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ABSTRACT

The arguments for, or against, the use of user fees at outdoor recreation settings are often based upon philosophical, moral, and ethical grounds. Empirically-grounded research on the debate has been sparse. In this study, we report on a unique natural experiment comparing the incomes of individuals visiting very similar outdoor recreation settings which differ only in their requirement of a marginal user fee. Our comparison of the incomes of outdoor recreationists using the settings requiring a fee versus those that do not suggest user fees do play an important role in how low-income individuals choose outdoor recreation settings. Low-income outdoor recreationists tended to choose non-fee settings when they are available and if they support similar activities and opportunities as settings which require a fee. Low-income outdoor recreationists’ aversion of settings which require a fee is not a product of their inability to pay the fee, but rather a product of their unwillingness to pay the fee. Low-income outdoor recreationists reported traveling over three times as far to reach non-fee settings relative to comparable settings which require a fee. If user fees are being considered as a visitor management tool, land-use and outdoor recreation planners should not only expect a shift in the socioeconomic composition of visitors to the areas where the fee will be enforced, they should also anticipate displacement and increased use at nearby non-fee settings. Recreation managers should avoid requiring fees at all outdoor recreation settings within an area to ensure displacement does not become exclusion.

1. Introduction

Few, if any, issues related to the management of outdoor recreation on public lands are as controversial as user fees. These fees are created by land management agencies to either generate revenue for the agency, which is most commonly used to fund labor and maintenance-related costs, or in rare cases to restrict use (Manning, 2011). The controversy surrounding user fees has been a persistent point of focus for the land-use planning and outdoor recreation research communities.

Some academics as well as land-use and outdoor recreation planners advocate for user fees for a variety of reasons: User fees allow public land management agencies to be more self-sufficient and less-dependent upon erratic and unpredictable appropriations from federal, state, or local governing bodies (Fretwell, 2000; LaPage, 1994; More, 1998); user fees provide a much needed stream of revenue to fund agencies’ large deferred maintenance backlogs (General Accounting Office, 1998); and lastly user fees provide an indirect, yet efficient, way to restrict use to an area, limiting the environmental impacts associated with rising visitation levels (Hammitt, Cole, & Monz, 2015; Manning & Baker, 1981; Stankey & Baden, 1977).

Other academics as well as land-use and outdoor recreation planners believe the benefits associated with user fees are irrelevant because: User fees are antithetical to public land management agencies’ mandates to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to all members of the public and not just those who can afford it (Fix & Vaske, 2007); because user fees require the public to ‘pay twice’ for one service (i.e., the fee and the portion of their federal, state, or local taxes that go to public lands management) (Crompton & Lamb, 1986).

The controversy surrounding user fees arises because many of the arguments for, or against, user fees are true. User fees allow outdoor recreation managers to generate revenue, fund local maintenance and improvement projects, and reduce environmental damage. In many contexts, such as on federally-managed public lands, user fees require outdoor recreationists to pay for a service that they are obligated to receive as part of their rights as a citizen. It is unclear whether the final argument, whether or not fees are discriminatory, is true. Scholarship focused on this question has been limited to findings that are correlational (as opposed to causal) (Taylor, Vaske, Shelby, Donnelly, & Browne-Nunez, 2002) or based on hypothetical scenarios presented to individuals via mail or online surveys (More & Stevens, 2000; Reiling, Cheng, & Trott, 1992; Reiling, McCarville, & White, 1994). Only three studies have used observational data of actual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type of method</th>
<th>Managing agency</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>On-site survey/experiment with fee levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manning et al. (1984)</td>
<td>On-site experiment combined with a mail survey</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service, Linville Gorge Wilderness Area; Privately-owned Grandfather Mountain</td>
<td>Mail survey</td>
<td>The implementation of a user fee would affect the behavior of low-income anglers more than that of high-income anglers. The overall elasticity of the market with a user fee was substantially higher than that of a $5 per person fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamford et al. (1988)</td>
<td>On-site experiment combined with a mail survey</td>
<td>Vermont State Parks; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Mail survey</td>
<td>Lower income recreationists were significantly less likely to pay for 'prime' campsites when compared to wealthier recreationists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C. Lamborn et al.</td>
<td>Non-behavioral telephone survey</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service, Ashley National Forest</td>
<td>Mail survey</td>
<td>Lower income recreationists were significantly less likely to believe that fees at the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area were acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The user fees examined in this study were a $4.50 per night fee and a $8.50 per night fee in 1982; these are equivalent to a $11.25 per night fee and a $22.56 per night fee in 2016.

b Grandfather Mountain is now part of the North Carolina State Parks system.

The user fees examined in this study were a $2.50 per person day-use fee and the $5.00 per person overnight-use fee in 1985. Data for the Leuschner et al. (1987) study was collected in 1985, when the user fees were still in place. The amount of the hypothetical fee increased as the differential effect increased, suggesting higher fees would displace a higher proportion of users with lower incomes.
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