U. S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act

Strategic Planning

Partners' and Stakeholders' Meetings

Cumulative Summary Minutes

CONTENTS

Prelude 3

Overview of SNPLMA Program and Process to Update the Strategic Plan 3

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis 5

Co-Creating an Inspiring Future for the SNPLMA Program 9

Identifying Themes 14

Vision and Mission Statements 15

- Vision Statement 15
- Mission Statement 16

Next Steps 16

Acronyms 17

Attachments 18

- Attachment 1 – Attendance at Meetings 18
- Attachment 2 – SNPLMA Program Questionnaire Feedback 19

Final Draft

PRELUDE

In August 2013, the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) Executive Committee (EC) provided guidance and direction for updating the SNPLMA Strategic Plan specifically requesting foundational input from SNPLMA partners and stakeholders.

Mary Orton

The Mary Orton Company, LLC was retained by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to assist in designing a robust public involvement process for updating the Strategic Plan. The process involved three Partners' and Stakeholders' (P&S) meetings in Las Vegas, Reno, and Ely, Nevada held on December 2nd, 3rd, and 19th, 2013, respectively, and will include opportunities for stakeholders and partners to review and provide input into various versions of the Strategic Plan as it is developed. As designer and facilitator of the public involvement plan, Mary's goal was to obtain the information needed by BLM and also to ensure the public involvement process met the needs of the stakeholders and partners. To help achieve this goal, a questionnaire was sent to each person in advance of the P&S meetings addressing traditional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) and asked how each person would like to be involved in the process.

Persons attending the three P&S meetings are summarized in Attachment 1.

OVERVIEW OF SNPLMA PROGRAM AND PROCESS TO UPDATE THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Jill Ralston

Jill Ralston, BLM's Special Legislation Management and Program Analyst, provided an overview of the SNPLMA program's 15-year history in terms of generating $3.3 billion from federal land sales, providing funding for 1,194 projects, and adjusting to seven legislative amendments which increased the program's geographic scope and the number of categories.

Since inception of the program, 555 projects have been completed. There are 528 projects currently in progress, 133 projects have been terminated through September 30, 2013, and the Secretary of the Interior approved 21 Round 14 projects on November 12, 2013.

The SNPLMA program has been highly successful in producing tangible results of which a small sample is highlighted in the inset to the right.

SNPLMA Program Accomplishments

- Acquisition of over 67,000 acres of Environmentally Sensitive land
- Construction or improvement of over 300 miles of roads and trails for recreational use
- Remediation of 400 hazardous sites
- Construction or refurbishment of over 90 federal buildings or facilities
- Construction or improvement of over 8,700 acres of parks or natural areas
- Survey and inventory of over 11,500 acres of cultural or paleontological resources
- Treatment or restoration of over 30,000 acres of invasive plant species

As directed by the SNPLMA legislation, sale of federal lands within the disposal boundary in Clark County has paid $153.3 million to the State of Nevada for its education fund, $300 million to the Southern Nevada Water Authority, and deposited $2.6 billion into SNPLMA's Special Account. Through 14 SNPLMA rounds, revenue from the SNPLMA Special Account has funded projects within eight major categories and pre-proposal planning projects.

(The rest of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

Additional facts (listed below) addressing each SNPLMA category were highlighted in the presentation.

- A comparison of the location of environmentally sensitive lands acquired and distribution of allocated funding within the Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisition category;
- SNPLMA land sale disbursements;
- Round 14 revenue distribution by major category;
- Geographic funding distribution within the Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas and Capital Improvement categories;
- Funding distribution by planning area within the Hazardous Fuels and Wildfire Prevention category; and,
- Funding distribution by type of project within the Conservation Initiatives category.

The presentation also outlined desired outcomes from updating the SNPLMA Strategic Plan including:

- Providing a tool to prioritize project funding and defining the vision of success for the SNPLMA program;
- Summarizing the program's accomplishments; and,
- Identifying specific milestones for accomplishment within the five-year timeframe of the plan.

Input received during the Partners' and Stakeholders' meetings will be used to develop themes that will be incorporated into the vision of the SNPLMA program. Following development of the vision, a draft Strategic Plan will be prepared and distributed to all partners and stakeholders for review and comment, which will be considered as the final Strategic Plan is prepared.

During and following the presentation, participants had opportunity to ask questions.

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS ANALYSIS

Prior to each P&S meeting, participants received a questionnaire addressing eight major categories (inset below) asking several questions. Feedback received was summarized and sent to all stakeholders in advance of their respective meeting. It is also provided in Attachment 2.

SNPLMA Program Questionnaire Categories

1. **Outline of the FY2015 – 2019 Strategic Plan**
    a. Should anything additional be included?
    b. Is there anything in the outline that should be changed or deleted?
2. **Process for Updating the Strategic Plan**
    a. Is there anything missing?
    b. What should be changed?
    c. What should be added?
    d. Is there any other feedback?
3. **Public Meeting Design**
    a. How would you improve on this agenda?
4. **Strengths of the SNPLMA Program**
    a. What are the strengths of the SNPLMA program?
    b. What does the program do well?
    c. What resources does the program have plenty of?
5. **Weaknesses of the SNPLMA Program**
    a. What are the weaknesses of the SNPLMA program?
    b. What does the program not do well?
    c. What resources does it lack?
6. **External Factors**
    a. Social
        i. What external social factors may threaten the SNPLMA program?
        ii. What external social factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
    b. Technological
        i. What external technological factors may threaten the SNPLMA program?
        ii. What external technological factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
    c. Economic
        i. What external economic factors may threaten the SNPLMA program?
        ii. What external economic factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
    d. Political
        i. What external political factors may threaten the SNPLMA program?
        ii. What external political factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
7. **Issues**
    a. What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?
    b. What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?
    c. What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
8. **Additional Comments**

During each P&S meeting, participants were provided time to review the questionnaire feedback and an opportunity to identify additional strengths (Table 1), weaknesses (Table 2), and opportunities and threats (Table 3).

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Table 1 - Additional Strengths

LAS VEGAS MEETING
Over the past few years, communication between the SNPLMA Division and SNPLMA partners has improved.
The SNPLMA organizational structure (PWG, EC) for approving projects is working well. There is good representation by the Federal, State and local agencies, and non-governmental organizations.
Process for applying for funding, managing projects, etc. is very clear.
The SNPLMA program pulls in a lot of partnerships. Inclusive of a lot of agencies to get the projects done.
SNPLMA staff has been very responsive.
RENO MEETING
The SNPLMA organizational structure (PWG, EC) for approving projects is working well. There is good representation by the Federal, State and local agencies, and non-governmental organizations.
Process for applying for funding, managing projects, etc. is very clear.
The SNPLMA program pulls in a lot of partnerships. Inclusive of a lot of agencies to get the projects done.
SNPLMA staff has been very responsive.
ELY MEETING
Improved quality of life of Nevada citizens
SNPLMA brings funding into areas that don't have much access to federal grants
Taking an asset in one location and investing in another for conservation measures
Allowed agencies to implement high quality projects
Gives agencies greater opportunity to meet their stewardship responsibilities

Table 2 - Additional Weaknesses

LAS VEGAS MEETING
Projects don't have clear goals.
Evaluating and determining when habitat restoration has been successful can be difficult – it is hard to determine the end point.
Projects should be designed to ensure sustainability over time. Implementers should have "skin in the game" (their own funding to sustain the project.)
The availability of Operations &Maintenance funding should be added to the criteria in all categories.
Using terms that haven't been clearly defined. An example given was "sustainability."
Project criteria should contain a long-term sustainability component. Some were defining "sustainability" as fewer staff, lower energy usage, durability of materials, and long-term planning.
Some projects are gone now because they were not "sustainable." Others have partners to sustain them.
Difficult to meet the intent of the legislation due to its disparate elements. It is difficult to have the same rules for all categories or to compare projects across categories.
Congress is not bound by "sustainability" rules. The example given was Congress requiring $300 million be used for Lake Tahoe which significantly affected other parts of the SNPLMA program.
Political expectations which are difficult to maintain as funding levels decrease. The example given was requiring $10 million be spent for hazardous fuels projects in each round, which, in turn, became an expectation of some SNPLMA partners.
SNPLMA funding has negatively impacted funding received by other federal and/or State programs.

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

Table 2 – Additional Weaknesses (continued)

RENO MEETING
Not much incentive to save money or come in under budget on projects. The participant would like the incentive to be the use of all or a portion of the savings or have priority for using project savings in a subsequent round.
ELY MEETING
Acquired so much land that it broadened the federal land base
Lack of collaboration on projects. The program should give priority to cross-district collaboration. Example given: Site a project here to service the south
Fiscal and project accomplishment accountability is getting better but needs to improve
Less distribution of funding across the state – more focus in impacted areas (Clark County, Lincoln County and southern Nye County)
Not a strong enough focus on health & safety (fuels, water conservation)
The SNPLMA database is getting better but still needs improvement
Quarterly funding transfers are received one or two quarters after they are requested.
Limiting fuels management to the three legislatively identified geographic planning areas – Spring Mountains, Lake Tahoe, and the Carson Range
Not enough funding for archeology

Table 3 - Additional Opportunities and Threats

LAS VEGAS MEETING
Hard to foresee all opportunities; therefore, a reserve account should be established to address unexpected opportunities as they arise.
Ensure funding is being used to meet the original intent of the Act which was understood to be mitigation of the impact(s) of land sales in southern Nevada.
More money should be allocated to Clark County.
Enhance interagency/inter-governmental partnerships through Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas successes.
Give priority to projects with a greater regional benefit.
Explore avenues to assist each other to address project operation and maintenance costs.
Refine the SNPLMA program and make it better.
We have the opportunity to change the system. The SNPLMA program has changed; we can refine the SNPLMA program and make it even better.
Make the SNPLMA program less susceptible to revenue fluctuations, economic threats, and be more resilient, perhaps by establishing a reserve fund.
Establish shared goals and a better understanding of the program resulting in less conflict during program management.
Establish a termination date for the SNPLMA program. The land is a finite resource. Careful consideration should be given to making this a "forever" program or a program with a termination date or "sunset" criteria. The program should have sunset criteria or an end plan.
Expand the disposal area boundary or allow the sale of land in the Lake Tahoe area.
Selling land in Lake Tahoe would make management more difficult.
Most places don't have public land sales in urban areas. Nevada is different in the amount of public lands and the checkerboard ownership.
If the program moves to two-year cycles, establish a reserve that could allow the purchase of sensitive land in off-years, if an opportunity arises.
Will lands set aside be returned? This would require legislation.
Expectations that revenue generated from land sales should stay in Clark County, which is not mandated by SNPLMA.

Final Draft

Table 3 – Additional Opportunities and Threats (Continued)

LAS VEGAS MEETING (CONTINUED)
Some believe SNPLMA funding replaces an agency's core funding or funding for other programs.
Others (Lake Tahoe and 48 Senators) continue to look at the SNPLMA program as a funding source.
The Act doesn't mandate that the money should stay in Clark County.
RENO MEETING
SNPLMA being touted as a model for use in other western States.
With a push to renew the Federal Land Transaction and Facilitation Act, it is unclear how similar proposals for a SNPLMA type process will be written.
ELY MEETING
What was created by Congress can be taken away by Congress
Lack of accountability that casts the program in a bad light and gives ammunition to those who want to attack the program or take funding away
A decision could be made to put a hold on the SNPLMA program until the State of Nevada Assembly Bill 227 (proposed transfer of public Federal lands to the State) is decided.
Inability to use SNPLMA funding for operations and maintenance
Opportunities will continue as long as federal lands are identified for disposal – the disposal area boundary may need to be revisited periodically
Competing needs – Example given: The State could look to SNPLMA for additional funds for educational purposes.
Program could become too broad and diluted – too many areas eligible for funding, too many categories
It just takes legislation to add new categories
It would be nice to be able to use the funding for immediate needs or initiatives such as fuels reduction or bio fuels initiatives.
Provides an opportunity for agencies to address sage grouse issues that could prevent the bird from being listed.
Land restoration would be a good category for inclusion into the SNPLMA program – it could be used to address fuels reduction needs in areas other than the three legislatively identified areas
Population growth in Clark County impacts the resources in rural areas

(The rest of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

CO-CREATING AN INSPIRING FUTURE FOR THE SNPLMA PROGRAM

A scenario exercise was used during each meeting to draw out thoughts and ideas as to what participants believe would describe an inspiring future for the SNPLMA program. Participants were divided into two-person teams and invited to interview their partner using two questions. After conducting interviews, each particiant was given the opportunity to summarize their interview results.

The first question participants were asked to respond to was, "Think about a time connected to the SNPLMA program that you recall as a "high point:" an experience or moment you remember as having left you with an intense sense of pride, excitement, or involvement in having been a part of something that was meaningful." Responses to this question are depicted in Table 4.

Table 4 – Responses to Interview Question 1

LAS VEGAS MEETING
• Being part of the effort to develop and write the SNPLMA legislation; the opening of Craig Ranch – a $140 million undertaking to acquire and develop the City of Las Vegas's first regional park and the interest expressed by many to establish a "Friends of Craig Ranch" organization.
• SNPLMA projects allowing the Moapa Dace, an endangered fish species, to find refuge from rising water temperatures caused by wildfire.
• Being part of the "Neon Boneyard" effort outside of Las Vegas.
• Being part of the dedication of the Laughlin Regional Trail project.
RENO MEETING
• Acquisition of sensitive lands in Washoe Valley to protect the view shed.
• SNPLMA fuel break projects in the Spring Mountains slowing the rapid spread of wild fires which prevented resource destruction and loss of homes.
• Working with the development of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, identifying a science component, working with a consortium of people to manage and allocate the funding for key research needs, and seeing the results from that effort.
• Purchase of a conservation easement in the Carson Valley where the funding received was reinvested in the property.
• Visiting SNPLMA projects on-the-ground in the Spring Mountains area, meeting the people involved with those projects, and experiencing their excitement for the projects.
• Working with people within the hazardous fuels program and experiencing their pride and excitement in their projects.
• Getting a handle on the Federal Highway Administration's Lake Tahoe Restoration Act SNPLMA projects, understanding what has been accomplished, and being a part of the projects into the future.
ELY MEETING
• Successfully working on SNPLMA projects that accomplished their indicated goals.
• Completing a tour of completed SNPLMA projects allowing for an appreciation of the results of the SNPLMA program.
• Experiencing the satisfaction of working with people who went on to have successful careers within the federal agencies as well as working with people who were efficient in completing projects often below budget.
• Serving as the catalyst for moving the Lincoln County Archeology Initiative forward, promoting its educational outreach for increasing the understanding and importance of archeology, evaluating the effectiveness of different archeological tools, and working with different federal and non-federal partners.
• Being part of the planning and implementation of the North Schell area which serves as a model for other National Forests.
• Being part of the McGill Ball Park SNPLMA project which addressed restoration and healthy/safety issues.
• Working with the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection to obtain funding for health/safety issues while preserving SNPLMA funding for the restoration efforts.

Final Draft

Participants were then asked to respond to the following question, "Imagine that we have all been asleep for a long time, and we wake up in 2033. As you look around you, see show different things are o- everything having to do with the SNPLMA program is just as you always wished it could be. What do you see? What is happening? What are people doing? What are people saying?" At each meeting, the responses to the second interview question were identified by each participant and recorded on flip charts. Once all responses were recorded, the responses were reviewed to ensure they were clearly understood by the participants. Following the review, each participant was provided a specific number of green and red dots to demonstrate support or a lack of support for the different "Inspiring Future" thoughts and ideas. Particpants were told they did not need to use their red dots. Red dots demonstrated a lack of support and green dots demonstrated support for the thought or idea. The responses and results of the placement of dots is provided in Table 5.

Table 5
Appreciative Inquiry Interview Results

Item	Dots Received Red	Dots Received Green	Comments
LAS VEGAS MEETING			
There is a comprehensive system of local and regional parks connected by trails to schools, residential and downtown areas, and other public areas.	0	7	
SNPLMA projects are sustainable (maintained) through stewardship (community involvement).	1	7	"Stewardship" was clarified to mean having communities more involved as stewards of the land. "Sustainable" was clarified to mean SNPLMA projects maintained.
At least 70% of SNPLMA project funding is designated for projects within southern Nevada.	1	7	"Southern Nevada" was later clarified to be Clark County. 70 percent was an arbitrary figure which could be changed to "the majority."
Lessons learned were used to improve the program and people say "the federal government did it right."	0	6	
SNPLMA funded facilities are still operating and maintained to a high standard.	0	6	
SNPLMA funding has resulted in vibrant well-balanced communities with areas that are well managed and sustainable.	0	5	"Well balanced" was clarified to mean full implementation of the SNPLMA categories in a community so that there is a benefit to everyone.
Natural areas are preserved, properly managed, and open to the public.	0	5	
A significantly greater percentage (than the currently legislated cap of 10%) is dedicated for habitat and species-related projects within the Conservation Initiatives category.	1	5	The intent was the legislated 10% cap on the Conservation Initiatives category would be lifted.
All land critical for T/E species is protected.	0	4	This was clarified to mean primarily critical habitat.
Projects are properly maintained and accessible to all.	0	4	One participant indicated that some projects may or should not be accessible to the public. Example used was natural areas which protect sensitive species.
SNPLMA funding was spent wisely and didn't repeat mistakes made early in the program.	0	3	
People are enjoying SNPLMA projects.	0	3	
Southern Nevada has the best parks, trails, and outdoor opportunities in the Nation.	0	3	
SNPLMA projects (parks, fuel reduction, etc.) provide direct mitigation within the region affected by land disposal.	0	3	
Inholdings within protective areas have been purchased.	0	3	

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Draft

Table 5 - Appreciative Inquiry Interview Results (continued)			
Item	**Dots Received**		**Comments**
	Red	**Green**	
LAS VEGAS MEETING (CONTINUED)			
There is an endowment account to continue efforts after all land within the disposal boundary has been sold.	3	5	Dot Analysis Discussion: One participant felt that the SNPLMA projects being built need to have a sustainable source of funding and the endowment approach was the only way to accomplish that. Other thought it important as there are many areas to be managed, which will require resources. An endowment is a good avenue for the future. The endowment approach would be a good avenue for the community to give back to itself. One person indicated they put a red dot on this idea as the needs of current viable projects outweigh the need of future projects at this time. There is a concern that if we don't use the current SNPLMA funding for projects that someone will take that money away from us. Would there be a future risk of an endowment being re-allocated to another area? There was some confusion as to how an endowment would be used. Some believed it could be used for project maintenance while others were thinking purchase of environmentally sensitive lands or new projects.
SNPLMA projects are inter-connected by pathways (trails, complete streets, etc.)	0	2	
Important cultural resources are identified and protected.	1	3	
There is a legacy account.	1	3	Explained to mean the establishment of a legacy account for funding future opportunities regardless if they are "on cycle" or "off cycle" (if SNPLMA funding is allocated through a biannual process).
There are comprehensive, connected recreation opportunities in Clark County.	0	1	
SNPLMA program has met its goals and did a good job.	0	1	
There is a park within one mile of every resident in the City of North Las Vegas.	1	1	This idea was later expanded to a more regional perspective where recreational needs of Clark County are met.
The checkerboard land pattern within Clark County has been removed or eliminated.	1	1	"Checker board land pattern" was clarified to mean the scattered isolated tracts of federal land within the disposal boundary.
There are regional business plans for the operation of recreation facilities.	1	2	Creation of a regional business plan which allows the sharing of ideas and avenues for addressing operational and maintenance costs of major recreational facilities such as Craig Ranch. Also explained to mean at least sharing of information among managers.
Federal legislation dictates the fair use of SNPLMA funding.	3	2	"Fair use" was clarified to mean that revenues generated from all land sale within the State should be placed into a single account which is accessible by all entities.
Strip area businesses are working with Clark County to make the area more "walkable" and "park like."	3	2	

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Table 5 - Appreciative Inquiry Interview Results (continued)			
Item	**Dots Received**		**Comments**
	Red	**Green**	
LAS VEGAS MEETING (CONTINUED)			
The fuels program is caught up with sufficient funding from other sources (i.e., an endowment) for maintenance.	5	0	The intent is that SNPLMA funding would be used to address or "catch up" the fuels program with current demands for fuel treatments but future maintenance of fuel projects would be funded through other sources. Dot Analysis Discussion: One participant believes maintenance of fuel projects is a "bottomless pit" and that projects don't always protect communities under extreme fire conditions. Others thought that SNPLMA revenues should not be used for fuel treatment projects within communities; alternative funding mechanisms should be identified for fuel reduction projects within communities, which is a risk that should be borne by people building in fire prone areas. The cost of having to maintain fuel reduction projects 10 or 20 years after the original project was also of concern.
SNPLMA terminated 15 years ago.	8	1	"Terminated" was changed to "completed."
RENO MEETING			
Identify innovative ways for operation and maintenance to ensure they are sustainable into the future.	0	6	Dot Analysis Discussion: This project was viewed as a more specific example of Item #3 above.
Improving people's participation in the outdoors.	0	5	
All investments made by the program are maintained and ongoing.	0	4	
Local government and local Counties see the benefits and remain engaged in the SNPLMA program and inter-governmental connections are still strong.	0	4	
Shift in the funding for a more even split of funding for natural resource management.	0	4	In clarifying, a question was asked as to what categories were considered "natural resource management?" In response, the intent was to see a shift in funding from "building stuff" to fuel reduction, wildlife conservation projects, etc. Continue to develop natural resource management projects; rather than infrastructure projects.
Enhances SNPLMA relationships between Federal, Local, State governments and non-governmental organizations which are working together on projects.	0	4	
The SNPLMA program is successful in protecting sensitive lands which will be enjoyed by the public and future generations.	0	2	
Communities have new recreational opportunities which are connected by trails and are connected to the public lands.	0	2	
Kids are getting environmental education through trails and enjoying nature.	0	2	
There is an abundance of SNPLMA funding, the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act gets re-authorized with sufficient funding, and TMDL is achieved.	0	2	
Public has a great sense of pride in the work completed and are experiencing a benefit from the funds expended.	0	1	
SNPLMA program has been expanded and serves as a model for other parts of Nevada and other States'.	0	1	In clarifying this idea, a question was raised if the expansion was addressing the disposal boundary. The intent wasn't to expand the disposal but the SNPLMA concept was expanded and being used in other parts of Nevada as well as other States.

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

Table 5 - Appreciative Inquiry Interview Results (continued)			
Item	**Dots Received**		**Comments**
	Red	**Green**	
RENO MEETING (CONTINUED)			
People are saying that SNPLMA is great and has accomplished many good things.	0	1	
Improving access and connection to public lands.	0	1	
News articles indicated that SNPLMA helped achieve all of Tahoe environmental standards.	0	1	
Lots of lands which people treasure have been protected.	0	0	
Resources invested by other agencies in SNPLMA projects are ongoing.	0	0	
All funds for projects have been completed as envisioned.	0	0	
Project and program management is "dialed in".	0	0	"Dialed in" was clarified to mean functioning.
Everyone is healthy and happy.	0	0	
Additional sources of funding are available.	0	0	Are the additional sources of funding internal (the disposal boundary had been expanded and more federal lands have been sold)? Response: The additional funds could come for any source.
Funding from lands sales go back into the economy of areas where it was sold.	2	0	Dot Exercise Analysis: Why would someone support or oppose funding going back into the economy where the land was sold? In support, working as an NGO it would be desirable to have the funding go back into the land. Someone would not like to see this idea to become a "hard and fast" rule. The example given described a situation where there might be a priority in Tahoe but the land is being sold in Vegas. It is important to develop a balance between disposal and acquisition. Where that balance will be varies between among individuals.
ELY MEETING			
Administrative processes are streamlined	5	0	
Everyone is completing projects and is accountable	4	0	
Rural communities have a higher quality of life because of the SNPLMA program due to the importance of their natural resources.	4	0	
A statewide habitat restoration program is meeting the needs of sage grouse and other species.	4	0	
New dynamic public facilities	3	0	"Dynamic" was clarified to mean interactive, beyond its normal purpose, multi-functional. The example given was a pool that is use for more than just a pool, perhaps a water feature as well.
The black mark on the program caused by retained dollars has been solved.	3	0	"Retained funding" was clarified to mean the delay in the completion of awarded projects.
Sustainable biomass utilization accomplishes land restoration	3	0	
Fire Safe communities with well planned, highly used recreational facilities (parks, trails, botanical gardens)	2	0	
SNPLMA money is invested; the principal revenue remains and restoration work is completed using the earned interest	2	1	
Better public acknowledgment and appreciation for the huge scope of work that has been accomplished	1	0	
People are proud because of the high quality of projects	1	0	

Table 5 - Appreciative Inquiry Interview Results (continued)			
Item	**Dots Received**		**Comments**
	Red	**Green**	
ELY MEETING (CONTINUED)			
Ongoing restoration projects – "to infinity and beyond"	1	0	
Biomass valued highly enough for sustainability and feasibility	1	0	
SNPLMA is a model for other States of efficient use of government revenue	1	0	
Research for biomass is funded by SNPLMA	1	1	
Land restoration and biomass is being utilized effectively and economically	0	0	
Projects are highly sought after	0	0	This was clarified to mean that awarded SNPLMA projects are of such high quality that it is viewed as having received a "gold star."
Regardless of funding source, outcomes and benefits of SNPLMA are celebrated	0	0	

IDENTIFYING THEMES

Working in small teams, participants at the Reno and Ely meetings were asked to review their identified ideas for an "Inspiring Future" and agree within their group on four or five themes. There was insufficient time at the Las Vegas meeting to complete this exercise.

The potential themes identified at the Reno and Ely meetings are highlighted below.

RENO MEETING

Table 1

- Natural Resource Management
- Coordination, Collaboration, and Partnerships
- Benefits Realized: Longevity and Long- Term
- Public Funding equals Public Benefit

Table 2

- Operations and Maintenance Funding for Long-Term Project Sustainability
- Shift more funding toward natural resource management
- Inter-governmental/Agency and NGO Cooperation and Coordination
- Access and Participation of the Public in the Outdoors

(The remainder of this page was left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

ELY MEETING

Group 1

- Restoration/Conservation/Utilization
- Administration & Accountability
- Improvement of Quality of Life
- Recognition of Success
  - Pride in program, celebration of accomplishments

Group 2

- Management Efficiency
  - Administration
  - Celebration of accomplishments
- Restoration
- Facilities
  - Parks, Trails, Others

VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

Participants at the Reno and Ely meetings were asked to develop ideas for vision and mission statements. Definitions were proposed by the facilitator and agreed to by the participants (inset to right). There was insufficient time at the Las Vegas meeting to complete this exercise.

Vision Statement Definition

An inspiring statement of what you want to become and achieve.

Mission Statement Definition

Statement of your fundamental purpose why you exist and who you exist for. It is the essence of your existence – the last purpose to be abandoned.

VISION STATEMENT

Vision statements are future oriented, difficult yet realistic and specific enough to serve as a "call to action" and drive behavior. The current SNPLMA Strategic Plan does not contain a vision statement.

The following vision statements were developed.

RENO MEETING

"Leave a legacy of self-sustaining blend of natural resource management and recreation opportunities created through partnerships for the benefit and enjoyment of the public today and for future generations."

ELY MEETING

"Improve economic opportunities and quality of life in southern Nevada while supporting those opportunities and qualities statewide."

"Realignment of state-public assets to sustain quality of life and prolong enjoyment of those assets for years to come by Nevadans."

Other ideas for a vision statement included:

- Selection within the categories that has high return to the land and the people;
- Restore Nevada;
- Beneficial to Nevadans;
- Responsible (administration and management);
- Efficient funding source for projects that improves the quality of life and the environment for residents in Nevada (and beyond); and,

Final Draft

- Success land and community health initiatives.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission statement in the current SNPLMA Strategic Plan reads:

> "Under the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA), program partners facilitate the orderly disposal of Federal land in the Las Vegas Valley and manage the financial resources generated to acquire environmentally sensitive land and implement Federal, State, and local projects that protect resources and enhance the quality of life for current and future generations."

When asked if the current mission statement could be improved, one participant at the Ely meeting suggested it needed to be updated to reflect 15 years of history. While Ely participates felt the mission statement addressed the basics, some thought it was too long. The group suggested the following edits:

> "~~Under the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA),~~ With our program partners, we facilitate the orderly disposal of Federal land in the Las Vegas Valley and manage the financial resources generated to ~~acquire environmentally sensitive land and implement Federal, State, and local projects that~~ protect resources and enhance the quality of life ~~for current and future generations~~."

At the Reno meeting, it was felt the current mission statement was very good and reflected the mandates of the SNPLMA legislation. One participant felt the language in the SNPLMA legislation was somewhat restricting as it is specific to the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land while there are other ways to protect environmentally sensitive land besides acquisition. Another participant felt the mission statement did not address disposal of federal land, which is an important part of SNPLMA.

Key components of the mission statement identified at the Reno meeting included:

- Partners
- Orderly Disposal
- Manage finances
- Acquire environmental sensitive lands
- Implementation of federal and state projects
- Protect resources
- Enhance the quality of life

NEXT STEPS

In closing each meeting, Jill Ralston expressed her appreciation for everyone attending and participating in the meeting. She indicated that each participant would receive the draft meeting minutes for review and comment. Once the minutes from each individual meeting are finalized, they would be compiled into one document and, again, distributed to everyone who participated in the Stakeholders' and Partners' meetings.

The first draft of the updated Strategic Plan is anticipated to be released for review and comment in the late spring or early summer, 2014.

(The remainder of this page is left blank intentionally)

Final Draft

ACRONYMS

The following acronyms were used during the meeting and listed in alphabetical order.

Acronym	Meaning
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
EC	SNPLMA Executive Committee
P&S	Partners' & Stakeholders'
PWG	SNPLMA Partner's Working Group
SNPLMA	Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

Final Draft

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1 – ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Name	Affiliation	Meeting Attended		
		Las Vegas	Reno	Ely
Becci Rogers	Bureau of Reclamation	X		
Bill Dunkelberger	U. S. Forest Service		X	
Bill Martin	Bureau of Reclamation	X		
Bill Wolf	Pinyon Juniper Partnership			X
Carol Bass	BLM			X
Carol Carlock	U. S. Forest Service			X
Chuck Pope	Nevada Land Trust		X	
Dagny Stapleton	Nevada Association of Counties		X	
Dan Rolince	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service	X		
Dominique Etchegoyhen	Legacy Land and Water, LLC		X	
Elizabeth Harrison	Nevada Division of State Lands		X	
Emily Simpson	BLM			X
Genevieve Masters	U. S. Forest Service		X	
Gina Venglass	City of Las Vegas	X		
Jane Feldman	Sierra Club	X		
Jim Garza	White Pine County			X
Jin Zhen	Federal Highway Administration		X	
Jodi Bechtel	Clark County	X		
Johanna Murphy	City of North Las Vegas	X		
John Hunt	Friends of Nevada's Wilderness	X		
Kevin DesRoberts	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service	X		
Lori Headrick	U. S. Forest Service	X		
Paul Andricopulos	City of Henderson	X		
Ron Gregory	Clark County	X		
Rosemary Thomas	BLM			X
Scott Jarvis	City of Henderson	X		
Tricia York	California/Tahoe Conservancy		X	

Final Draft

November 2013

1. Outline of the FY 15-19 Strategic Plan. Should anything additional be included? Is there anything in the outline that should be changed or deleted?

Respondent #2:

(Map) The process/processes to create and change 'the disposal boundary' is/are not well understood, probably because the boundary in the Las Vegas region has been directed within the federal legislative process so many times. I would think that the strat plan needs to display the current boundary, and also describe how it was arrived at, and how it can be changed.

(Appendix - The Act) The Act enables action (at least some actions) – it does not REQUIRE action. The Act allows SNPLMA funds to be spent on projects in Tahoe and elsewhere outside Clark County; it does not require such projects to be funded. This should be pointed out, emphasized, highlighted, encouraged, explained, etc.

(Mission) The mission should be described in language that emphasizes mitigation in Clark County for the loss of public lands, habitat and species in Clark County.

Respondent #4:

This looks like a good place to start.

Respondent #5:

OK.

(This respondent made edits to Item 2 of the outline; edits appear below in **bold underline**.)

1. Introduction and Background
    a. History **and current status** of the program
    b. Selected accomplishments **? Do you mean the metrics to measure program performance?**

Respondent #6:

- This is a good structure for the Strategic Plan. It follows from the current Plan's layout, which makes for a logical transition.
- You may want to include a list of the adopted performance measures in the Appendices to help show how the objectives are determined as being met.

Respondent #7:

This looks very logical for a strategic plan update.

Respondent #8:

The Introduction and Background should contain a summary and breakdown of the Accounting, i.e., Total Disposal Proceeds Generated, Total Project Allocations by Category, Total Project Allocations Completed, Total Project Allocations Outstanding (i.e. how much has been allocated but not yet spent), and Total Administrative Costs.

The Appendices should contain a copy of the original Act, each Act of Congress that amended the original Act, and the final text of the Act as amended.

Final Draft

Respondent #9:

Keep format as closely as possible to the last plan to reduce confusion.

2. **Process for Updating the Strategic Plan. Please tell us what is missing, what should be changed, what should be added, or any other feedback.**

Respondent #2:

0

Respondent #4:

This looks OK

Respondent #5:

(This respondent made edits to the Strategic Plan process; edits appear below in **bold underline**.)

Draft Roles

Partners and Stakeholders:

(Partners are those entities who receive SNPLMA funds. Stakeholders are those who have an interest in the outcome of the SNPLMA program.)

- Provide foundational input **an iterative process** to the Strategic Plan.

The process needs to be much more iterative. Currently, as described the process seems very linear.

For example

October-November-December 2013

- BLM drafts, with input from partners and stakeholders:
  - Outline of the updated Strategic Plan
  - The Strategic Plan development process
  - Design of stakeholders' meetings
- BLM asks for input from partners and stakeholders **to develop a SWOT Analysis:**
  - The strengths and weaknesses of the SNPLMA program
  - The opportunities and threats facing the SNPLMA program
- **BLM sends the SWOT Analysis to partners and stakeholders for comment.**
- **SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the SWOT Analysis**
- **Provide the SWOT Analysis to the PWG for review and feedback**
- **SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the SWOT Analysis**
- **Provide the SWOT Analysis to the EC for review and feedback.**
- **SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the SWOT Analysis**
- **SNPLMA staff disseminates the final the SWOT Analysis stakeholders, partners, PWG and EC.**

The January-May 2014 time frame needs to be broken into multiple parts.

- Part 1. SNPLMA staff develops first draft Strategic Plan: vision, mission, goals, and quantifiable objectives with timeframes
- **Part 2. SNPLMA staff disseminates the first draft to stakeholders and partners for feedback.**
- **Part 3. SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the first draft Strategic Plan**
- **Part 4. Provide a first draft to the PWG for review and feedback**

Final Draft

- **Part 5. SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the first draft Strategic Plan**
- **Part 6. Provide a first draft to the EC for review and feedback.**
- **Part 7. SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the first draft Strategic Plan**
- **Part 8. SNPLMA staff disseminates the final draft to stakeholders and partners for feedback.**
- **Part 9. SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the first draft Strategic Plan**
- **Part 10. Provide a first draft to the PWG for review and feedback**
- **Part 11. SNPLMA staff to incorporate feedback into the first draft Strategic Plan**
- **Part 12. Provide a first draft to the EC for review and feedback.**

Then move to June-July 2014

Respondent #6:

- This appears to be a very reasonable and inclusive process and timeframe for the update.
- Please provide a more specific timeframe for the distribution of the first draft to stakeholders and partners for feedback.
- Besides the public input meetings in the three regions, include teleconference options for those who can't attend the meetings in person.

Respondent #7:

This seems reasonable.

Respondent #8:

None.

Respondent #9:

No comments. Looks good.

Final Draft

3. Public Meeting Design. How would you improve on this agenda?

Respondent #2:

0

Respondent #4:

I think you will [receive] your best information out of these meetings.

Respondent #6:

Besides the public input meetings in the three regions, include teleconference options for those who can't attend the meetings in person.

Respondent #7:

Without some better context, I don't how one would respond to the first item. It might be very helpful to set the context for the discussion recognizing that you have invited stakeholders from various different entities and not all federal agencies.

I am used to the vision and mission discussion being typically the first step not the last step because it helps to generate the thoughts for future outcomes and visualization.

Respondent #8:

None.

Respondent #9:

No comments.

Final Draft

Strengths of the SNPLMA Program

What are the strengths of the SNPLMA program? What does the program do well? What resources does the program have plenty of?

Respondent #3:

It has not addressed all recreation and sport equally.

Respondent #4:

The recent changes to the processes have helped a lot. I also support the new changes that are in the process. It is amazing that so many amazing projects have been completed.

Respondent #5:

- Conservation and restoration of the outdoor environment is increased substantially with funding from SNPLMA.
- SMPLMA funding is leverage through interagency cooperation over management boundaries
- SNPLMA funding provides the opportunity to acquire matching funds from other sources.
- SNPLMA funding creates local jobs.

Respondent #6:

- The program has improved greatly in the area of inter-agency coordination.
- The program has had great success in using funds to benefit the public through the projects that have been implemented.

Respondent #7:

The SNPLMA 101 training was very helpful and the new web enabled reporting is a huge plus. SNPLMA has been a very effective way for the Federal Government to meet the federal commitment to the LTRA and the Lake Tahoe EIP. It has also been a source of funding for a broad spectrum of projects that utilized existing agencies and structures to disperse the funds in an efficient way. It has provided the ability for projects to demonstrate success.

Respondent #8:

The biggest strength of the SNPLMA program is its original purpose, as drafted by Senator Richard H. Bryan, which was to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal lands in Clark County, Nevada, and to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands (defined as land or an interest in land, i.e. conservation easement) in the State of Nevada.

Respondent #9:

Committees rating and recommendations for projects funding followed by Executive Committee reassessment of the ratings works really well. Removes bias from the system.

On-line reporting has been successfully implemented and is improvement from the past system.

Final Draft

4. Weaknesses of the SNPLMA Program

What are the weaknesses of the SNPLMA program? What does the program not do well? What resources does it lack?

Respondent #2:

The program tries to fund too many things in too many areas. Selling public land in Clark County cannot be expected to pick up the federal (or County) funding shortfall throughout the state. The dollars from the sale of public land in Clark County was argued to be returned to Nevada because the habitat and ecosystem impacts were felt in the place where the land was sold. It was argued that selling federal land in southern Nevada should NOT be used to mitigate habitat impacts, for example, in the Florida Everglades' the funding should be used in Nevada because that's where the impacts were felt. Similarly, the impacts are felt in the Mojave Desert, not in the Great Basin Desert and not in the Sierra Nevada montane ecosystems. This is the biggest weakness in the program, and it can be managed locally. The federal legislation mandates a certain percentage to be paid to the schools and to the water district; but project funding can be allocated to Mojave Desert projects that have conservation, and not recreation, values.

Respondent #3:

What's missing is a broad view to accommodate a comprehensive recreation plan that serves all.

Respondent #4:

One of the weaknesses of the program is the necessity of a consensus vote. This makes terminating a project very difficult. You might consider a majority vote after some time has passed and the issue can't be resolved.

I don't think the program has enough Program Managers. They all work very hard but I think the number of projects that each of them oversee is overwhelming and doesn't allow for the highest quality of work.

(Editor's Note: According to the Implementation Agreement, neither the Partners' Working Group nor Executive Committee use consensus for decision making.)

Respondent #5:

- Cannot move funding from one project to another
- Subject to Las Vegas Economy
- Designed for large dollar projects and the overhead to support those large dollar projects. With smaller projects it is difficult to meet all the requirements of the IA
- There are no O&M SNPLMA Funds
- Sustainability of the projects are not identified in the nomination packages.
- When the IA changes it often retroactive
- Disseminations of information is sometimes slow and or indirect

Respondent #6:

- One of the greatest weaknesses of the program is that it is subject to political pressures, especially concerning funding. During the "big money" rounds (5 and 6), there was pressure to obligate the money as quickly as possible to avoid having the funding appropriated by other agencies or interests. As a result, many older projects suffered from "scope creep" as they were developed and many of the older projects have yet to be completed.

Respondent #7:

Not all programs under SNPLMA seem to be consistent or set priorities in the most efficient manner.

Final Draft

Should have had mandatory training for the web-based reporting system.

It seems odd and difficult to have project proponents evaluating submittals, including their own, in the White Pines program.

(Editor's Note: The White Pines program refers the Hazardous Fuels Category.)

Respondent #8:

A primary weakness of the SNPLMA program is that it has become too bureaucratic and time consuming, resulting in a waste of resources on processing, management, and planning, thereby accomplishing less than intended by the Act. Another weakness is that the ranking criteria overemphasize (1) the fee purchase of environmentally sensitive lands, and (2) public access.

The SNPLMA ranking criteria overemphasize fee acquisition of environmentally sensitive properties. Many of Nevada's resource rich lands are privately owned and managed. This is not a bad thing. In fact, it is very positive because most of these resource rich lands require active management. Private landowners are often better suited than federal agencies to provide such active management. In many instances, we could protect the resources for a fraction of the cost by acquiring conservation easements on these environmentally sensitive working landscapes instead of acquiring these properties in fee. Acquiring conservation easements helps to maintain a balance between the number of acres sold and the number of acres acquired. Plus, the continuing management burden remains with the private landowner, thereby reducing the federal government's future management costs. Conservation easement properties also contribute to the local economy by remaining agriculturally productive and on the property tax roll. Therefore, the SNPLMA ranking criteria should support the acquisition of conservation easements in lieu of fee acquisitions.

The SNPLMA ranking criteria also overemphasize public access as a factor in acquiring interests in environmentally sensitive properties (conservation easements). Our state is largely publicly owned. Public access is not the issue we face. Protecting our threatened natural resources from development is the issue we face. By focusing on public access instead of the public benefit of protecting these resources, we lose both. Therefore, the importance of public access should be minimized, and the SNPLMA ranking criteria should support the acquisition of conservation easements because of the public benefit that accrues from protecting our natural resources.

Respondent #9:

SNPLMA staff should be in facilitating/supporting role and not an advocating role. There have been instances in the past when SNPLMA staff opinions have overridden the standard process.

Program tracking and database design is cumbersome and could be streamlined. Lack of feedback from system after reporting is completed.

Sideboards of legislation limit creativity.

Final Draft

5. External Factors

What external SOCIAL factors may <u>threaten</u> the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external SOCIAL factors may offer the SNPLMA program <u>opportunities</u> during the next ten years?
Respondent #1: Attempts to direct more funds into the BLM general fund may occur.	Respondent #1: Southern Nevada has been hit hard by the economic recession. As we begin the move upward economically requests from entities for new land disposal boundaries will allow for an upswing in funding for the program.
Respondent #2: Impacts of climate change, increasing drought, dryness, fire and storms, affecting both high-elevation and low-elevation species and habitats. Impacts of large-scale solar and wind installations to species and habitats.	Respondent #2:
Respondent #3: Growth. Las Vegas metropolitan area population has grown more than ten times over a decade.	Respondent #3: Stakeholder interest
Respondent #5: Federal Budget issues result in the diversion of the funding. ie. Take the funding for something else Community and or media believe funds are and or were used incorrectly creating negative publicity and the fall out issues that could result for that. Community and or media believe funds should be used differently creating negative publicity and the fall out issues that could result for that.	Respondent #5: Community and Media create national attention about the benefits of SNPLMA and bring more people to Las Vegas resulting in more demand for lands and increased land values. Social media is leveraged to get community partners/volunteers to help sustain projects.

Final Draft

What external SOCIAL factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external SOCIAL factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #6:	Respondent #6: Increased community support for the programs and projects funded through SNPLMA may provide political support to keep the program going strong.
Respondent #7: Recent western wildfires and natural disasters could influence priorities due to emotion rather than need.	Respondent #7: Push for sustainable communities and Federal All Lands integration.
Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.	Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.
Respondent #9: Amount of unfinished projects and lack of accountability gives public a poor perception of the program. Lots of great city park-type projects completed but inability of cities or towns to maintain those projects gives the public the perception of poor planning and lack of assessment of future requirements.	Respondent #9:

Final Draft

What external TECHNOLOGICAL factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external TECHNOLOGICAL factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #3: Growth.	Respondent #3: Stakeholder interest
Respondent #5: Web based database is hacked.	Respondent #5:
Respondent #6:	Respondent #6: Improvements to the SNPLMA reporting system would provide opportunities for streamlined project updates and program accountability.
Respondent #7:	Respondent #7: Consistent performance metrics for the SNPLMA program as a whole to measure and evaluate projects
Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.	Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.

Final Draft

What external ECONOMIC factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external ECONOMIC factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #1: Additional growth in Southern Nevada will further impact the quality of life in our communities. Most of our families cannot afford to walk and camp in areas that are outside these communities. More and more people will need to have opportunities for enriching their lives through nature provided for them in SN.	Respondent #1: Now is the time to bring the program's attention back where it belongs. The fact is that Southern Nevada alone bears the brunt of Southern Nevada growth. Saving places all across the state has to be done using some other program. Our communities deserve all the good and wonderful impacts of this program. Just as they feel and bear all the bad impacts from growth.
Respondent #2:	Respondent #2: Continued slow pace of land sales and development in southern Nevada, which gives a chance to put mitigation in place for past impacts
Respondent #3: Growth.	Respondent #3: Stakeholder interest
Respondent #5: Federal Budget issues result in the diversion of the funding. ie. Take the funding for something else Economy deteriorates or doesn't improve resulting in no land sales	Respondent #5: Economy improves resulting in large dollar value land sales
Respondent #6: Lack of land sales may continue, or land prices may decline again, leading to diminished program funding.	Respondent #6: Land sales and prices may increase, providing additional funding for the program.

Final Draft

What external ECONOMIC factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external ECONOMIC factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #7: Continued or another recession and all of the economic issues that come with that complicated by the expectation by grantees that the funds will be there whenever.	Respondent #7: Global economic recover, the need to develop funding to support long term monitoring programs to demonstrate success and to use to continually learn and evolve from
Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.	Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.
Respondent #9: Reduced funding of federal agencies and increased reliance on SNPLMA project funds.	Respondent #9: Improved economic stability in Clark county

Final Draft

What external POLITICAL factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external POLITICAL factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #1: Politics runs this program and can just as easily close it down.	Respondent #1: More and more people living in SN support conservation and know that their quality of life is increased greatly by interaction with nature. Providing access for that interaction needs to be a top priority.
Respondent #3: Growth.	Respondent #3: Stakeholder interest
Respondent #4: With the government's budget being in such a deficit, I think there will be more and more pressure to use the funds somewhere else.	Respondent #4:
Respondent #5: Federal Budget issues result in the diversion of the funding. ie. Take the funding for something else	Respondent #5:
Respondent #6: Other Federal entities may seek to appropriate SNPLMA funding for other programs. The Act may be amended to give funds to yet more entities, further diluting the programs ability to fund projects.	Respondent #6: The SNPLMA disposal boundary may be expanded, allowing for greater opportunities for land sales.

Final Draft

What external POLITICAL factors may threaten the SNPLMA program during the next ten years?	What external POLITICAL factors may offer the SNPLMA program opportunities during the next ten years?
Respondent #7: Pushback or perception that dollars should be spent where they are generated	Respondent #7: National Priorities – both new, emerging and historic
Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.	Respondent #8: This is a bureaucratic waste of time.
Respondent #9: The biggest threat to the program is lack of accountability for project completion leaving a large amount of funds on the books which will tempt Congress to extract the funds to pay for other needs.	Respondent #9:

Final Draft

6. Issues

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #2, Issue #1: The program tries to fund too many things in too many areas. Selling public land in Clark County cannot be expected to pick up the federal (or County) funding shortfall throughout the state. The dollars from the sale of public land in Clark County was argued to be returned to Nevada because the habitat and ecosystem impacts were felt in the place where the land was sold. It was argued that selling federal land in southern Nevada should NOT be used to mitigate habitat impacts, for example, in the Florida Everglades' the funding should be used in Nevada because that's where the impacts were felt. Similarly, the impacts are felt in the Mojave Desert, not in the Great Basin Desert and not in the Sierra Nevada montane ecosystems. This is the biggest weakness in the program, and it can be managed locally. The federal legislation mandates a certain percentage to be paid to the schools and to the water district; but project funding can be allocated to Mojave Desert projects that have conservation, and not recreation, values.	Issue #1 Constraints: Arguing that the federal legislation is mandatory rather than enabling	Issue #1 Opportunities: Boost funding of conservation projects in the Mojave Desert, when projects outside of the Mojave are no longer funded.

Final Draft

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #2, Issue #2: Slow-rolling the funding to stretch the money and the projects out over years, decades	Issue #2 Constraints: Perception of staff	Issue #2 Opportunities: The SNPLMA money should NOT be sitting around in a bank account gathering dust (or interest). It should be put to work NOW to mitigate for impacts that have already been felt on species and habitats in southern Nevada.
Respondent #3, Issue #3: Growth. Las Vegas metropolitan area population has grown more than ten times over a decade. Housing starts are now again on the rise. Managing growth and providing recreation for an increasing population and conserving natural values.	Issue #3 Constraints: Accommodating population growth & resource demands (mining, renewable power, etc.) while maintaining free public access to public lands and conserving natural values.	Issue #3 Opportunities: Education & foster empathy & mutual respect.
Respondent #3, Issue #4: (Same as Issue #3)	Issue #4 Constraints: Preserve motorized recreation and sport opportunities surrounding metro Las Vegas by setting aside designated open areas connected by a designated trail network.	Issue #4 Opportunities: Partnerships with Nevada's recently formed Commission on Off Hwy Vehicles, Conservation Partners, Nevada Trail Stewards, etc., to serve the citizens of Nevada by recreational opportunities and attracting tourism creating jobs and income for Nevada.

Final Draft

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #3, Issue #5: (Same as Issue #3)	Issue #5 Constraints: For point-to-point off highway adventure trips, designate suitable existing minor highways and trails as Designated OHV routes.	Issue #5 Opportunities: Provide recreation opportunities for Nevadans and attracting tourism creating jobs and income for Nevada.
Respondent #4, Issue #6: Changing the mind set of partners that once the money is awarded to them that they have it as long as they want it and can use it for things not identified in the nomination.	Issue #6 Constraints:	Issue #6 Opportunities:
Respondent #4, Issue #7: Many times projects are delayed because SNPLMA money is considered no year money. An example is when projects are put though contracting at year end. Many times SNPLMA projects are bumped since the money will still be there next year.	Issue #7 Constraints: Federal law doesn't really allow for anything else.	Issue #7 Opportunities:
Respondent #5, Issue #8: Decreased funding	Issue #8 Constraints: Lack of land sales.	Issue #8 Opportunities:

Final Draft

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #5, Issue #9: Sustainability	Issue #9 Constraints: Sustainability is not built into project nominations.	Issue #9 Opportunities: Interagency collaboration and partnerships
Respondent #5, Issue #10: Continued effective operation of SNPLMA and projects by partners during downsizing	Issue #10 Constraints: Increased workload with less resources	Issue #10 Opportunities: Interagency collaboration and partnerships
Respondent #5, Issue #11: Federal Budget issues result in the diversion of the funding.	Issue #11 Constraints: Keeping Congress informed about the positive impacts of the SNPLMA program provides for the State of Nevada.	Issue #11 Opportunities: Open communication of all partners with their congressional members. Having influential individuals continually communicating the benefits SNPLMA has on the community.
Respondent #6, Issue #12: Continued funding of the program.	Issue #12 Constraints: Program funding is based on BLM land sales, which has been in decline in recent years. Land sales are picking up again, but it is difficult to forecast with accuracy if that will continue.	Issue #12 Opportunities: Continue to limit the number of projects submitted for funding by each entity. Continue to limit the amount of funding per round.

Final Draft

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #6, Issue #13: Not being able to fund robust projects.	Issue #13 Constraints: Limited funding is the greatest obstacle to preventing substantial projects from being funded.	Issue #13 Opportunities: Limit rounds of funding to every other year to allow larger projects to be funded. As land sales increase, continue to limit the number of projects funded in the short term to allow for the funding reserve to increase and be able to fund more substantial projects in the long term.
Respondent #7, Issue #14: Competition for the funding – need greater than available funds	Issue #14 Constraints: Limited land sales/economic reactions; agreement of priorities between all agencies	Issue #14 Opportunities: Expansion of the land sale program to other agencies and expand the scope of the land sale program to include other opportunities.
Respondent #7, Issue #15: Information from older projects not in a centralized place to find and learn from	Issue #15 Constraints: Locating where all of this information is on different federal websites – possessive mindset rather than sharing	Issue #15 Opportunities: New web-reporting system could be populated with old information.

Final Draft

What do you think are the main issues facing the SNPLMA program, over the next ten years and in the longer term?	What do you see as the greatest difficulties or obstacles to resolving each issue?	What opportunities are you aware of that may help resolve each issue?
Respondent #7, Issue #16: Dependence on funding	Issue #16 Constraints: Changing the current mindset	Issue #16 Opportunities: Decline in sales brought about a sense of potential reality – don't just go back to before it income from sales increases dramatically.
Respondent #8, Issue #17: Completing Projects in a timely manner.	Issue #17 Constraints: Bureaucratic stranglehold.	Issue #17 Opportunities: Plan less, do more.
Respondent #9, Issue #18: Letting unfinished projects drag on for decades	Issue #18 Constraints: Entities depend upon funding and will be hurt if project cancelled.	Issue #18 Opportunities: Recall funding and redistribute to projects submitted to entities that have demonstrated success.
Respondent #9, Issue #19: Another economic downturn could lead to only enough funds to administer the program.	Issue #19 Constraints: Little control over larger economic forces	Issue #19 Opportunities: Keeping administrative cost down but still staffing at a level to administer the projects
Respondent #9, Issue #20: Adding more funding categories.	Issue #20 Constraints: A declining base	Issue #20 Opportunities: Flexibility to prioritize funding categories as part of strategic process.

Final Draft

7. Additional Comments

Respondent #3:

The same attitude at SNDO as Ely DO in building OHV trailheads and designated trail networks.

Respondent #7:

We would recommend that SNPLMA be identified as the funding for the new LTRA that has been re-introduced by Senator Feinstein once it passes, given Lake Tahoe's priority as a national treasure of outstanding significance and its value to Nevada. It seemed to be an appropriate source for the current LTRA. It might be nice to have consistency between how the different program use priority lists, especially for funds that aren't fully utilized by their initial priority.

Respondent #8:

The SNPLMA is one of Nevada's great Acts. Unfortunately, SNPLMA has lost its way. The goal

should be to get SNPLMA back on track, with less administration, and more successful acquisition

of environmentally sensitive lands and interests in land.

Final Draft