

U.S. Coastal Tourism and Recreation Policy: A Federal, State, and Local Perspective

Chi-Ok Oh*, Robert B. Ditton** and Jason Draper***

< Contents >

- | | |
|--|---|
| I. The Socio-Economic Importance of Coastal Tourism and Recreation | State Coastal Programs from a Perspective of Recreation Resource Management |
| II. Current Tourism Policy Structure in the U.S. | VI. Private Sector Approach to Tourism Development |
| III. Current Coastal Tourism Policy Structure in the U.S. | VII. Selected Coastal Tourism Cases |
| IV. Federal, State and Local Government Roles in Coastal Recreation Management | VIII. The Future of Coastal Tourism in the U.S. |
| V. The Overview of the Federal and | References |
| | Abstract |

I. The Socio-Economic Importance of Coastal Tourism and Recreation

Coastal tourism and recreation typically includes any recreational activities that take place in the coastal margin and adjacent coastal waters such as beach visitation, recreational fishing, snorkeling and diving, recreational boating and cruises (Kline, Osleeb, & Viola, 2004). Coastal tourism and recreation is big business in the United States. In 2000, the ocean economy (that portion of the economy that relies directly on ocean attributes) contributed more than \$117

Received 19 October 2006; accepted 17 December 2006

* Assistant Professor, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0735 USA. (Corresponding author : chiokoh@clemson.edu)

** Professor, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2258 USA, r-ditton@tamu.edu

*** Doctoral Student, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0735 USA, jdraper@clemson.edu

billion to the American prosperity and supported considerably more than two million jobs (U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, 2004). About 75% of the jobs and about 50% of the economic value were produced by ocean-related tourism and recreation. To put this in some perspective, ocean-related employment and total economic output was nearly $1\frac{1}{2}$ and $2\frac{1}{2}$ times larger, respectively, than the agriculture sector in the U.S. Also, it should be noted that the coastal tourism and recreation sector far outpaces other ocean sectors such as transportation, ship building, mineral extraction and construction when it comes to the number of jobs involved and GDP by sector.

The coastal economy (or that part of the economy that takes place on or near the coast, whether or not the activity has a direct link to the ocean) is even larger. More than \$1 trillion, or about one-tenth of the nation's gross national product (GDP) is generated in the riparian zone adjacent to the shore. When all of the coastal watershed areas are taken into account, this estimate of economic output grows to over \$4.5 trillion (U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy 2004). If about 50% of this is tied to the coastal recreation and tourism industry in some way, this industry defies public perception.

While more than 75% of summer travelers want to visit beaches, coastal tourism is the largest and fastest growing sector of the U.S. service industry (Kline et al., 2004 YOTO, 1998). Approximately 85% of tourism-related revenues are made in coastal states. For example, while the precise figure is not available of the total number of visitors to beaches, California beaches alone attracted tourists of an estimated 567 million and they contributed an estimated \$73 billion to the economy directly and indirectly (Houston, 2002). This is more than all of those who went to all national parks in the USA (286 million). Likewise, in Florida, beach tourism contributed \$33.7 billion to the economy (Houston, 2002).

There are additional economic values, such as what recreation participants are willing to pay above and beyond current expenditures for tourism and recreation experiences as well as those human experiences that are not bought and sold in the marketplace. Some sectors of the U.S. coastal tourism and recreation economy do an excellent job of estimating their economic value, but others do not! Those that do so make use of their information in the public policy making arena. There is a certain increased standing that comes with having such

estimates of economic output. For example, the cruise ship industry and its passengers account for about \$12 billion in expenditures. While the total value of the commercial fishing industry in the U.S. exceeds \$28 billion annually, the marine recreational fishing industry is valued at about \$20 billion annually. Nationwide retail expenditures on recreational boating overall in freshwater and saltwater exceeded \$30 billion in 2001 (U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, 2004).

II . Current Tourism Policy Structure in the U.S.

Despite widespread recognition of the tourism industry as a major economic engine, the U.S. has lagged far behind other countries in tourism marketing and promotion (Cicin-Sain & Knecht, 1999). The Year of the Ocean (YOTO) report indicates the following in the U.S. (YOTO, 1998):

“Ronald Allen, chairman of Delta Air Lines, Inc., notes The Republic of Ireland, with a population of less than 4 million people, spends \$45 million in public funds annually to promote tourism. The U.S., with 260 million people, spends less than \$17 million in federal money. Spain, with its attractive beaches and climate, spends 10 times more than the United States in advertising to attract international tourists. The United States ranks 31st in the world in international tourist market advertising” (p. F-4).

It is well known that the private sector has been the main driving force for tourism development in the U.S., mainly focusing on its contribution to economic growth. In particular, tourism development and marketing effort at the federal level has been relatively low and sporadic in the U.S. (Miller, 1993). Regardless of the existence of the federal agency such as the United States Travel and Tourism Administration (USTTA), (which was abolished in 1996), tourism has never been a high national priority (Miller & Auyong, 1991). There has been debate at the national level on whether a greater national-level agency dealing with tourism promotion is required (YOTO, 1998; Wildavsky, 1995). Nevertheless, the principle of market economies up to now has been more supported based on the argument that private companies as a major beneficiary rather than the general public should bear the costs of tourism programs (Wildavsky, 1995 YOTO, 1998).

Nevertheless, when public tourism agencies promote tourism, they have two kinds of goals: international and domestic goals (Gee, Choy, & Mackens, 1984). Whereas the international goals are mainly to increase tourism receipts through foreign exchange earnings for economic development, to produce favorable foreign public opinion, and to understand another nation's culture, domestic goals focus more on public health and well being balanced economic growth/redistribution of national income and state and local earnings public respect for the environment preservation of regional and minority tradition sand protection of the individual's right to leisure (Miller & Auyong, 1991).

The approach taken by the federal government has an effect on the management functions hierarchically for state and local forms of government. While governmental policy making usually allows for a national administrative culture, there has been a tacit agreement in the U.S. that the public sector, in particular, the federal government should play a limited role. One of those includes a regulatory role to resolve conflicts between private sector providers and to enhance tourism resource conservation. Based on taking a *lassiez faire* approach, the role of the USTTA, established in 1981 in the U.S. Department of Commerce as per the National Tourism Policy Act (NTPA), was also quite limited compared to those in other countries (Elliott,1997). Originally, the USTTA intended to develop a comprehensive program to promote the U.S. as an international destination and support the development of tourism facilities and services to satisfy foreign tourists (Edgell, 1999). However, the U.S. government decided to abolish the USTTA in 1996 based on the long-term belief in the 'user-pay and user-benefit' principle and the ideology of market economies. Since the abolishment of USTTA, its functions have been divided among various governmental agencies including the U. S. International Trade Administration. Accordingly, there is no longer a single government agency to oversee international tourism issues but there is now burgeoning support within the U.S. Congress for legislation to launch a new governmental agency, like the USTTA with tourism policy guidelines (Edgell, 1999).

Consequently, the U.S. federal government has not paid any particular attention to coastal tourism either based on their *lassiez faire* approach to tourism. With regard to U.S. coastal tourism policies, Miller (1993) summarized

that 'tourism is dominantly driven by the private sector to wit, the vast majority of the shorelands in the nation's 48 contiguous states are controlled by private interests [Ditton & Miller, 1986, p.237] and mandates to shape tourism policies have been generally uncoordinated and lightly funded throughout federal, state, and local public bureaucracies' (p.182).

In contrast to the absence of policy at the federal-level to promote tourism including coastal tourism, state and local governments have been much more interested in increasing the governmental role in tourism during the last several decades (Miller & Auyong, 1991). The goal here is to stimulate state and local income and employment by attracting more tourists to state and local destinations. In particular, with regard to the structure of tourism programs, most planning and management decisions for tourism development are made at the local level. As Miller and Auyong (1991) have indicated, many cities have paid an attention to the development of tourism as a positive contribution to economic growth regardless of the structure of tourism programs used such as independent city programs (e.g., Miami), programs contracted outside of public agencies with convention and visitors bureaus and chambers of commerce (e.g., New Orleans, New York, San Diego) or a mix of these two approaches (e.g., Boston).

III. Current Coastal Tourism Policy Structure in the U.S.

Various forms of coastal tourism and recreation have existed probably as long as humans have. Coastal tourism is considered a branch of tourism but it is different from other types of tourism activities because coastal tourism requires a coastal and marine environment that is vulnerable to human activities and, accordingly, provides many challenges and needs special management measures (Orams, 1999). Thus, coastal tourism should be integrated and managed in a comprehensive and cross-cutting way (Miller, 1991). Federal agencies have been criticized for their lack of attention to coastal tourism and recreation in contrast with other important issues such as coastal zone management, port management, offshore oil and gas exploration and wetland restoration (YOTO,

1998). This is demonstrated again in the recent report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (2004) where coastal tourism and recreation was not included as a stand-alone topic among the thirty-one topical chapters listed in the report. Coastal tourism and recreation was recognized as one of the most important ocean assets but was merely a sub-set of concern in this report. Not surprisingly, there has been no coordination between coastal tourism programs and other coastal management programs (YOTO, 1998). The growth of coastal tourism commonly results in the concern for coastal environmental impacts such as resource degradation and pollution. As Miller and Auyong (1991) point out, in the absence of some clearly defined leadership by a federal agency charged with coordinating coastal tourism issues, the responsibility for coastal tourism and recreation does not belong to any one agency but is dispersed over a number of them. They also add:

“That tourism has received only slight and oblique attention in the literature of marine policy can be attributed in part, to the facts that tourism has been dominantly driven by private sector interests, rather than government regulatory policies, and that much tourism takes place on the land of the coastal zone. Furthermore, the problems of tourism do not fall squarely within a single subdomain of marine affairs or within the purview of a single discipline. Certainly the rise of investment in coastal tourism forces concern about environmental pollution and protection. It is also pertinent to the policies of ports authorities and local governments, and to those of fishery management, national park, and coastal zone management agencies; not to mention the recreational practices of individuals” (p. 75-76).

As a result, various management agencies are involved in coastal management in a very complicated manner. For example, at the federal level, various federal agencies have coastal management responsibilities including the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resources Management (OCRM) in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (Beatley, Brower, & Schwab, 1994). As a result, there

is no clearly defined single public agency fully in charge of the promotion and management of coastal tourism. While each agency has its own goals and responsibilities with some degree of the involvement in coastal management, none has primary responsibility for promoting coastal tourism programs. Due to the fragmented nature of these diverse agencies, there is a lack of coordination among agencies to promote coastal tourism in a sustainable manner to minimize adverse effects of tourism development. For this reason, YOTO (1998) indicated that 'one of the greatest challenges facing coastal managers in the U.S. and elsewhere is how to integrate tourism development within the realm of integrated coastal management, and thus increase the likelihood of long-term sustainability' (p. F8).

IV. Federal, State, and Local Government Roles in Coastal Recreation Management

While state and local governments play a major role in tourism promotion as described previously, the federal government plays a major role in the provision and management of the natural resources that underlie tourism and outdoor recreation experiences. In the U.S., the federal government has responsibilities for the coastal national park areas, coastal national wildlife refuges, coastal and marine protected areas including marine sanctuaries and national estuarine reserves as well as interstate and federal fishery resources and endangered species. These are generally referred to as resource-based areas and are generally special natural attractions that are generally not located close to where people reside (U.S. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 1962). Since federal fishery resources know no boundaries and move from state jurisdiction to federal jurisdiction, they are clearly the responsibility of the federal government. State governments provide coastal state parks and wildlife refuges; these areas are not necessarily as pristine as national parks and areas but nevertheless are oriented to meet public needs for coastal tourism and recreation. These areas are referred to as intermediate areas because in terms of development that fall in between the resource-based areas managed by the Federal government and the more user-oriented areas maintained by local governments for its constituents.

Fishery resources within state waters (normally out to 3 nautical miles (nm) in most states except for Texas, the west coast of Florida, and for the island of Puerto Rico where state fisheries jurisdiction extends out to approximately 10.25 nm) generally remain in state waters but may move along shore into other states creating the need for a more coordinated approach among states. States promulgate rules and regulations for their fishery resources and seek to provide anglers with the experiences they desire while maintaining a sustainable fishery resource base. Finally, there are the user-oriented tourism and recreation areas which are located in the communities, large and small, where people live. These resources are generally much less oriented to coastal natural resources but rather more facility oriented to provide people with the recreation experiences they want and need. This would include city shoreland parks, fishing piers, artificial reefs, urban fishing programs, marinas, viewing platforms, urban waterfronts, etc. Because these facilities are so close to where people reside and can be a part of their daily life at little to no cost in time and money, user-oriented facilities and areas for coastal tourism and recreation account for most of overall use across the three types of areas addressed here (U.S. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, (1962)

V. The Overview of the Federal and State Coastal Programs from a Perspective of Recreation Resource Management

The susceptible nature of beaches and coastal zones recurrently requires human management efforts. Kline et al. (2004) indicate that 'ocean waves and winds constantly alter the shoreline by redistributing beach sand. Given the importance of tourism to the economic well being of many coastal communities, preserving the quality of beaches for recreational purposes has become a primary consideration' (p.1081). In other words, public agencies which are in charge of coastal tourism development have twofold objectives of supporting coastal recreation and tourism as well as protecting and enhancing ocean and coastal resources concurrently. Thus, coastal tourism and recreation policy is not separate and is normally incorporated into the cooperative coastal resource programs among federal, state, and local levels. At the federal level, national

management and planning is mainly based on the CZMA legislated in 1972. While the purview of the CZMA is beyond tourism and recreation development in the coastal areas per se, three management practices of the CZMA are 'especially important for ensuring sustainable tourism development: (1) provisions for the management of coastal development; (2) provisions to improve public access to the shoreline; and (3) provisions to protect and, where necessary, to restore coastal environments' (YOTO, 1998, p. F-10). The OCRM at the NOAA is primarily responsible for overseeing the implementation of coastal management programs at the state level. However, derived from the basic constitutional ideology that a multitude of self-governing states are united together, 'the U.S. coastal management framework is clearly one of shared management between federal, state, and local jurisdictions' (Beatly, Brower, & Schwab, 1994, p. 59). Accordingly, while each coastal state has a main responsibility to prepare for detailed management actions, the federal agency using incentives through the CZMA also has a certain degree of control over the main principles (YOTO, 1998).

In addition to the management of coastal development and improvement of public access to the shorelines stipulated in the CZMA, there are a number of particular federal laws that seek to encourage sustainable coastal and tourism development such as management of clean water and healthy ecosystems, management of coastal hazards, and beach restoration programs (Cicin-Sain & Knecht, 1999). For example, different federal agencies such as USEPA are involved in management of clean water and healthy ecosystems based on the Clean Water Act and the Oil Pollution Act to protect the coastal and marine environment (Cicin-Sain & Knecht). In addition, the USACE and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) are the main federal entities that play an important role in the maintenance and restoration of beach and shores according to the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Marine Sanctuary Programs (Beatly et al., 1994).

Because the role of the federal government is to assist the state programs through the financial and technical assistance, state and local governments have the main control over land planning and management. According to Beatly et al. (1994), 'one of the key features of the CZMA is the flexibility coastal states have

in crafting their plans to meet their own unique or special circumstances and political and cultural contexts' (p. 104). With respect to the coastal tourism and recreation, the state report published in California seemingly stands for the present view of this in the U.S.: 'Economically it is in the [California] state's interest to encourage ocean and coastal recreational activities and tourism. At the same time, the state must ensure that tourism and related activities are compatible with environmental protection goals and that conflicts between user groups are managed properly' (California's Ocean Resources, 1995; p. 5G-1). Further, the report adds, 'The California Coastal Act was crafted by the legislature to protect and enhance marine and coastal resources while also protecting recreational opportunities and public access to the shoreline. These principals must be incorporated in the localcoastal programs developed by all local governments along the California coast' (p. 5G-3).

VI. Private Sector Approach to Tourism Development

Mill and Morrison (2002) suggest that the benefits of tourism to businesses, organizations and individuals are one of the greatest strengths of tourism. The business side of tourism is motivated by profit, which requires entrepreneurs who "are very aware of and/or study the environment, especially social change, market trends, technological advancements, and economic conditions" (Crossley, Jamieson & Brayley, 2001, p. 40-41). Thus, tourism infrastructure and amenities tend to develop from the knowledge of individuals (or entrepreneurs)who realize there is an economic opportunity for a destination to attract or increase a share of the travel industry. Inherently, as entrepreneurs recognize economic opportunities, competition not only between destinations, but between businesses in individual destinations, is created.

Facilitators of travel include travel agencies, travel information services, visitors' and conference bureaus and/or chambers of commerce (Crossley et al., 2001). Travel agencies and information services compete for the attention of potential travelers to purchase their services while visitors and conference bureaus and/or chambers of commerce compete to attract tourists to specific destinations they represent and market as destinations. Visitors and conference

bureaus and/or chambers of commerce are typically not profit seeking entities, but they are vital to local tourism destinations as the organization representing the stakeholder businesses and interests. Inherently, transportation is required for travelers to leave their origin and visit a tourism destination. Aside from personal automobiles, tourists may rely on airlines, rental automobiles, bus lines and railroads to reach their destination and/or return to their origin (Crossley et al., 2001). Although not as likely as the experience at the actual destination, the travel experience to the destination and return to origin are the first and last experiences of the travel experience. Obviously, traveling to and from the destination also contribute to tourists' experience and provide entrepreneurs an opportunity to benefit economically.

The destination itself provides most of the tourism experience. As such, tourists rely on the local hospitality sectors including hotels and motels, restaurants and bars/taverns, resorts and camping or other lodging facilities (Crossley et al., 2001). Another tourism destination sector vital to tourism development includes the local commercial and entertainment venues. Crossley et al., (2001) break this sector into three categories. First, there is an entertainment sub-sector including concerts, festivals/fairs, theater and other spectator types of venues. Second, a more participatory sector includes opportunities for tourists to participate in programs and activities. Finally, a destination's retail sector provides tourists an opportunity to purchase local or other products to use during their experience or remember the experience after returning home.

Coastal tourism certainly includes all the commercial/private development discussed previously that provide tourists the amenities and opportunities that derive the tourism experience. However, coastal tourism builds upon the aforementioned because of the uniqueness of the destination. For example, coastal tourism provides tourists with various recreational activities such as recreational fishing, snorkeling and diving and recreational boating in the coastal zone and in offshore waters (Klein et al., 2004) that non-coastal tourism destinations lack. Inherently, such opportunities provide entrepreneurs with the opportunity to gain economically. In addition, in the United States several indicators, including total visitation and tax revenue, reflect coastal tourism as a

major attraction (Houston, 1996).

While government and other entities have an interest in tourism, development tends to be driven by the private sector. The private sector includes many sub-sectors necessary to provide tourists with amenities and services required when traveling, all of which are driven by economic strategies. For example, hotel and lodging facilities operate according to a supply and demand model. As supply of rooms for any given night or time period decreases, hotels and lodging facilities are able to charge higher rates for remaining supply. The same concept applies to other private sector tourism business, such as airlines. As a flight's seats are booked, the limited supply often leads to higher rates for remaining seats. Private property and resort development also tends to drive the economics of developing tourism in many areas. With limited open land, the cost to obtain property increases and ultimately causes limited development opportunities and constraints to policy development and implementation. While tourism development will continue to require the private sector, 'the best destination plan is created jointly by nonprofit organizations, government and private sector' (Gunn, 2002, p. 234).

VII. Selected Coastal Tourism Cases

We know much more about the socio-economics of some forms of coastal tourism and recreation than others. For example, we probably have the best understanding of anglers and their fishing activity because they are involved in harvesting fishery resources and potential consumption. Because federal and state agencies have responsibilities for fisheries management, there is a need to have a thorough understanding of the angler population and an ability to sample it on a regular basis. This is the social science analogy to doing a stock assessment. Thus, it should not be surprising that there has been a National Survey of Fishing, hunting and Wildlife-Associated Outdoor Recreation conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Bureau of the Census since 1955. Likewise, the Marine Recreational Fishing Statistics Survey has been conducted along our coast lines since 1979. In addition, saltwater fishing licenses in most of the coastal states provide a means for identifying the

universe of anglers for sampling purposes. Anglers widely support saltwater licenses because monies derived go to support fisheries management under application of a user pay, user benefit approach. This approach is used to get the funds needed to cover the costs of marine fisheries management and not to tax or punish anglers. It is not viewed as a tax in the U.S. but rather a user-generated fee which is dedicated to support fisheries management exclusively. Where funds are proposed as general tax revenues, rather than to a dedicated fund in support of fisheries management, anglers do not support this arrangement and there is no salt water license requirement. And furthermore, anglers receive little to no services in support of fisheries management

We know a good deal about boaters and their boating activity as well because of a federal law requiring uniform boat numbering and registration to prevent the movement of stolen boats across state lines. This boating information system provides a universe of boats and their owners for sampling purposes. Alternatively, we know little about scuba divers (and even less about snorkelers) because these activities are considered self-regulating private sector activities with no governmental involvement. While several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) certify scuba divers when they take courses, the resultant universe of scuba divers is never updated to only include active divers. Again, there is little investment in equipment required to become a snorkler, it is impossible to know how many there are or secure a universe of participant names. While going to the beach or doing beaching may be the most popular of all of the coastal tourism and recreation activities mentioned so far in this paper, there is virtually no data collected at the beach level unless fees are charged and accounting requirements result in some estimate of use but there is no listing of names and addresses for follow-up research purposes. Typically, there is little interest in knowing the extent to which public beaches are used until there is an outbreak of red tide or an oil spill and some idea of damages needs to be calculated. In the following two sections we focus on beach access and recreational fishing.

Shore Access Including Beach Access

The U.S. is the first country in the world to initiate a systematic national coastal management program under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)

(YOTO, 1998; Beatley et al., 1994). One of the Coastal Zone Management Act's primary purposes was 'to provide public access to the coast for recreational purposes' (Pogue & Lee, 1999, p. 220). While the CZMA declares public access a national policy, it is the individual coastal states' responsibility to implement and manage the policy. Accordingly, each coastal state is granted the flexibility in managing their priority policy agendas to meet their own needs (Beatly et al., 1994).

Pogue and Lee (1999) recognize coastal counties as 'among the most densely populated and rapidly growing counties in the nation' (p. 220). Inherently, with dense population and growth comes development that either intentionally or unintentionally inhibits public access to the coast. In addition to the use of beaches by residents of coastal counties, tourists frequently travel to the coast and fuel an important and growing economic sector of coastal communities (Kriesel, Landry & Keeler, 2005; Pogue & Lee, 1999).

It is indisputable that there is an increasing burden on public agencies to provide an adequate level of recreational opportunities in the coastal zone and this is heightened by the expected increases in resident and tourist demand. Nevertheless, beach access and amenity requirements for residents and non-resident coastal visitors differ, requiring consideration of how to best provide sufficient and adequate access and amenities for each group. Brower (1978) suggests that providing beach access for local tax paying residents is fairly simple and inexpensive while the access needs of non-residents, who do not pay any local taxes besides the bed tax which is usually dedicated to support marketing and promotion efforts, might require additional 'public and private support activities, such as camping and picnic areas, bath houses, as well as restaurants, motels and other commercial activity' (p. 37). Because of these differences, Brower (1978) suggests the main interest of local government is likely to be acquisition of right-of-ways to the beach and state government is to provide resources and amenities required by residents who visit the beach but do not live near the beach. Inherently, these resources and amenities would also serve out-of-state and international visitors.

Current policies regarding beach and coastal access, in particular at state- and local-level, focus on acquiring additional shoreline access points using a variety

of financial options. In general, policies for the acquisition of land include fee-simple and less-than-fee-simple approaches. Policies focused on identifying and implementing feasible financial options often include a target effective strategy. In assessing policy implementation, benefit-cost analysis is useful for maximizing net benefits, which is achieved when marginal social benefits and marginal social costs are equal (Loomis & Walsh, 1997).

Fee-simple approaches to land and resource acquisition include outright purchase and outright donation. While outright purchase policies provide flexibility (Brower & Dreyfoos, 1979), the approach or policy is also considered an expensive approach (Brower & Dreyfoos, 1979; Beatley et al., 1994; Crompton, 1999). Conversely, outright donation or dedication policy approaches are maintained by local government through “such comparatively low-cost activities as placing signs, marking public accessways, providing trash cans, and conducting periodic policing of the accessways and beach” (Brower & Dreyfoos, 1979, p. 72).

Less-than-fee-simple approaches or policies allow local governments to purchase easements, or right for the public to pass over private lands, in instances where full proprietary rights are not required and/or monetarily feasible (Beatley et al., 1994). The less-than-fee-simple approach or policy also considers location and proximity to parking and other necessary facilities as well as the seller’s willingness to sell an access easement (Brower & Dreyfoos, 1979).

When a willing seller is not available, an eminent domain policy can enable local government acquisition at the appraised value of the land (Crompton, 1999). Brower and Dreyfoos (1979) suggest eminent domain policy be used to ‘acquire an easement in an area that the public is already using, with permission of the owner’ (p. 72).

Financial/Funding Possibilities- When considering beach improvement or access projects, several questions arise. Black, Donnelley and Settle (1990) suggest three key considerations: 1) is the project worthwhile, 2) if yes, who should pay? and 3) how should they pay? Black et al. (1990) suggest benefit-cost analysis will answer question one while “rules of thumb” are useful for answering the remaining two questions.

Black et al. (1990) recommend a ‘target effectiveness’ strategy in seeking

funds for beach nourishment that might be considered in assessing increased beach access or improvements. In such a strategy, the tax or fee paid for a good is proportionate to the benefit received. This becomes more complex when considering that beaches are used by residents and nonresidents alike. Nonresidents, especially day visitors, will require additional services such as parking (Brower & Dreyfoos, 1979).

User or access fees are common revenue streams for parks and recreation venues. However, since access to the coast is considered under the common law Public Trust Doctrine, there may be several barriers to collecting access fees besides public trust concerns. Black et al. (1990) suggest:

“local communities may decide against beach access fees for several reasons: (1) local business or governmental opposition, arising from concerns that access charges will drive away too many tourists; (2) relatively high collection costs that make access charges impractical; or (3) communities are already using access charges to raise revenue for other purposes” (p. 204).

Inherently, collecting a fee at the beach requires additional resources and planning compared to beaches without a fee. While user or access fees are highly target effective, they are more feasible and practical when increasing an existing access fee than initiating a new one (Black et al., 1990). User or access fees for public recreation areas are often viewed by some, especially locals, as a duplicate tax (Winter, Palucki & Burkhardt, 1999). When assessing a beach access fee, alternative options such as weekly and seasonal passes for frequent beach users help minimize administrative and political ramifications (Black et al., 1990). Several beach destinations in New Jersey assess user fees ranging from daily to seasonal passes (Jersey Shore Guide of Beach Fees Info, <http://www.ourtownrentals.com/index.php?a=28&b=143>).

Another type of user fee, namely, parking fees through the use of public pay lots and/or metered parking, are another revenue stream to support beach improvement projects. While parking fees are also target effective for day users who drive to the beach, they generally are not target effective when considering beach users who reach the beach other than in vehicles or are dropped off at the beach (Black et al., 1990). In addition, a parking fee per vehicle does not evenly distribute the fee among all beach users and a parking fee may be assessed to

individuals accessing other venues in proximity to the beach, but not actually accessing or using the beach (Black et al., 1990). The parking fee approach is relevant and target effective for day users of the beach that are not within walking distance, but some target effectiveness is lacking for other beach users. Kriesel et al. (2004) identify parking fees as those collected at many beach destinations and suggest identifying the use level and fee required to raise the revenue needed for a beach improvement project as an initial step in assessing project feasibility.

Beach destination visitors also stay overnight at the destination. Accommodations serving visitors who spend the night(s) include hotel/motel, campground, rental house/condominium or timeshare properties. Visitors staying in hotels, rental homes/condos, campgrounds, etc that are beachfront or in walking distance to the beach may avoid parking fees because of the proximity of their accommodations to the beach. Therefore, a renter's tax on rental properties and an accommodations or bed tax assessed on hotel/motel properties allow local government to target overnight visitors at beach destinations (Black et al., 1990). Bonham, Fujii, Im and Mak (1992) suggest tourist destinations regularly assess taxes that target tourists, such as accommodation taxes, but Black et al (1990) suggest a county wide accommodation tax is weak in target effectiveness as a result of not reaching most beach users. Therefore, Black et al. (1990) recognize a special district accommodation tax for beach area accommodations as the most target effective. For example, Galveston, Texas implemented a three percent hotel/motel tax used to provide tourist services (Gunter, Ditton & Olson, 1987). The revenue generated was "divided equally among tourist information services, lifeguard and emergency rescue services, and beach cleaning" (Gunter et al., 1987, p. 253).

Black et al. (1990) suggest taxing property owners of beachfront property for improvements such as nourishment and that this is highly target effective since property owners benefit the most. However, with beach improvement projects such as provision of beach access, a property tax is not target effective since beachfront property owners often have their own access and, as already mentioned, require less in terms of access and amenities than non-resident beach users (Brower, 1978).

Public access to the coast is well documented as a public good. For example, providing public access to the shore for purposes of recreation was a primary goal of the Coastal Zone Management Act (Pogue & Lee, 1999). A continuous challenge to providing access to the beach is created by the rapid population growth in coastal counties (Pogue & Lee, 1999) that inherently drives increased development and threatens sufficient public access to the beach for nonresidents and residents alike who do not live on the shore. With increasingly less dependency on state and federal funding sources (Kriesel et al., 2005), provision of beach access requires strategic 'target effective' revenue generation (Black et al., 1990).

Recreational Fishing

According to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), there are approximately 13 million persons who participate one or more times in the previous year in marine recreational fishing in the U.S. This activity generates about \$30 billion in economic impact and supports about 350,000 jobs (NMFS-Constituency Services webpage: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ocs/recfish/index.htm>).

It is difficult to go fishing as tourism and recreation if fishery resources are depleted. Therefore, fisheries management agencies regulate the means, manners, and methods of all fishing activities (recreational and commercial) in their respective jurisdictions. As discussed earlier, state fisheries jurisdictions generally extent to 3 miles from shore, with some notable exceptions. Federal fisheries jurisdictions generally extent from the end of state fishery jurisdiction out to 200 miles. It should be noted, however, that all fish are landed within state jurisdiction making consistency of regulations between state and federal jurisdictions essential.

State fisheries management is much more straightforward than federal fisheries management. At the state level, there is normally a Department of Natural Resources or Wildlife and Fisheries involved. Generally, there is a staff that works for an executive director who is responsible to a Board or Commission. Members of the board or Commission are generally appointed to these bodies by the Governor and generally lack professional training in fisheries management. The principle here is to have civilian leadership and decision makers in charge of a professionally

trained staff. Generally, all matters that revenue consequences must be taken to the legislature for their approval.

Fisheries management at the federal level is carried out according to the Magnuson- Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) as passed by Congress and signed into law in 1976. The NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service is responsible for fisheries management within the 200 miles exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of the United States. The agency's regional fisheries science centers conduct fishery resource stock assessments, gather other scientific data and complete social and economic analyses as needed. This information is provided to eight regional fishery management councils and their advisory committees on a timely basis so that staff can develop fishery management plans for the stocks found in their respective regions. These plans are then sent forward to the Secretary of Commerce (NOAA Fisheries is located in the Department of Commerce) for review (approval or remand) based on ten national standards identified in the Magnuson- Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Council members generally have little or no expertise in stock assessment or other forms of fisheries science and must rely on advice from various advisory panels, fishery organizations, NOAA scientists, and an engaged public. The councils seek manage and conserve fishery resources while balancing competing recreational and commercial fishing interests.

Besides fish and anglers, there is an entire system needed for the recreational fishing industry to flourish. As anglers make decisions on a fishing destination, they also require information on various locations, information on the quality of fishing as well as lodging opportunities, restaurants, and other fishing related infrastructure related to their particular trip. For successful fishing destinations, there must be a partnership of public and private sector efforts.

There are a variety of modes of recreational fishing currently available at various prices. Most anglers fish from shore, piers, jetties, banks, bridges or using other shoreland facilities. This approach is a relatively low cost approach to recreational fishing and depends mostly on near shore or state jurisdiction fish populations. Next are those that own their boats of varying size that allow anglers to go fishing in near shore or offshore waters. Here, the boat owners and those they take fishing must bear all of the costs of the fishing trip but their

chances of catching fish are greater. Finally, there are several forms of fee-fishing that provide tourists, and visitors without boats at their disposal with an opportunity to fish from a boat. First, guides are available to take one or two individuals at a time fishing in bays and near shore waters. These guides are generally knowledgeable and can help anglers with limited experience catch fish. Second, a group of 4-5 anglers can rent a recreational fishing boat with a captain to take them fishing offshore. Again, the angler is not only renting the boat for the day, for example, but is also renting the captain's experience and this should lead to a more successful fishing experience. Finally, in and around large coastal population areas, much larger boats take people out on a per head basis, hence the name head boat. Usually, there area break-even number of clients that must agree to go fishing off shore before the boat leaves the dock. The cost of going fishing on a head-boat is much less than a charter boat where there are only a small number on board and the boat and captain have been rented by the group. Several in the fee-fishing category should appeal to the tourist group if they want to go for larger game species offshore.

Little to nothing has been written in the U.S. about recreational fishing as tourism except for a paper by the same name by Ditton et al. (2002). The National Surveys of Hunting, Fishing, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation make no mention of fishing as tourism either in terms of international tourists coming to the U.S. to fish or in terms of domestic tourism where people are attracted to other states besides where they reside to go fishing. Anecdotally, we know a large number of people come to the U.S. to access our marine recreational fishing opportunities but we have no evidence of this. The National Surveys allow for a basic understanding of anglers' fishing activity in other states but there are sample size problems with estimates provided. Some states such as Minnesota, Florida, Wisconsin, North Carolina, and New York(top five) rank high in attracting angler days of fishing from outside the state while others such as Illinois, Texas, Pennsylvania, California, and Virginia (top five) rank high in exporting angler days to other states (Ditton et al. 2002). Unfortunately, besides looking at inland states and coastal states, there was no way to break down these totals into marine and freshwater fishing. Thus, findings are of limited use in further understanding marine recreational fishing as tourism activity.

Overall, international and domestic tourists fishing in the U.S. are making use of the same fishery resources as residents and doing so at the same cost. There are some differences, however. In those states where a license is required of residents to fishing in the marine waters of the state (most states in the U.S. except for the New England states in the Northeast U.S.), licenses are also required of nonresidents and typically they are higher priced than for residents. In an effort to discourage illegal fishing because paper fishing licenses could not be purchased from an agent of the state, point of sale computerized licensing systems have made purchasing a license convenient for resident and non-resident anglers alike. Likewise, when resident and non-resident anglers purchase fishing equipment here in the U.S., a 10% excise tax is taken on the purchase and put into a dedicated fund and returned on a formula-basis to the states. Finally, there is an incentive for international tourists to come to the U.S. to fish because costs are about the same for residents and tourists with the exception of the marine recreational fishing license. The similarity in opportunity available and costs of fishing make differentiating residents and tourists unimportant and may be why so little data are available on this group.

VIII. The Future of Coastal Tourism in the U.S.

We don't anticipate any major changes in the way that tourism and recreation in the U.S. is currently promoted overseas. The *lassiez faire* approach described earlier in this paper is really not *laissez faire* but rather the result of explicit wording in the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution whereby powers not delegated to the U.S. by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states, respectively. There is no basis for the federal government in the U.S. to be in the business of marketing and promoting the U.S. as a tourism destination. Furthermore, it would pose a slippery slope in that some regions of the U.S. would feel that federal efforts are doing more to promote some areas of the U.S. than others. For this reason alone, we can expect that states will make special efforts to promote their tourism opportunities domestically and internationally.

On the other hand, we can expect all federal coastal and marine management

agencies to better recognize they are in the tourism and recreation business and make efforts to provide tourism and recreation opportunities on a systematic basis. This has been a long standing problem for outdoor recreation in general in the U.S. For example, in 1962, the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) was created in the Department of the Interior (DOI) in response to several national studies. It was recognized that there was a need to deal with outdoor recreation in one federal agency rather than to have outdoor recreation be dealt with on a casual and haphazard basis among fifty agencies across numerous departments. Eventually, the BOR was disbanded in favor of letting land and water management agencies “do their own thing” when it came to outdoor recreation management and development. At the very least, an agency like the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) can make an effort to coordinate its various coastal and marine tourism and recreation programs in an effort to provide coherent offerings not otherwise available.

References

- Beatley, T., Brower, D. J., & Schwab, A. K. (1994). An introduction to coastal zone management. Washington, D. C.: Island Press.
- Black, D.E., Donnelley, L.P., & Settle, R.F. (1990). Equitable arrangements for financing beach nourishment projects. *Ocean & Shoreline Management*, 14, 191 -214.
- Bonham, C., Fujii, E., Im, E., & Mak, J. (1992). The impact of the hotel room tax: An interrupted time series approach. *National Tax Journal*, 45(4), 433 -441.
- Brower, D.J. (1978). *Access to the nation's beaches: Legal and planning perspectives*. United States: Sea Grant Publication UNC - SG - 77 - 18.
- Brower, D.J., & Dreyfoos, W. (1979). Public access to ocean beaches: If you find a parking space, how do you get to the beach? *Coastal Zone Management*, 5(1/2),61 -81.
- California's Ocean Resources (1995). An Agenda for the Future Chapter 5G: Tourism and Recreation. Sacramento, CA: The Resources Agency of California.
- Cicin - Sain, B. & Knecht, R. W. (1999). The future of U.S. ocean policy: Choices for the new century, Washington, D. C.: Island Press.
- Crompton, J.L. (1999). *Financing and acquiring park and recreation resources*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Crossley, J.C., Jamieson, L.M., & Brayley, R.E. (2001). *Introduction to commercial recreation and tourism: An entrepreneurial approach*(4thed.). Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.

U.S. Coastal Tourism and Recreation Policy: A Federal, State, and Local Perspective

- Ditton, R. B., Holland, S. M., & Anderson, D. K. (2002). Recreational fishing as tourism. *Fisheries*, 27, 17 - 24.
- Ditton R. B., & Miller, M. L. (1986). Coastal recreation: An emerging area of managerial concern and research opportunity. *Leisure Sciences*, 8(3), 233 - 239.
- Elliott, J. (1997). *Tourism: Politics and public sector management*. New York: Rutledge
- Edgell, D. L. (1999). *Tourism policy: The next millennium*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Gee, C. Y., Choy, D. J. L., & Mackens, J. C. (1984). *The travel industry*. Westport, CT: AVI Publishing Company.
- Gunn, C.A., & Var, T. (2002). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases (4thed.)*. New York: Rutledge
- Gunter, V.J., Ditton, R.B., & Olson, S.G. (1987). An assessment of beach access and management issues on Galveston Island. *Coastal Management*, 15, 247 - 260.
- Houston, J. R. (2002). The economic value of beaches: A 2002 update. *Journal of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association*, 70(1), 9 - 12.
- Houston, J. R. (1996). International tourism and U.S. beaches. *Shore and Beach*, 64(2), 3 - 5.
- Jersey Shore Guide of Beach Fees Info*. Retrieved June 6, 2006 from <http://www.ourtownrentals.com/index.php?a=28&b-143>
- Kline, Y. L., Osleeb, J. P., & Viola, M. R. (2004). Tourism - generated earnings in the coastal zone: A regional analysis. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 20(4), 1080 - 1088.
- Kriesel, W., Keeler, A., & Landry, C. (2004). Financing beach improvements: Comparing two approaches on the Georgia coast. *Coastal Management*, 32, 433 - 447.
- Kriesel, W., Landry, C.E., & Keeler, A. (2005). Coastal erosion management from a community economics perspective: The feasibility and efficiency of user fees. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 37(2), 451 - 461.
- Loomis, J.B., & Walsh, R.G. (1997). *Recreation economic decisions: Comparing benefits and costs*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Mill, R.C., & Morrison, A.M. (2002). *The tourism system (4thed.)*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Miller, M. L. (1993). The rise of coastal and marine tourism. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 20, 191 - 199.
- Miller, M. L., & Auyong, J. (1991). Coastal zone tourism: A potent force affecting environment and society. *Marine Policy*, 15(2), 75 - 99.
- Orams, M. B. (1999). *Marine tourism: Development, impacts, and management*. New York: Rutledge Publishing.
- Pogue, P., & Lee, V. (1999). Providing public access to the shore: The role of coastal zone management programs. *Coastal Management*, 27, 219 - 237.
- U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. 2004. An ocean blueprint for the 21st century.

Chi-Ok Oh, Robert B. Ditton, Jason Draper

- Washington, D. C. Retrieved June 6, 2006 from <http://www.oceancommission.gov>
- Wildavsky, B. (1995, September 6). Travel advisory. *National Journal*.
- Winter, P.L., Palucki, L.J., & Burkhardt, R.L. (1999). Anticipated responses to a fee program: The key is trust. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(3), 207 - 226.
- Year of the Ocean (YOTO) Discussion Papers. (1998). Prepared by the U.S. Federal Agencies with ocean - related programs. Washington, D.C.

미국 연안관광과 레크레이션 정책

오치옥, Robert B. Ditton and Jason Draper

요 약

연안관광여행과 레크레이션은 일반적으로 스노클링, 다이빙, 레포트피싱, 해변방문, 보우팅, 크루저등의 연안근처에서 이루어지는 모든 레크레이션 활동을 포함한다.

2000년에 바다와 관련된 산업은 미국에 1,170억 달러를 기여 했고, 200만개의 직업을 창출하였다. 그 중 직업의 75%와 경제적가치의 50%는 해양관련 관광과 레크레이션에 의해 생산되었으므로 연안관광과 레크레이션은 미국경제에서 커다란 부분을 차지하고 중요하다고 할 수 있다.

본 연구는 미국에서 연안관광과 레크레이션이 가지는 중요성에 대하여 설명하고 이에 따른 연안관광여행에 대해 현재 사용 및 적용되고 있는 미국의 정책구조를 정리하고, 이와 관련된 기관들과 그 역할에 대하여 분석하였다. 또한 연안 레크리에이션 관리가 미국내의 연방, 주, 지역정부차원에서 어떠한 방식으로 이루어지는지에 대하여 분석하였다.

레크리에이션 자원 관리의 개념으로부터의 연방 및 주의 연안 프로그램의 문제점 및 상황과 관광 여행 개발을 위해 사유지 부분 접근문제해결에 대하여 연방 및 지방정부의 대응방법을 분석함으로써 미래 연안관광자원의 이용을 위한 이론적 기본틀을 제시하고 있다.

key words : coastal tourism, coastal tourism policy, private sector approach, recreation, recreational fishing