6-9-1998

Response: Drawbacks to the Teaming with Wildlife Proposal [outline]

David Secunda

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.law.colorado.edu/outdoor-recreation-promise-and-peril-in-new-west

Part of the Finance Commons, Natural Resources and Conservation Commons, Natural Resources Management and Policy Commons, Recreation Business Commons, and the Recreation, Parks and Tourism Administration Commons

Citation Information

Reproduced with permission of the Getches-Wilkinson Center for Natural Resources, Energy, and the Environment (formerly the Natural Resources Law Center) at the University of Colorado Law School.

Reproduced with permission of the Getches-Wilkinson Center for Natural Resources, Energy, and the Environment (formerly the Natural Resources Law Center) at the University of Colorado Law School.
RESPONSE:
DRAWBACKS TO THE
TEAMING WITH WILDLIFE PROPOSAL

David Secunda
Executive Director
Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America

Outdoor Recreation:
Promise And Peril in The New West

June 8-10, 1998

Natural Resources Law Center
University of Colorado
School of Law
Boulder, Colorado
RESPONSE: DRAWBACKS TO THE TEAMING WITH WILDLIFE PROPOSAL
By David Secunda

I. Teaming With Wildlife Excise Tax

II. ORCA supports the goals of Teaming With Wildlife
   A. Maintaining habitat
   B. Protecting natural resources

III. ORCA and our members have stepped up to the plate:
   A. Leave No Trace
   B. Conservation Alliance
   C. Support of Land Agencies
   D. Conservation Giving

IV. ORCA invited IAFWA to meet with the industry
   A. 1994 Outdoor Retailer Show
   B. Open forum with industry members and state fish and wildlife representatives
   C. The industry was looking for solutions
   D. IAFWA was pushing an agenda

V. ORCA thoroughly examined the proposal
   A. Taxable list
   B. State fish and wildlife as primary recipients
   C. Lots of different types of recreationists as well as non-recreationists affected
   D. IAFWA calls it a "user free"/user pay concept

VI. After careful consideration, we could not support TWW
   A. Too broad to be a "user fee."
   B. State F&W is too narrow a conduit for the type of recreation that will be taxed.
C. The tax is inefficient and hidden.
D. Too many unanswered questions.

VII. **Too broad to be a “user fee”**
A. Hunting/fishing tax has worked, the taxed product is DIRECTLY connected to recreation.
B. Many of the products in TWW will never be used outdoors.
   1. 69% of backpacks used for books
   2. 27% of sleeping bags for indoors
   3. 80% of outdoor footwear never hits a trail

VIII. **Too broad to be a “user fee”**
A. Wildlife enhances, but is not the center of taxed recreation.
B. Outdoor footwear vs. Urban ascent shoe
C. There is not a tight enough connection to be a “user fee”

IX. **State fish and wildlife is too narrow a conduit for the type of recreation that will be taxed.**
A. The natural resource needs of consumers who buy the products are FAR more diverse.
B. The fishing pole to fish & wildlife model works, but the climbing equipment to fish & wildlife does NOT.
C. Climbers, kayakers, hikers, mountain bikers, skiers, backpackers turn to ALL land agencies.

X. **The tax is inefficient and hidden**
A. 5% at wholesale becomes 7-10% at retail.
B. Retailers finance inventory and must pass on costs.
C. Consumers will not see it on their receipt.
D. Will manufacturers actually mark products?

XI. **Too many unanswered questions**
A. Show me the money.
B. Imports as well as domestically produced products?
C. Define which boot or backpack should be taxed?
D. Ensure that small companies as well as big companies taxed?

XII. What would we support?
A. Real user fees
B. Land and Water Conservation Fund
C. Conservation giving
D. Volunteer solutions
E. Voluntary solutions