

BLM National Recreation Forum
Wednesday, January 28, 2004
Issues - Session A

Group Name: _Communities Related_

	Issue/Concern	Individual Rankings <small>(1=most important; 7=7th most important)</small>	Average Rank
C1	BLM should work closely with other state, local and private recreation providers to evenly distribute recreation demand to avoid over-use of public resources	7	4.86
C2	How can BLM ensure that it can fund its recreation mandates into the future	6	3
C3	Changing demographics of the US/CA population affect possible support for public lands in the future (ex: changing ethnic demographics will affect future support)	1	2
C4	BLM needs to develop new partnership approaches to meet the various ranges (full range) of recreation opportunity needs on BLM lands (ex: one approach is the recreation opportunities are managed by another agency and resources managed by BLM.	4	3.75
C5	Heard today about the service industry and growth. Communities adjacent to these public lands. Industry is a large tax base for communities. Industry makes improvements to public lands. Recreation at this point does not pay for our public lands and our improvements on them (we need to recognize contribution of multiple-use industries) No correlation between recreation values and PILT	6	4.33
C6	Communities are being inundated with pressures created by the desirability of	5	3.2

	public lands. Communities need help in planning, design guidelines, visual simulation, etc., to look at change before it occurs. BLM has not bridged the gap between beauty of public lands and long term character of the communities.		
C7	Perception/reality that it takes too long to work with BLM	2	3.5
C8	Concern that professionals in federal/state/local land mgmt agencies and urban-suburban park recreation professionals do not engage in problem solving diligently (when problems are only different by degree). EX: Many problems are so common to all agencies...main different is spatial. Everyone needs to get together.	2	4
C9	BLM should keep its attention and focus as clearly on the user as it does on the resources	7	4
C10	Working with all partners on a landscape scale vs. jurisdictional boundaries (resource mgmt, recreation, planning, etc)	3	4.33
C11	Gateway communities: communities are often affected by both positive and negative impacts...many times communities not involved in decision making process. (EX: Yosemite decided full on memorial day weekend...Yosemite put notice that there would be no available spots, the communities were severely impacted. Impacted a major weekend. Communities can accommodate/have capacity for visitors)	5	3.8

C12	BLM suffers from mis-alignment with budget and priorities with respect to the changes we were seeing from the values of the public lands we manage. Budget alignment issue... is there a need for a re-alignment in funding priorities.	4	3.5
C13	When BLM develops plans - communities, people and local economies need to be factored in. Local governments need to have cooperating agency status (under NEPA).	9	2.89
C14	Scenic values on BLM lands are off the charts, but too rarely discussed. The word scenic or beauty was presented on power point once this morning. Each one of these is an issue unto itself. Cell towers, billboards, etc. These issues need to be taken very seriously and how it impacts public lands and access roads into public lands. Very little environmental education in this country includes "scenic" education. Scenic values need to be included in EE and Interp.	2	4
C15	Inconsistency that some BLM offices care and some don't about working with communities. Ex: Special events, tourism in general. Hear from those communities that don't feel they are not coordinated with (no response from BLM, etc)	# of Hits: 2	3.5
C16	Current practices and dispensation in the mgmt of contracting and procurement opportunities in federal	1	6

	land mgmt agencies Supports nepotism, discrimination and exclusivity		
--	--	--	--