

Appendix D: Interview Questions

1. Please tell us about yourself (affiliations, title, roles, and responsibilities) and your interest in public lands recreation access in Washington state. What specific recreation does your group engage in? And in what region(s)?
2. In early 2016, the Washington State legislature asked the WA Parks and Recreation Commission, WA Department of Natural Resources, and WA Department of Fish and Wildlife to coordinate a process to develop options and recommendations to (1.) improve consistency, equity, and simplicity in recreational access fee systems while (2.) accounting for the fiscal health and stability of public land management.
 - a. What would success look like for achieving (1.) above?
 - b. What would success look like for achieving (2.) above? Explain what's working well and where there is room for improvement.
3. Recognizing Washington's commitment to provide equitable access to all Washingtonians, fiscally sustain recreation management operations, and manage public lands, what key issues need to be addressed? What values or objectives should be prioritized? What would you most like to see in public recreation access policy? Least? If you could change one thing about public land access in Washington what would it be and why?
 - a. How does the current system effect you? Please differentiate between barriers and annoyances.
 - b. How would you rank these key issues in order of priority? Why?
 - c. Are there barriers to addressing these key issues? If so, how might they be overcome?
 - d. What data or information is needed to understand or successfully address these issues?
 - e. Do you have access to or can you provide that information?
 - f. Who would be an appropriate information provider and analyst? Would WSU and/or UW be able and appropriate to provide data or analysis?
4. The Legislature asked the WA Parks and Recreation Commission to analyze and make recommendations on several areas of public recreation access. Please respond to the following questions from your perspective:
 - a. What benefits or impediments might result from a *coordinated system* of state and federal access passes? What challenges might arise from coordinating state and

federal recreation access? How would your answers change if there could be a *single pass or an open system* that provided access to both state and federal lands?

- b. Does Washington's current access pass accurately and consistently capture revenue from all users (including but not limited to those that access public lands on foot, by bike, on horseback, by boat, by air, by car or by other vehicles, etc.)? How could the system improve and provide more consistent access? More consistent revenue?
 - c. How can Washington ensure comprehensive, equitable and consistent approach to provide discounts and/or exemptions to qualified users and groups? What should the priorities be for any discount or exemption program? What currently works well? What could be improved and how?
 - d. Who should pay to ensure that Washington provides consistent, equitable and simple access to public recreation lands? What percentage of public recreation access fees should be covered by the state and/or by users? Is there an optimum or preferred cost share? Does the share depend on the type of user? The type of land? The amount of demand? The quality of lands and access?
 - e. How might technology improve access to public recreation lands? How might technology improve public access fee systems on state lands, federal lands, or both?
5. Could other examples provide instructive guidance for Washington's recreation access programs (other states, other nations, other non-governmental programs)? What works better? What should Washington avoid?
 6. In a typical collaborative process, stakeholders are asked to share perspectives, define issues, identify interests and common ground, and then generate options and processes for addressing issues and seeking agreement.

Earlier we asked about key issues you feel need to be addressed:

- a. Now that we've talked about some of the issues in detail, what would you like to add or reprioritize?
 - b. Do you feel there is potential for using a collaborative process to address any of these issues?
 - c. If the issues you identified are not resolved in a collaborative process, how do you think they could be resolved?
 - d. What would be the key topic for you?
7. If at the conclusion of this assessment a recommendation were made to develop a collaborative process to address key issues in public recreation access fees, what steps should

that process include? Should the Ruckelshaus Center convene the process? If yes, why? If no, who should convene the process?

- a. Who would need to be involved?
 - b. Would you be willing to participate in a collaborative process? Why or why not?
 - c. Would you be willing to delegate to an individual or organization that could accurately represent your perspective? Who could that be?
8. Are there others we should be talking with about these issues? [organizations, names, recreation types]
 9. What questions should we be asking as a part of these interviews that we didn't ask?
 10. Do you have any questions for us?