

**Visitor Experiences, Indicators, Standards and Appropriate Management of Forest  
Service Wilderness in the Pacific Northwest, with Emphasis on Heavily Used Places,  
Day Use and Mountain Climbing**

**A Collaborative Program of Research and Administrative Studies**

**Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, Rocky Mountain Research Station  
(ALWRI), the Pacific Northwest Region, Forest Service (R6) and the Department of  
Resource Recreation and Tourism, University of Idaho (UI)**

**Program Coordinators:**

**David Cole, Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute (ALWRI)**

**Susan Sater, Pacific Northwest Region (R6)**

**Troy Hall, University of Idaho (UI)**

**June 2002**

## **The Issue**

There is considerable controversy about appropriate management of popular wilderness trails and destinations areas. Much of the controversy stems from alternative interpretations of the language from the 1964 Wilderness Act that describes what wilderness should offer visitors, “outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.” There is growing debate regarding what causes more degradation of solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation: growing crowds of visitors, or Forest Service imposed use limits or restrictions, especially limits on day use. In the Pacific Northwest Region, this controversy has led to administrative reversals of direction and successful appeals of Forest Service plans. In other regions it has led to litigation. The controversy largely results from a lack of consensus among legitimate wilderness stakeholders about how to balance the benefits of public access with concern for maintaining outstanding opportunities for “solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation” (a wilderness experience). Controversy is inevitable, given the disparate views of wilderness stakeholders. However, the intensity of the controversy is aggravated by inconsistent decision-making and by the lack of an adequate informational basis (science and monitoring data) for decision-making.

Tough, value-laden decisions must be made about appropriate management objectives (including indicators and standards) regarding experiential conditions in wilderness and about the management actions needed to keep conditions in compliance with standards. Scientific information is needed as well, not because it will identify “the right decisions” or that it will even make decisions easier. It is needed because it will make decisions more informed. Scientific information will make it easier to explain and

justify decisions, because the likely consequences of a given decision or alternatives to it will have been explored and can be articulated. Current scientific information related to these issues is woefully inadequate.

Wilderness use, particularly in urban-proximate western wildernesses, is increasing, and a large part of this growth comes from day use. Many wilderness management plans, following a LAC-type process, specify indicators and standards related to experience quality. This is guided by Wilderness Act direction, which mandates that wilderness provide “outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.” A basic assumption is that as use levels (density -- the number of people per unit space -- or direct encounters between groups) increase, experiences will be adversely affected, for at least some segment of the visitor population. Because day use tends to occur at scenic areas within a few miles of trailheads, certain areas within wilderness are experiencing very heavy use. In several areas (e.g. Mt. Hood, Three Sisters, Alpine Lakes), standards for number of encounters per day have been exceeded, and managers have considered or proposed use limitations. These limitations are usually explicitly intended to protect opportunities for appropriate experiences in wilderness.. In the Pacific Northwest, management is also complicated by the popularity of several mountain climbs (e.g. Mt. Hood, Mt. Baker and Mt. Adams).

Recently, managerial effectiveness has been challenged on several fronts regarding the provision of opportunities for appropriate experiences in wilderness. First, visitors and researchers have both questioned whether the types of indicators that have been selected for experience quality (almost always measures of encounters between groups) indeed indicate what they are designed to indicate. Many question whether

encounters is an adequate proxy for “outstanding opportunities for solitude” or for “primitive and unconfined” experiences. Apart from whether the indicator itself is appropriate, many have questioned whether the particular standards selected (usually on the order of 10 encounters per day in the most popular places) are appropriate.

Other basic questions about experiences have arisen. Assuming that wildernesses should provide unique “wilderness” experiences, some people have asserted that certain visitors, for example, day users, do not seek “wilderness experiences,” while other types of visitors (for example overnight users or purists) do seek them. Some people assert that visitors cannot have “wilderness experiences” in high-density areas. Proponents of these assertions argue that managers should restrict use to provide the experiences sought by those who seek truly “wilderness” types of experiences. These assertions are underlain by numerous untested assumptions, however, about the experiences sought by different visitors types and attained in different settings. For example, it is assumed that:

- visitors have well developed expectations and experiential goals when they visit wilderness.

- use density/ encounters influences the ability of some or many visitors (but not all) to attain their preferred or acceptable experience.

- wilderness environments offer opportunities for experiences that differ, at least to some extent, from those that can be obtained in other types of environments.

- if wilderness cannot provide opportunities for all types of users, managers should privilege those users who have goals most consistent with legislative intent.

- encounters is an adequate or the best indicator of wilderness experience quality.

-wilderness experiences are primarily characterized by freedom (they are “unconfined”), solitude and/or privacy.

Evaluating such claims is difficult because researchers are not clear about the basic nature of experiences that people have when on wilderness trips. There has been copious research on the relationship between density and visitor satisfaction or density and crowding, but most of this research has been done off-site (using post-hoc questionnaires), at a “trip-wide” level (asking for overall evaluations for a trip as a whole). Such research has found little relationship between density or encounters and satisfaction or crowding. However, other potential aspects of experiences besides feelings of crowding and satisfaction have generally not been assessed. Additionally, querying visitors about their “trip as a whole” may mask relationships between variables that occur moment-to-moment.

### **A Collaborative Program Between Forest Service Research and Management and the University of Idaho**

Given the need for active management of heavy use, day use and climbing in wilderness, the high degree of controversy and public scrutiny of wilderness management and the substantial uncertainty created by sparse research and monitoring data, a collaborative program of research and administrative studies has begun.

In 2001, recognizing the need to better understand the nature of visitor experiences in heavy use wilderness in order to develop appropriate indicators and standards for such places, ALWRI and UI developed a research joint venture agreement (RJVA)(01-JV-11222044-241) to conduct collaborative research on “the nature of the

experiences visitors have in wilderness and how experiences vary with trip length and visitor density.” The emphasis of this project is on developing instruments capable of providing insight into people’s experiences and applying those instruments in one or two case studies. Funding for the (RJVA) totaled \$122,258. In 2002, this RJVA was amended to expand the objectives to include improved understanding of “visitor behavior and conflict in high-use areas” and an assessment of “visitor use histories for evidence of displacement and substitutability.” An additional \$47, 340 in funding was added. These research projects were funded to allow for three seasons of fieldwork (2002-2004), followed by a year of analysis and report writing. The RJVA terminates in July, 2006.

In 2002, recognizing that the intensity of the controversy about how best to protect a unique wilderness experience was being aggravated by seemingly inconsistent decision-making and by the lack of adequate information for decision-making, the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service (R6) funded a study of social indicators and standards for wilderness, providing up to \$100,000 per year in 2003, 2003 and 2004. These funds can be used to conduct administrative studies which apply the instruments developed in the RJVA across a spectrum of wildernesses in R6, as well as to conduct administrative studies which complement those using instruments developed under the RJVA.

Because this program of research and administrative studies is jointly funded by appropriations to the Forest Service for both research and management, care has been taken to ensure that funds have been allocated appropriately between the two activities. Research funds will be spent on the development of measurement instruments, their testing, and application in a few places to develop new scientific knowledge.

Management funds will be spent to (1) apply research-developed instruments across the entire Pacific Northwest Region to gather information essential for management and (2) to conduct standard visitor surveys across the region, for the purpose of gathering information essential for management.

### **Program Rationale**

The program is guided by a set of questions that managers must address. Research and administrative studies will provide knowledge and data that will inform decisions related to the following questions:

- 1. What are the most appropriate standards for indicators of experiential (social) conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**
- 2. What are the most appropriate indicators of experiential (social) conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**
- 3. What are the most appropriate management actions to take in order to maintain appropriate social conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**

### **Study Strategy and Design**

Each of these questions will be addressed in a variety of research and administrative studies. A triangulation strategy, relying on different research methods (including questionnaires, observational studies, and visitor interviews), and also a variety of study

designs and sample site characteristics will be utilized within the different studies proposed here to compensate for shortcomings among various approaches and study designs if used alone.

**1. What are the most appropriate standards for indicators of experiential (social) conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**

. The most commonly used approach for providing information relevant to decisions about appropriate standards involves asking current on-site visitors for their opinions about the maximum acceptable number of encounters or persons at one time. This approach is often referred to as the normative approach because proponents of the approach postulate that responses to such questions are indicative of social norms. Other researchers question the assertion that responses are indicative of norms at all. In the current study, asking current on-site visitors for their opinions is described as the opinion or judgment approach. This approach attempts to assess how the public might make the kinds of value-laden decisions that the manager might make. Sometimes this approach is considered a form of public participation and seen as a democratic procedure in which decisions are based on the informed judgments of the populace.

This approach has the advantage of being relatively easy to conduct and inexpensive. However, many disadvantages to this approach have been articulated. Little information is available regarding the opinions of stakeholder groups other than current users. Moreover, displacement of certain users from popular wilderness would mean their opinions are not heard. The diversity of opinions among on-site visitors is lost when

central tendencies and standard deviations (or even coefficients of variation) are the only statistics reported. Managing for the tastes of the median user (“the average user who doesn’t exist”) will not necessarily satisfy more users than managing for any other recreational taste. Psychological research suggests visitors may find it difficult to isolate and accurately report what influences their experience, particularly when asked about something that they have never experienced and when given a written questionnaire in which they are asked to recollect their trip and generalize to the entire trip. Opinion research suggests that visitors’ opinions are likely to be volatile, inconsistent and characterized by wishful thinking, unless respondents are well informed, given sufficient time and required to work through their personal ambivalence regarding difficult choices and to accept responsibility for the consequences of their opinions. Questions often allow respondents to compartmentalize their thinking—to “have their cake and eat it too”. Even when trade-offs are made explicit, it is difficult to accurately describe the trade-offs that must be made when prescribing a standard and optimistic to think that respondents can instantaneously arrive at wise choices.

Nevertheless, some of these limitations can be overcome and others can be kept in mind when interpreting results. This study will assess peoples’ opinions and judgments regarding appropriate standards and will develop an understanding of how they would make trade-offs between access and experiential conditions. The study will differentiate between different user types at the same wilderness location, compare the opinions of day and overnight users and of users at high and low-use wilderness and seek the opinions of non-users. This information is collected primarily in the administrative studies referred to as **Visitor Survey (Study 4 below)**. The opinions of a broader segment of society will be

assessed in the study we refer to as **Informed Public Judgment About Management (Study 5 below)**. In addition, we will try to consider the potential influence of displacement in the research we refer to as **Displacement and Substitutability (Study 3 below)**.

A different approach from the opinion approach involves describing the relationship between setting attributes, particularly visitor use density, and the nature of visitor experiences. In this approach, the objectives of research are to provide (1) a deeper appreciation than we currently have of the nature and frequency of experiences that people have in wilderness and (2) a better understanding of the relationship between visitor density and other setting attributes and the opportunities for various types of experience. Decision makers are still left with the task of deciding which types of experience they will manage for. However, they can do so on the basis of detailed descriptions of experiences (perhaps selecting those which are most consistent with language in the Wilderness Act, or those which are rare on other public lands). Moreover, once decisions are made about the types of experience that will be managed for, the research results should suggest the setting attributes, including visitor density, that are conducive to these experiences. This can form the basis for decisions about appropriate standards for setting attributes that are subject to managerial influence.

The advantage of this approach is that there is no need to rely on untested assumptions about the quality of visitor opinions and judgments about appropriate standards. Nor are there concerns about accessing the opinions of all legitimate stakeholders. The disadvantages lie in the challenges of (1) developing a deep understanding of the nature of something as intangible as experience and (2) describing

relationships between relevant setting variables and experiences, when we are certain that those relationships vary greatly between visitors and with variables that are not subject to managerial influence. Nevertheless, we are convinced that this approach, in combination with the opinion (norms) approach, will provide the most solid informational basis for decision-making. This research, which will require both qualitative and quantitative approaches is referred to as **Visitor Experiences (Study 1 below)**. It will examine the nature of people's experiences, what might best be characterized as their immediate conscious or lived experiences, as well as the meanings they attach to those experiences.

## **2. What are the most appropriate indicators of experiential (social) conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**

Much of the preceding discussion presupposes that visitor density (or a related measure like number of encounters) is either a good indicator of the wilderness experience or is causally related to wilderness experience. Many researchers have criticized the reliance on number of encounters (or some other measure of density) as an indicator of the visitor experience, particularly in more popular places. They note, for example, that there are many other dimensions of the experience that are ignored when so much emphasis is placed on solitude, that encounters can be positive as well as negative, and that number of encounters is not very directly related to opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. We generally agree with most of these statements and the conclusion that number of encounters is not a very helpful descriptor of the wilderness experience in popular places. However, we disagree with the conclusion that this indicts

number of encounters as an appropriate indicator. We believe that something can be a good indicator either if it is a good descriptor of the appropriate experience or if it is a setting attribute that is causally related to opportunities to obtain the appropriate experience. In this context, some measure of visitor density might still be a good indicator in a popular place, as long as it is causally related to some aspect of experience which is deemed relevant (such as the lack of anticipatory stress associated with concern about not being able to find a spot to picnic because there are too many other visitors).

Nevertheless, even if we ultimately decide to use number of encounters, or some other indicator of density, as an indicator, we still need to understand the relationship between density and the qualities of experience we are ultimately concerned about. To do so we need to identify those aspects of wilderness experience we are most concerned about. These might be positive aspects of the experience that are vulnerable to disruption or negative aspects of experience that occur in specific situations. This again implies a need to develop a deeper understanding of the nature of visitor experiences in wilderness, what influences the nature and quality of experience and how experiences vary with setting attributes, including use density. Moreover, given the interest in day use and the high likelihood that experience varies greatly with length of stay, we also should study differences between day and overnight visitors.

We envision a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, conducted in many different wilderness locations that vary situationally. Input to these questions will be derived from the study we refer to as **Social Interaction and Behavior in High-use places (Study 2 below)**, as well as from the research on **Visitor Experiences** and the **Visitor Surveys**. We are likely to use interviews to query people and/or listen to their

stories about specific aspects of experience, including whether or not they had outstanding opportunities for solitude or unconfined recreation. Based on research on experiences in psychology, other questions might query visitors about moods, focus of attention, physical sensations, and content of thought. Testable indicators may also be developed from a review of legislative intent (e.g., dealing with “solitude” and “primitiveness” or “unconfined recreation”), common sense (e.g., stress, intrusion, territoriality), and reviews of literature about what visitors consider to be “good” or “bad” influences on their experience quality. This research ought to suggest a suite of potential indicators. Although research cannot determine which indicators should be adopted, it can help evaluate how well different indicators correlate with dimensions of experiences, whether they meet criteria for “good” indicators, and the extent to which they are influenced by setting factors such as density. Research will need to focus on these potential indicator measures in wilderness, so that data on setting features and other influencing variables can be collected simultaneously. These factors will be identified from the literature (for example, scenic qualities are known to affect mood, as is level of exertion) and will include measures of density. Data on setting factors may be collected through observation or may be respondents’ reports.

### **3. What are the most appropriate management actions to take in order to maintain appropriate social conditions in portions of wilderness that receive heavy-use and substantial day visitation?**

Decisions about appropriate management actions to take are particularly controversial. In our opinion, this controversy largely results from an inability to articulate desired

conditions (indicators and standards) and a lack of consensus on desired conditions. The research discussed above should at least partially alleviate that problem. Nevertheless, there is value in further work related to appropriate management actions. Previous research has had limited success in helping managers mesh visitor opinions about desirable wilderness qualities (as in the normative or opinion approach) with appropriate and acceptable management responses when standards are exceeded. We know a lot about the conditions visitors prefer or say they would tolerate, but much less about their acceptance of different methods for ensuring those conditions. This has been particularly evident in public outcry against proposed use limits in various wildernesses. Therefore, part of the overall research endeavor should address visitor concerns about different management approaches. Because standard questionnaire approaches in the past (“do you support/oppose”) have been of such limited utility, we suggest an interview approach that could better address people’s reasons underlying their attitudes. This research would also focus on how people make trade-offs among desirable, but incompatible, goals such as unrestricted access and preferred experiences. Most information will come from **Visitor Surveys and Informed Public Judgment about Management**).

### **Proposed Research Projects and Administrative Studies**

To provide the types of information just described, we will conduct five interrelated research projects and administrative studies. We will use varied approaches to triangulate information, each approach compensating for shortcomings of alternatives. We will also spread our efforts across numerous wildernesses in the PNW Region,

including popular and unpopular wilderness destinations, urban-proximate and urban-distant wildernesses, as well as day use and overnight destinations.

**Study 1: Visitor Experiences.** This project will be funded primarily through the RJVA between the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute and the University of Idaho. Some PNW Region management funds will be used to increase the number of wildernesses in which the measurement instruments are applied. In this study, we propose to:

1. Explore different concepts and measures of experience and develop measures of experience that are applicable to wilderness visits;
2. Explore the literature to identify likely influences on experience, and develop testable hypotheses where possible;
3. Explore the relationship between use density, and other situational variables, and dimensions of experience; and
4. Explore the relationship between time spent in wilderness and measures of experience.

Results from this study will contribute to all three of the information types needed for management—appropriate standards, indicators and management actions. There will be 3 years of data collection, beginning with pilot testing in 2002, intensive data collection in 2003 and again in 2004. A mix of depth, qualitative (e.g. long interviews) and representative, quantitative data (e.g. experience sampling method, short interviews, questionnaires) will be collected.

Experiences have been studied at a variety of temporal scales and with a variety of methods. A fundamental decision in any research project is whether to focus on the ‘immediate conscious experience’ or the ‘recollected’ experience. Another decision is whether to use standard psychological metrics or to use narrative approaches. All have been done, although certain approaches have predominated in research on experiences in wilderness. In general, most such research has paid little attention to defining what is meant by “experience,” but the use of techniques such as post-trip mail surveys imply that experience can be captured well after the fact and through written instruments. Research in psychology suggests that this assumption may not be valid, and that the correlations between immediate and recollected experiences may not be strong.

In this study, we choose to focus primarily on ‘immediate conscious experiences,’ that is, respondents’ reports of their experiences during the course of their wilderness visit. This might be conceived of as focusing more on the nature of the experience than on the meaning of the experience. Such approaches typically ask respondents to report on the most recent feelings, thoughts, and sensations they experienced immediately prior to being questioned about them. We recognize that all such measures are in fact “recollections,” but we feel that focusing on recollections over the shortest time frame will allow us most confidently to isolate relationships among setting attributes, individual trait variables, and experiences.

Later phases of this research will relate immediate conscious experiences to later, recollected experiences (meaning of the experience). There is some guidance in the psychology literature about how individuals recall past events and feelings, as well as about how they integrate moment-to-moment evaluations into overall assessments. To the

extent that immediate experiences differ from later recollections, managers face a value decision about which to manage for.

Most research explicitly or implicitly defines experience as a cognitive or bodily phenomenon. It is comprised of affective states (moods, emotions, level of arousal), focus of attention (internal, external), bodily sensations (temperature, fatigue), and cognitive content (specific thoughts). In casual uses of the term “experience”, some include activities and settings. In this research, activities and settings are presumed to influence experiences, not to constitute part of experience.

Psychological research suggests that individual traits (personality) have a significant, perhaps overriding, influence on at least some dimensions of experience. For example, several studies have shown that moods are largely a function of individual trait variables. Additionally, much research in recreation has shown that individuals’ expectations, and how well those expectations are met, have a dominant influence on their emotions and levels of satisfaction. Therefore, we expect in this study that individual trait variables may have as much or more influence on experience dimensions than do settings or activities. Therefore, we will attempt to use repeated measures approaches, to isolate and control for individual differences.

**Study 2: Social Interaction and Behavior in High-use Places.** This project will be funded entirely through the RJVA between the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute and the University of Idaho. It is exploratory in nature, although results should inform the selection of indicators and standards. To obtain more insight into appropriate indicators and standards for high-use destinations in wilderness, we will conduct focused

studies of visitors' behavior and interactions in high-use places. There is general agreement that in such places, opportunities for solitude or for a free or unconfined experience are probably not outstanding, but most visitors still have positive experiences. Nevertheless, certain situations might lead to experiences considered undesirable enough to suggest the need to restrict use.

In particular, we imagine that management should attempt to avoid situations that cause high levels of stress in visitors. High levels of stress might be associated with conflict and competition. Visitors might experience anticipatory stress—worrying that they will not be able to do what they want to do because of the situation, such as too many other people. We will observe and assess the social situation in high-use destinations for insights into whether people are either having negative experiences (such as high levels of stress) or having positive experiences (such as peace and tranquility) that are frequently disrupted by social conditions.

This study is likely to involve qualitative interviewing and quantitative questionnaires, as study 1 does. However, we imagine an observational component as well. It will be conducted over two field seasons (2003 and 2004), with analysis and report writing in 2005.

**Study 3: Displacement and Substitutability.** This project will be funded entirely through the RJVA between the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute and the University of Idaho. It is exploratory in nature, although the results will be used to interpret surveys of current on-site visitors and to assess the likely consequences of alternative decisions regarding use limitation. Many people contend that it is

inappropriate to study only current visitors to high-density areas, because they are likely to be satisfied with what they encounter—regardless of what they encounter. Other, more sensitive visitors may have been displaced because of use density (or other factors), and their views are not captured in cross-sectional studies of current users. Most such arguments seem plausible, but are speculative in the absence of empirical evidence one way or another. One way to evaluate this problem would be to conduct a general population study to inquire about past use of wilderness and the ways that use has been affected by use density. However, such an approach is impractical, given the very low per capita levels of wilderness use and general public unfamiliarity with federal wilderness.

To overcome this limitation, this study would involve interviewing wilderness visitors at a range of wilderness destinations, to investigate their use of these and other destinations—inside and outside of wilderness. Interviews would allow more depth and discussion about the impact of use density, without priming respondents to that issue. For example, visitors could initially be asked to describe how they began using wilderness areas, how their visits have changed over time, and what has caused such changes. Later questions could probe more directly about the influence of density (crowding) and other social factors (e.g., behavior of others). Questions could also address the issue of the substitutability of non-wilderness lands. This study would include, but not be limited to, the high-use volcanic peaks in Region 6 (e.g. Mt. Hood, S. Sister, Mt. Baker). It will be conducted over two field seasons (2003 and 2004), in several heavily-used wildernesses, with analysis and report writing in 2005.

#### **Study 4. Visitor Surveys**

This study is funded with PNW Region management funds, as well as some in-kind funding from ALWRI and UI. We will conduct more traditional surveys of visitors in which we obtain their opinions about expectations, experiences, indicators, standards and management actions. Since it is likely that opinions will differ among visitors, we intend to segment the visitor population in various ways. Furthermore, any restrictive management decision will affect some users more than others, and managers need information about which groups will be most affected by alternative actions. Therefore, these studies will need to assess visitor characteristics that are likely to be important (e.g. wilderness experience and knowledge, wilderness “purism”, and expectations).

We will assess peoples’ opinions and judgments regarding appropriate standards and how they would make trade-offs between access and experiential conditions. We will differentiate between different user types at the same wilderness location, compare the opinions of day and overnight users and of users at high and low-use wilderness. Specific questions we will address include:

1. What do people experience on their visits to wilderness?
2. How do personal and situational factors influence the nature of peoples’ experiences?
3. In particular, how do length of stay and visitor density affect the nature of peoples’ experiences?
4. To what extent do people experience stress, conflict, competition and other negative experiences in high-use places and to what degree are these experiences a result of high visitor density?

5. What do people expect from their wilderness visit and to what extent do expectations vary with length of stay and with visitor density?
6. What are the opinions and judgments (norms) of different subpopulations of visitors regarding encounters and other potential indicators of experiential conditions?
7. What are the opinions and judgments of different subpopulations of visitors regarding appropriate management actions and how would they make trade-offs, particularly between access, density and experiential conditions?
8. What evidence is there for displacement resulting either from increasing visitor density or increasing management restriction?
9. What is the potential substitutability of recreation on non-wilderness lands should access to wilderness lands be restricted?

Fieldwork will be conducted in a few locations in the summer of 2002, with much more extensive fieldwork in 2003, probably in about 15 different wilderness locations. Analysis and report writing will occur in 2004.

**Study 5: Informed Public Judgment about Management.** This study is funded with PNW Region management funds, as well as some in-kind funding from ALWRI and a University cooperator (probably either UI or University of Montana). Many scholars and policy analysts argue for a democratic role for citizen input into managing public lands. Some say that even those who do not use, and never will use, wilderness should have a say in management decisions. This study will utilize focus groups of wilderness users and non-users as a means of discussing and evaluating alternative trade-offs between access

and wilderness conditions. Sufficient time will be allowed for participants to “work through” the values conflict that this dilemma presents. Results will include the preferred alternative scenarios of participants, as well as insight into the thought processes of participants and how attitudes changed as a result of the working through process.