

Running Head: TRAIL FEE PASSES ON NATION FORESTS

Portfolio Essay

Trail Fee Passes on National Forests: The Ethical Debate

Kristi D. Laguzza-Boosman

Walden University, MMPA 6230-01

November 2007

Trail Fee Passes on National Forests: The Ethical Debate

Introduction

The 1996 establishment of user fees at National Forests has opened an ethical debate. On the one side are public officials and private concessions anxious to find the money to maintain public services in our National Forests; on the other are National Forest users and public interest groups that argue against double taxation, the privatization of public lands and a reduction of the national commons. Both sides have valid concerns, which I share. Because of this conflict, my personal response to Forest Service user fees has been to straddle the issue by refusing to pay. However, I had enough sense of conflict about this that I typically chose to park outside the recreational fee parking area and hike to the trail from a free access point, usually along the highway. In this way, I was neither violating the law nor supporting it, since I was not completely comfortable with either.

The purpose of this study is to use the “Ethics Triangle” to analyze both sides of the ethical dilemma posed by the National Forest Service user fees required when accessing public lands, in order to reach an ethics-based conclusion on how best to respond. My intention is to explore the arguments for and against user fees from the standpoint of the three different analytical perspectives of the Ethics Triangle: Cognitive, consequential and virtue ethics. I will begin by putting the issue of imposing user fees to access public lands into historical perspective.

Background

In his book, *The Great Risk Shift* (2006), Yale Political Science Professor, Jacob Hacker, describes the three decades long campaign by corporate interests and conservative republicans to shift the burden of economic security from government and business interests “onto the increasingly fragile balance sheets of workers and their families where “Government programs...have been cut, restructured, or simply allowed to grow ever more threadbare” (Preface x). The process for doing so was as follows: “Emboldened by Richard Nixon’s landslide 1972 victory, extreme conservatives moved to reduce the responsibilities (and increase the wealth) of wealthy Americans, while cutting back on public services for the poor and average working Americans” (De Graff, 2006). Conservative Republicans launched a war on “big government” with the aim of cutting taxes and funding for federal programs so that, in the words of conservative lobbyist, Grover Norquist, they could “reduce (government) to the size where I can drag it into the bathroom and drown it in the bathtub” (Retrieved November 5, 2007 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grover_Norquist).

Cutting taxes and reducing government services is now a long-standing reality in the United States. A 1996 Joint Economic Committee Report stated, “The Reagan (economic) expansion was boosted by tax cuts...accompanied by low taxes and low government spending” (Saxton, 1996).

President Clinton continued the process of reducing government through the creation of “National Performance Review” (NPR), more popularly known as the “reinvention of government,” to produce a government that worked more efficiently and cost the taxpayers less money. By 1996, NPR had cut nearly a quarter million jobs, saving tax payers an estimated \$118 billion” (Stafford, 2007).

George W. Bush raised the bar by enacting the largest tax cuts in the history of the country (Williams, 2004). As a result, he began his administration with a \$236 Billion Dollar surplus, which, by 2004, had turned into a \$413 Billion Dollar deficit (The Concord Coalition, 2004). This prompted an even more heavy handed approach to federal budget cutting, with President Bush declaring that if reelected in 2006, his budget likely would “include spending cuts for virtually all agencies in charge of domestic programs” (Weisman, J. 2004).

How these tax cuts have impacted average Americans is revealing. The Center on Budget Policy and Priorities show distribution of these cuts as follows:

...the top one percent of households (whose incomes average nearly \$1.2 million) will receive an average tax cut of approximately \$40,990 in 2004...or...more than 40 times the average tax break for those in the middle fifth of the income distribution. (And that in order to offset) the costs of the tax cuts, more than three-quarters of American households ultimately would be made worse off. They will lose more from the financing measures than they would gain from the tax cuts” (Kamin and Shapiro, 2004).

This loss included a significant reduction in government services, or, in the words of Thomas Friedman, “When you shrink government, what you do, over time, is shrink the services provided by federal, state and local governments to the vast American middle class” (2003). In other words, three-quarters of the American public have experienced a reduction in public services in order to fund tax breaks that have primarily benefited the wealthy.

United State’s Forest Service Budgets

Within this context, the United States Forest Service has seen a dramatic decrease in their annual appropriations from Congress needed to maintain basic services within its 193 acres of national forest. These cuts began with the Regan era Gramm-Ruddman Act

of 1985 and continue today with President Bush's proposal to cut The USFS budget for 2006 "from \$4.28 billion to \$4.06 billion" (Pegg, 2005), followed by cutting the 2008 USFS budget by hundreds of millions of dollars, in addition to a proposal to "sell \$800 million of National Forest lands to pay down the deficit" (Retrieved November 5, 2007 from http://democrats.senate.gov/dpc/dpc-new.cfm?doc_name=fs-110-1-16).

Impacts

The impacts of over two decades of USFS budget cuts have been clear. "Twenty-five years ago I could afford to hire three full crews to maintain our trail system," said John Newcom, District Ranger for the Methow Valley Ranger District. "Now I'm down to one and I struggle to maintain that" (J. Newcom, personal communication. October 22, 2007). This assessment was supported by Jennifer Zbyszewski, Recreation & Wilderness Program Manager for the Wenatchee/Okanagan National Forests. "I would rather get a \$300K appropriation for trail maintenance like we use to, instead of the current \$30K" (J. Zbyszewski, personal communication, November 2, 2007).

User Fees

To offset budget shortfalls and the more than 8 billion dollars in USFS trail maintenance backlogs, Congress, in 1996, authorized an experimental initiative called the *Recreational Fee Demonstration Program*, which allowed the US Forest Service (along with the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service) to raise money from user fees in order to accommodate shrinking budgets and meet trail maintenance backlog (GAO-04-745T, May 2004). The fee demonstration project was originally intended to last 3 years. "But when it comes to federal revenue, intermittent streams have a way of becoming perennial. Fee demo was extended in 2001,

and again in 2004, when it was expanded into the Recreation Enhancement Act” (Williams, 2007) or REA, for short, which was extended again until 2014.

The fee demo program was allegedly the brain-child of the American Recreation Coalition (ARC), a lobbying group composed mainly of motorized recreational interests and resort developers, (who) boasted that the fee-demonstration program was "a direct result of our efforts" (McManus, 1999).

Critics maintain that user fees are the beginning of a process of handing public lands over to private concessionaires, where more remote trails and campgrounds enjoyed by hikers and environmentalists will be closed, in support of the more lucrative recreational sites used by off-road vehicles, snowmobiles and RV users. Columnist Ted Williams explains in a May 21, 2007 issue of *High Country News*:

With little public or congressional oversight the Forest Service assesses recreational facilities for profitability. The ones that generate least revenue -- remote campgrounds and trailheads, places to which lovers of wildness and quiet would naturally gravitate -- are now first to get disappeared. Bulldozers are knocking down campgrounds, dismantling latrines, removing fire pits. You won't even be able to park. The agency is financing the process with \$93 million in fee receipts; in effect, charging you for the rope it hangs you with. (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.WOTRArticle?article_id=170488)

The USFS web site describes the REA as follows:

The Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act benefits visitors to Federal public lands by:

- Reinvesting a majority of fees back to the site of collection to enhance visitor services and reduce the backlog of maintenance needs for recreation facilities (including trail maintenance, toilet facilities, boat ramps, hunting blinds, interpretive signs and programs);
- Providing an interagency fee program that reduces confusion over differing fee programs and passes by reducing four national passes down to one.
- Providing more opportunities for public involvement in determining recreation fee sites and fees;

- Providing focused criteria and limits on areas and sites where recreation fees can be charged; and
- Providing more opportunities for cooperation with gateway communities through fee management agreements for visitor and recreation services, emergency medical services and law enforcement services. (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from <http://www.fs.fed.us/passespermits/fee-legislation-summary.shtml>).

Fee opponents, on the other hand, describe user fees as follows:

- **It is double taxation:** We already pay for the professional management of our public lands through our taxes. Facilities which we now must pay to access were built with our taxes.
- **Economic discrimination:** Such fees are already pricing out 1 of every 4 lower income taxpayer. See More, Journal of Leisure Research, 2000, Vol. 32, No. 3 p. 341- 357.
- **It doesn't work:** According to the Christian Science Monitor, nationally 4% of such fees are used for habitat enhancement and resource preservation. 52% is consumed by operations, law enforcement and collection costs. See [Resistance to Rising Fees](#). According to a recent New York Times article, Bush is hoping to cut \$175 million from the current FS budget. This is more than double what they have made in SIX years of Fee Demo.
- **It privatizes our natural heritage:** International business interests have been lobbying for such fees for over two decades. They see dollar signs where we see landscapes. "Have we fully explored our gold mine of recreational opportunities.... and managed it as if it were consumer-brand products?" (ARC).
- **It robs us of our natural heritage:** Fee Demo disempowers the people of the United States by turning us into customers and not owners of our own national heritage.
- **It encourages development and bureaucracy:** Fee Demo makes our public land agencies dependent upon increased visitation and greater development for funds. As this happens, the impact to these areas increases.
- **Where is the money going?** - (Figures based on Forest Service's summary report to Congress for 2000 in the Southwest Region and communications with the Sedona Ranger District in the Coconino National Forest.)**39.6%** of all money collected went to the cost of "annual operations. "
 - **21.9%** was consumed by "fee collection" (not including enforcement).
 - Only **0.5%** was spent on "habitat enhancement" and "resource preservation" **COMBINED**.
 - In Sedona, AZ, **60%** of every dollar put into an automatic payment machine, at a trail-head etc., goes to the private company that owns the machine. After they make \$175,000, their take drops to 40%.

- **The Forest Service is fiscally irresponsible.** The agency has been red flagged by the Government Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, numerous times. Roger Viadero, the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, testified in front of Congress that "The depth of the Forest Service's accounting deficiencies is so extraordinary that even the most fundamental principles.... are not always honored" in 1997. (Retrieved November 15, 2007 from <http://www.aznofee.org/aznofee/info.php>).

Impacts on Low-income Families

In analyzing the ethical issued involved in the recreational fee program, its impact on low-income families is a major concern. In a study done in 2000 by the Northeast Research Institute, and another conducted in 2005 by Western Washington University, both discovered that recreational fees reduced the ability of low-income families to access public lands by up to 49%. Their conclusions were, “That fees reduce visitation by about a third among all users and by almost half among low-income users, as shown in the following:

Year of Study	2000	2005
Study performed by	Dr. Thomas More US Forest Service Northeast Research Center	Michael Kirshenbaum M.S. Candidate Western Washington University
Geographic Region	New Hampshire & Vermont	Western Washington States
Method survey	Random mail survey	Random telephone
Low income upper limit	\$30,000	\$35,000
Medium income upper limit	\$75,000	\$75,000
% of ALL respondents saying they now visit public lands less often because of access fees	38%	33%

% of Low Income respondents 49% 46%
saying access fees negatively
impact their use of public
lands” (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from
http://www.westernslopenofee.org/NoFee/RSFMP_update.pdf)

According to the Western Slope No Fee Coalition, “recreation fees have displaced traditional forest users in favor of more affluent and mobile visitors and have been correlated to decreasing recreational use and visitation” (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from http://www.westernslopenofee.org/NoFee/RSFMP_update.pdf)

User Fees in Washington State

These studies correspond to the Washington State experience where a state parks user fee law was passed by the Legislature in 2003, charging a \$5 parking fee for all visitors to Washington State Parks. The law was passed in a recession year in order to maintain funding for park services. But it was rescinded in 2006 due to a 15% drop in park attendance that occurred after the fees were imposed. Attendance dropped from 45 million to 37 million as a result of the fees (Ammons, 2006). As Washington State Parks attract out of state visitors and hundreds of millions of dollars in tourism dollars each year, this reduction in attendance was a concern. In addition, one-fourth of the fees collected went into maintaining the fee collection process, not park maintenance as originally intended. (Judd, 2006). Also attendance at the more remote state parks that were dependent on local visitors dropped, in some cases, by as much as 80%. This coincides with the More study cited above where low income people in the vicinity of the US Forests were more highly impacted by the fees when they noted that, “the sites most likely to experience decreased demand were lesser known sites and sites used mostly by the surrounding communities” (Schroeder & Louviere, 1999, as cited by More &

Stevens, 2000, p. 3). The conclusion by More & Stevens, in their study, “Do User Fees Exclude Low-Income People From Resource-Based Recreation” (2000), was that user fees “may substantially reduce participation in resource-based recreation by those earning less than \$30,000.”

Closing Public Recreation Facilities

In addition to requiring user fees to hike on National Forests, Wild Wilderness, another no-fee organization, reported in July of 2007 that:

For the past two years the U.S. Forest Service has been engaged in a process called Recreation Site Facility Master Planning (RSFMP). The bureaucratic rationale is complicated, but it all boils down to this: Each of the more than 16,000 National Forest recreation sites in the country – more than 2,600 of them in Oregon and Washington – has to demonstrate that it can pay for itself or it will be closed. (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from <http://www.wildwilderness.org/content/view/820/58/>).

Zbyszewski, denies collusion with the recreational industry to privatize national lands. “The recreational fee program has nothing to do with privatizing public lands” (J. Zbyszewski, personal communication, November 2, 2007). But she concurs that the forest service is under pressure to make public lands self-supporting. Under the RSFMP, all USFS districts have been asked to identify a “niche” market that would allow them to be more self-fund. They are required to make a list of all the maintained sites within their forests, ranked by how well they fit into their stated niche. The understanding is that all Forest Service Districts will eventually be required to abandon (or close) the sites that do not meet their “niche” in terms of self-funding. The process clearly benefits those sites that collect the most user fees from parking, motorized off-road, snowmobile or hiking use. Though inconclusive, this process does appear to confirm the fears of those concerned with a possible collusion between the recreational industry and the USFS to

transfer funding from wilderness areas to areas of high recreational use that involve more fees.

To combat the pressure imposed by RSFMP, Zbyszewski and her crew have identified their niche as “variety” and hope to find a ways to continue to fund the many sites within their district that are popular with the public, but are not self-funded. But she clearly separates the trail fee program from the larger issues surrounding the RSFMP.

Zbyszewski is supportive of the trail fee program as a way to maintain their trail system despite reduced budgets. She states that the only way they have to maintain the trails, given Congressional budget cuts, is through the fee program. But even the fees are not enough.

Typically, The Methow Valley Ranger district takes in \$60K - \$80K in fees, and then tries to leverage those as matching grants from other funding sources to meet their much higher trail maintenance budget. “It’s stressful,” Zbyszewski says. “Our cobbled together program doesn’t meet the demand for services from the public” (J. Zbyszewski, personal communication, November 2, 2007). She would much rather see Congress fully fund the USFS recreation program, but that seems unlikely. “My fear” she says, “is that we lose the rec fee program and then have to close the trails” (J. Zbyszewski, personal communication, November 2, 2007).

Section Summary

An objective list of pros and cons around the recreational fee program is fairly extensive on both sides.

Pros:

- Fees can allow certain recreational facilities to be self-supporting, or at least attempt to provide for adequate maintenance and operation.

- If facility operation and maintenance is suffering in a given time period, fees can be raised to ensure self-sufficiency.
- When the overall economy is down, leading to general revenue shortfalls and state budget deficits, fees for state services keep these programs going.
- Fees can provide flexibility in the overall funding mix of state services.
- Fees can allow citizens to make choices on whether they want the state service offered, or help determine how much it may be monetarily worth to them.
- Fees promote equity by charging recreational users; nonusers do not have to pay as much for something they don't use.
- Fees can be recreationally broad-based, or individual and specific, based on the recreational service offered.

Cons:

- Public land, where recreational fees take place, is owned by the public, generally purchased by general tax revenue, and is meant to be enjoyed by all, regardless of ability to pay.
- General taxes purchase public recreational lands, generally pay for public employees management, so another fee/tax shouldn't be charged to enjoy their use.
- Recreational fees may cause state agencies to begin to favor higher fee services, rather than more equitable, traditional low-fee services.
- In the case of long-standing budget shortfalls, recreational managers may succumb to higher fee activities that change the whole nature of a recreational area (i.e., allowing golf in a wilderness park area).
- Recreational user fees constitute a regressive system because as the fees become higher, the percentages of population that can afford them become lower and there are more nonusers subsidizing users.
- Public recreation enables people to participate who might not do so otherwise. If recreational managers go to self-funding through fees, pricing low-income people out of participating, the public purpose for ownership is defeated.
- Recreational fees can create an incentive for a public agency to make resource decisions based on increasing the number of visitors to recreational land, not based on the carrying capacity or what is best for the land and its natural resources. (Retrieved November 12, 2007 from <http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/issinfo/ssrecfee.htm>)

The user fee issue on National Forests is clearly a right versus right dilemma with strong arguments on both sides. An analytical tool is required to select an ethical response.

Case Analysis Using the “Ethics Triangle”

In determining an ethical response to the trail fee dilemma, I employed a theoretical tool known as the “Ethics Triangle.” The Ethics Triangle requires that I analyze the user fee issue from three perspectives: Duty ethics (deontology), results ethics (consequentialism), and virtue ethics. My analysis is as follows:

Duty Ethics

Deontology requires that I analyze the Forest Service trail fee issues from the perspective of rules. The rule (or law, in this case) is that everyone is required to purchase a trail fee pass before accessing fee trails in our national forests. To be duty-bound, one must obey the law, so, in the case of trail fees, I should purchase a pass before accessing the trails. I respect the Forest Service and the integrity of the employees I interviewed, and I do believe them when they say removing user fees, in the current political and budgetary environment, would mean closing trails for lack of maintenance funds. I don’t want to see the trails closed, so, I have a duty to pay the trail fee to keep them open. Deontology requires that I ask the question, “Would I want everyone else to make the decision I did?” If the answer is “yes,” then the choice is justified; if “no” it is not (Berman & West, 2006, p. 27).

But in analyzing the trail fee law, I can see how it is, in some cases, unfair, and it excludes certain groups; mainly low-income families living near the national forests from accessing the trails. I also question the ethical reasoning upon which this law is based. Is it fair to require the majority of Americans to get reduced federal services in order to provide the wealthiest Americans with large tax cuts? To follow rule ethics, in this case, would mean ignoring broader issues of fairness in order to blindly follow the law.

If I reject the law and refuse to pay, would I want everyone else to do the same thing? Yes. There is power in numbers. Trails may close temporarily, but having a majority reject a law would send a clear message that the law needs to be revised. The problem is, most people seem to be following the law and are purchasing passes (if not reluctantly, and if they can afford them), which makes changing the law much more difficult. Is my duty, then, to follow the current law or is it to try and change the law and somehow make it fairer? And what do I do about the fees in the midterm? Deontology, when rules are unfair, does not offer the answer. Perhaps the issue will become clear by employing a different point on the triangle?

Results Ethics

Employing results ethics (consequentialism) requires that I look at the outcome of my decisions. I must pursue an action that results in “the greatest good for the greatest number”; what is right is that which creates the largest amount of human happiness” (Berman & West, 2006, p. 27).

In the case of trail fees, keeping the trails open seems to constitute the greatest good and the largest amount of human happiness. The question then becomes how to do so? Should people pay the trail fees as a way to keep the trails opened? Or should they require that Congress allocate enough funding to the Forest Service to do so?

The More (2000) and Kirshenbaum (2005) studies show that trail fees exclude many low-income people. Another result, as we saw in the Washington experiment, is that user fees also reduce the number of people who use fee facilities. Is the reduced use of public lands, and the reduced impacts an example of the greater good, or are they unjust and unfair, as these reductions are leveled at primarily the poor? If everyone refuses to pay

the trail fees and the trails are closed, that does not benefit anyone? Consequentialism does not provide a clear-cut solution when the results of an action render both positive and negative impacts on “the greater good.” Perhaps virtue ethics will provide the answer?

Virtue Ethics

In order to apply virtue ethics to the trail fee dilemma, I must employ “moral intuition, not intellect... Virtue ethics, instead, is a way of life, not merely... a method of analysis to be solved by projecting assumed results or established rules to a situation” (Berman & West, 2006, p. 28). As the other points of the triangle raised more questions than they answered, perhaps the question of user fees comes down to my own character and what I feel is right? What I feel is this: Congress should appropriate enough money to allow USFS managers to manage recreation and trail programs required by the public. They should not have passed a law that excludes a large number of low-income families from accessing public lands so that wealthy Americans can pay less in taxes. The ethics of congressional budgetary priorities are also highly suspect. In the words of District Ranger Newcom, “You could probably take one days funding for a particular war and pay to maintain all our national forests forever” (J. Newcom, personal communication. October 22, 2007).

On the other hand, the law is the law, and I cannot fault the United States Forest Service for following it. They are in a bind between needing to maintain the trails and services people want while having their budgets cut most years. To deny them funds to maintain the services I want seems unethical on the surface. Though there is power in numbers, the numbers are not there in terms of citizen refusal to pay trail fees. The law is

unlikely to change under these circumstances. However, if I refuse to act on my moral intuition that the law is unethical, then I have helped to guarantee that it never will.

Summary

Employing the ethics triangle created more questions than answers in terms of deciding an ethics based response to paying national forest user fees. However, the process did help solidify my opinion of this law and lead me to a course of action.

Conclusion

The law requiring citizens to pay a user fee is unethical. It was passed in the larger context of tax cuts for the wealthy that reduced government funding and services for the rest of Americans. It is an unfair law with negative consequences that does not serve the greater good. My conclusion is that I should work to change the law by expressing my opposition to user fees on public lands to my elected officials through letters and phone calls. At the same time, denying the Forest Service the fees they need to keep the trails I love in good condition is still an ethical quandary. Researching this paper has helped to clarify my position that the trail fee law, as written, is unethical. Complying with an unethical law is also not ethical. Making the job of people I like and an agency I respect more difficult to do what I want them to do, also feels unethical. However, supporting their implementation of an unethical law does not serve the greater good of having the law overturned. It only reinforces the existence of a bad law. I should, therefore, continue to refuse to pay user fees as I take stronger action to have the fees rescinded in support of full appropriations for USFS maintenance of recreation programs on our nation's public lands.

References

- Ammons, D. (March 21, 2006). \$5 fee at state parks is gone. Seattle Post Intelligencer. Retrieved from <http://archives.seattletimes.nwsourc.com>
- Berman, E.M., & West, J.P., (2006). The ethical edge (2nd Ed.). International City / County Management Association. Washington, D.C.
- Closing the national forests (July 1, 2007). The Source editorial board. The Source Weekly. Retrieved from <http://www.wildwilderness.org> .
- De Graaf, J. (2006). What's the economy for, anyway? Retrieved November 5, 2006 from http://www.newdream.org/newsletter/economy_for.php).
- Democratic Policy Committee (n.a.) (February 7, 2007). President Bush's Budget Cuts Environmental, Natural Resource and Energy Independence Programs. Retrieved from <http://democrats.senate.gov> .
- Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (December 2004). National Recreation Pass - Recreation Fee Legislation Summary. United States Forest Service. Retrieved from <http://www.fs.fed.us/passespermits/fee-legislation-summary.shtml>
- Friedman, T. (June 11, 2003). Read my lips. The New York Times. Retrieved from (Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com> .
- Hacker, J. (2006). The great risk shift. Oxford University Press. New York, NY.
- Judd, R. (March 30, 2006). Parks are free again, as they should be. The Seattle Times. Retrieved from <http://archives.seattletimes.nwsourc.com>
- Kamin, D.& Shapiro, I. (September 13, 2004). Studies shed light on effects of administration's tax cuts. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from <http://www.cbpp.org> .
- McManus, R. (Nov/Dec99). Land of the fee. Sierra. Vol. 84 Issue 6, p22, 2p, 1c; (AN 2416603). Retrieved from EBSCO database.
- More, T. & Stevens, T. (2000). Do user fees exclude low-income people from resource-based recreation? Journal of Leisure Research. 3rd Quarter. Vol. 32 Issue 3, p341, 17p; (AN 3903955). Retrieved from EBSCO database.
- Pegg, J.R. (February 9, 2005). Bush budget cuts target environment, social programs. Environment News Service (ENR). OneWorld.net. Retrieved from <http://us.oneworld.net/article/view/102922/1/7263>
- Reasons Americans oppose the fee demo program (n.a./n.d.). Arizona No Fee Coalition.

Retrieved from <http://www.aznofee.org/aznofee/info.php>

Recreation Fees: Comments on the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, H.R. 3283. (May 6, 2004). GAO Report 04-745T. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04745t.pdf>

Saxton, J. (1996). America's prosperous future: Limited government. Joint Economic Committee Report. United States Congress. Retrieved from <http://www.house.gov/jec/growth/future/future.htm>

Stafford, T. (2007). The US forest service enterprise program: Reinvigorating government. Retrieved from <http://www.fs.fed.us/enterprise/about/20071005-enterprise-program-history.pdf>

The Concord Coalition (n.a.). October 21, 2004. Fiscal Policy in Campaign 2004: Electing the First President of the Senior Boom. Issue Brief. Retrieved from <http://www.concordcoalition.org/issues/fedbudget/old-doc/041021issuebrief.pdf>

The pros and cons of recreational fees. (July 2003). House research. Minnesota House of Representatives. Retrieved from <http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/issinfo/ssrecfee.htm>

Update on recreation site facility master planning. (June 18, 2007). Western Slope No Fee Coalition. Retrieved from <http://www.westernslopenofee.org>

Weisman, J. May 27, 2004. 2006 cuts in domestic spending on table. The Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com> .

Wikipedia (2007). Grover Norquist. Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org> .

Williams, T., (May, 2007). Fees have become a public-lands shakedown. High Country News. Retrieved from <http://www.hcn.org> .

Williams, W. (September 26, 2004). Bush's dismal policy failures in tax cuts and Iraq are being sold as achievements. Seattle Post Intelligencer. Retrieved from <http://seattlepi.nwsource.com>.

Kristi, Good outline.

APPENDIX A
Week 5: Portfolio Essay Outline
Kristi Laguzza-Boosman
MMPA 6230

Trail Fee Passes on National Forests: The Ethical Debate Out West (w.t.)

Kristi D. Laguzza-Boosman

MMPA 6230-01

- I. Introduction (1–2 pages in final paper)
 - A. The 1996 establishment of user fees at National Forests has opened an ethical debate. On the one side are public officials and private concessions anxious to find the money to maintain public services in our National Forests; on the other are National Forest users and public interests group that argue against double taxation, the privatization of public lands and a reduction in the national commons.
 - B. The purpose of this study is to use “Nash’s 12 Questions” to analyze both sides of the ethical dilemma posed by the National Forest trail fees to determine whether to continue my civil disobedience and refusal to comply with this federal mandate.
 - C. Overview Statement for Entire Paper
- II. Background (no more than one-third of the paper; building on Part I, provide pertinent policy and historical material to assist in understanding the nature of the case)
 - A. Section Overview Statement
 - B. History of the user fee on National Forests
 - C. Argument in favor of user fees
 - D. Argument against user fees
 - E. Washington State as a case study in public park fees
 - F. Summary/Transition
- III. Case Analysis Using Nash’s 12 Questions
 - A. Section Overview Statement
 - B. The questions
 - C. The answers
 - D. Weighing the results
 - E. Summary/Transition

III. Conclusion

Bibliography (tentative)

- Clifford, H. (2001, August 21) In the great outdoors resistance to paying fees. *Christian Science Monitor*. Vol. 93 Issue 187, p1, 0p, 2c. EBSCO database
- Davis, T. (2006, November 27). Fed up with paying to play. *High Country News*. Retrieved from http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article_id=16702
- Mench, P. (2004, January 19). A moment of truth for user fees. *High Country News*. Retrieved from <http://www.headwatersnews.org/HCN.userfees.html>
- More, T., & Stevens, T. (2000). Do user fees exclude low-income people from resource-based recreation? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 3rd Quarter, Vol. 32 Issue 3, p341, 17p. EBSCO database
- Puttkammer, A. (2001). Linking wilderness research and management—volume 3. Recreation fees in wilderness and other public lands: an annotated reading list. Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://leopold.wilderness.net/pubs/440.pdf>
- Queener, N. (2003). Desolation wilderness case study: Visitor response to fee. Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://leopold.wilderness.net/research/nutshell/N017.pdf>
- Recreation fees: Comments on the federal lands recreation act, h.r. 3283 (2004). *GAO Report 04-745T*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04745t.pdf>

Additional research will include personal interviews with:

Public Affairs Officer: Paul Hart
Okanogan- Wenatchee National Forests Headquarters

District Ranger: John Newcom
Methow Valley Ranger District

Free the Forests Members:
Isabelle Spohn
Lorah Waters

APPENDIX B
Checklist for Portfolio Paper
Kristi Laguzza-Boosman
MMPA 6230

Please submit a paper that fulfills all of the criteria shown below; attach this completed Checklist to your work as an appendix.

Format Requirements

1. The title for the paper should be indicative of its contents; that is, the title (which should be brief accompanied by an explanatory subtitle) it should serve as a thematic guide to the entire paper.
2. Following a proper title page (consult a style manual), the study consists of at least three clearly labeled sections as follows:
- Introduction (identify the issue under study and its importance; state purpose of paper—about one page)
 - Text (this section should have a substantive headings--i.e., not "text")—most of the paper;
 - Avoid descriptive summaries of the material
 - Instead, critically analyze it by comparing theory with practice, using interview data, employing other sources, and so forth
 - Conclusion (i.e., not a summary)--two pages or less.
3. The analysis is properly documented with references for all sources (interviews, reports, speeches, articles, books, and so forth).
4. The manuscript contains references to course concepts as appropriate.
5. It is typed (double-spaced), stapled in the upper left hand corner, and *not* put in a folder, mailer, or plastic cover ([except as required by Walden preferences regarding long block quotes](#))

Style Hints

1. The title page and page one should not be numbered; use proper top/bottom, right/left margins throughout. ([I'm sorry, I could not figure out how to remove the page numbers for these pages](#)).

- _____ 2. Utilize overview or "contract" sentences to introduce the paper *and* each section of it. I was unsure of what a "contract" sentence was, but, hopefully provided a proper summary.
- ___x___ 3. Provide a brief summary and/or transition statement at the end of each section.
- ___x___ 4. Sentences and paragraphs are not to be excessive in their length. Do not needlessly repeat terms when synonyms can be used.
- ___x___ 5. Ensure that the tense used in the paper is consistent throughout.
- ___x___ 6. Indent and single space quotations five or more lines in length; do not use quotation marks for such quotations.
- ___x___ 7. Use triple spacing to separate section headings that occur in the paper.
- ___x___ 8. Use APA style correctly throughout.
* * *

If you have any questions about these standards, do not hesitate to ask.

BOW-339B