



• 5500 West Amelia Earhart Drive  
• Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

• 5215 Old Main Hill  
• Logan, Utah 84322

• Content Analysis Enterprise Team (CAT)  
• USDA Forest Service, WO-EMC

## Collaboration Service Team

# Supplement 1

## *Short Index of Additional Readings Related to Recreation Fees and the USDA-Forest Service's Recreational Fee Demonstration Program*

April 29, 2002

### **Final Report Prepared By:**

Peter Williams  
Justin Black

### **Submitted To:**

Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Program  
USDA Forest Service, Washington Office





This page intentionally left blank.



# Supplement 1

## *Short Index of Additional Readings Related to Recreation Fees and the USDA-Forest Service's Recreational Fee Demonstration Program*

### Document Purpose

This document is a supplement to the document entitled Issues and Concerns Related to the USDA Forest Service's Recreational Fee Demonstration Program. It provides references and citations for primary information sources related recreation fees and the USDA-Forest Service's Recreational Fee Demonstration program. References cited in this index were used directly in preparing the Issues and Concerns document. In order to keep this supplement concise, many sources published before 1996 have been omitted and only the most relevant references have been included. Although . For a more complete biographical listing of these documents, see the related document entitled Supplement 2: Extended Index of Additional Readings Related to Recreation Fees and the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program.

A primary source for this document is an annotated bibliography completed in 1999 by staff of the USDA Forest Service's Rocky Mountain Research Station. It contains descriptions of 294 research publications related to recreation fees or the Recreational Fee Demonstration program and published between 1963 and 1999. That document is currently an unpublished reference resource available electronically and publicly on the Internet at Recreation Fee Bibliography - Wildland Resource Valuation or through the following direct address: ([http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/value/research-refee\\_bibliog.html](http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/value/research-refee_bibliog.html)).

Other significant sources include Congressional Hearing testimony, annual agency reports submitted to Congress, reports related to Individual Recreation Fee Demonstration program pilot projects, and reports compiled by the General Accounting Office and Congressional Research Service. The Forest Service distributes electronic copies of annual agency reports and other materials related to the program through the Recreation Fees on National Forests website. A direct link to the site is available at the following internet address: ([http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/fee\\_demo/fee\\_intro.shtml](http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/fee_demo/fee_intro.shtml)).

General Accounting Office reports are available at the Find GAO Reports website and the | GAO Reports | Find GAO Reports | menu options where a search under the keyword "recreation" will find the relevant reports. The direct link is available at <http://www.gao.gov/docdblite/form.php?entry=1>. Congressional Research Service's nonpartisan reports related to the Recreational Fee Demonstration program are redistributed through the Library of Congress's National Library for the Environment website at Congressional Research Service Reports at the National Library for the Environment (NLE) which is at <http://cnie.org/NLE/CRS/>.



## Sources for Additional Fee Information

### **A general overview of issues and concerns regarding the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program**

Martin, S. R. (1999). "A policy implementation analysis of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program: Convergence of public sentiment, agency programs, and policy principles?" Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 15-34.

### **How trust relates to the implementation and management of the Recreational Fee Demonstration program**

Anderson, K. (2001). The Debate Surrounding Newly Implemented Recreation User Fees on Federal Land: An Examination of Those Actively Opposed. School of Forestry. Missoula, University of Montana: 120.

Winter, P. L., Burkhardt, R. L. and Gable, R. (1998). Assessing community impressions of a fee pilot: Findings from southern California, USDA Forest Service.

Winter, P. L. and Palucki, L. J. (1999). "Anticipated responses to a fee program: The key is trust." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 207-226.

### **Public involvement in the Recreational Fee Demonstration program**

More, T. A. (1999). "A functionalist approach to user fees." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 227-244.

### **Literature relating to the distributive effects of fees**

Bowker, J. M. and Leeworthy, V. R. (1998b). Ethnicity, user fees and recreation demand: Some results from the Florida Keys, USDA Forest Service.

Emmett, J. L., Havitz, M. E. and McCarville, R. E. (1996). "A price subsidy policy for socio-economically disadvantaged recreation participants." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **14**(1): 63-80.

Jurowski, C. (2001). Free Day-Use Parking Pass Distribution Program Evaluation Study for the Prescott National Forest, Northern Arizona University: 33.

Marsinko, A. (2000). The effect of fees on recreation site choice: management/agency implications. 1999 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium, Bolton Landing, NY, USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.

More, T. (2000). "Do user fees exclude low-income people from resource-based recreation?" Journal of Leisure Research **32**(3): 341-357.

Reiling, S., Cheng, H.T., Robinson, C., McCarville, R. and White, C. (1996). Potential equity effects of a new day-use fee. Proceedings of the 1995 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. Radnor, PA, USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, General Technical Report NE-218: 27-31.

Schneider, I. E. and Budruk, M. (1999). "Displacement as a response to the federal recreation fee program." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3):76-84.




## **The acceptability of fees**

### *The acceptability of fees in general*

- Bowker, J. M., Cordell, H. K. and Johnson, C. Y. (1999). "User fees for recreation services on public lands: A national assessment." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 1-14.
- Calkin, D. E. and Henderson, J. E. (1997). Evaluation of Effects of Implementing Day-Use Fees at Corps of Engineers Recreation Areas. Vicksburg, MS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station: 48 pp.
- Clawson, M. and Knetsch, J. (1966). Economics of Outdoor Recreation. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press.
- LA Times (2001). Los Angeles Times Poll. Nation: Environmental Issues, Study #458.
- McCarville, R. E., Reiling, S. D. and White, C. M. (1996). "The role of fairness in users' assessments of first-time fees for a public recreation service." Leisure Sciences **18**: 61-76.
- McCarville, R. (1998). Overview and comments on fee-based presentations, 7th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, USDA Forest Service.
- Winter, P. L. and Palucki, L. J. (1999). "Anticipated responses to a fee program: The key is trust." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 207-226.

### *Acceptability of the Recreational Fee Demonstration program*

- Anderson, K. (2001). The Debate Surrounding Newly Implemented Recreation User Fees on Federal Land: An Examination of Those Actively Opposed. School of Forestry. Missoula, University of Montana: 120.
- Bengston, D. and Fan, D. (2000). The Public Debate About the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program on the U.S. National Forests. Diverse Challenges of our times: People, Products, Places: Third Symposium on Social Aspects of Recreation Research, Tempe, AZ.
- Bengston, D. and Fan, D. (2001). The Recreation Fee Demonstration Program on the National Forests: An Updated Analysis of Public Attitudes and Beliefs, 1999-2001.
- Chavez, D. J. (1998). Voices across the United States: Opinions from national forest customers about recreation fees, USDA Forest Service.
- Chavez, D. J. and Gable, R. (1998). Will they pay to play on national forests? Perceptions of customers in the Enterprise Zone, USDA Forest Service.
- Gable, R., Burkhardt, R. L. and Winter, P. L. (1997). Assessing Community Impressions of a Fee Pilot Program: Final Report. Claremont, CA, Claremont Graduate University, Center for Organizational and Behavioral Sciences: 61 pp.
- Hoschek, D. (2001). Public Access Coalition. Statement to Congress: Hearing on the Forest Service Recreation Fee Demonstration Program, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health.
- HPRC (2001). Statement of the Human Powered Recreation Coalition. Statement to Congress: Permanent Extension of the Forest Service Recreation Fee Demonstration Program, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health.
- Johnson, M. E. (2001). VP/Government Affairs, Outdoor Industry Association. Statement to Congress: Oversight Hearing on Permanent Extension of the Forest Service Recreation Fee Program.
- Keith, J. (2001). The Access Fund. Statement to Congress: Testimony on the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program.
- Krannich, R. S., Eisenhauer, B. W., Field, D. R., Pratt, C. and Luloff, A. E. (1999). "Implications of the National Park Service Recreational Fee Demonstration Program for park operations and management: Perceptions of NPS managers." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 35-52.
- LA Times (2001). Los Angeles Times Poll. Nation: Environmental Issues, Study #458.
- Lamb, J. (2001). Public Policy Director, National Outdoor Leadership School. Statement to Congress: Testimony Regarding the Fee Demonstration Program.



- Lime, D. W., Lundgren, A. L., Warzecha, C. A., Thompson, J. L. and Stone, T. G. (1998). Reactions of 1997 park visitors to the National Park Service Recreational Fee Demonstration Program, USDA Forest Service.
- Lundgren, A. L. and Lime, D. W. (1997a). Overview of a 1997 National Park Service Monitoring Study to Obtain Visitor Reactions to the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program. St. Paul, MN, University of Minnesota, Department of Forest Resources, Cooperative Park Studies Unit: 38 pp.
- Mackey, C. (2001). Outward Bound USA (Public Policy Liaison). Statement to Congress: Regarding the Fee Demonstration Program, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health.
- Martin, S. R. (1999). "A policy implementation analysis of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program: Convergence of public sentiment, agency programs, and policy principles?" Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 15-34.
- Miller, S. (1998). "A walk in the park: Fee or free?" The George Wright Forum **15**(1): 55-62.
- Novak, T. (1998). "Forest Service fee program draws fire." Inner Voice **10**(1): 11-13.
- Olsen, S. (1998). Visitor Response to a Fee Demonstration Pilot Project in the Pariah Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area. School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University: 52 pp.
- Payne, B. R. (1998). What did we learn? Where to from here?, USDA Forest Service.
- Powers, J. (1999). Is the Forest Service fee program appropriate for public lands?, Prescott National Forest Friends.
- Richer, J. R. (1998a). Monitoring visitor response to the Adventure Pass Program, USDA Forest Service.
- Richer, J. R. (1998c). Southern California National Forest Adventure Pass Recreation Fee Demonstration Monitoring Program - Summary Of First-Year Findings: Descriptive Statistics, July 1997 - June 1998. San Bernardino, CA, California State University-San Bernardino, Department of Economics, School of Social and Behavioral Sciences: 31 pp.
- Richer, J. R. (2001). Fee Retention Monitoring Program- Preliminary Report. Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.
- Robertson, J. (2001). American Whitewater's Access Director. Statement to Congress: Statement on the FS Recreation Fee Demonstration Program.
- Sierra Club Yodeler (1999). The corporate takeover of nature. Sierra Club Yodeler. The newspaper of the San Francisco Bay Chapter: 1,4-5.
- Spencer, T. (2001). Why a Modest Fee is Important for Protecting our Forests. Forest Magazine. **Nov/Dec**: 46-49.
- USDA (2001a). Forest Service- Region 6 Recreation Fee Program Activity Review. Pacific Northwest Region: 21pp.
- USDA (2001b). USDA Forest Service. A Collection of Comment Card Analysis.
- Viehman, J. (2001). Publisher, Backpacker Magazine. Statement to Congress: Testimony regarding the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program.
- Warren, B. (2001). Chairman of the National Alliance of Gateway Communities. Statement to Congress: Testimony Regarding the Fee Demonstration Program.
- Watzman, N. (2001). Playground or Preserve. The Washington Monthly. **May**: 36-43.
- Winter, P. L., Burkhardt, R. L. and Gable, R. (1998). Assessing community impressions of a fee pilot: Findings from southern California, USDA Forest Service.
- Winter, P. L. and Palucki, L. J. (1999). "Anticipated responses to a fee program: The key is trust." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 207-226.
- Zauberls, L. (2001). Four Corners Back Country Horsemen Announce Opposition to Recreation Fee Demonstration Program. Back Country Horsemen of America. **12**: 6.




### ***Acceptability of fees for Wilderness use***

- Christensen, N. A., Borrie, B. and Williams, D. R. (1998). Appropriateness to pay: Is wilderness a unique recreation experience?, USDA Forest Service.
- Lewis, M. S. and Lime, D. W. (1998a). Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness User Fee Evaluation: 1998 Study of Camper Party Leaders. St. Paul, MN, University of Minnesota, Department of Forest Resources: 85 pp.
- Lewis, M. S. and Lime, D. W. (1998b). Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness User Fee Evaluation: 1998 Study of Campers Who Purchased the Seasonal Fee Card. St. Paul, MN, University of Minnesota, Department of Forest Resources: 53 pp.
- Lewis, M. S. and Lime, D. W. (1999). Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness User Fee Evaluation: 1998 Study of Area Cooperators. St. Paul, MN, University of Minnesota, Department of Forest Resources: 36 pp.
- Loomis, J., Bonetti, K. and Echohawk, C. (1999). Demand for and supply of wilderness. Outdoor Recreation in American Life: A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends. H. K. Cordell. Champaign, IL, Sagamore Publishing: 352-375.
- Richer, J. R. and Christensen, N. A. (1999). "Appropriate fees for wilderness day use: Pricing decisions for recreation on public land." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 269-280.
- Trainor, S. F. and Norgaard, R. B. (1999). "Recreation fees in the context of wilderness values." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 100-115.
- Vogt, C. A. and Williams, D. R. (1999). "Support for wilderness recreation fees: The influence of fee purpose and day versus overnight use." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 85-99.
- Williams, D. R., Vogt, C. A. and Vitterso, J. (1999). "Structural equation modeling of users' response to wilderness recreation fees." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 245-268.

### **Suggestions and concerns relating to pricing structure**

- Alexander, G. D. (1997). Adding value to the outdoor recreation experience. Proceedings of the 1996 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. W. F. Kuentzel. Radnor, PA, USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, General Technical Report NE-232: 213-215.
- Bierhanzl, E. J. and Downing, P. B. (1998). "User charges and bureaucratic inefficiency." Atlantic Economic Journal **26**(2): 175-189.
- Christensen, N. and Richer, J. R. (1998). Maximum and appropriate price for day use in the Desolation Wilderness, USDA Forest Service.
- Clawson, M. and Knetsch, J. (1966). Economics of Outdoor Recreation. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press.
- Kyle, G. T., Kerstetter, D. L. and Guadagnolo, F. B. (1999). "The influence of outcome messages and involvement on participant reference price." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 53-75.
- Manning, R. E., Callinan, E. A., Echelberger, H. E., Koenemann, E. J. and McEwen, D. N. (1984). "Differential fees: Raising revenue, distributing demand." Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration **2**(1): 20-38.
- Marsinko, A. (2000). The effect of fees on recreation site choice: management/agency implications. 1999 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium, Bolton Landing, NY, USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.
- Martin, S. R. (1998). Recreation fees: Convergence of public sentiment, agency objectives and policy principles?, USDA Forest Service.
- McCarville, R. E. (1997). "The anchoring effect of price-last-paid information on willingness-to-pay levels." Journal of Applied Recreation Research **22**(3): 191-209.
- McLean, D. J. and Johnson, R. C. A. (1997). "Techniques for rationing public recreation services." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **15**(3): 76-92.



- Miller, S. (1998). "A walk in the park: Fee or free?" The George Wright Forum **15**(1): 55-62.
- More, T. A., Dustin, D. L. and Knopf, R. C. (1996). "Behavioral consequences of campground user fees." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **14**(1): 81-93.
- More, T. A. (1999). "A functionalist approach to user fees." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 227-244.

### **Recreational Fee Demonstration program implementation issues and concerns**

- Anderson, K. (2001). The Debate Surrounding Newly Implemented Recreation User Fees on Federal Land: An Examination of Those Actively Opposed. School of Forestry. Missoula, University of Montana: 120.
- Goodale, T. (2001). Keynote Address: Discipline and Chaos. 2000 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium, Bolton Landing, NY, USDA Forest Service, Northeast Research Station.
- Krannich, R. S., Eisenhauer, B. W., Field, D. R., Pratt, C. and Luloff, A. E. (1999). "Implications of the National Park Service Recreational Fee Demonstration Program for park operations and management: Perceptions of NPS managers." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 35-52.
- Martin, S. R. (1999). "A policy implementation analysis of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program: Convergence of public sentiment, agency programs, and policy principles?" Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 15-34.
- Powers, J. (1999). Is the Forest Service fee program appropriate for public lands?, Prescott National Forest Friends.
- Zauberls, L. (2001). Four Corners Back Country Horsemen Announce Opposition to Recreation Fee Demonstration Program. Back Country Horsemen of America. **12**: 6.

### **Monitoring and evaluation of the Recreational Fee Demonstration program**

- Absher, J. D., McCollum, D. W. and Bowker, J. M. (1999). "The value of research in recreation fee project implementation." Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 116-120.
- Martin, S. R. (1999). "A policy implementation analysis of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program: Convergence of public sentiment, agency programs, and policy principles?" Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 15-34.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1998). Recreation Fees: Demonstration Fee Program Successful in Raising Revenues but Could Be Improved. Washington, D.C.: 116 pp.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2001). Report to Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate. Recreation Fees: Management Improvements Can Help the Demonstration Program Enhance Visitor Services.
- USDOJ & USDA (1998). Recreational Fee Demonstration Program: 1997 Progress Report to Congress.
- USDOJ & USDA (2000). Recreational Fee Demonstration Program: Progress Report to Congress Fiscal Year 1999.

### **Potential impact on natural resources related to fees being charged**

- Moskowitz, K. (1998). "Recreation Fee Demonstration Project: You play, you pay." Different Drummer **13**: 40-44.
- Powers, J. (1999). Is the Forest Service fee program appropriate for public lands?, Prescott National Forest Friends.





- Sierra Club Yodeler (1999). The corporate takeover of nature. Sierra Club Yodeler. The newspaper of the San Francisco Bay Chapter: 1,4-5.
- Watzman, N. (2001). Playground or Preserve. The Washington Monthly. **May**: 36-43.

### **Liability concerns related to charging fees**

- Kozlowski, J. C. (1984). "Fees may have adverse impact on recreational use immunity." Trends **21**(4): 26-30.
- USDOJ & USDA (1998). Recreational Fee Demonstration Program: 1997 Progress Report to Congress.

### **Research questions**

- Anderson, K. (2001). The Debate Surrounding Newly Implemented Recreation User Fees on Federal Land: An Examination of Those Actively Opposed. School of Forestry. Missoula, University of Montana: 120.
- Gillette, C. P. (1988). User fees and environmental protection: A legal perspective on user fees. Administrative Conference of the United States: Federal User Fees, Proceedings of a Symposium. T. D. Hopkins. Washington, D.C.: 19-27.
- Martin, S. R. (1999). "A policy implementation analysis of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program: Convergence of public sentiment, agency programs, and policy principles?" Journal of Park and Recreation Administration **17**(3): 15-34.
- More, T. (2000). "Do user fees exclude low-income people from resource-based recreation?" Journal of Leisure Research **32**(3): 341-357.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1998). Recreation Fees: Demonstration Fee Program Successful in Raising Revenues but Could Be Improved. Washington, D.C.: 116 pp.
- Watson, A. E. and Herath, G. (1999). "Research implications of the theme issues "Recreation Fees and Pricing Issues in the Public Sector" (Journal of Park and Recreation Administration) and "Societal Response to Recreation Fees on Public Lands" (Journal of Leisure Research)." Journal of Leisure Research **31**(3): 325-334.