I welcome this opportunity of meeting with you today for both a selfish and a professional reason. It affords me an opportunity of observing more of your fine country and of meeting the key Canadian professionals in landscape architecture. But, more than this, it gives all of us a moment to concentrate on what I believe is the greatest challenge for landscape architecture today—the redesign of the world for tourism, recreation and park use.

Because landscape architects have not yet fully responded to this challenge I intend to discuss with you several very important areas of interface between landscape architecture and the combined field of tourism, recreation and park development. My purpose is to prevent you from leaving this congress without feeling somewhat responsible for the present quality of the leisure environment and also challenged to do something about it.

I would like to open my remarks with two observations that concern all of us. I am disturbed by two trends I see in landscape architecture. Both are contrary to a basic
fundamental of the profession— that of creativity. The first is PSEUDO-SCIENCE and the second is ANTI-DEVELOPMENT. Both of these relate to comments I will be making later on regarding the interface between landscape architecture and the combined fields of tourism, parks and recreation.

What do I mean by PSEUDO-SCIENCE in landscape architecture? Today, both in schools and in offices, we have responded very forcefully to the glamor of science and technology. A project report today seems to suffer if it does not contain words like eutrophication, ecosystems, biosystems, biochemical oxygen demand and other glamor words of science. Parallel to this is the hero-worship of the computer. It seems that a hand-drawn map with color coding and smooth-flowing delineations is no longer as glamorous as a paste-up of black-and-white computer printout sheets with X's, O's and dots forced into a zig-zag rectangular grid. Personally, I am in favor of innovations and more efficient ways of getting jobs done. At Texas A & M we made generous use of SYMAP and similar computer mapping programs. I am impressed with the mindboggling capacity and speed of the computer—as a tool. But, from some of the uses I have seen in recent years, for some landscape professionals, it has become master rather than tool.

Landscape architecture does need the input of science. There is no longer a place for the dreamy esthete who thinks
only of bilateral symmetry, color harmony and textural nuances. Solid grounding in geology, soil science, climatology, biology, psychology, sociology and yes, -- even computer science -- are more important to today's landscape architect than ever before. The training of the future landscape architect must include these and other disciplines as well. But, there is a big difference between solid groundings and the superficialities of pseudo-science trappings.

Why do I object to ANTI-DEVELOPMENT? Doesn't it seem strange to you that we, whose training and livelihood deal with the creation of landscapes now turn our backs upon development the very reason for our being? The popular stance today is to be overtly against development while we covertly support more and more development by our personal deeds every day.

To me, this is a complete sell-out of landscape professional objectives to the armchair critics who enjoy the anti-development fashion of the day. To me, this is an abortion of professional responsibility -- the responsibility of creating order and beauty out of chaos and ugliness. As long as man is on this earth there will be development. In my definition, development decisions include those that protect resource characteristics as well as those that make readjustments in the present scene or those that accompany
expansion. Our responsibility, as design professionals, is to see that it is done in a manner that respects the givens of Nature at the same time that it makes this earth more livable.

We have no overdevelopment. Most factories are busy, most highways are used; most houses are occupied; most farms are in operation. But, we do have an abundance of mis-allocation of resources, low-quality development and opportunities foregone. Our problem is not no much a quantitative one as a qualitative one. And, who is better able to assist in the planning and design of resources, qualitatively, than landscape architects?

Instead of supporting pseudo-science and anti-development, landscape architects today could well espouse those objectives for which they are better qualified--the planning and design of high quality environments. For this, we can utilize all the historical data that science can provide but can add that valuable ingredient of environmental design professionalism that grows only out of ability, training and experience.

The facet of landscape architecture that I have been asked to discuss today is that relating to tourism, recreation and parks. As most of you know, this is the specialty of landscape architecture I have been working in for some time.
But, you may well ask, why to I link tourism with parks and recreation? After all, most people who are in favor of parks are against tourism--those who work with tourism seldom include either parks or recreation in their vocabulary. Universities have departments of recreation, recreology, park administration, sometimes parks and recreation and sometimes tourism, usually included within hotel schools. Seldom are these linked together. And, seldom, do landscape architects get training in any of them.

If we examine the functions of these three--tourism, recreation and parks--we find there are very important differences but at the same time, there are some overlaps, especially important to landscape architects.

First of all, threaded through all three categories are people who seek certain personal satisfactions through participation in certain environments. The people who travel and spend money on accommodations and food also visit parks. Frequently, though not always, the opposite is true. Recreation is often defined as engagement in any socially acceptable activity that provides physical and mental release. Those who travel and those who visit parks frequently engage in activities that even the specialists would define as recreation.

Secondly, the same environments are frequently called upon to serve tourists, recreationists and park visitors.
National parks, state and provincial parks and city parks are often the target for tourists as well as local recreationists and park visitors. Interpretation of historic and natural features is often included in readings on recreation. These are frequently parks of both tourist and park activity.

My reason for emphasizing these two major overlaps—people and environments—is that most institutions and organizations, including landscape architects, do not yet consider them in this manner. Because individual business enterprise and individual public agencies make the decisions on the development of tourism, parks and recreation areas, it is natural that we should find a great amount of segregation. But, unfortunately, this produces a major design problem. The common denominators of people and environments demand design coordination and integration that does not yet exist. This is an entirely new realm of opportunity for the landscape architect the alert and aggressive one. If we are to measure up to this demand we need to develop a new competency. We must build upon the traditional elements of landscape architecture with new understandings and new creativity.

For the next few minutes, I would like to discuss tourism/recreation/park planning from two broad-perspective
models. First, the way it is now and second, the way I think it could be planned. Because my experience in Canada is limited, you will have to be the judge on how well it applies to Canada.

SLIDES

If we were to classify all developers, we might group them as represented here by the 3 color patches (red, yellow, green) representing government, private enterprise and non-profit organizations.

Generally, all go through the same steps of setting objectives, selecting sites, designing sites and structures and finally engaging in their own management practices.

Notice that the resulting white symbols of development are cut apart. Not only does each group operate independently but hundreds of decision-makers within each group act independently. This is the way development is created.

My next few slides represent just a sample of the many problems that result from such a fragmented approach. On the one hand we say it is unlawful to litter and then proceed to do it with a flair.
Without regional design guidance, we allow excessive concentration of recreational uses that cannot help but produce problems—not only problems of conflict within one use, such as canoeing, but also with other uses, such as vacation homes along the river and fishermen using motorized boats.

Even some of our efforts toward a broad-scale approach are sometimes aborted. I found on a recent trip that all of the state-managed tourist information centers I contacted gave me inadequate or even incorrect information.

Seldom do we plan design beyond the narrow dimensions of the site scale. The restroom facilities here were planned for a maximum of 200 persons per day—a normal weekend load—and obviously were totally inadequate for 20,000 persons attending the Makaha International Surfing Meet.

This example of poor broad-scale design shows a single rock mass along a nine-mile stretch of beautiful sand beach. Instead of protecting this esthetic feature, the short-sighted designers of the hotel smothered it by building the hotel around it.
Although I believe in free enterprise, I think it is nothing short of criminal to destroy nature by cutting out a treetop to display a commercial sign.

Poor planning examples are not restricted to the United States. Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, a 1000-year-old historic port city on the Adriatic, is scheduled to receive 5 times as many tourists in the next 10 years.

But, the only highway leading to the ancient city is narrow and flanked with buildings that should not be destroyed.

And yet, this is slated to be widened to four lanes to handle projected traffic. A regional approach should provide an alternate transportation solution—one that would not destroy the resource. To me, this is a design problem.

Also near Dubrovnik is an example of what I feel is just plain bad taste—a "Yellow Submarine Discoteque."
Let me give you another example of poor planning and design coordination. You are looking at the Hacha Falls, Canaima National Park, Venezuela. Although this is owned by the national park agency of Venezuela, a Belgian squatter has installed a thatch-roofed restaurant and some concrete cabins that make up the only hotel for hundreds of miles.

After finally persuading the National Park people to meet the country's tourism agency—they hadn't for several years even though they are officed across the street from each other—I was shocked to hear the tourism officials tell the national park officials that soon a hugh runway would be installed to handle jets. Hardly a coordinated approach to planning.

Another example is located in Vienna—a marvelous travel destination. Here and elsewhere around the world, visitors are finding great satisfaction in visiting historic sites, such as the Hofburg Palace, shown here.

But, the mass of modern automobiles of all colors, shapes and sizes introduces an incongruous element to the scene, making it difficult to imagine the palace at its peak period of elegance and horse-and-carriage use.
Amsterdam is well-known for its beautiful canals and towers. Motelbahn tower is old enough to have been sketched by Rembrandt in 1623...

But, the romance is shattered by seeing trash and garbage in the canal before it. The interrelatedness of the many pieces of travel and recreation often fail to be properly assembled for people's use and appreciation.

As many of you know, I have attempted to make a plea for greater coordination of tourism, recreation and parks especially during the planning stage, in my book by this title.

The experience of research the topic did bring me to some conclusions--conclusions that I believe will be useful to those of us in the profession of landscape architecture. Let me name just four:

The first conclusion is that attractions--all the way from commercial theme parks to national parks--are the FIRST POWER. Without beaches, scenery, historic sites and developed attractions, there would be no tourism, recreation and parks.
Second: There appears to be a trend toward large attraction complexes. Today, it is difficult for the small and isolated attraction to gain much popular response. This trend may become even stronger with increased stress on energy.

Third: In addition to the appeal of natural areas at remote locations, cities and transportation are equally important components. Cities provide the base for many attractions such as historic sites, entertainment and speciality-food service. They also provide the service base. Furthermore, travel nodes occur at cities.

And Fourth: The element of distance--particularly the distance from home to attraction destinations--is very critical. In Canada, you have done some excellent studies on this--I am thinking particularly of Roy Wolfe's work.

If these conclusions are correct, they carry heavy implications. They raise many questions about our institutions and techniques for planning and design.
For the next few minutes, I would like to give the high points of a concept that I believe has promise is we wish to do planning and design on a regional basis. The methods are crude but may suggest some principles.

Instead of single-purpose goals, as we have pursued them in the past, it is my opinion that we can achieve all three goals at the same time. Planning for tourism recreation and parks must recognize the need by private enterprise to make profits and by not-for-profit agencies to meet their social rewards. All planning must be directed toward better user satisfactions. And, we must recognize that leisure land use depends upon environmental resources. Therefore, the protection and balanced utilization of land assets must be a goal of development planning.

Ideally, environmental planning and design can be the link between all these goals. But, this demands collaboration among all participants in development.
This diagram shows the steps that could be followed for tourism planning that hopefully would provide an ecologically sound and functionally efficient development system. Again, I am emphasizing the "what" of planning rather than the "who".

The color coding suggests three stages. The "blue" stage includes determining the meaningful facts about the region to be planned. Research-Resource Base Research-Markets/Transport Summer Analysis

The "green" stage is conceptual. This stage goes beyond the facts and offers creative concepts for making something constructive out of the region. Concept Development Redevelopment of Region Com. - Attraction Study Com. - Attraction Concepts

The final "yellow" stage includes the creation of specific feasibility studies of specific projects. Feasibility - Attractions Feasibility - Facilities Services Transportation

Now, I'd like to illustrate each of these steps.
1. A first step is to reach the natural and cultural resources of an assumed region. This would include understanding the climate, vegetation, topography, soils, geology, water and waterlife, esthetics, history, ethnic background as well as existing development. (Please keep this resource map in mind as we progress through the steps.)

2. An equally important part of the research is study of the markets and transportation. Knowledge of the population characteristics—their interests, ability to participate and their mobility is important to planning. Time-distance information and transportation options are also important.

3. The next step is to synthesize these findings into meaningful statements and maps showing areas of greatest importance. A diagram, such as the one shown, can summarize the more important geographic information and its location. Points of special resource interest can be identified for further consideration.
4. This step begins the next stage. The creative designer introduces the art and innovation of planning as well as uses the facts that have been gathered.

At this point the regional boundary assumptions can be confirmed or denied. The research may have indicated that the assumed regional boundaries were wrong. A tourism-recreation-parks region can be of almost any size but it always has some uniform characteristics that bind it together.

5. From this information, one may conceptualize the entire region as having only 3 major elements. The white circles represent the power units of tourism, what I call the COMMUNITY-ATTRACTION COMPLEXES.

Within these lie the potential attractions and their linkage with communities that serve them.

These are linked together by the overall circulation corridor. Wherever the circulation penetrates the region a special design element to provide the function of "entering" becomes important. The remainder of the region is not critical for development, except as a spacer.
6. From the broad-scale concept, each Community-Attraction Complex can be studied further. Within some radius of influence, the resource characteristics can be examined in greater depth.

7. Conceptually, this diagram represents the planning approach to development. It does not yet declare "who" should make the investment nor whether it will be profitable. It does identify the kinds and locations of attraction complexes and their relation to a supporting service community.

8. From this conceptual stage, we can then move into actual feasibility studies. By knowing the overall view, planners can assess the relative importance and make priorities. Specific attraction potential that has top priority---vacation home complexes, scenic areas, public parks, nature centers---can then be given detailed feasibility.

Such feasibility would contain detailed design, cost estimates, owner policies, projected visitor use and impact upon the environment.
9. Equally important segments of feasibility studies would be those concerning both transportation changes and creation of new facilities and services—if needed.

10. The series of steps I have outlined assumes a great amount of know how in research, analysis and creativity that we may not yet possess or, that we may not even want to—but I believe it gives us some direction.

All this of course demands a higher degree of collaboration than we now generally find. If we are to have coordinated regional development that is functional for the users, (the participants) it must be planned that way at the start. I am arguing that we can maintain the integrity of individual decision-making and individual development but need to develop mechanisms for coordinating plans.

Now, I would like to show how we applied this concept to Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Actually, it began about ten years ago when the Upper Peninsula Committee on Area Progress sought our assistance at Michigan State University. We developed a team that included state and local specialists, a landscape architectural firm as well as specialists from the University.
1. Roughly, we proceeded along the steps outlined. First, we researched the natural and cultural resources of the region.

2. We utilized both primary and secondary data to study the markets and transportation. For example, we found that 40 million people lived within one-day's drive. The prime markets were Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. Through our own and existing surveys we learned about the preferences and interests of travelers.

3. We then drew conclusions from these findings and identified the key tourism resources and limitations on the map. This summary analysis gave us a factual base to work from. (At this point, I should emphasize that from the start, local people were involved. County committees in all 15 counties gave us valuable information and in turn became interested in development and planning as they had never done before.)

4. Then, we began the second stage, the conceptual one, confirming the fact of Upper Peninsula of Michigan as a region. Although some forces tended to pull it apart, there were enough common elements to give it strong cohesion.
5. Based upon the studies of the resource characteristics of the region, the markets and transportation, we were able to delineate 10 subzones that seemed to have internal cohesiveness. In this way, we were able to establish a series of Community-Attraction Complexes--9 of them, linked together by a circulation corridor. The main entrance to the region at the Mackinac Bridge took on particular significance.

6. Each of the zones was then studied in greater detail. For example, Zone "A" contained a dominance of historic background, such as Fort Michillimackinac.

7. This localized study produced general locations for 16 attraction complexes in this zone. In addition to historic potential, we found opportunity for vacation home, nature interpretation and outdoor recreation complexes. This overall Community-Attraction Complex contained both St. Ignace and the Soo as service centers, shown by the red dots.
8. We built into our regional planning effort the beginning stages of six feasibility projects. These had grown out of our research and concept development for the region as well as local evidence of ability to produce.

One was the redevelopment of the Menominee waterfront into a major park-business complex.

(This reminds me to make a special point of the value of regional effort to integrate development. The local people of Menominee had suggested that an ore liner be drydocked and opened to tourists, as shown here. However, at the other end of the peninsula, we discovered that the leaders of the Soo had the same idea. We suggested that this might be an unfortunate duplication and asked if some other historic era could be symbolized. Menominee then decided it could use equally well an old-time sailing schooner, typical of those that once hauled iron ore and lumber over the Great Lakes.)

9. Another feasibility was developed at the entrance to the Upper Peninsula at the Mackinac Bridge.
We also studied the several levels of travel corridor development. Each one was to have different criteria for esthetic design as well as carrying capacity.

We concluded our planning report and total effort with recommendations for priority development and suggestions for implementation in order to capture the essence of this vacationland and yet protect its charm and natural assets.

Last summer was the first that I visited the region since the planning effort was initiated. Previous to this visit, I obtained from one of the regional resource development leaders, Mr. Ray Gummerson, area resource development specialist from Michigan State University, a list of developments that he believed had resulted directly or indirectly from the plan. I visited as many of these as time would permit.

I was impressed with the increased level of standards. The trail to these falls, for example, once was muddy and almost impassable. The Upper Peninsula Power Company, owner of the reservoir above and controller of the water flow and owner of this land, has installed board walks, steps and overlooks for tourists—and makes no charge for visitor use.
Let me highlight a few other projects that have been developed. The U.S. Forest Service has established a new recreation area, called Sylvania. This includes several thousand acres of forest and lakes for camping, fishing, canoeing. A visitor's interpretation center and a central meeting and service building are now available to the public.

Several million dollars of private investment has gone into winter sports areas including new vacation homes, new lodges and new lifts. Not far from this is the new Gogebic Ski Fly--a new million-dollar investment in skiing.

Based upon our recommendations, this old copper mine is being redeveloped as an attraction.

Thus far, the renovation of the largest steam hoist in the world, housed in this building, has been the first stage of development. Also planned are narrow gauge railway scenic tours and schooner rides from old stamp mills to a copper wire mill.
This mechanical wonder provided power for bringing both men and copper in and out the mine—a total distance of 9000 feet (6000 feet deep).

This drum carried the cable and notice the huge mechanical brake. Local people have invested $75,000 in this restoration, thus far.

Our report made much of the early explorations of the region by Jesuit missionaries and recommended that this should be developed for visitors and Upper Peninsula citizens. This huge statue to Fr. Baraga has been erected near L'Anse and is open to the public.

Many of the older hotels seemed worthy of restoration rather than destruction. Here is an example of one now serving a modern public but containing an aura of the past.

We showed that the region had an abundance of natural resource assets but lacked modern facilities to make them available. We now see several new lodging and conference centers under construction.
Even remote areas, such as Big Bay, the locale of the best-seller, "The Anatomy of a Murder," are showing signs of renovation.

During the Planning of this region, members of the team were engaged in studying the feasibility of a national seashore along the Pictured Rocks. This is now established and is in the beginning stages of development.

Throughout the Upper Peninsula, I saw many tourist and recreational innovations. There are now many more nature foot trails and interpretive drive-throughs than ever before.

Two things have happened on historic Mackinac Island. The Mackinac Island Park Commission was able to float bonds to make major restoration and expansion of the fort.

Private interests have spent millions of dollars to restore old hotels, restaurants, shops, homes and the harbor. This area is far more attractive and serviceable with modern facilities than in its heyday of the early 1900s.
In our planning of this region, we believed in the ingenuity of the people of the region as well as our own professional ability and tried to allow this to develop wherever possible. Even though we had not conceived of an historic-interpretive tower at the Soo, we had told the city that its future appeared to depend upon how well it expanded its historic background for tourists. It was a priest who came to us, seeking advice on building this interpretive sightseeing tower overlooking the entire city and the famous Soo locks. We did not think of going to the churches--they came to us.

Now, visitors can grasp more of the meaning and background of this interesting area.

Here we see the ore freighter that has been drydocked and opened to the public for tours.
In addition to these highlights, we had recommended:

1. Refinancing of the Mackinac Bridge (this has been done).

2. Establishing new information centers (2 have been).

3. Establishing expressways (plans are laid for US2 X-way).

4. Gateway development (contracts were let last fall).

5. Establish major event (not yet done).

6. Establish roadside controls (state and fed legislation, local zoning established).

Let me emphasize 3 points, learned from Upper Peninsula example: 1) Developers--invest, must be involved; 2) Resource-market interface is important; 3) Time--much time is required.

One of the problems of regional planning for tourism/recreation/parks is the difficulty of making uniform evaluation of the resources and doing it less laboriously.

With one of my graduate classes at Texas A & M, I experimented in 22 counties in central Texas.

*The map on the left shows how we quantified all the natural and cultural resource assets and limitations. This came about by aggregating the several individual evaluations.
On the right is the same map, but regrouped in a color code. The potential for development (based only on resources) ranges from the lowest to highest—from yellow to orange, green, blue and purple.

Using the same map, we then applied what we called "enhancement factors". There were three of these, each of which we used as a multiplier of the numerical resource evaluation. They were: transportation, markets, and internal cities. These factors, when applied to the base map produced the map on the right—again the poorest to the best, ranging from yellow through orange, green, blue and purple. Notice how dramatically the picture changed.

Here you see how this factual base, on the left, was conceptualized into recommended Community-Attraction Complexes—five of them.

This gives the investor and the environmentalist basic guidance on the proper allocation of resources for development. We might even call it an ecological-marketing approach.
As you can see, I am convinced that regional design for tourism-recreation-parks does have considerable merit.

I would like to conclude by saying that, in my opinion, we need now not only much more research and development of new and better techniques but more and more collaboration at the planning stage. And, who is better qualified to assert leadership in this field than landscape architects?