. Later in the day, we visited park headquarters and found that the interpreter had no winter programs and did not know
why the people were there. He was surprised to learn that both the local and
state tourism agencies had promoted special winter tours to the Gulf coast
throughout northern U.S. and Canada.
Few park agencies maintain linkage with tourism agencies and organizations.
Such collaboration could give us much greater insight into the visitors.

*For the next part of my presentation, I would like to take you
to two Canadian locations. These are not research studies but merely highlight
some of my own observations relating to interpretation.
The first setting is Banff National Park, located on the border between the
Canadian provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.

*We enjoyed a transcontinental train trip from Toronto to Banff. But, we made the observation that a great interpretive opportunity was missed.
No information about Banff and Jasper on the train! Almost three days with a
captive and receptive audience.

*Only from casual contact did we learn that for our tour of
Banff and Jasper national parks we could rent a narrative tape. But, rather
than from headquarters, this was available only from a local camera shop. And,
it was prepared in New York.

*We were surprised that the tape did not mention the very foun-
dation of this park. Railroad engineers, pushing through this wild country in
the late 1800's accidentally found this spring near the right-of-way. The fed-
eral government immediately exploited the resort potential by establishing a
national park, much like our Hot Springs.
*The tape led us to many interesting sights along the 178-mile trip to Jasper. Most were very well linked with interpretive messages, such as this one at Moraine Lake.

*Elsewhere around this site, there were no other intrusions that might mar the beauty, mystery and grandeur of the view.

*Several times, roadside maps helped to key the visitor with the tape and general highway maps of the two parks.

*Had it not been for the tape, we would have missed this spectacular view of a glacier lake, with its strange blue-green hue, derived from the powdered rock suspended in the melting glacier waters.

*Throughout Jasper and Banff National Parks, we found all the concessioners, such as this one with snowmobile tours, of excellent quality. This gives visitors an opportunity to get onto the Athabaska ice field and hear interpretive information from the tour guide drivers.

*Our guide was very informative telling us we were sitting on an ice cube 1000-feet deep and 6-miles long. He brought us in contact with many of the special characteristics of glaciers, including this 200-foot deep hole.

*Many times along the way, interpretive signs aided in describing what we were viewing. Occasionally, these were not in synchronization with the tape. This caused much confusion.
*Many scenic areas demanded no interpretation. The highway designers had, however, been sensitive to many of these vistas and had provided turnouts to prevent traffic accidents and congestion.

*A well-designed special exhibit provided interpretation of the native sheep that frequently congregate in this area.

*The second location in Canada I would like to illustrate is that called Huronia. This is a very loosely defined area in southern Ontario, centered on the city of Midland. Much of early North America history was created in this locale.

*Ever since early fur trading in the North, Midland has been an important port city. Today, cruise tours are available to visitors.

*Just a few miles from Midland, around the bay at the base of Georgian Bay, is located an excellent interpretive museum—Museum of the Upper Lakes. Because of the importance of the Great Lakes in early history, this display identifies significant transportation routes.

*This is a portion of the hull of the British schooner, "Nancy," buried in the Nottawasaga River for the last 150 years. When the captain, in a battle of the War of 1812, realized he was trapped by three American ships, he set the schooner on fire and it burned to the waterline.
*This unusual interpretive center, designed to simulate the three sails of the Nancy, provides a dramatic sound-slide presentation of the War of 1812--of course from the British point of view.

*Inside another portion of the museum, exhibits, displays and artifacts help to surround the visitor with marine lore and history.

*Back to the Midland area, this outdoor interpretive map re-inforces the significance of early use of these waters--even their linkage with Europe.

*The view at this sign reinforces the significance. It is hard to comprehend that all transportation on these waters was by canoes coming from Georgian Bay into this river outlet and bay.

*Turning around just 180° the visitor gets this view of the river entrance and surrounding lowlands.

*The last views of the Wye River and marsh were taken from this site--the Shrine of the Martyrs, built in 1926. This commemorates the six or more missionaries, the first canonized saints of North America, that were burned at the stake at the hands of Indians in the early 1600's. This can be interpreted two ways, depending upon the visitor's attitude toward the concept of Christian-izing Indians.
From this same vantage point, one can see two major interpretive areas, developed and managed by the Ontario Provincial Parks: the Wye Marsh Wildland Reserve in the background and the restored Sainte Marie-Among-the-Hurons in the foreground.

By car, one first comes to an excellent visitor center for Sainte Marie-Among-the-Hurons. This contains exhibits, interpretive shows, an information desk and literature. One can tour the area on his own or follow an interpretive guide.

A great amount of archeological research was required to determine exact locations and building types that stood here between 1639 and 1649. A book, written by the archeologists illustrates some of the work and how visitors enjoyed watching, even during reconstruction work in the 1950's.

Present exhibits replicate the cultural settings and activities that represented that colorful and dramatic era of the first European settlement in inland North America.

The compound was served with canoe transportation via the Wye River. Everything, including foods, supplies and messages, came in and out this way—tied all the way by water to Europe. Note the lock and interpretive guide. These guides were available but gave no canned narratives. Their presence minimizes vandalism and enriches the experience for all who seek their help.

Of interest to the visitors are the several interpretive demonstrations, such as this one showing how logs were hand-hewn for use in construction.
*A reproduction of an Indian hogan, shows that Indians came into the compound and stayed while the missionaries began closer communication with them; the interpreters didn't mention however that the missionaries introduced diseases that nearly wiped out all the Indian nations.

*Right nearby is the Wye Marsh Wildlife Refuge. This sign at the entrance is an attempt to take the chill and formality off the usual museum approach to nature. Timely information is added regularly.

*Excellent exhibits and simple description. Here I saw a remarkable way of satisfying thousands of visitors without their setting foot on fragile natural settings. Just out of this view is a television monitor, picking up the complete drama of a bird and nest over a mile away where a camera is focused on the natural scene.

*For the areas close by the visitor center, excellent walks are provided. This handles the greatest need for the short-run trails used by the vast majority of the visitors.

*Along the way, there is an attempt to call attention to interesting points, such as this guide to trees.

*One can turn the arrow toward the tree and find its identification on the dial. A bit hokey, but kids like it.

*I smiled at this sign that is well-intentioned. It is supposed to convey to the visitor that the management is really busy in its concern over nature. But, must we emphasize so strongly that we are going to completely rebuild nature?
*For access to the marshy areas, boardwalk trails are provided. Note the marker along the way.

*An overlook tower is provided for visitor observation of the setting and wildlife.

*One of the most interesting exhibit areas is this underwater viewing site. It was built at the tip of an arm of the Wye Marsh.

*The shelter provides a shaded location where the creatures and plantlife of the marsh bottom can be viewed. Several benches are provided for about a dozen visitors to sit and watch. This could have been enhanced by some interpretive guidance on exhibits or panels alongside the window.

* * * * * * * * * * *

This concludes my discussion of research and examples and now I would like to draw some conclusions from what we now know about visitors and interpretation.

*Here are just seven conclusions that I believe highlight these observations and opportunities for improving the sensitivity of all interpretive programs and facilities toward the visitor.

1. If visitors are disturbed by arbitrary rules and regulations, why can't the management and interpretation eliminate minor and obsolete regulations and provide adequate explanation for necessary rules, such as "don't touch," and "no photographs." It is my opinion that with proper design and information, nearly all of the don'ts can be eliminated. Certainly, those controls that remain must be reasonable and justified.

2. If visitors are to avoid confusion and congestion, why can't interpretive designers create people-circulation flows that provide a
maximum of contact without difficulty? Management should be constantly feeding attendance information and forecasts to designers to adjust building and ground design and construction as well as interpretive programs to meet new needs. Good functional design is a part of interpretation.

3. If visitors come to natural and cultural sites with varied interests and needs, why can't interpretive facilities and programs be segmented? It need not demand an overly-complicated system—just recognition of the need for different displays, literature and narratives for certain groups. Planning for the average will surely produce mediocre interpretation, suited to no one.

4. If visitors come in contact with park personnel and environments outside structured interpretive settings and programs—and they do—why shouldn't management consider interpretation in its broadest context? Interpretation, although needing specialized individuals, facilities and programs, cannot be left only to these specialized functions. The major justification for all management's budget and personnel is that of serving the visitor. And, incidentally, properly serving the visitor is good resource management.

5. If visitors in fact enjoy, appreciate and gain information and insight from non-typical media and programs, why can't these be used? In many instances, drama, art, music, photography and special events could be used but today are refused because of prejudices against them by management.

6. If visits to natural and cultural resource areas are in the context of vacation trips, bus tours, camping trips, weekend outings and even post-convention tours, why shouldn't management and interpretation be planned in this context? This would mean greater collaboration with external and supporting services, such as airlines, bus companies, motels and hotels, travel wholesalers and highway agencies.
7. If greater understandings of visitors are needed, such as knowledge of their interests, habits, background, degree of sophistication and amount of time available, why can't management and interpretation run regular observation surveys of visitors? We find that managers and interpreters know much about resources and techniques but little about their visitors. As an aid to this, our interpretive specialist, Dr. John Hanna, and a colleague, have prepared a manual for doing this job. You may find it very useful.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Let me close by saying that I have every confidence in the ability and creativity of both interpreters and managers. The challenge today, as I see it, is to redirect these efforts to the visitor. I have no doubt that if this were done, we could serve even twice as many visitors with even double the personal satisfaction and enrichment at the same time we could reduce impact on the environment.
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