

# IMPROVING ACCESS TO OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON FEDERAL LANDS

"What I need to make progress on accessibility at our Park is a reasonable list of feasible goals."

Doug Morris, Superintendent  
Shenandoah National Park



Prepared by Wilderness Inquiry  
June 27, 2000



## PREFACE

On November 10th, 1998, President Clinton signed Public Law 105-359, requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to improve access for persons with disabilities to outdoor recreational opportunities made available to the public. The law states:

### **Section 1, Study Regarding Improved Outdoor Recreational Access For Persons With Disabilities.**

- (a) **STUDY REQUIRED.** – The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly conduct a study regarding ways to improve the access for persons with disabilities to outdoor recreational opportunities (such as fishing, hunting, trapping, wildlife viewing, hiking, boating and camping) made available to the public on the Federal lands described in subsection (b).
- (b) **COVERED FEDERAL LANDS.** – The Federal lands referred to in subsection (a) are the following:
  - (1) National Forest System lands.
  - (2) Units of the National Park System.
  - (3) Areas in the National Wildlife Refuge System.
  - (4) Lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management
- (c) **REPORT ON STUDY.** – Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.

Several members of Congress urged the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to hire an external agency to conduct the study. In response to this request, Wilderness Inquiry, a non-profit organization with more than 22-years experience providing outdoor recreation opportunities for persons with disabilities on federal lands, was hired to conduct the study. Principal authors of this report are Gregory J. Lais, MBA and Michael J. Passo, UTAP MT, GBPF.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This report would not have been possible without the active involvement of the following individuals:

### U.S. Department of Agriculture

Janet Zeller, Civil Rights Program Manager, USDA Forest Service  
Joe Meade, Director of Recreation, Region 3, USDA Forest Service  
Jim Bedwell, Chief Landscape Architect, USDA Forest Service

### U.S. Department of the Interior

David Park, Chief, Office on Accessibility, National Park Service  
Destry Jarvis, Senior Advisor  
Kay Ellis, Access Manager, Bureau of Land Management  
Karen Megorden, ADMS Program Manager, Bureau of Reclamation  
Doug Staller, Chief, Outreach and Visitor Services, National Wildlife Refuge System

### U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Act Compliance Board (Access Board)

Larry Roffee, Executive Director  
David Capozzi,  
Peggy Greenwell  
Jim Raggio

### National Center on Accessibility

Todd Paxton, Director of Research

### University of Minnesota

Leo McAvoy, Phd.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page #</u>
Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction .....	3
Limitations and Assumptions .....	7
Recommendations for Improving Access .....	9
1) Agencies must rededicate their efforts .....	9
2) Conduct baseline assessments of existing facilities and programs .....	12
3) Increase awareness and educational opportunities .....	13
4) Increase funding .....	16
5) Increase accountability and oversight .....	16
6) Improve communication with persons with disabilities .....	18
7) Clarify the balance between resource protection and accessibility .....	19
- Recommendations regarding off road vehicles .....	20
Outdoor Recreation Activity Specific Recommendations .....	23
Fishing .....	23
Hunting .....	23
Trapping .....	24
Wildlife Viewing .....	24
Hiking .....	25
Boating .....	25
Camping .....	26
Other Recommendations .....	27
Working with outfitters .....	27
Establish a more accurate means of identifying people with disabilities ...	27
Hire persons with disabilities .....	28
Exercise caution in promoting special treatment .....	28
Implementation of recommendations .....	29
Methodology .....	31
Creation of an Interagency Committee .....	31
Review of agency policies and procedures .....	32
In depth interviews with Agency personnel .....	33
Solicitation of suggestions from Consumers with Disabilities .....	34
Solicitation of suggestions from Service Providers .....	36
Review of recent technological advances .....	36
Expert advisory focus groups .....	37

Appendices: Appendices are not currently available in this file. They will be made available soon.

Until that time you may request that a hard copy of the Appendices be sent to you by contacting:

Mike Passo  
Wilderness Inquiry  
808 14th Ave SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414  
612.676.9416  
mikepasso@wildernessinquiry.org

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is intended to fulfill the request Congress put to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to conduct a study to determine ways they can improve access to outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities on federal lands administered by the USDA Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Suggestions to improve access to outdoor recreation were sought from many sources. However, it should be noted that this report is not a poll, nor is it a public opinion survey. Each suggestion for improvement was considered on its merit alone--regardless of how many times it was suggested or where it came from.

Two important factors were considered in developing recommendations for this report. First and foremost, every effort was made to ensure that the recommendations are in keeping with the spirit and intent of legislation regarding the civil rights of persons with disabilities. Secondly, only recommendations that the federal agencies could conceivably implement were put forward. The criteria for judging suggestions include:

- Consistency with the intent of previous legislation related to disability and public lands.
- Practicality for implementation by the land management agencies.
- Potential for broad impact in accomplishing that intent.

Public Law 105-359 specifically requested suggestions to improve access for outdoor recreation programs—fishing, camping, hunting, etc. Although Public Law 105-359 did not specifically request a review of outdoor recreation facilities, the two issues—programs and facilities—are so interconnected that they must be considered together. This report does consider them together.

### **Recommendations for improving access to outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities on federal lands.**

The following recommendations address issues of primary importance for all federal land management agencies in improving access to outdoor recreation experiences for persons with disabilities. The reader is urged to review the complete text for each recommendation contained in this report.

- 1) Agencies must re-dedicate their efforts to achieve the goal of equal opportunities for access to outdoor recreation by persons with disabilities.
- 2) Agencies should conduct baseline assessments of existing facility and programmatic accessibility, and develop and implement transition plans for facilities and programs that are not now accessible to bring them into compliance.
- 3) Increase accessibility related awareness and educational opportunities for agency personnel, service providers, and partners.
- 4) Increase funding to federal land management agencies for accessibility.
- 5) Increase accountability and oversight in implementing accessibility initiatives.
- 6) Improve communications about opportunities for outdoor recreation to persons with disabilities.
- 7) Clarify the balance between resource protection and accessibility.

**Other recommendations:**

- Work with outfitters and other partner organizations to maximize efforts to
- Establish a more accurate means of identifying people who are considered “disabled”
- Hire persons with disabilities
- Exercise Caution in promoting special treatment solely on the basis of disability

Each agency should develop a "response team" to develop specific, strategic and tactical initiatives to implement the recommendations of this report. These teams should include high level management staff, as well as persons with expertise in the area of accessibility. Plans for implementation should be developed and put forward to agency leadership no later than September 1, 2000.

## INTRODUCTION

The demand for outdoor recreation on federal lands has increased dramatically over the last 25-years, and it is expected to continue to rise. Yet, for a multitude of complex reasons, the majority of Americans—including persons with disabilities--still do not participate in outdoor recreation. This report addresses many of the reasons why people with disabilities do not participate in outdoor recreation as much as they could.

While this report was specifically developed to improve access for persons with disabilities, we believe that many of the recommendations can be generalized to the American public as a whole. This is especially true when we consider that almost everyone will encounter a disability at some point in their lives, either personally or through friends or family.

Suggestions to improve access to outdoor recreation were sought from many sources. However, it should be noted that this report is not a poll, nor is it a public opinion survey. Each suggestion for improvement was considered on its merit alone--regardless of how many times it was suggested or where it came from.

Two important factors were always considered in developing the recommendations for this report. First and foremost, every effort was made to ensure that the recommendations are in keeping with the spirit and intent of legislation regarding the civil rights of persons with disabilities, including the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1974 and, though it does not specifically apply to federal agencies, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990. If these laws could be summarized in two words, those word are equal treatment—not better, not worse, but equal. It is the intent of this report to advance the opportunities for outdoor recreation among persons with disabilities on an equal basis with those Americans who do not currently have a disability.

Secondly, only recommendations that the federal agencies could conceivably implement were put forward. Some suggestions, such as developing anti-gravity hover craft, were disregarded as impractical or beyond the mission of the federal land management agencies. In discussions with personnel from the federal land management agencies, three general areas of concern consistently arose. These concerns are:

**Setting of Precedent:** Many land managers are concerned that if they allow for a special use by one person or group of persons, it will "open the floodgates" for special requests, making it difficult to manage a large volume of requests for similar treatment by others. To be sure, the agencies do have many examples of how this has happened in the past with many issues. This speaks to the

importance of doing the right thing the first time, so the precedent that is set is the precedent that is desired. This is part of the reason why federal agencies are urged to use caution in the use of "special" programs and treatment (see recommendations on pages 25-26).

**Allocation of resources:** Access for people with disabilities is often perceived as a secondary consideration to other, more pressing needs. One of the underlying issues here is that many people (not just federal land managers) tend to "pigeon hole" the access issue as simply another special need of yet another minor constituency. For accessibility to receive a higher share of the resources that are available, resource allocators need to recognize that accessibility is an issue that does or will effect everyone. While it is true that the federal land management agencies have been expected to do more with less in recent years, it is also true that accessibility for persons with disabilities can be advanced in ways that compliment and augment other efforts to better serve ALL Americans who recreate on public lands.

**Use of disability access issue to repeal environmental protections:** A third major obstacle to promoting greater opportunities for accessibility is the perception among many land managers that many accessibility initiatives are simply disguised efforts to repeal policies and practices intended to protect natural resources. Unfortunately, the land management agencies have many examples where this perception appears to be accurate—most notably in challenges to road closures by persons or organizations who claim these closures violate the civil rights of persons with disabilities. This negative reaction among land managers is most unfortunate, because it instantly polarizes discussions about access and casts doubt on the motives of people and organizations who advocate for legitimate opportunities for improved access to outdoor recreation.

**In order for this report to move the accessibility agenda forward it is important that the concerns of the land management agencies be addressed. This report attempts to do so.**

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, to understand the context of this report, we must first understand why increased opportunities for integrated outdoor recreation are so important.

Many people consider access to recreation a lower priority when compared to issues of employment, health care, or access to basic services such as use of use of restrooms or the ability to enter a building through the front door. This attitude toward recreation – the belief that it is nice but a low priority -- is shared by many in the United States. Yet, in whatever form people chose, most people agree that the ability to recreate with peers is one of the greatest, most rewarding elements of life.

Simply put, there is no greater statement of social acceptance than being asked to recreate together as a friend, peer, or colleague. When people enjoy each other enough to extend the invitation to recreate together, they will—usually voluntarily—seek to make accommodations to facilitate participation. For most people, the accommodations they make in a social, recreational context do translate into other areas of life—including employment, health care, and access to basic services such as the use of restrooms.

This is why increasing opportunities for integrated outdoor recreation is so important—it serves as an effective catalyst in changing attitudes (McAvoy,.....all the studies here). It is far more efficient and effective at accomplishing what legislated mandates can only attempt to do—promote equality. It serves to motivate people to change because they want to, not because the law is telling them they have to. Once this attitudinal change is accomplished, the implementation of other aspects of the civil rights of any minority group becomes far easier.

This is why this issue is so important.



## LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

This report sought qualitative ideas for improving accessibility on federal lands. Though every attempt was made to reach a wide diversity of persons with disabilities, agency representatives, and service providers, this report is not a public opinion survey. Each idea received from survey respondents is therefore judged, not by the number of people that have the idea, but by the quality of the idea itself. The criteria for judging suggestions include:

- Consistency with the intent of previous legislation related to disability and public lands.
- Practicality for implementation by the land management agencies.
- Potential for broad impact in accomplishing that intent.

Public Law 105-359 specifically requested suggestions to improve access for outdoor recreation programs—fishing, camping, hunting, etc. (See Appendix 1) Although Public Law 105-359 did not specifically request a review of outdoor recreation facilities, the two issues—programs and facilities—are so interconnected that they must be considered together. This report does consider them together.

Many respondents were chosen because of their exceptional interest in providing accessible outdoor recreation opportunities to persons with disabilities. This could bias the views put forth in the interviews to not be representative of the “average” land manager, person with a disability, or service provider. However, we believe this selection process provided the most effective sources for innovative ideas for improving accessibility on federal lands.

As with any research, human error was possible in recording conversations during interviews and interpreting written responses. Also, it is assumed that all answers to questions were answered truthfully and to the best of the respondent’s ability.

Finally, this report does not specifically consider outdoor recreation in units of the National Wilderness Preservation System (NWPS). The decision to exclude the NWPS from consideration is based on the fact that most outdoor recreation on federal lands takes place outside of the NWPS, and the issue of access to the NWPS by persons with disabilities was addressed in a previous study by the National Council on Disability in 1991 (Wilderness Access, National Council on Disability, 1991).



## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING ACCESS TO OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ON FEDERAL LANDS.**

The following recommendations address issues of primary importance for all federal land management agencies in improving access to outdoor recreation experiences for persons with disabilities.

### **1) AGENCIES MUST RE-DEDICATE THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACCESS TO OUTDOOR RECREATION BY PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.**

While providing access to people with disabilities, people of color and other "non-traditional" users of outdoor recreation is a mandated goal of every federal land management agency, it has not been accomplished to anyone's satisfaction. To be sure, much progress has been made in the last 25 years, however, implementation of many basic steps to improve equal access to outdoor recreation opportunities among people with disabilities has been slow. There are a multitude of reasons for this, including a lack of funding, a lack of oversight, and a lack of understanding. However, the primary reason for slow progress is that providing equal opportunities for outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities is a relatively low priority among the leadership of all federal land management agencies.

In researching this report, the policies regarding people with disabilities were reviewed for each agency (see Appendix 2B: Policy Review). Overall, the policies are sound, however taking the steps necessary to implement opportunities for Americans with disabilities to enjoy the benefits of outdoor recreation is a relatively low priority when compared with other federal initiatives. In addition to the federal land management agencies, the low priority status of this issue applies equally to Congress, the outdoor recreation industry, and organizations representing the community of persons with disabilities.

To be sure, there are many personal champions for this effort, especially within the land management agencies themselves. In general, the people whose jobs are to help provide accessible outdoor recreation opportunities are passionate about it, and they know what to do. Most of the people who are passionate about it became so through direct, personal experience--either through friends, family members, or their own disability. They did not derive this passion because the law or their supervisor mandated them to do so.

Many of these champions are frustrated because too few within their agencies have listened to them or taken them seriously enough to put access to outdoor recreation as a true agency priority. Often, these champions rely on the issue of complying with what the law already requires in order to move their agenda forward. Unfortunately, this has been ineffective, either because the laws have no penalties, or no one is enforcing them, or both.

In defense of the land management agencies, Congress has saddled them with a myriad of laws--often in conflict with one another--and provided little funding, little guidance, and little oversight in seeing that these laws are implemented. However, it is clear that in order to accelerate progress in achieving the goal of increased opportunities for persons with disabilities the issue must become a higher priority among the leadership of the federal land management agencies. This includes issues of budgeting, organizational structure, personnel selection, hiring persons with disabilities, training programs, communications and many others.

Specific recommendations:

- Establish centralized offices, mechanisms, and processes for national oversight in implementing opportunities for equal access within the national headquarters of each agency. These offices should work closely with regional and district counterparts throughout each agency, which, in turn, work closely with accessibility coordinators within specific parks, forests, refuges, or other units of the land management agencies. These offices must be fully supported by the leadership of each federal land management agency. Currently:
  - The National Park Service has a small, understaffed office on accessibility that primarily deals with complaints and provides consultation assistance to units of the National Park Service on matters of accessibility--when asked. While this office does know both the law and the right thing to do, it has relatively low profile within the agency. Many agency personnel do not know that it exists.
  - The BLM has one staff person assigned as the national accessibility coordinator.
  - The role of national accessibility coordinator at the Forest Service is currently a collateral duty of the Chief Landscape Architect. The Forest Service has recently decided to restore a full time national accessibility coordinator in the Washington office, however the position remains unfilled due to budget constraints.
  - The BOR has one full-time national accessibility coordinator in Boise, ID.

- The role of national accessibility coordinator at the Fish and Wildlife Service is also collateral duty.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should develop a set of policies regarding accessibility for persons with disabilities that accommodate these mandates within the overall framework of the agencies mission.
- All agencies must incorporate and give a high priority to accessibility compliance into the performance standards for all managers and supervisors.
- All agencies must put Accessibility for persons with disabilities at the same level of priority as “Health and Safety” in Deferred Maintenance.
- All agencies must develop guidelines that federal land managers can use for making decisions regarding access to outdoor recreation opportunities.
- Whenever possible, all agencies should avoid assigning the function of accessibility coordinator as a co-lateral duty that is a lower priority than other job functions. Agencies should establish clear guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of each accessibility coordinator position.

In researching this report it became evident that many accessibility coordinators are assigned this position as a co-lateral duty that is often subordinate to other, higher-priority job functions. The inevitable result is too few effective “Champions” for providing accessibility to outdoor recreation on federal lands. In conducting a similar study with state land management agencies, the authors of this report found the following example—which is typical within many federal agencies:

*The official Accessibility Coordinator position is 20% co-lateral duty to that of Chief Engineer, and was therefore a lower priority for this employee. Within this agency, the person who has been most effective at championing accessibility initiatives works in the strategic planning department and technically has nothing to do with access issues. It turns out his son is a person with paraplegia, and this connection has made him personally concerned about improving access for persons with disabilities. Most people in that agency know of his son and respond to his calls for accessibility for personal reasons—not because state and federal law mandate these initiatives.*

Therefore, it is the recommendation of this report that efforts be made to assign the duties of Accessibility Coordination to personnel who are full time, or, if co-lateral duty positions are a financial

necessity, agencies must make efforts to select or hire personnel who are qualified for the job and who want the job.

## **2) CONDUCT BASELINE ASSESSMENTS OF EXISTING FACILITY AND PROGRAMMATIC ACCESSIBILITY, DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT TRANSITION PLANS FOR FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT CURRENTLY ACCESSIBLE TO BRING THEM INTO COMPLIANCE.**

Despite the fact that Federal agencies have been required to make their outdoor recreation facilities and programs accessible under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, there are still far too many facilities and parts of facilities that are not accessible. Several examples include the offices of the Superintendents of Grand Canyon National Park, Shenandoah National Park, and Cumberland Island National Seashore. A greater concern was the lack of information and knowledge of the state of accessibility today in all but one of the Federal agencies interviewed. As stated by one Superintendent, "We don't know enough about what could and should be done. We have a 'global' understanding of it, but when it comes down to the actual, specific implementation, we often don't know."

This conclusion is echoed in the Department of Interior Disability Rights Summit report, "**BEYOND AWARENESS: Equal Opportunity for People with Disabilities in the Department of the Interior in the New Millennium,**" April 25-27, 2000. This report cited a lack of baseline information on the degree to which existing programs and facilities are, or are not, currently accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. It recommended the following:

"In order for the Department and its' Bureaus to make knowledgeable decisions and more effective progress, we need to have a much better understanding of where DOI facilities and programs we are in relation to full compliance with the appropriate mandates and standards. Without this baseline information, most efforts will continue to be sporadic and inconsistent. All units of the Department need to ensure that the comprehensive reviews of all facilities and programs are conducted in order to ensure that corrective actions taken are done in conformance with the appropriate standards and regulations. It is imperative that all units of the Department have this baseline information in order to ensure that action plans are appropriate and comprehensive, and will result in accurate, priority conscious planning."

In considering that the Federal agencies have been required to implement accessibility regulations and gather this information by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act since 1978, and discovering the relative lack of priority, funding, and commitment among some of the Federal agencies, it raises the

issue of the need for general Departmental support to implement this recommendation. Implementation of this recommendation will require that priorities be established, funding be provided, and comprehensive action plans be prepared by each of the respective Departments to ensure that baseline assessments can be completed. Implementation of this recommendation will require a high degree of specialized knowledge that is not currently evident among the federal agencies.

Specific recommendations include:

- Solicit Congressional support for funding baseline assessments of the facilities and programs of the Federal agencies. This would enable the agencies to do a more effective job of long term planning, prioritizing, budgeting, and scheduling accessibility retrofits. Beyond the assessments, employ accountability measures to hold agencies accountable for implementation.
- Use outside, independent organizations representing persons with disabilities to work with the Federal agencies to complete the baseline assessments and develop action plans to implement changes that are specific to each agency and land management unit. Emphasize that facilities and programs are to be made as accessible as is feasible within the existing resource protection framework.

### **3) INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY RELATED AWARENESS AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AGENCY PERSONNEL, SERVICE PROVIDERS, AND PARTNERS.**

Policies governing how access should be provided to persons with disabilities on Federal lands have been in existence since 1973 (See Policy Review, Appendix 2B). However, there is a significant lag between policy and practice. This lag can be partly addressed by providing regular, consistent training opportunities for federal land management agency personnel, service providers, volunteers, and other partners.

This conclusion is echoed in the following finding of the Department of Interior Disability Rights Summit report, "**BEYOND AWARENESS: Equal Opportunity for People with Disabilities in the Department of the Interior in the New Millennium,**" April 25-27, 2000. This report cited a general lack of awareness and understanding of Departmental and Bureau responsibilities specific to persons with disabilities, and more importantly, how this responsibility can be met.

The applicable laws and regulations regarding disability rights are very broad and encompassing. In spite of the myriad of training and technical assistance efforts made throughout the Department, many managers and program directors are still unaware of the requirements, and methods and procedures that need to be implemented to bring our

programs into full compliance. The Department, through the Bureaus, must find a way to broaden continuing education and technical assistance efforts in order to reach more individuals and more program areas.”

This conclusion is further reinforced in the study, “**Accessibility in the National Park Service: A Study on perceptions of National Park Personnel,**” by the National Center on Accessibility, September, 1999. This study found:

“The overriding issue to be addressed by the NPS is the lack of knowledge of park staff regarding accessibility. When asked to identify their perception of their park's overall accessibility (both physical and programmatic), most individuals surveyed indicated that their facilities were 'mostly accessible.' However, when asked specific questions related to these areas, most individuals responded 'Don't know' or 'none'. This lack of understanding is better understood in the context of the finding that 75% of the Superintendents surveyed reported that they had less than 1 hour of accessibility training in the last 5 years, and 52% of the accessibility coordinators had less than 10 hours of training.”

Increased accessibility related awareness and education is also necessary for service providers and other partners operating on federal lands. The interviews with service partners conducted through this study showed a lack of interest, understanding, and knowledge on the parts of these partners--partners that account for a significant amount of the public services provided on federal lands.

Specific recommendations include:

- Develop agency-wide, mission-based training programs for awareness and core competencies for all staff, service providers, and partner organizations operating on federal lands, to ensure accessible opportunities for all people in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.
- Develop agency specific training as needed to address certain issues--such as programmatic access, facilities design, civil rights compliance, etc.--within the specific framework of the mission of each federal land management agency.
- Develop an awareness training program specifically aimed at the Department of Public Affairs within each agency. This program should emphasize the use of appropriate terminology in all brochures, articles, videos, and other media pieces. It should also focus on adding accessibility information to all written materials. For example, all existing brochures should contain statements

of availability in alternate formats, phone numbers that are available for use with a TTY system, and other statements identifying accessibility options.

#### **4) INCREASE FUNDING TO FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES FOR ACCESSIBILITY.**

Most public land managers cited the need for increased funding to adequately fulfill their mandates for accessibility. These funding requests included support for facilities and trails, personnel, and training. Some land managers thought the issue was more a matter of how existing funds are allocated and prioritized than simply a lack of funds. However, almost all land managers recognized that while public demand for recreation is at an all time high, agency budgets have been reduced, putting significant pressure on what are considered lower priority issues.

This sentiment is echoed in the Department of Interior Disability Rights Summit report, **“BEYOND AWARENESS: Equal Opportunity for People with Disabilities in the Department of the Interior in the New Millennium,”** April 25-27, 2000. This report describes the severe limitations in the amount of funding the resources designated for implementation of disability programs.

“Even though accessibility and disability rights issues are mandated by federal legislation, there has never been any allocation of funding initiatives to address them. Consequently, the programs are still viewed as, and frequently operated as an ‘unfunded mandate’. Many accessibility initiatives can and should be addressed as an element of other programs such as life safety, repair and rehabilitation, cyclic maintenance and new construction. However, effective implementation of a comprehensive program requires professionally trained staff, more in-service training opportunities, and some fiscal resources to address some of the reconstruction, renovation, and modification necessary to bring out existing facilities and programs into compliance. Allocation of fiscal resources is necessary to ensure more proactive efforts.”

Specific recommendations include:

- For FY '01, the Secretaries of DOI and USDA should make a concerted effort to have the President and Congress appropriate ear-marked funds in each public land agency's budget for projects that improve access to recreation opportunities on Federal lands. Such projects should include campgrounds, picnic areas and trails in particular.

- For FY '02, each public land agency should include significant projects in its appropriation request for improving access to recreation on the public lands.
- For FY '01 – '05, each Federal public land agency should select a representative number of management units (such as 1-2 per region/state), to be designated as “Model Accessibility Units,” and for which sufficient funds are sought and/or allocated, to enable these units to achieve an optimum level of accessibility, at standards that meet or exceed those promulgated by the federal Access Board.
- For FY '01 and '02 (or longer if the program is extended), each federal land agency that received funds through the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program should identify and allocate funds to capitol improvements or repair / rehabilitation projects that improve access for recreation.
- For FY '02 – '06, Congress should appropriate a percentage (3%-5%) of each federal land agency's budget for construction and maintenance into a “Recreation Access Improvements Fund” to be administered by an external agency or committee--possibly the federal Access Board. Each participation bureau should then compete for grants equaling the total of its deposit into the fund. The Access Board should award grants from the fund to worthy agency projects that improve recreation access at standards suitable to the Access Board.

## **5) INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.**

All programs and facilities provided to the public on Federal lands have been required by law to be accessible to persons with disabilities since 1973. Failure to accomplish this has, in part, been due to a relative lack of accountability and oversight of the requirements. There is a clear need for increased accountability and oversight regarding the mandates for accessibility for persons with disabilities.

The report from the Department of Interior Disability Rights Summit, “**BEYOND AWARENESS: Equal Opportunity for People with Disabilities in the Department of the Interior in the New Millennium,**” April 25-27, 2000, cited an ongoing perception that accessibility is a much lower priority than other programs or concerns.

“The Department is constantly faced with ‘high priority’ or ‘crisis’ issues. Many of these issues are due to congressional oversight or litigation. Accessibility is still viewed by many managers as ‘something to address after these other important issues are resolved.’ Consequently, in spite of the fact that disability rights mandates have been in place for over 30 years, the degree of compliance is still relatively minimal. This low level of importance is reflected in the lack of funding for accessibility programs, in the limited number of professionally trained staff to implement the programs, and in the emphasis placed on this program throughout the Department. We must develop strategies to raise the “sense of urgency” regarding these programs, so more consistent and professional actions can be taken.”

This recommendation includes all issues relating to the methods and systems used by the federal agencies of ensuring that federal employees and service providers have clear and consistent ways of identifying and implementing accessibility requests and issues, and are held accountable for them.

Specific recommendations include:

- Provide each Superintendent/Forest Supervisor/Refuge Manager/Site Manager with simple, succinct lists of things to do to improve access to outdoor recreation. This list should be the result of the information generated from the baseline assessments of each agency’s state of accessibility (See Recommendation #2: Conduct Baseline Assessments).
- Include assessments of the facilities and trails on Federal lands for accessibility to persons with disabilities into the GPRA goals, and move it to a higher priority.
- Incorporate accessibility compliance into the performance standards for all managers and supervisors, including better clarification of the role of managers in making decisions about increasing accessibility for persons with disabilities
- Create a partnership/mechanism or process that oversees the development of a consistent system for receiving complaints and recommendations from persons with disabilities. The partnership/mechanism or process should be made up of experts in accessible outdoor recreation, environmental protection, and disability issues on federal lands.
- Congress should empower the Access Board so that it can become more proactive at enforcing the Architectural Barriers Act, Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and the Americans

with Disabilities Act. The Access Board needs to go beyond its current complaint driven process, in part because this process is highly underutilized. (77% of the respondents with disabilities surveyed have never submitted a request or complaint).

- Include appropriate language regarding the provision of accessible services and facilities in the contracts of all service partners operating on federal lands and enforce this language.

## **6) IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS ABOUT OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.**

It is clear that many people with disabilities are unaware of the opportunities available to them on federal lands. Many people believe that the best way to improve accessibility to persons with disabilities in the outdoor environment is to simply provide the information that will allow them to decide whether a program or facility meets their specific needs. By providing this information in a useable format for all people, visitation of federal lands by persons with disabilities will increase. Accessibility upgrades should be promoted as improvements that will help all people, not just “the” disabled. It is a fact that at some point in most individuals’ lifetimes, they or a family member will experience a significant disability.

Specific recommendations include:

- Public Affairs should promote how persons with disabilities can enjoy each park/forest/refuge/site. All existing brochures must contain statements of availability in alternate formats, phone numbers that are available for use with a TTY system, etc.
- Public Affairs should maintain consistent contact and foster information exchange with disability organizations. Public Affairs should inform public media sources and other constituency groups about efforts / successes in providing accessible features to persons with disabilities.
- Agencies should create positive, high-profile awards that identify model parks/forests/refuges/sites and programs, and service providers / partners within all federal land agencies that exemplify innovative application of accessibility standards without compromising the resource protection agenda of the agency.

- Include safety and comfort suggestions for persons with disabilities in general safety and comfort publications produced by the agencies for general visitors.
- Check all websites of federal land agencies, so that the requirements of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act are met, and Congress should provide funds for meeting the requirements of Section 508.
- Create a website that provides the information gathered by the baseline assessment of federal lands (see Recommendation #2) to the public in a user-friendly format. Link this website to the websites of all existing parks/forests/refuges/sites. Provide copies of the website in alternate formats available on request (i.e. printed, large type printed, Braille, audio tape, etc.).

## **7) CLARIFY THE BALANCE BETWEEN RESOURCE PROTECTION AND ACCESSIBILITY.**

Federal land management agencies do have a fundamental mandate to protect the natural resources in their charge. Persons with disabilities must recognize that natural, cultural, and historical resource protection is primary. Research suggests that the majority of persons with disabilities do recognize and accept these mandates. They do not support compromising these mandates solely in the name of providing access.

The increased use of "off road vehicles" (ORV's), "all terrain vehicles" (ATV's), airplane over-flights, motorboats, snowmobiles and other forms of motorized access has been advanced by some as necessary to increase opportunities for outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities. This issue has become extremely controversial when federal land management agencies have sought to eliminate or restrict motorized access to certain areas due to resource protection or user conflicts.

Unfortunately, increased use of motors as a means to provide access to outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities has frequently been misrepresented by some who have other goals as a priority--increased motorized vehicle use on public lands for profit, convenience, or as a means to establish patterns of use that would make it difficult for land management agencies to designate lands as closed to motorized vehicles due to management needs or to become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System at some future date. These proponents of increased motorized use are simply using the claim of "access for the disabled" to advance other goals and priorities.

This issue is specifically cited because it has created a significant barrier to providing equal opportunities for accessible outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities. Too often, when the issue of providing equal access for persons with disabilities is brought up, the people involved assume that the issue centers on increasing motorized use. In this context, they become polarized on that issue without listening to the real priority set forth by Congress and people with disabilities: Equality.

Motorized recreation on federal lands is a highly charged issue. However, in terms of providing equal opportunities for outdoor recreation among people with disabilities, motorized use is, in fact, a minor issue--especially when compared to other issues.

### **Recommendations regarding off road vehicles:**

Since Off Road Vehicles are most frequently cited as a means to provide equal access to outdoor recreation, it is suggested that federal agencies consider a recent decision on special ORV use by persons with disabilities made by the United States District Court, Northern District of New York (Theodore Galusha, Teena Willard, and William Searles vs. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. (98-CV-1117)). This case was decided as an interpretation of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA). As noted earlier in this report, although the ADA does not generally apply to federal agencies, Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act does apply, and the principles are similar.

Specific recommendations include:

- When federal agencies close motorized use to areas, roads, or trails because of concerns over the impact of continued motorized use, those areas should be closed to motorized use for everyone--including people with disabilities--with no exceptions. According to the New York court, motorized access should not be allowed if such access would fundamentally or substantially alter the park/forest/or land management unit program. Furthermore, federal agencies are not required under this interpretation to allow motorized use as a reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities unless there has been frequent, daily, non-emergency motorized vehicle use by agency and non-agency personnel within the area.

In short, if the agencies close areas to motorized use to the public, but continue to use motorized vehicles for daily, non-emergency administrative purposes on closed areas, roads, or trails, then the

agencies should consider allowing motorized use by persons with documented physical disabilities as a reasonable accommodation. This practice should apply to any outdoor recreation activity occurring on federal lands.

- When agencies do close areas to motorized vehicles, they should seek to provide alternative means of enabling persons with disabilities to access these areas that are compatible with the environment.

According to a study titled Wilderness Access (National Council on Disability, 1991), the majority of people with disabilities prefer to visit federal lands for the same reasons and using the same methods of access as non-disabled users. These methods of access typically follow the same non-motorized means that persons without disabilities use. In most cases this will probably involve working with outfitters or other service providers to encourage them to provide these alternative means.

For definitional purposes, frequent, daily, non-emergency use does not include agency use of motorized vehicles for emergency search and rescue, fire suppression, law enforcement when federal officials must use motorized vehicles to have any realistic chance of apprehending persons in violation of law, or other extraordinary events. Also, "motorized wheelchairs" are not considered a motorized vehicle, provided the wheelchair is designed solely for use by a mobility impaired person for locomotion that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area (ADA, Title V, Section.507(c)).



## **OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTIVITY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Although PL 105-359 simply asked for suggestions to improve opportunities for outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities, it did specifically list several forms of outdoor recreation. For this reason, each of these forms of recreation are specifically addressed below:

### **Fishing**

Fishing is the one of the most popular outdoor recreational activities surveyed on public lands and was given an overall accessibility rating of 3.9 out of 5 by persons with disabilities. The biggest problems cited related to accessibility include eroded or heavily vegetated fishing banks, or docks and piers that are too narrow, have steps, or are in disrepair. Specific recommendations include:

- All fishing piers and structures comply with the recommendations currently being advanced by the federal Access Board.
- On advertised bank fishing locations, secondary undergrowth at key access locations should be cleared to allow access to the fishing opportunities to persons with mobility impairments, unless this clearing would diminish the resource due to erosion or the removal of rare or endangered species, or fundamentally alter the natural environment or recreational experience of the setting.

### **Hunting**

Hunting had the 3rd fewest responses of those recreational activities surveyed among persons with disabilities. It was given an average accessibility level of 3.6 out of 5. Some of the issues raised around hunting include ORV use, the creation of hunting programs or seasons specifically for persons with disabilities, allowing use of crossbows or rifles in seasons or areas where they are prohibited, and access around closed gates. Specific recommendations include:

- (d) Use gate systems that allow passage of a wheelchair through or around the gate. This is already a requirement for newly constructed gates, however, this requirement needs to be enforced, and, ideally, applied to existing gates where access around the gate is essential to the programs provided (hunting, hiking, wildlife viewing, etc.).

- The creation of “Special” hunting areas or seasons for persons with disabilities, should be done ONLY as a last resort for providing programmatic access to persons with disabilities when integration into regular hunting seasons is deemed impossible. Every effort should be made to integrate persons with disabilities into hunting areas and seasons that are available to the general public (See recommendations on special programs on pages 25-26).
- Special permits for crossbow and rifle use in areas and seasons where they are prohibited should be allowed as a reasonable accommodation ONLY as a last resort to individuals who can prove that their disability will not allow them to safely or effectively use equipment that is allowed to the general public in the area and/or season in which the agencies deem appropriate for hunting by the general public.

## Trapping

Survey respondents rarely listed trapping as an activity they pursue or wish to pursue on federal lands. The average accessibility rating given for trapping (3.6 out of 5). Some of the issues raised included the use of ORV's (see pages 18-19 for recommendations on this issue) and special seasons or special areas. Specific recommendations include:

- Creation of “special” areas or seasons for trapping for persons with disabilities should be done ONLY as a last resort when it is deemed impossible to provide trapping opportunities in areas and seasons that are open to the general public.

## Wildlife Viewing

Wildlife viewing is one of the most popular outdoor recreation activities for everyone, including people with disabilities. It received an accessibility rating of 3.8 out of 5. Specific recommendations include:

- All facilities (i.e. platforms, blinds, etc.) built for the purpose of wildlife viewing, should be made accessible to the extent that it does not change the fundamental nature of the experience. Currently there are no common accepted standards for these types of facilities, however standards can easily be derived from the elements for accessible fishing piers and other outdoor recreation facilities. For example, all railings at wildlife viewing stations should have periodic

openings of a specified height through which people who use wheelchairs would have an unobstructed view.

- Trails and access routes to wildlife viewing areas should meet ADAAG standards as they become applicable.
- Assess all wildlife viewing trails and facilities and provide information on accessibility characteristics to the public, so that they can choose the experience they wish to have.

## **Hiking**

Hiking is an extremely popular activity on federal lands for all persons, including persons with disabilities. It received an overall accessibility rating of 3.7 out of 5 from survey respondents. Specific recommendations include:

- Assess existing trails for information on their state of accessibility and provide the information to the public so they can decide for themselves whether a trail meets their needs.
- Ensure accountability of meeting ADAAG standards for newly constructed trails and trails that undergo significant re-construction.
- Train program personnel on decision making process for what types of equipment to allow in certain environments (See Appendix 4: Technological Advancements and Recommendation #3: Training).

## **Boating**

Survey respondents with disabilities were asked about both non-motorized and motorized boating. Respondents who participated in motorized boating rated its accessibility at 3.9 out of 5, while respondents who participated in non-motorized boating rated its accessibility at 4.2 out of 5. Specific recommendations include:

- Assess and assure that all docks and piers comply with the recent additions to the ADAAG standards put forward by the Access Board.

## Camping

Camping is one of the most popular activities on federal lands for persons with disabilities and those without disabilities. It received an overall accessibility rating of 4.0 out of 5 from survey respondents. Specific recommendations include:

- As all picnic tables, fire rings and grills are replaced, they should ALL be replaced with elements that meet ADAAG standards for access. At no point in the future should elements be replaced with elements that are not fully accessible. These accessible elements can be added for little increased cost regardless of whether the site is a designated accessible site. Moreover, if the agencies commit to ordering accessible elements as “standard equipment”, increased costs due to limited production runs for special, accessible elements among suppliers will be eliminated.

## **OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **Working with Outfitters and other Partner Organizations**

One of the most important issues identified as having great effect on improving accessibility is how the federal agencies work with partner organizations operating on federal lands. Federal land managers often have little contact or oversight of these partners, other than through contracts and permits. Specific recommendations include:

- Include appropriate language regarding the provision of accessible services and facilities in the contracts of all service partners operating on federal lands.
- Enforce the accessibility related language in contracts to partners.
- Provide incentives to service partners to encourage serving persons with disabilities. Agencies should ask service providers which types of reasonable incentives would be most effective.

### **Establish a more accurate means of identifying people who are considered “disabled”**

One of the difficult issues facing land managers is how to delineate legitimate requests based on disability from other, less legitimate requests. Due, in part, to a lack of training, many land managers do not feel qualified to make this distinction. For a variety of reasons, the land management agencies are generally reluctant to make this determination.

- It is recommended that federal land management agencies develop criteria for determining who is and who is not considered disabled under the definitions of disability provided in the Americans with Disabilities Act. These definitions should be refined to focus on the functional abilities or impairments that people need in order to effectively participate in outdoor recreation opportunities. In short, federal agencies must develop the essential eligibility requirements for participation in outdoor recreation programs, and determine which types of impairments require which kinds of assistance. These criteria should be made easily available and understandable to persons who make determinations about special requests.

## **Hire Persons with Disabilities**

Currently, less than 1% of federal land agency employees have a disability, and even fewer hold management level positions (See Appendix 5). Inclusion of more PWD's in the federal workforce related to outdoor recreation will increase sensitivity and understanding regarding issues related to disability and accessibility. Specific recommendations include:

- Hire more qualified persons with disabilities.
- If qualified persons with disabilities are difficult to find, the agencies should consider working with other agencies that promote employment for persons with disabilities to develop proactive initiatives and programs that will help persons with disabilities acquire the skills needed for employment in federal land management agencies. These other agencies include the President's Committee on Employment of Person's With Disabilities, vocational rehabilitation organizations, and various non-profit organizations.

## **Exercise Caution in Promoting Special Treatment Solely on the Basis of Disability**

Some well intentioned initiatives have the potential to do more harm than good in promoting equal access to outdoor recreation—reinforcing the stereotype that persons with disabilities are less able or capable. Although popular with many people, it is recommended that federal land management agencies promote special treatment of persons with disabilities only as a last resort when such treatment is truly required to provide equal opportunities. In other words, special treatment should be used only when it is proven impossible to integrate people with disabilities into existing programs for the general public.

For example, some suggestions were made calling for a reduction in service and entrance fees for persons with disabilities. Currently, some federal agencies offer reduced fees for persons with disabilities and others—such as the “Golden Access Pass”. While commonplace and well intentioned, the notion that persons with disabilities or anyone should be granted reduced fees simply because they are members of a defined class of the "disabled", or "elderly" is discriminatory. It is, in effect, a form of stereotyping and discrimination which does not further the issue of equality that is fundamental to so many civil rights initiatives.

Specific recommendations include:

- Federal land management agencies should discontinue the policy of reduced fees for classes of individuals solely on the basis of membership within that class. Instead, reduced fees for enjoyment of public lands should be extended to every American based solely on their ability to pay--not on their membership in a minority class. While this may pose challenges to federal agencies in terms of fair and accurate implementation, the tools and measures are available. For example, persons eligible for welfare, aid to families with dependent children, and certain forms of Social Security benefits should be allowed access to federal lands at reduced cost provided they present some form of proof that they are indeed eligible for these benefits.
- Personal Care Attendants (PCA's) and Sign Language Interpreters (SLI') should be exempt from fees and not included in group size limitations when accompanying a person with a disability who must use a PCA or SLI while at home. For people with disabilities who truly need them, PCA's and SLI's are essential supports needed for these individuals to fully participate.

### **Implementation of Recommendations**

Each agency should develop a "response team" to develop specific, strategic and tactical initiatives to implement the recommendations of this report. These teams should include high level management staff, as well as persons with expertise in the area of accessibility. Plans for implementation should be developed and put forward to agency leadership no later than September 1, 2000.



## **METHODOLOGY**

This goal of this report is to identify, review, and prioritize specific recommendations on ways the federal land management agencies can improve accessibility to outdoor recreation for persons with disabilities. To accomplish this goal, several steps were taken, including:

### **1) Creation of an Interagency Committee to assist in gathering information.**

This committee was made up of the respective national accessibility coordinators from each of the federal land management agencies mentioned in PL 105-359. In addition to these agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation was also included in this report. The members of the committee include:

Kay Ellis  
Access Manager  
Bureau of Land Management  
1849 C St NW Room 204  
Washington, DC 20240-0001  
202/452-7799  
[kay\\_ellis@blm.gov](mailto:kay_ellis@blm.gov)

Doug Staller  
Accessibility Coordinator  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
4401 N Fairfax Dr, Room 670  
Arlington, VA 22202  
703/358-2364  
[Doug\\_Staller@fws.gov](mailto:Doug_Staller@fws.gov)

Karen Megorden  
ADMS Program Manager  
Bureau of Reclamation  
1150 N Curtis Road #4700  
Boise, ID 83706-1234  
208/378-5053  
[kmegorden@PN.USBR.GOV](mailto:kmegorden@PN.USBR.GOV)

Janet Zeller  
Civil Rights Program Manager  
USDA Forest Service  
25 Everett Road  
Dunbarton, NH 03045-4604  
603/528-8751  
[jzeller/r9@fs.fed.us](mailto:jzeller/r9@fs.fed.us)

David Park  
Chief, Office on Accessibility  
National Park Service  
1849 C St NW  
Box 37127  
Washington DC 20013-7127  
202/565-1255  
[david\\_park@NPS.GOV](mailto:david_park@NPS.GOV)

## **2) Review of agency policies and procedures.**

National accessibility coordinators from each of the federal agencies were asked to find and submit all currently existing policies that pertain to accessibility compliance within the participating federal land management agencies (USFS, NPS, BLM, USFWS, BOR). These policy documents were then reviewed and organized into categories that define the scope of the policy within each agency. (See Appendix 2A: Policy Matrix) The matrix developed in this process provides a “road map” of the current known policies with regards to accessibility, so that land managers or individuals with disabilities can quickly determine what policies pertain to different situations, and where they may be found.

The policies, once compiled and mapped, were then reviewed for any inconsistencies. (See Appendix 2B: Policy Review) They were each analyzed to determine if any existing accessibility policies conflicted with known policies within the agency, or if there

were any obvious issues present that counteract the desire of the agencies to provide an integrated setting for persons with disabilities.

### **3) In depth interviews with agency personnel.**

Seventy nine (79) federal land management personnel at 36 locations were interviewed to determine successful or unsuccessful practices and make suggestions for improvement.

#### Subjects

The subjects identified for the purpose of this study were chosen by the members of the interagency committee according to the following criteria:

- Representative of a wide range of management types.
- Representative of a wide geographic distribution.
- Even distribution among the participating agencies.

The Interagency Committee identified an overall list of potential subjects that included 79 federal employees from 36 total sites, including:

- 8 Bureau of Land Management State and Field Offices
- 7 Bureau of Reclamation Regions
- 7 National Forests
- 8 National Parks
- 6 National Wildlife Refuges

#### Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used for agency personnel interviews took the form of a discussion outline designed for use in a telephone conference call. It consists of a set of questions designed to stimulate discussion on how to improve access to federal lands.

#### Data Collection

For the purposes of this study, the survey instrument was created as a general outline for use in a conversational telephone interview with the agency representatives. The outline was sent by U.S. mail to each of the interviewees 1-2 weeks before the telephone interview to allow them to prepare for the questions that would be asked. Agency personnel then participated in a conference call with the report researcher, Mr. Mike Passo. No written responses were required of the agency personnel. The responses to the interview questions were recorded on both audio cassette tape and interview notes. See Appendix 6A and 6B.

#### **4) Solicitation of suggestions from consumers with disabilities.**

Suggestions for improvement of accessibility on federal lands were received from 288 persons with disabilities through mailed and on-line questionnaires. The information gathered includes current and past participation patterns, future expectations for participation, analyses of the perceived quality of the participation, identification of activities desired but perceived to be unavailable, and a review of recommendations for improving opportunities.

##### Subjects

Persons with disabilities from a broad socio-economic and geographic distribution within the United States were identified for participation in this study. Efforts were made to represent a variety of outdoor interests and preferences. Respondents for this study came from five different sources.

- 2,781 individuals with disabilities from throughout the United States were identified from the mailing lists of Easter Seals, a national non-profit organization serving people with disabilities, and Wilderness Inquiry, a national non-profit organization serving people with disabilities (and the contracting agency for conducting this report).
- 28 outdoor recreation organizations that specialize in serving people with disabilities were asked to respond and distribute the survey to people with disabilities whom they serve. The list of outdoor recreation organizations can be found in Appendix 7.

- 6 national disability organizations were asked to respond and send the survey to people with disabilities in their constituency. The list of disability organizations can be found in Appendix 8.
- 34 members of the Regulatory Negotiation Committee of the Access Board were also asked to respond and send the survey to people with disabilities in their constituency. The list of Regulatory Negotiation Committee members can be found in Appendix 9.
- 15 persons with disabilities who are employed by the federal land management agencies were interviewed in depth to determine their ideas for improving accessibility.

#### Instrument

See Appendix 10A.

#### Research Design

The Consumer Survey was designed to answer 4 types of questions.

- 1) What is the profile of the respondent?
- 2) What is the respondent's past outdoor recreational experience on federal lands?
- 3) What was the perceived level of accessibility of outdoor recreation activities on federal lands?
- 4) What are the respondent's suggestions for improving access to outdoor recreation on federal lands?

The survey instrument was broadly disseminated by mail, e-mail, and handed out to interested parties by the subjects listed above. Responses were returned via U.S. mail and e-mail.

Upon receipt of the returned survey, the data was transferred into a Microsoft excel database for tabulation and reporting (see Appendix 10B).

### Procedures for data collection

The procedure for data collection from persons with disabilities was accomplished in the following manner:

- An on-line version of the Consumer Survey was created at [www.wildernessinquiry.org/accesssurvey.html](http://www.wildernessinquiry.org/accesssurvey.html). Individuals with disabilities could access and complete the survey on-line--including persons with visual impairments or those who have difficulty with the physical act of writing. This option was presented in all mailed surveys, as well as through a bulk e-mail to the outdoor recreation organizations, national disability organizations, and Reg-neg representatives.
  
- 3100 Consumer Surveys were printed and mailed to
  1. 2782 surveys mailed to the mailing list of individuals with disabilities.
  2. 5 surveys were packaged and mailed to each of the outdoor recreation organizations, disability service organizations, and Reg-neg representatives listed above.
  3. Individual requests for printed surveys.

### **5) Solicitation of suggestions from service providers.**

Attempts were made to include service providers and other partners operating on federal lands. Forty six service providers were identified by the Agency Representatives cited in #3 above. Of this number, 22 were contacted for this report. Of the 22 service providers contacted, 7 agreed to be part of the survey. The service providers were reluctant to participate in the study, difficult to reach and provided vague and uninformative responses. See Appendix 11 for the Service Provider Discussion Outline.

### **6) Review of recent technological advancements in assistive technology.**

This report contains examples of the latest technology enhancements and/or inventions that are currently available in the “commercial marketplace.” (See Appendix 12A) This

review of “cutting edge” enhancements discusses the degree to which these devices “are” or “are not” consistent with current policies and practices of the federal agencies.

The examples identified in this report were gathered over the last two years by experts in the adaptive equipment field. The sources of this information originated from disability-related periodicals, catalogs, and internet web sites. The representation of technological advancements offered in this report represent only a sampling of the wide array of adaptive equipment currently in use or development throughout the world, and provide good examples of what land managers are likely to see in use on federal lands in the future.

See Appendix 12B for a listing of sources that featured the technological advancements included in this report.

## **7) Expert advisory focus groups.**

A meeting at Shenandoah National Park was held May 21-23, 2000 to obtain further suggestions on ways to improve access to outdoor recreation on federal lands. Over 30 people from federal land management agencies, the federal Access Board, and other organizations attended (see Appendix 13 for the list of attendees). Also, 10 experts within the field of providing accessible programs and features in the outdoor recreation environment were interviewed and convened in an advisory capacity to this report. These groups both provided recommendations and reviewed suggestions to determine the validity and feasibility of the recommendations.

## **Summary of Methodology**

The majority of recommendations generated in this report are from federal agency representatives, experts in the fields of outdoor recreation and disability, and directly from consumers with disabilities. This report does not represent a scientific sample of the level of understanding of outdoor recreation accessibility issues throughout the entire population. Therefore, the number of responses generated should not be taken quantitatively to represent the views of each of these populations as a whole, but should be used as a set qualitative of responses.

## **Appendices**

**Appendices are not currently available in this file. They will be made available soon. Until that time you may request that a hard copy of the Appendices be sent to you by contacting:**

**Mike Passo  
Wilderness Inquiry  
808 14<sup>th</sup> Ave SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414  
612.676.9416  
[mikepasso@wildernessinquiry.org](mailto:mikepasso@wildernessinquiry.org)**

