Wilderness Recreation Participation: Projections for the Next Half Century

J. M. Bowker
D. Murphy
H. K. Cordell
D. B. K. English
J. C. Bergstrom
C. M. Starbuck
C. J. Betz
G. T. Green
P. Reed

Abstract—This paper explores the influence of demographic and spatial variables on individual participation in wildland area recreation. Data from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) are combined with GIS-based distance measures to develop nonlinear regression models used to predict both participation and the number of days of participation in wilderness and primitive area recreation. The estimated models corroborate previous findings indicating that race (black), ethnicity (Hispanic), immigrant status, age, and urban dwelling are negatively correlated with wildland visitation; while income, gender (male), and education positively affect wildland recreation participation and use. The presence of a distance or proximity factor mitigates some of the influence of race and ethnicity. The results of the cross-sectional models are combined with U.S. Census (2004) projections of total population, changes in population characteristics, and with estimates of current National Forest Wilderness visitation estimates to give some insight into pressure that might be expected on the nation's designated Wilderness during the next half century. Results generally indicate that per capita participation and visitation rates will decline over time as society changes. Total Wilderness participation and visitation will, however, increase but at a rate less than population growth.

J. M. Bowker, Research Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Athens, GA U.S.A.
D. Murphy, Former Research Coordinator, University of Georgia, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Athens, GA, U.S.A.
H. K. Cordell, Pioneering Research Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Athens, GA, U.S.A.
D. B. K. English, Program Manager for the National Visitor Use Monitoring Project, Recreation and Heritage Staff, USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC, U.S.A.
J. C. Bergstrom, Professor, University of Georgia, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Athens, GA, U.S.A.
C. M. Starbuck, Assistant Professor, New Mexico State University, Department of Economics and International Business, Las Cruces, NM, U.S.A.
C. J. Betz, Outdoor Recreation Planner, USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Athens, GA, U.S.A.
G. T. Green, Assistant Professor, University of Georgia, Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, Athens, GA, U.S.A.
P. Reed, Regional Social Scientist, Region 10, USDA Forest Service, Anchorage, AK, U.S.A.

In: Watson, Alan; Sproull, Janet; Dean, Liese, comps. 2007. Science and stewardship to protect and sustain wilderness values: eighth World Wilderness Congress symposium: September 30–October 6, 2005; Anchorage, AK. Proceedings RMRS-P-49. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Introduction

According to some, visits to Wilderness and primitive areas are increasing in the United States (Taylor 2000). Recreational use of the original 54 Wilderness areas, as designated by the Wilderness Act of 1964, increased by 86 percent between 1965 and 1994 (Cole 1996). Participation monitoring has demonstrated that Wilderness use was increasing faster than outdoor recreation use in general (Watson and others 1989). Recent trends indicate that visitor use of Wilderness is still increasing and will continue to increase with additional designations (Watson and Cole 1999). Recreation use of National Forest (NF) Wilderness grew 9.6 percent annually between 1965 and 1974 and by 10 percent annually between 1975 and 1985. After 1985, as designation leveled off, the increase in use grew more slowly with an increase of 8.4 percent by 1993. The same pattern was seen in National Park Service (NPS) Wilderness use following designation (Cordell and others 1999a). Cordell and Teasley (1998) conservatively estimated 40.4 million visits to Wilderness or other primitive areas for 1995. Future estimates show increased use per acre and an increase in the number of people who want to experience the opportunities afforded by Wilderness (Cordell and others 1999b).

Alternatively, recent and continuing changes in the ethnic fabric of U.S. society raise questions about culturally induced shifts in outdoor recreation preferences and a subsequent decline in Wilderness visitation (Johnson and others 2004; Murdock and others 1990; Taylor 2000). In-depth analyses and understanding of shifting social, spatial and economic variables, as well as impacts of growing demand for Wilderness or other primitive area recreation are needed to inform

Wilderness and other public land managers about potential user conflicts and pressures on the resource. Moreover, information about the number of future users can serve as a potential barometer for societal support for maintaining recreation access to the NWPS, though not necessarily as a measure of support for its other statutory purposes.

In this study, statistical models for individual participation in Wilderness and primitive area recreation are explored and developed. The influence of socio-demographic and spatial factors on people's decision-making process whether to participate in Wilderness recreation, and if so how often, are also tested. Lastly, estimated models are combined with Census projections of expected changes in total population and population composition over the next half century and NF Wilderness visitation to forecast recreation participation and use on NF Wilderness and the National Wilderness Preservation System (NWPS) overall.

Data and Methods

This study uses data from a variety of sources. Statistical models were based on data from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE). The NSRE is the eighth of the U.S. National Recreation Surveys started in the 1960s. The current survey started in 2000 and continued through 2004 (Cordell and others 2002). The NSRE is a random-digit-dialing telephone survey of more than 90,000 households nationally. The survey gathers information on a number of outdoor recreation and environmental topics, including outdoor recreation participation, environmental attitudes, natural resource values, attitudes toward natural resource management policies, household structure, lifestyles, and demographics. The data are weighted using post-stratification procedures to adjust for non-response according to age, race, gender, education, and rural/urban strata (Cordell and others 2002). Data for this study were taken from the eighth of eighteen versions of NSRE. This version, containing the relevant participation and use questions, was conducted between March and June, 2001. The total sample size was just under 5,000 observations.

To examine the impact of spatial factors on participation from different areas of the United States, zip code points (ESRI Data & Maps 2000 http://www.esri.com/) were matched with respondents' zip codes to create a base location map for respondents. These points were placed at the delivery-based centroid representing 5-digit zip code areas. Zip codes with few or no delivery locations were assigned a single business in the area. The *Wilderness Areas of the United States* boundary map (USGS 2004) was used to locate designated Wilderness areas in relation to respondent zip codes.

Data for participation and use forecasting were primarily obtained from U.S. Census Bureau data from 2004 and were used to determine interim projections by age, gender, race, and Hispanic origin. Woods & Poole, Inc. (2003) data were used to determine metropolitan population projections. National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) survey data (USDA Forest Service 2005) were used to determine the number of NF Wilderness days and NF Wilderness visitors for 2002. These base numbers were used to create an index to project future use.

Regression Models

Logistic regression was used to describe recreation participation behavior. Participation was based on the probability of a visit to a wildland area in the past year and was modeled as a function of various socio-demographic and spatial explanatory variables. The general form of the logistic equation is:

$$\text{Probability (participate)} = 1/(1+\exp(-XB)) \qquad (1)$$

where exp represents the exponential function, X is a matrix of explanatory variables, and B is a vector of parameters. This type of model is commonly used in recreation and social science research examining individual choice behavior (Bowker and others 1999; Johnson and others 2001; Johnson and others 2004; Miller and Hay 1981).

The binary (yes/no) dependent variable in this model was drawn from the NSRE question, "Did you visit a wilderness or other primitive, roadless area (within the last 12 months)?" Socio-demographic independent variables included in the X vector were the age of the respondent, gender, whether a person was born in the United States, education level, and household income. The relationship between ethnicity and participation was examined by using three categorical variables for Hispanic, black, and other (American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian). Additional variables were used to describe population density of the county of residence (metro or rural) and whether a respondent belonged to an environmental organization. This variable served as a proxy measure for environmental support of Wilderness and other primitive areas. All of the above variables are listed and defined in table 1.

Table 1—Variables used in the empirical models.

Independent variables	Definitions
AGE	Age of respondent in years
SEX	Gender; 1 if male; 0 otherwise
HISPANIC	1 if Hispanic; 0 otherwise
BLK	1 if Black; 0 otherwise
OTHER	1 if other; 0 if Black or White
BORNUSA	1 if born in the U.S.; 0 otherwise
EDUC	1 if BS or above; 0 otherwise
URBAN	1 if metro; 0 if rural
INCOME	1. $4,999 or >
	2. 5,000–9,999
	3. 10,000–14,999
	4. 15,000–19,999
	5. 20,000–24,999
	6. 25,000–34,999
	7. 35,000–49,999
	8. 50,000–74,999
	9. 75,000–99,999
	10. 100,000–149,999
	11. 150,000 or <
MEMBER	Member of an environmental/conservation group: 1 if member; 0 otherwise
MILES	Distance to the nearest wilderness area in miles
WILDERN	Willingness to visit wilderness or other primitive areas: 1 if interested; 0 otherwise

An important addition to the NSRE data was the inclusion of a distance or availability proxy variable. The respondent's zip code was used to calculate the distance to the nearest Wilderness area. ArcView 8.3 was used to calculate the distance from each zip code point to the nearest Wilderness area by joining zip code points with the Wilderness areas based on spatial location. This calculates the distance from each point to the nearest Wilderness area. Because the zip code points are delivery based centroids and the distance calculated falls on the nearest point of the closest Wilderness area, these distances are not meant to be exact. They do, however, provide a proxy for availability of a wildland setting. In order to calculate exact distance, more precise information on the respondent's location and the exact location of the Wilderness entrances would be needed. With this information, a network analysis could be performed using the cost weighted direction function, which used road maps to determine the route along the least-cost path that the respondent could take to the closest Wilderness area. Other types of calculations that could be performed with more specific information include straight line distance from the respondent's home to the nearest Wilderness entrance or the cost weighted distance which modifies the straight-line distance by some other factor (for example, elevation).

A negative binomial regression model was used to determine intensity of participation or the number of participation days. Negative binomial models have been used extensively in recreation visitation modeling (Betz and others 2003; Bowker 2001; Zawacki and others 2000). Following Yen and Adamowicz (1993), the negative binomial probability distribution can be represented as:

$$\text{Prob}(Y_i = y_i; y_i = 0,1,2,...) = \frac{\Gamma(y_i + 1/\alpha)}{\Gamma(y_i+1)\Gamma(1/\alpha)}[(\alpha\lambda_i)^{y_i}(1+\alpha\lambda_i)^{-(y_i+1/\alpha)}] \quad (2)$$

where, λ_i = exp(Ω, X, u_i), with variables as listed for Equation 1, Ω is a parameter vector, Γ represents the gamma function, and α is the over-dispersion parameter. The expected value for the number of days, $E(Y_i)$ is λ_i , and the variance, $Var(Y_i)$ is λ_i $(1 + \alpha\lambda_i)$. An asymptotically significant α indicates the presence of over-dispersion, making the negative binomial model appropriate. When the over-dispersion parameter α is zero, both $E(Y_i)$ and $Var(Y_i)$ are equal to λ_i and the Poisson model is appropriate (Yen and Adamowicz 1993). $Exp(u_i)$ is assumed to follow a gamma distribution with mean 1.0 and constant variance (Greene 2000). The dependent variable for this model, also obtained from NSRE data, was the individual's response to, "On how many days did you visit a wilderness or primitive area in the past 12 months?" Those not answering affirmatively to the participation question were assigned zero days. The same explanatory variables that were used to describe participation probability in the logistic regression were used to estimate and project the amount of use (number of days).

Results

Table 2 contains sample means, both post-sample weighted and unweighted, for data used in the analysis. These means indicate the presence of some response bias according to certain demographic variables. The post sample weighting procedure brings these variables in line with Census values.

Table 2—Weighted and unweighted means for explanatory variables.

Variable	Weighted	Unweighted
AGE	42.8	43.7
GENDER	0.474	0.438
BLACK	0.138	0.076
HISPANIC	0.152	0.067
OTHER	0.048	0.038
BORNUSA	0.882	0.945
MEMBER	0.229	0.259
INCOME	6.92	7.09
EDUCATION	0.208	0.320
URBAN	0.793	0.658
MILES	75.7	76.7

The logistic participation and negative binomial days regression models were estimated using LIMDEP 7.0 (Greene 1995). Results of the logistic participation regression are presented in table 3. Quantitative interpretation of the logistic regression parameters is not transparent; hence the last column in table 3 displays the change in probability of participation with a 1-unit change in the relevant explanatory variable. For example, with other factors set to sample means, a male is 12.2 percent more likely than a female to have visited a wilderness or primitive area in the past year. Similarly, a black is 19 percent less likely than a white to have visited this type of site.

Past studies have shown that the typical outdoor recreation participant is white, male, able-bodied, and well educated, with an above average income (Cordell and others 1999; Cordell and others 2005; Johnson and others 2004). The average age among Wilderness visitors is increasing (Watson 2000), but for the general population the likelihood of participation in Wilderness recreation decreases with age (Johnson and others 2004). Also, while the proportion of female participants appears to be increasing (Watson 2000), women are still less likely to visit a wilderness or primitive area (Johnson and others 2004). Past studies have indicated that blacks, Latinos, and Asians are less likely to say that they have ever visited a Wilderness area and that immigrants are less likely than native born respondents to visit Wilderness (Johnson and others 2004). The estimated

Table 3—Logistic regression parameter estimates, n = 4400.

Variable (weighted)	Parameter	Std Error	Pr>ChiSq	Change in visit probability
Intercept	–1.99	.291	.0000	–.386
AGE	–.019	.002	.0000	–.003
GENDER	.634	.070	.0000	.122
BLACK	–.986	.122	.0000	–.19
HISPANIC	–.824	.176	.0000	–.159
OTHER	–.585	.182	.0013	–.113
BORNUSA	1.31	.211	.0000	.254
MEMBER	.768	.078	.0000	.148
INCOME	.088	.021	.0000	.017
EDUCATION	.101	.086	.2363	.019
URBAN	–.139	.085	.1039	.026
MILES	–.002	.0006	.0003	–.0004

models corroborate previous findings indicating that income, gender (male), immigrant status (born in the United States), and environmental awareness are all factors positively correlated with wildland recreation participation; while race (black and other), ethnicity (Hispanic), age, and urban dwelling negatively affect wildland recreation participation and intensity. Education does not have a significant impact on the probability of participation.

Although not included in the literature cited above, another factor that is negatively correlated with wildland recreation participation is distance, with the chance of participation decreasing as distance increases. The presence of a distance or proximity factor tends to mitigate some of the influence of race and ethnicity (for example, 5 percent decrease in the black coefficient). Studies indicate that visitors are generally from the state in which the Wilderness area is located and from the closest region in the state (Roggenbuck and Watson 1989). Part of the negative correlation between race and visitation could be due to the geographic distribution of black populations (Johnson and others 2004), hence the importance of including both distance and race in participation models.

Results of the negative binomial regression are presented in table 4. Results indicate that the explanatory variables have similar qualitative effects on wilderness and primitive area visitation days as on the probability of participation. Unlike the logistic regression, interpretation of the parameter estimates for the negative binomial is more transparent. With expected days specified in a semi-log form, parameter estimates can be interpreted as the percentage change in days per a 1-unit change in the explanatory variable. Hence, other factors constant, males can be expected to spend about 42 percent more days per year visiting Wilderness and primitive areas than females. Education has a positive correlation with the number of days that a person visits, but has a more significant impact than on participation. This indicates that the level of education a person has may not significantly impact whether or not a person visits a wilderness or primitive area, but if a person does visit then the number of days increases with amount of education. The only other ambiguity between the results for the logistic and negative binomial regressions was that the variable for other races was not significant in determining the number of days on-site. Other races are less likely to participate than whites, but more likely than blacks or Hispanics. However, days of participation for other races is not statistically discernable from whites.

Table 4—Negative binomial parameter estimates, n = 4357.

Variable	Parameter estimate	Std. Error	P-Value
Intercept	0.046	0.280	0.0939
AGE	–.009	.002	.0000
GENDER	.42	.071	.0000
BLACK	–1.39	.085	.0000
HISPANIC	–1.40	.189	.0000
OTHER	.037	.171	.8269
BORNUSA	1.72	.151	.0000
MEMBER	.751	.088	.0000
INCOME	.057	.018	.0015
EDUCATION	–.359	.100	.0003
URBAN	–.721	.079	.0000
MILES	–.003	.0004	.0000

Projections

In order to assess future participation and use of Wilderness, the estimated regression models are combined with projections of explanatory variables from other sources. U.S. Census projections were used to estimate total population and means for age, gender, race (black), ethnicity (Hispanic), other race, native born, and urban dwelling. Projected means for these variables at 10-year intervals are combined with the parameter estimates for the respective participation and days models to develop an index of per capita rates through 2050. These per capita indices are combined with projected population growth to yield indices for total participation and total days on-site for the same time periods. It should be noted that the regression models and consequent indices are based on NSRE responses to "wilderness and other primitive areas," not just designated Wilderness. Nevertheless, given the potential for substitution across such areas in filling recreation preferences, this is arguably a good first approximation for future participants and users of Wilderness.

The participation index is reported in figure 1. The estimated logistic model combined with projected changes in the composition of the U.S. population indicates that potential Wilderness participation per capita will decrease by 15 percent nationwide in the next half century. This result is primarily driven by increases in population proportions for categories that are currently negatively correlated with participation in wilderness and primitive area recreation. Over the same time period, the general population is expected to increase by 49 percent. The growth of the population will accordingly dominate the decrease in participation per capita leading to an overall increase in potential Wilderness recreation participants by 26 percent.

Wilderness day indices are reported in figure 2. Here the pattern is similar to the predicted trend in participation. For example, the potential annual per capita days spent in Wilderness will decline by 19 percent out to the year 2050. However, the 49 percent increase in population growth during the same time will offset the per capita decline resulting in a net increase in potential Wilderness visitor site-days of about 21 percent.

The projection indices can be combined with estimates of annual participants and days to describe the potential magnitude of future Wilderness use. In spite of the difficulties associated with counting Wilderness users, a number of estimates exist for visitor days to the NWPS and various components thereof. For example, Cole (1996) estimated nearly 17 million visitor days of use throughout the NWPS for 1994. Loomis (1999), using Cole's data, subsequently estimated 12 million visitor days for NF Wilderness and 14 million visitor days for NF and NPS Wilderness combined. Cordell and Teasley (1998), using household data for the same time, estimated between 15.7 and 34.7 million trips to the NWPS annually. Finally, using a different approach, Loomis and Richardson (2000) estimated 26.7 million visits annually to the NWPS. These estimates present a range of annual use somewhere between about 14 million and 35



Figure 1—Participation index 2002 to 2050.



Figure 2—Wilderness visitor days index 2002 to 2050.

million days per year, while providing no estimate of the number of unique participants.

Alternatively, preliminary estimates of NF Wilderness site visits from the National Visitor Use Monitoring Project (NVUM) (English and others 2002) indicated about 10.5 million site-visits to NF Wilderness in 2001. This estimate has been subsequently revised to 8.8 million site-visits and 12.4 million site-days, annually, based on the complete 4-year cycle of NVUM data collection (USDA Forest Service 2005). Using estimated visitor shares among the four federal agencies managing the NWPS as reported in Bowker and others (2005a), we estimate annual recreation use for the NWPS at 10.7 million visits per year. Using a multi-day average trip length computed from NVUM Wilderness visitors (2.52), this translates to approximately 16.3 million on-site days system wide. This is considerably lower than the 26.6 million day reported in Bowker and others (2005a). However, their estimate is based on the preliminary NVUM visit estimate and an average trip length derived from previously published site-level Wilderness studies of over four days per visit.

Table 5 presents estimates of current NF and NWPS Wilderness days for 2002 and 2050 based on the day index in figure 2. The 21 percent increase in Wilderness use predicted by the negative binomial simulations translates to 15 million and 19.7 million site-days, respectively, on NF Wilderness and the NWPS by 2050. This amounts to annual increases of 2.6 and 3.4 million days, respectively, on the 35 million acres of NF Wilderness and 106 million acres for the NWPS; over half of which are in Alaska.

An estimate of the number of unique individuals annually visiting the NF Wilderness (2.27 million) and the NWPS (2.77 million) is reported in table 6. The estimates for 2002 are derived using the NVUM estimate for Wilderness site-days (USDA Forest Service), day-use and relative agency share estimates from Bowker and others (2005a), and an NVUM-based weighted estimate (3.88) of individual NF Wilderness

Table 5—Number of wilderness days (millions).

	2002	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
NF Wilderness	12.40	12.88	13.21	13.63	14.05	15.00
All NWPS	16.28	16.91	17.34	17.89	18.43	19.69

Table 6—Number of wilderness participants (millions).

	2002	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
NF Wilderness	2.27	2.39	2.47	2.57	2.68	2.87
All NWPS	2.77	2.91	3.01	3.14	3.27	3.50

visits per year (Bowker and others 2005b). Also reported are projections through 2050 based on simulations of the logistic participation models and Census projections. By the middle of this century, it is estimated that NF Wilderness will be used by 2.9 million unique visitors, while the NWPS will see about 3.5 million unique visitors annually.

Discussion

Essential Wilderness attributes include relative naturalness, lack of development, and solitude (or low visitor density) (Freimund and Cole 2001). With an increase in total U.S. population of almost 50 percent by the year 2050, the amount of pressure on Wilderness is expected to increase, threatening these Wilderness attributes. Past experience shows that with an increase in population growth there will be an increase in total recreation use including the density of recreation use in most Wilderness areas (Freimund and Cole 2001). The issue of use levels in wildlands is not a new concern. In fact, as early as the 1930s there was concern expressed over this matter (Freimund and Cole 2001). Since that time, there have been major developments in monitoring and managing for use levels.

Our models, combined with Census projections for population growth and expected structural changes in the U.S. population suggest that Wilderness use and Wilderness users will increase at less than half the rate of the general population increase. Nevertheless, the amount of pressure on these wildland resources is still increasing. Moreover, as more wildlands and rural areas are developed the remaining lands will come under increasing pressure. Between 1982 and 1997, 3 percent of natural range was converted to agricultural or developed uses and 11.7 million acres of natural forest cover was converted to developed uses (Cordell and Overdevest 2001). In this study it was determined that distance to a Wilderness area was an important factor in determining the probability of participation and amount of participation. Populations surrounding areas with abundant natural scenery and opportunities for outdoor recreation are increasing. This is especially true for Wilderness areas proximal to rapidly growing cities in the West and Southwest.

Another factor potentially increasing Wilderness use at a rate faster than we predict is the possibility of Hispanic- and Asian-American acculturation, resulting in stronger preferences for Wilderness on the part of these groups in the future (Johnson and others 2004). For the general population, greater mobility, growing interest in health and physical activity and the environment, as well as new technological developments in outdoor recreation equipment (Hendee and others 1990), are all factors contributing to increased use.

In order to effectively manage Wilderness over the long-term, an orderly planning process is needed to develop strategies necessary to meet specific management objectives (Hendee and others 1990). Studies like this one can help with developing goals, objectives, and plans to help deal with increased pressures that Wilderness and primitive areas will be subjected to in the future. Hendee and others (1990) outline a framework for Wilderness management planning that can be flexible and adapted to individual Wilderness areas and needs. This framework can be used to develop goals and objectives and to assess current conditions and make assumptions about future trends, pressures, and problems related to each objective (Hendee and others 1990). Results from this study can be used to help make assumptions about future trends and pressures on wild and primitive areas based on projected population and socio-demographic changes. With projected increases in visitation pressure, managers may have to limit use levels to provide "outstanding opportunities for solitude" as legislated by the Wilderness Act (Freimund and Cole 2001) and to protect the naturalness of the land.

References

Betz, C. J.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Bowker, J. M. 2003. A contingent trip model for estimating rail-trail demand. Journal of Planning and Environmental Management. 46(1): 79–96.

Bowker, J. M.; Cordell, H. K.; Johnson, C. Y. 1999. User fees for recreation services on public lands: a national assessment. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration. 17:1–14.

Bowker, J. M. 2001. Outdoor recreation participation and use by Alaskans: projections 2000–2020. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-527, Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 28 p.

Bowker, J. M.; Harvard III, J.E.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Cordell, H. K.; English, D. B. K.; Loomis, J. B. 2005a. The net economic value of wilderness. In: Cordell, H. K.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Bowker, J. M., eds. The multiple values of wilderness. State College, PA: Venture Publishing. 161–180.

Bowker, J. M.; Starbuck, C. M.; English, D. B. K.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Harvard, J. 2005b. Estimating the value of recreation access to U.S. National Forest Wilderness. Poster Presentation. 8th World Wilderness Congress, Anchorage, AK, October 1–6. Available: http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/recreation/present.html.

Cole, D. N. 1996. Wilderness recreation use trends, 1965 through 1994. Res. Pap. INT-RP-488. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 10 p.

Cordell, H. K.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Bowker, J. M. eds. 2005. The multiple values of wilderness. State College, PA: Venture Publishing. 297 p.

Cordell, H. K.; Betz, C. J.; Bowker, J. M.; English, D. B. K.; Mou, S. H.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Teasley, R. J.; Tarrant, M. A.; Loomis, J. 1999a. Outdoor recreation in American life: a national assessment of demand and supply trends. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing. 449 p.

Cordell, H. K.; Green, G. T.; Betz, C. J. 2002. Recreation and the environment as cultural dimensions in contemporary American society. Leisure Sciences. 24(1): 13–41.

Cordell, H. K.; McDonald, B. L.; Teasley, R. J.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Martin, J.; Bason, J.; Leeworthy, V. L. 1999b. Outdoor recreation participation trends. In: Cordell, H. K.; Betz, C. J.; Bowker, J. M.; English, D. B. K.; Mou, S. H.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Teasley, R. J.; Tarrant, M. A.; Loomis, J. 1999a. Outdoor recreation in American

life: a national assessment of demand and supply trends. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing. 219–321.

Cordell, H. K.; Overdevest, Christine. 2001. Footprints on the land: an assessment of demographic trends and the future of natural lands in the United States. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing. 314 p.

Cordell, H. K.; Teasley, R. J. 1998. Recreation trips to wilderness. International Journal of Wilderness. 4(1): 23–27.

English, D. B. K.; Kocis, S. M.; Zarnoch, S. J.; Arnold, J. R. 2002. Forest Service national visitor use monitoring process: research method documentation. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-57. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Southern Research Station. 14 p.

Freimund, W. A.; Cole, D. N. 2001. Visitor use density and wilderness experience. In: Freimund, W. A.; Cole, D. N., comps. 2001. Visitor use density and wilderness experience; 2000 June 1–3; Missoula, MT. Proceedings RMRS-P-20. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station: 67.

Greene, W. H. 1995. LIMDEP, Version 7.0. Plainview, NY: Econometric Software, Inc.

Greene, W. H. 2000. Econometric analysis. 4th edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1004 p.

Hendee, J. C; Stankey, G. H.; Lucas, R. C., eds. 1990. Wilderness management. 2nd edition. Golden, Colorado: North American Press. 546 p.

Johnson, C. J.; Bowker, J. M.; Cordell, H. K. 2001. Outdoor recreation constraints: an examination of race, gender, and rural dwelling across regions. Southern Rural Sociology. 17: 111–133.

Johnson, C. Y.; Bowker, J. M.; Bergstrom, J. C; Cordell, H. K. 2004. Wilderness values in America: do immigrant status and ethnicity make a difference? Society and Natural Resources. 17: 611– 628.

Loomis, J. B. 1999. Do additional designations of wilderness result in increases in recreation use? Society and Natural Resources. 12: 481–491.

Loomis, J. B.; Richardson, R. 2000. Economic values of protecting roadless areas in the United States. Available: http://www.wilderness.org/Library/Documents/upload/Economic_Values_of_Protecting_Roadless_Areas_in_the_U_S_Loomis.pdf. [February 1, 2005].

Miller, J. R.; Hay, J. M. 1981. Determinants of hunter participation: duck hunting in the Mississippi Flyway. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 63: 677–684.

Murdock, S. H.; Backman, K. E.; Colberg, E.; Hoque, M. N.; Hamm, R. R. 1990. A modeling demographic change and characteristics in the analysis of future demand for leisure service. Leisure Science. 12: 79–102.

Roggenbuck, J. W.; Watson, A. E. 1989. Wilderness recreation use: the current situation. In: Watson, A. E., comp. Outdoor recreation benchmark 1988: Proceedings of the national outdoor recreation forum; 1988 January 13–14; Tampa, FL. Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-SE-52. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station: 346–356.

Taylor, D. E. 2000. Meeting the challenge of wild land recreation management: demographic shifts and social inequality. Journal of Leisure Research. 32(1): 171–179.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2004. U.S. interim projections by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin. Available: http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/ [November 3, 2004].

USDA Forest Service. 2005. National Forest visitor use monitoring program—NationalProject results – January 2000 through September 2003. Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/national_report_final_draft.pdf. [December 5, 2005].

USGS. 2004. Wilderness areas of the United States boundary map. Available: http://www.nationalatlas.gov/mld/wildrnp.html. [March 1, 2006].

Watson, A. E.; Cordell, H. K.; Hartmann, L. A. 1989. Characteristics of wilderness users in outdoor recreation assessments. In: Lee, Marty; Brown, Perry J., eds. Recreation and park management: papers from the first national symposium of social science in resource management; 1986 May 12–16; Corvallis, OR. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University, College of Forestry: 1–10.

Watson, A. E.; Cole, D. N. 1999. Wilderness users and use: recent additions to understanding outdoor recreation in American life: a national assessment of demand and supply trends. In: Cordell, H. K.; Betz, C. J.; Bowker, J. M.; English, D. B. K.; Mou, S. H.; Bergstrom, J. C.; Teasley, R. J.; Tarrant, M. A.; Loomis, J. 1999. Outdoor recreation in American life: a national assessment of demand and supply trends. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing: 377–380.

Watson, A. E. 2000. Wilderness use in the year 2000: societal changes that influence human relationships with wilderness. In: Cole, David N.; McCool, Stephen F.; Borrie, William T.; O'Loughlin, Jennifer, comps. 2000. Wilderness science in a time of change conference-Volume 4: Wilderness visitors, experiences, and visitor management; 1999 May 23–27; Missoula, MT. Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-4. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station: 53–60.

Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. 2003. The complete economic and demographic data source. Washington, DC: Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.

Yen, S. T.; Adamowicz, W. L. 1993. Statistical properties of welfare measures from count data models of recreation demand. Review of Agricultural Economics. 15(2): 203–215.

Zawacky, W.; Marsinko, A. R.; Bowker, J. M. 2000. A travel cost analysis of economic use value of nonconsumptive wildlife recreation in the United States. Forest Science. 46: 496–505.

Bowker, J. M., D. Murphy, et al. (2007). Wilderness recreation participation: projections for the next half century. Science and stewardship to protect and sustain wilderness value: eighth world wilderness congress symposium, Fort Collins, CO, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Station.

Endnote # 7