

BLM GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT REPORT



A STUDY BY THE MESA STATE COLLEGE
NATURAL RESOURCES AND LAND POLICY INSTITUTE
OCTOBER 2009

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
1. Introduction	8
2. Participating Communities.....	9
2.1. Grand Junction	9
2.2. Fruita	10
2.3. Mesa County	10
2.4. Palisade	10
2.5. Glade Park	11
2.6. De Beque	11
2.7. Collbran	11
2.8. Gateway	11
2.9. Loma and Mack	11
3. Participating Groups	12
4. Focus Group Script	13
5. Values	14
5.1. Values: Aggregate Results	14
5.2. Values: Community Results.....	15
5.21 De Beque	16
5.22 Fruita	17
5.23 Grand Junction.....	18
5.24 Glade Park	18
5.25 Loma and Mack.....	19
5.26 Mesa County.....	20
5.27 Palisade	20
5.28 Gateway	21
6. Concerns.....	22
6.1. Concerns: Aggregate Results.....	22
6.2 Concerns: Community Results	23
6.21 De Beque	25
6.22 Fruita	25
6.23. Grand Junction.....	27
6.24. Glade Park	29
6.25. Loma and Mack.....	29

6.26. Mesa County	30
6.27. Palisade	31
6.28 Gateway	33
7. Outcomes	33
7.1. Outcomes: Aggregate Results	33
7.2 Outcomes: Community Results.....	34
7.21. De Beque	35
7.22. Fruita	36
7.23. Grand Junction	37
7.24. Glade Park	38
7.25. Loma and Mack.....	39
7.26. Mesa County	40
7.27. Palisade	40
7.28. Gateway	41
7.3: BLM Actions:	42
8. Collaboration.....	42
8.1. Collaboration: Aggregate Results.....	42
8.2. Collaboration: Community Results	44
8.21. De Beque	45
8.22. Fruita	45
8.23. Grand Junction	46
8.24. Glade Park	47
8.25. Loma and Mack.....	47
8.26. Mesa County	48
8.27. Palisade	48
8.28. Gateway	50
9. Findings	50
Appendix	53
Appendix 1. Values: Rural and Grand Valley Communities	53
Appendix 2. Concerns: Rural and Grand Valley Communities	54
Appendix 3. Outcomes: Rural and Grand Valley Communities	55
Appendix 4. Collaboration: Rural and Grand Valley Communities	56
Appendix 5. Values: Group Type	57
Appendix 6. Concerns: Group Type.....	58

Appendix 7. Outcomes: Group Type	60
Appendix 8. Collaboration: Group Type.....	61
Appendix 9: Focus Group Script.....	62
Appendix 10: Action Items by Community	66
Appendix 11: Focus Group Notes by Community.....	80

Purpose

Between February 23, 2009 and April 22, 2009, eleven focus groups were conducted with community leaders and residents living in the Grand Junction BLM Field Office's (GJFO) management area. The communities include: Grand Junction, Fruita, Mesa County, Glade Park, Palisade, De Beque, Gateway, and Loma-Mack. The purpose of the focus groups was to ascertain what participants value about the community they live in and the accompanying public lands (values); their concerns in achieving their community and public lands vision (concerns); the beneficial outcomes their vision would produce (outcomes); and the appropriate role of collaborating partners in planning and managing public lands (collaboration). This data will be used in the revision of the GJFO Resource Management Plan.

Methodology

Focus groups lasted an average of 1.5 hours and were held in a convenient location in their respective communities. Focus groups were populated in one of three ways: 1.) community leaders only, 2.) community residents only, and 3.) a mixture of community leaders and community residents. A majority of the focus groups were mixed groups while larger communities (Grand Junction, Fruita, and Palisade) were divided between leaders and residents. Advertising was done using social networks, phone calls, letters, e-mail notices, posters hung in strategic locations (post offices) and word of mouth. A total of 76 participants attended the focus groups.

The general format for each focus group section was two-fold: 1.) present an open-ended question to participants for discussion, 2.) using i>clickers, measure participants' intensity about the issues raised in the open-ended discussion. This format allowed researchers to identify key issues and then anonymously measure the intensity of individual participants. A benefit of this methodology is that it minimizes the impact of vocal participants while providing a method of participation to timid participants. Often in a focus group an issue might get mentioned but it is difficult to tell how important that issue is to anyone beyond the person that mentioned it. The i>clicker technology allows the BLM to better understand the salience of that issue for all participants in the group.

Community Summaries

Mesa County: Overall the county is a sparsely populated huge land mass roughly the size of the states of Delaware and Rhode Island combined. Within this area the vast majority of the county's 143,000 residents are located in the Grand Valley. Since the oil shale bust of the 1980s the county has focused on diversifying its economy. While the energy industry remains an important part of the county's economy, economic development efforts have significantly increased the area's role as a regional hub for retail trade, restaurants and entertainment as well as medical services. The county has also successfully marketed itself as a retirement community. Access to public lands has played a key role in the county's economic development and is expected to continue to do so in the future.

Mesa County seeks to continue economic growth and stability through diversifying its economy. At the same time they hope to limit the negative impacts of growth by containing sprawl and maintaining the community's awareness of its heritage and culture. The pursuit of high paying jobs should not come at the expense of agriculture's traditional role in the county's economy and culture. Education will play an important role in providing the highly skilled work force needed to attract the diverse industries necessary to maintain a stable economy.

The BLM can play a key role in assisting Mesa County in achieving its vision for the future. To assist in attracting new industries the BLM can provide diverse outdoor recreational opportunities in limited areas that are well developed with trailheads, ample signage, maps and easy access. This will help provide a social setting for community members to meet, recreate and maintain the healthy lifestyle important to today's professionals. At the same time the provision of these front country opportunities should not preclude maintenance of other more

primitive areas where wildlife can be protected and solitude can be experienced by both residents and tourists alike. While the BLM should continue to support the role the extraction industry plays in the county, the expansion of recreational opportunities is seen as a benefit for attracting new economic activity to the area. Development of educational and interpretive programs can help the county protect awareness of its agricultural heritage and culture based on the landscape provided by the surrounding federal lands.

Grand Junction: As the largest city between Denver and Salt Lake City, Grand Junction is the center for regional activity in Mesa County. Ample shops, restaurants and medical services contributes greatly to the city's economic role as a regional hub. Along with the county, the city has gone to great lengths to diversify its economy while maintaining a robust extraction industry. To do this the city seeks to attract a talented pool of professionals eager to expand the area's economic base.

Outdoor recreation is important to the professionals the city seeks to attract. Access to public lands and a variety of recreational opportunities that can be provided on BLM lands will play a significant role in the Grand Junction Economic Partnership's efforts to expand the community's economic base.

Concentrating recreational opportunities to limited areas will allow the BLM to maintain open space and protect wildlife and promote agricultural activity. As the population grows the BLM's assistance in educating new citizens on safety, and the importance of ranching and other aspects of the community will be needed.

Fruita: Like much of Mesa County, Fruita's population has increased greatly over the last twenty years. The community prides itself on its small town atmosphere and its role as "Gateway to our Federal Lands". Like other Grand Valley residents, Fruita sees the BLM and other federal lands as a good buffer against sprawl. While the community would like to promote its economy, the focus is much more on developing its potential tourism industry. Consequently, the community is somewhat suspicious of growth and supports good planning to maintain its small town atmosphere while promoting economic vitality.

The BLM can contribute to this vision by ensuring continued access to outdoor recreational activity, protecting open space, improving trails and assisting with keeping its lands clear of trash and burnt cars. The energy industry should not be discouraged but efforts to reduce the risks posed by extraction activities should be a priority. Efforts to develop "green energy" should also be pursued.

The benefit of access to the public lands is at the heart of the Fruita community. Public lands are the economic engine that drives the community. The BLM should increase access for hikers, bikers and ATV use. The BLM should act to prevent the dominance of land use by any single user group. Because land preservation limits access by many to BLM lands it should be used sparingly. Continued access to recreational activities on BLM lands will help the city achieve its economic goals and maintain a healthy lifestyle for city residents.

Palisade: The town is small and very community oriented. It is surrounded by high end agriculture consisting of orchards and many wineries that cultivate their own grapes. The area is also well known for its stunning scenery and viewscapes. The town's vision includes further development of its downtown core to promote entertainment and economic activity. Each year the town sponsors a number of festivals and events that highlight its heritage and agricultural background.

The town would like to maintain its connection to the land through the continued prosperity of its high end agricultural activities and tourism activities. The BLM can assist this vision by providing more access points to public lands, creating more bike trails in the area, preserving the area's hunting and fishing activity which is so

important to family values and economic opportunities in the community. To this end the town favors recreational opportunities and resource protection over resource extraction. This emphasis will provide viable year round economic benefits while avoiding the risk to views and the area's water and air quality that may be caused by the energy industry. Additionally, a tourism based economy will reduce pressures on housing and minimize the boom and bust economic cycle so prevalent in the energy industry.

Debeque: Located in the far eastern part of Mesa County, Debeque is a town with a little over five hundred people. Traditional agriculture such as ranching and the natural gas industry provide much of the economic base for community residents. The town expects rapid growth due to the boom in the natural gas industry. Many think the development of natural gas reserves can be done with minimal environmental consequences but some fear the community could become a waste pit for the industry.

Community members were quick to point out that they live in Debeque because the surrounding public lands provide opportunities to observe wildlife, hunt, fish and enjoy "God's Country". They would like to see the BLM continue to promote the family values and agricultural heritage of the area by providing greater access to public lands, continued provision of grazing opportunities on public lands and better signage on trails to protect sensitive areas. The town would not mind having more recreational visitors in the area as this promotes more economic activity in local stores. But more people will probably create a need for another road through town to access BLM lands.

Glade Park: A part of unincorporated Mesa County, Glade Park is a small community located behind the Colorado National Monument. Consequently, the area is fairly well isolated from the Grand Valley, a fact that appeals to its residents. The community has strong historical family ties to the area. Ranching and traditional agriculture has always been a major part of the economy and the heritage in the community. Area residents wish to preserve this lifestyle for the future. The BLM can assist this effort by continuing to provide access to its public lands for residents who need it for ranching operations or outfitting. Increased recreational opportunities should be backed by increased resources (such as assistance to the fire department) to offset the stresses they can place on the community's services.

Sustainable agriculture and continued irrigation are primary concerns of area residents. They seek a BLM management plan that will protect their privacy, access to public lands for economic opportunities, and assist in educating the general public to the importance of continued ranching in the area.

Loma/Mack: Like Glade Park, the residents of Loma and Mack have a strong connection to ranching and farming. Located west of Fruita, the traditional agricultural community is in transition as more and more residents commute to Grand Junction to work. The rural lifestyle, the quiet, the lack of local government and its ability to tax were reasons cited for living in the Loma/Mack area. Area residents are proud of the fact that they aren't Fruita. They do not wish to be overrun by too many recreational opportunities. They want their community to stay the way it is – based in agriculture and affordable. The BLM can assist their vision by limiting bike trails, providing more ATV access and enforcing existing rules for trail use and dumping. As with other rural communities, the BLM lands serve as a buffer to prevent sprawl and should continue to be managed that way. The BLM should continue to allow resource extraction and promote ranching through grazing permits and other aspects of traditional lifestyles such as hunting.

Gateway: Located in the southern part of Mesa County, Gateway is a small unincorporated community with a strong heritage connected to traditional agriculture and resource extraction, particularly uranium. Recently the

community has been changed by the development of Gateway Canyons Resort. Residents are concerned that the resort's new emphasis on recreation will interfere with future resource extraction activity as well as grazing and other economic activity that have provided a living for generations of family members. The area is almost entirely surrounded by BLM land so any management decisions will have an impact on resident's livelihood and lifestyles.

The BLM can assist community members achieve their vision of the future by ensuring efforts to develop recreational opportunities do not interfere with community members who count on access to public lands for their economic security. The BLM should protect access to public lands for grazing, mining, hunting and fishing. Too much emphasis on resource protection is seen by community members as another way of promoting recreational activities on public land. The BLM should limit designation of wilderness areas as this limits human access to public lands.

Findings

1. The Value of Public Land: Regardless of the community, public lands are a vital component of what citizens enjoy about living in their community. The most frequently discussed values: wildlife, access, small-town atmosphere, quiet/isolation, open space and recreation, are all related to public lands. The same is true for concerns: health of public lands, social spaces, water, trash, oil and gas development, jobs and economic growth and user conflict on public lands. While some connections to public lands may not be as readily apparent as others, they are nonetheless visible. For example, the small town atmosphere of many communities is protected by surrounding public lands as it prevents significant population increases. It is clear that public lands both attracts and maintains residents and increases the quality of life in the Grand Junction Field Office.

2. A Tailored Approach to Managing Public Lands: In most cases the character of a community is shaped by its surrounding public lands. From Fruita's recreation destinations in the Grand Valley Management Area to Glade Park's ranching community, in the Glade Park Management Area public lands shape the communities they surround. Because citizens are attracted to the character of their communities, they have a strong desire to maintain it. The result is a lack of consensus among the communities, which complicates the management of public lands. The different interests and intensity preferences among the communities suggests that a tailored management approach for each community is preferable to a one-size-fits-all management approach. For example, there is more support for oil and gas development in the northern part of the Roan Creek Management Area than if that development took place in the Grand Valley Management Area. Agriculture is an emphasis in both the Glade Park and Grand Mesa Slopes Management Areas, but the type of agriculture differs, with communities favoring ranching in the Glade Park Management Area, and higher end fruit growing in the Grand Mesa Slopes area. Without a carefully tailored approach, the communities may feel as though the BLM is threatening their quality of life and the character of their community. Please reference the individual community write-ups for a more detailed discussion.

3. Conflicting Viewpoints: Even within communities there are conflicts over what they desire. For example, the experiences ATV users and quiet users seek are contradictory. Yet, because the participants believe that public lands should provide opportunities for multiple users, they expressed a desire for multiple-use management. Specifically, participants expressed a desire for a tailored multiple-use approach that reflects community values, addresses the concerns of community members, and helps the community achieve its outcomes. This might mean a greater emphasis on mountain biking in the Grand Valley and Grand Mesa Slopes Management Areas, while more OHV use in the remote areas of Bangs Canyon, Glade Park and Gateway Management Areas.

4. Economic Opportunities: Given the diversity of communities and public lands in the BLM GJFO, there are a diverse range of economic opportunities directly tied to public lands. These include agri-tourism, (in the Grand Valley and Grand Mesa Slopes Management Areas) ranching, (in the Glade Park Management Area) extractive resources development, (in the northern portion of the Roan Creek Management Area) tourism, (in the Gateway Management Area) attracting business, (in the Grand Valley Management Area) recreation services (in the Bangs Canyon Management Area), and hunting (in the Bookcliffs and Glade Park Management Areas) (just to name a few). Not all of these economic opportunities appear in each community. In fact, the uniqueness of the local economic opportunities on public land contributes to the unique characteristics of the distinctive communities. There can be conflict among these opportunities and the BLM should tailor the management of their lands to prevent and/or manage conflict.

5. Regional Hub: Grand Junction is a regional hub and there is recognition that the management of public lands can impact the city and surrounding communities. This impact can be felt in numerous ways, from acting as a natural barrier to growth, to encouraging high-density development, attracting young talent to the region, and attracting businesses. In turn, because Grand Junction is the regional hub, what happens in Grand Junction has an impact on surrounding communities. As a result, the BLM should factor this into their decision making process.

6. Educational Outreach: There was a desire by participants to see a conscientious effort by the BLM to engage in educational outreach. Educating citizens about public lands, the challenges of managing these lands, and stewardship were important to many communities. Beginning this process with children (in tandem with public schools) will help correct many of the problems witnessed on public lands such as trash and ad-hoc trail building. In turn, this will lessen the burden on the BLM, which is perceived to be stretched as a result of inadequate funding. This would help ameliorate public relations problems that may persist in the GJFO while giving communities a more focused understanding of how the BLM can appropriately help them achieve their vision.

7. Collaboration: Beyond outreach, there is a clear desire for collaboration between the BLM and various partners. The two groups that received the most support as collaborators are community residents and local governments. There was greater support for collaboration in the planning process than there was in the management of public lands. Also, a number of additional partners were identified as ones the BLM should consider when planning and managing public lands.

8. Identifying Areas of Action: Because of budgetary concerns, as well as a defined jurisdiction, the BLM cannot address every action desired by focus group participants. As such, the BLM should be judicious when identifying areas of action. Its emphasis should be on collaborating with other jurisdictions and partners to ensure that its management actions can have the greatest impact in helping communities achieve their vision.

1. Introduction

Between February 23, 2009 and April 22, 2009, eleven focus groups were conducted in communities residing in the Grand Junction BLM Field Office's (GJFO) management area. The purpose of the focus groups was to ascertain what participants value about the communities they live in and the accompanying public lands; their concerns in achieving their community and public lands vision; the beneficial outcomes their visions would produce; the

perceived impacts BLM decisions will have on their visions; and the appropriate role of collaborating partners in planning and managing public lands. This data will be used in the revision of the GJFO Resource Management Plan.

2. Participating Communities

Considering public lands span a diverse number of communities, numerous focus groups were scheduled in the GJFO's management area. The focus groups included the primary rural and urban communities that reside in the management area as well as Mesa County, of which 45% of lands are managed by the GJFO BLM. For a detailed list, see Figure 1.

Figure 1: Focus Group Locations and Dates

Community	Location	Date
Grand Junction (Leaders)	Grand Junction Municipal Building	2-23-2009
Grand Junction (Community)	Grand Junction Municipal Building	2-23-2009
Fruita (Community)	Fruita Civic Center	2-24-2009
Mesa County	Mesa County Annex Building	2-27-2009
Glade Park	Glade Park Community Center	3-3-2009
Palisade (Leaders)	Palisade Community Center	3-2-2009
De Beque	De Beque Town Hall	3-4-2009
Gateway	Gateway Community Center	3-10-2009
Palisade	Palisade Community Center	3-16-2009
Loma-Mack	Loma Elementary School	3-19-2009
Fruita (Leaders)	Fruita Civic Center	4-22-2009

2.1. Grand Junction

On February 23, 2009, two focus groups were conducted with Grand Junction leaders and residents. Grand Junction is a city of 49,688 residents on the western slope of Colorado and has experienced dramatic population and economic growth over the last 30 years. The population has increased from 29,034 in 1990, which is a 71 percent growth rate.¹ Grand Junction serves as the Mesa County seat and is the health care, educational, economic and political hub of Mesa County and Western Colorado. The city has seen a dramatic diversification in its economy since the boom and bust energy economy of the

¹ US Census Bureau, 2009.2008. Population Finder, Internet Website:

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFPopulation?_event=Search&_name=Grand+Junction&_state=04000US08&_county=Grand+Junction&_cityTown=Grand+Junction&_zip=&_sse=on&_lang=en&pctxt=fph. Accessed April, 2009.

1980s. Today, retail, health care, business, and government jobs make up a significant proportion of employment. Grand Junction is located in the Grand Valley Management Area.

2.2. Fruita

On Tuesday, February 24, 2009, a focus group was held with five community members in Fruita, Colorado, followed by a focus group with three leaders on April 22, 2009. Fruita is a community of 7,027 and is located between Grand Junction and the Utah state border. The community has been defined by rapid population growth since 1980, where its 2,810 community residents witnessed a 163 percent population increase by 2008.² The city is governed by a Council-Manager form of government with a six-member city council, mayor, and professional city manager responsible for carrying out the duties of the Home Rule city.³ Fruita is located in the Grand Valley Management Area.

2.3. Mesa County

On February 27, 2009, a focus group was conducted with six residents and leaders of Mesa County, Colorado. Mesa County is an important political unit in the management of public lands considering a vast majority of the 1.2 million acres managed by the Grand Junction BLM field office resides in Mesa County. The County has experienced dramatic growth since 1990, over which time, the population increased 53 percent from 93,145 residents in 1990 to 143,171 residents in 2008.⁴ The County is governed by a three-member Board of County Commissioners and was incorporated in 1883. Historically, Mesa County's economy had been focused around agriculture and energy extraction industries. Today, the County's booming economy is more diverse, but is still focused around a few key economic sectors, including: retail trade, health care and social assistance, accommodation and food service, and government.

2.4. Palisade

As a result of scheduling complications, focus groups were held on March 2nd and 16th, 2009 with community leaders in Palisade. The March 2nd leader's focus group involved four participants while the March 16th leader's focus group involved six participants. No community residents attended either of the two focus group meetings. Palisade is a small community of 2,793 residents located on the eastern edge of Grand Junction. The area is heavily involved in high-end agriculture (grapes, wine, peach orchards) and tourism. Palisade is located in the Grand Valley Management Area, but comments were

² US Census Bureau, 2008. Population Finder, Internet Website:

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFPopulation?_event=Search&_name=Fruita&_state=04000US08&_county=Fruita&_cityTown=Fruita&_zip=&_sse=on&_lang=en&_pctxt=fph. Accessed April, 2009. Colorado State Demography Office, 2009. http://www.dola.state.co.us/demog_webapps/population_census.jsessionid=3561622AE69B1D8530FABFBD1DCF2448. Accessed July, 2009.

³ City of Fruita, 2009. Internet Website: <http://www.fruita.org/cityhome.htm>. Accessed April, 2009.

⁴ US Census Bureau, 2008. Population Finder, Internet Website:

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFPopulation?_event=ChangeGeoContext&_geo_id=05000US08077&_geoContext=&_street=&_county=Mesa&_cityTown=Mesa&_state=04000US08&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&_ActiveGeoDiv=&_useEV=&_pctxt=fph&_pgsl=010&_submenuId=population_0&_ds_name=null&_ci_nbr=null&_qr_name=null&_reg=null%3Anull&_keyword=&_industry. Accessed April, 2009.

often directed toward other management units such as Grand Mesa Slopes Management Area and Roan Creek Management Area.

2.5. Glade Park

On March 3, 2009, a focus group was conducted with 10 residents of the Glade Park area to assess their concerns and hopes for public lands in their area. Glade Park is an unincorporated area of Mesa County, Colorado located on a plateau on the opposite side of the Colorado National Monument from Grand Junction. The area is home to a small community of dispersed residents, acting as a bedroom community to Grand Junction, and as a much longer established farming and ranching community surrounded by public lands on all sides, including the Colorado National Monument to the east and north, USFS lands to the south, and BLM land to the north, south, and west. Glade Park is located in the Glade Park Management Area.

2.6. De Beque

On March 4, 2009 a focus group was held at the town hall in De Beque, Colorado consisting of 12 community leaders and residents in order to determine their community's vision for the future and concerns about public lands as part of the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management's revision process of the Resource Management Plan. De Beque is a town of 522 in the eastern part of Mesa County, Colorado approximately 20 miles from Grand Junction and the easternmost population base in the GJFO. The economy of De Beque is largely driven by ranching and the development of natural gas on the surrounding public lands. The population of De Beque rises and falls with the price and production of natural gas in the surrounding area. De Beque is located in the Roan Creek Management Area.

2.7. Collbran

On March 9, 2009, a focus group was held for Collbran residents and leaders in the Collbran Town Hall. The focus group was cancelled after poor turnout. The mayor of Collbran did arrive in time for a brief interview regarding preferences for public lands. Collbran is located in the Plateau Valley Management Area.

2.8. Gateway

On March 10, 2009, a focus group was conducted with ten residents and leaders of the Gateway community south of Grand Junction in the GJFO resource planning area. Gateway is a community in transition. Traditionally, the economy of Gateway had been driven by uranium and other mineral extraction, ranching, and recreational support services. Several years ago, a new resort, Gateway Canyons, was built on private land, and the economic base of the community began shifting from traditional uses of public lands to tourism opportunities and extensive marketing by the resort of the surrounding public lands as a destination tourism site. Gateway lies in the southeastern area of Mesa County, approximately 50 miles from Grand Junction. The community is almost entirely surrounded on all sides by BLM managed public lands. Gateway is located in the Gateway Management Area.

2.9. Loma and Mack

On March 29, 2009, a focus group was held at Loma Elementary School with ten community leaders and citizens from the communities of Loma and Mack. Loma and Mack are rural communities located 15-20 miles west of Grand Junction. Traditionally, the economy of these communities has been driven by agriculture (both farming and ranching). In more recent times, many from the communities commute into Grand Junction to work, making it a community in transition with all of the associated challenges. Recently, a proposal for coal extraction in the area has also offered both economic promise and social clash for these communities. Participants were recruited by personal invitation based on their status in the community (i.e. public officials, members of the business community) and those who had previously shown an interest in public lands by attending a series of public meetings on the Red Cliff coal mine application. Loma and Mack are located in the Grand Valley Management Area.

3. Participating Groups

Two different groups were invited to participate in the focus groups. The first group was community leaders. Some examples of community leaders include elected officials, business leaders and non-profit organization leaders (just to name a few). The second targeted group was community residents.

Because of the differing population sizes, densities, and visions for their communities, recruitment was tailored to each community. In smaller communities, residents were contacted through e-mail and postal letters. Flyers were also posted on community centers and at the local post office. In larger communities, social networks were utilized to “spread the word” to interested citizens while phone calls and e-mails were made to community organizers with the intent of stirring interest.

Depending on the size of the community, focus groups were populated in one of three ways: 1.) community leaders only (leaders), 2.) community residents only (residents), 3.) community leaders and community residents (mixed). Larger communities were split into leader and resident focus groups while smaller communities were mixed. As illustrated in Figure 1, there were three leaders focus groups, conducted along with three community focus groups, and six mixed focus groups.⁵ As a general rule, leader focus groups were held in the afternoon while community and mixed focus groups were held in the evening. Regardless of the community, every focus group was held in the respective town and in a convenient location.

As illustrated in Figure 2, a total of 76 individuals participated in the focus groups. There were no individuals who participated in more than one focus group. Turnout varied by community and group. Of the 76 participants, 11 (14.5%) were solely residents and 17 (22.4%) were solely leaders. The remaining 48 participants (63.2%) are categorized as mixed. It is interesting to note that the largest turnout was in the GJFO’s less populous regions (De Beque, Gateway, Loma-Mack and Glade Park). In larger communities, there was a sense expressed by a few participants that too many focus groups were being conducted by the BLM and other government bodies, leading to focus group fatigue.

Figure 2: Communities and Participants

Community	Number of Participants	Percent
De Beque	12	15.8
Fruita	8	10.5
Grand Junction	10	13.2

⁵ This number includes a mixed focus group that was conducted in Collbran that was cancelled because of no turnout.

Glade Park	10	13.2
Loma and Mack	10	13.2
Mesa County	6	7.9
Palisade	10	13.2
Gateway	10	13.2
Total	76	100.0

4. Focus Group Script

The purpose of the focus groups was to explore the following issues: 1.) values, 2.) concerns, 3.) outcomes, and 4.) collaborating partners. For the purposes of this study:

- Values refers to:
 - What people like about living in their community.
 - The role public lands have on quality of life.
- Concerns refers to:
 - Participants' 20 year vision for their community.
 - Participants' vision for public lands.
 - The most important economic, social and environmental concerns that must be addressed to meet the 20 year vision.
- Outcomes refers to:
 - The changes in the community that result from BLM adoption of various resource management alternatives.
 - The beneficial outcomes of their vision.
 - How to best produce beneficial outcomes.
- Collaborating partners refers to:
 - The appropriate level of participation potential collaborating partners will have in planning and managing public lands.

The focus group script was constructed by melding traditional focus group methods with newly emerging technologies. As illustrated in Appendix 5, participants were asked 12 questions. The questions take one of two forms. The first are traditional open-ended questions intended to set the boundaries for discussion while allowing room for flexibility. These questions were presented to the group and left open for comments and discussion.

A second type of question was used to measure the intensity of key values, concerns, outcomes, and the appropriate role of collaborating partners. Using a technology known as i>clickers, participants were allowed to indicate their preference using a remote-like device. This technology was used to measure how intensely each participant felt about a value, outcome, concern, or collaborating partner that was mentioned during the group discussion. All of the values, concerns, and outcomes reported in this study were generated by the groups themselves as a result of an open-ended question. There was no attempt during the focus groups to standardize the language across issue areas. Using a widely accepted Likert Scale, participants were asked to select one of the following: A= Unimportant, B= Of Little Importance, C= Neither Important nor Unimportant, D= Somewhat Important, E= Very Important, when discussing values, concerns and outcomes. When discussing collaborating partners, the options were: A= "Never," B= "Rare," C= "Occasional," D= "Frequent," E= "Significant". The results were displayed after the participants made their selection for further comment.

The benefit of this approach is three-fold. First, it allows the researchers to anonymously measure community agreement or disagreement on various issues. What is important to one person may not be important to others. Second, given the vast array of issues raised in the focus groups, the results are easily comparable and amenable to ranking by intensity. This methodology adds an additional layer of analysis by allowing public land managers to determine which issues are important (and less important) to participants. Thirdly, it helps to avoid the dominance of any particular personality by capturing data from all participants in the room, not just those who speak first. This is an attempt to address a serious problem in the conduct and data collection from focus group methodologies.

Every focus group had a moderator, a human recorder (taking notes), and a digital recorder. The results of the polling with i>clickers is automatically saved in the computer's hard drive. Utilizing a tablet PC and projector (in lieu of butcher paper), all written comments were instantly recorded and displayed by the tablet PC. All written comments and recordings are digitally archived.

5. Values

Values refers to why people like living in their community, and the role public land has on the quality of life. The aggregate analysis (all participants' responses) is discussed first and is followed by the community results (data divided by community).

5.1. Values: Aggregate Results

The aggregate results of values are listed in Figure 3. The first column lists those issues that were raised by participants in open-ended questions and then assigned an importance value by each participant using the i>clickers. The second column (participants N) lists the number of participants that assigned an importance value to each issue, while the third column (community N) lists this same measure by the number of communities. The range column illustrates the distribution of responses on the aforementioned 5 point Likert Scale by measuring the gap between the lowest and highest measures assigned by the participants. A range of five indicates the widest gap with one or more participants selecting the lowest possible value (1= unimportant) and one or more participants selecting the highest value (5= very important). Likewise, a range of zero indicates unanimity among the participants for a specific value. The integer listed in column seven (recorded as the mean) is the average numerical value measuring importance on the 1 to 5 Likert Scale.

Values were first identified in an open-ended question asking: "what are the things you like about living in your community?" Participants were then asked to assign an importance measure using their i>clickers. Looking at the results in Figure 3, there are a total of 23 issues raised in focus groups, with a handful of issues spanning multiple communities. The most commonly discussed issues include wildlife, access to public lands, a small-town feel, quiet/isolation, open spaces, recreation, sense of community, viewscape and agriculture. The average response for these issues ranges from a high of 5 (recreation) to a low of 4.31 (viewscape). The range of responses also varies from a low of zero to a high of 5. This indicates that outside of recreation, unanimity was not shared on the importance of the values. However, the high mean value does suggest a relatively high importance assigned to all of these issues.

Figure 3. Values: Aggregate Focus Group Results

Issues	Participants N	Community N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Wildlife	35	4	3	2	5	4.69
Access	33	5	4	1	5	4.61
Small Town	31	4	4	1	5	4.35
Quiet/Isolation	23	3	3	2	5	4.43
Open Space	17	2	3	2	5	4.65
Recreation	13	3	0	5	5	5
Sense of Community	13	2	2	3	5	4.38
Viewscope	13	2	4	1	5	4.31
Agriculture	12	2	2	3	5	4.75
Recreation Access	10	2	1	4	5	4.9
Ranching	10	1	3	2	5	4.6
Family History	10	1	2	3	5	4.3
Big But Not Too Big	9	2	1	4	5	4.67
Lower Taxes	8	1	2	3	5	4.38
Not Grand Junction	8	1	2	3	5	4.25
Festivals	7	2	1	4	5	4.29
Variety of Ecosystems	5	1	1	4	5	4.8
Non-Motorized Access	5	1	1	4	5	4.6
Regional Provider	4	1	0	5	5	5
Tourism	4	1	1	4	5	4.5
Shopping	4	1	1	4	5	4.5
Culture Guided by Landscape	4	1	2	3	5	4.25
History/Heritage	3	1	1	3	4	3.67

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

5.2. Values: Community Results

As noted above, wildlife, access to public lands, a small-town atmosphere, quiet/isolation, open space, and recreation were commonly discussed among the participants. Data in Figure 4 illustrates the importance of these issues to each community. The integer in the table represents the average ranking of importance where: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important. Blank cells indicate that the community did not raise the issue. This table represents which communities addressed which issues as well as the importance they placed on those issues.

Figure 4. Values: Results by Community

Issues	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Recreational Access	5.00	4.67							4.90
Small Town	4.33	4.13					5.00	4.29	4.35
Wildlife	4.91	4.00		4.80				4.67	4.69
Sense of Community	4.11		5.00						4.38
Access		5.00	4.78			4.75	4.75	3.86	4.61
Viewscape		3.60					4.75		4.31
Recreation		5.00				5.00	5.00		5.00
Regional Provider			5.00						5.00
Open Space				4.80				4.43	4.65
Quiet/Isolation				4.50	4.56	4.00			4.43
Family History				4.30					4.30
Ranching				4.60					4.60
Festivals		4.33					4.25		4.29
Tourism							4.50		4.50
Big But Not Too Big			4.60			4.75			4.67
Culture Guided by Landscape						4.25			4.25
Variety of Ecosystems			4.80						4.80
Non-Motorized Access			4.60						4.60
Not Grand Junction					4.25				4.25
Lower Taxes					4.38				4.38
Agriculture					4.78		4.67		4.75
Shopping							4.50		4.50
History/Heritage		3.67							3.67

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

5.21 De Beque

When asked what they like about living in De Beque, 100% of the participants agreed that recreational opportunities were very important to them. Other values included the access to wildlife (91% indicated that was very important to them). Several supported the idea of a small-town feel and sense of community but not as intensely or uniformly as the other values (33% very important, 44% somewhat important and the rest neutral to the value). It was noted that De Beque is far enough from Grand Junction to get away from the urban feel, but not too far to lose access to the amenities and services of the city. Other values mentioned include the openness of the area, hunting, and the wild horses.

When asked how the surrounding public lands impact these values, the participants thought the question redundant since the public lands are what allow them to enjoy their lifestyles. The public lands are used for wild horse days, ATV riding, picnicking, etc. There is a point of pride to share the public lands with others. A lot of people come to town hall to get maps and learn about access to the surrounding public lands. The town's close proximity to these lands adds to its character. They are an important part of the heritage of the area and if access to the lands were denied, the entire value of the town would change.

5.22 Fruita

5.221. Fruita Residents

When asked what they liked about living in Fruita, residents were equally enthusiastic about their access to outdoor activities and the variety of outdoor activities their access allows them to enjoy. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant), 100 percent of the participants ranked access to, and variety of outdoor activities as very important. While somewhat less enthusiastic, residents discussed the viewscape surrounding the city (40%= very important; 20%=somewhat important; 20%= neither important nor unimportant; 20%= unimportant); the small-town atmosphere of Fruita (20%= very important; 60%= somewhat important; 20% unimportant); the wildlife and hunting resources (40% very important; 40% somewhat important; 20% of little importance); and their ability to remain a distinct community from Grand Junction while enjoying the benefits their proximity affords.

Public lands are an important component of Fruita residents' quality of life. One participant summed this up saying that public lands are the penultimate component of the quality of his/her life. Public lands were also identified as limiting the growth of the city while increasing its health. Specifically, public lands provide natural boundaries that restrict population growth and help maintain a small-town atmosphere. While limiting growth, it contributes to the economic growth of the region through tourism. In the very least, one respondent claimed that public lands allow residents to 'get away from it all.'

5.222. Fruita Leaders

When asked what they enjoyed about living in their community, its small-town atmosphere (very important=100%), outdoor recreational opportunities (very important= 66%, somewhat important=33%), community events (very important=33%, somewhat important=66%), and history (somewhat important=66%, neither important nor unimportant=33%) were mentioned. Also mentioned was the closeness of a diverse terrain (desert, river, mountains), the rich reserves of fossils in the area and the closeness of amenities, such as shopping.

Fruita leaders were quick to note that public lands have a significant impact on why they enjoy living in Fruita. Public lands were cited to be the reason that people choose to live in Fruita. Another participant commented that when showing off Fruita, he/she always takes the visitors to the public lands. Other comments cited public lands as being important to recreation opportunities; to keeping Fruita's population in check; and to contributing to the

air quality by cutting down on developed land and the smog such land produces. However, they also acknowledged that the attractiveness of public lands potentially places the small-town feel they all desire at risk because it draws people to the town.

5.23 Grand Junction

5.231. Grand Junction Residents

When asked what the residents like about living in Grand Junction, they mentioned the access to outdoor recreation, the variety of ecosystems, non-motorized public access and the amenities available to the large, but not too large population. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant), residents thought outdoor recreation was most important (100%= very important), followed by the variety of ecosystems (80%= very important; 20%= somewhat important), non-motorized public access (60%= very important; 40%= somewhat important) and the fact that Grand Junction is large, but not too large (60%= very; 40%= somewhat important).

Public lands have a large impact on the quality of life of Grand Junction residents. Some aspects of public land that were mentioned include the availability of solitude because of access to open land; the amount of undeveloped land; the general accessibility of public lands; self discovery on unmarked public lands; the impact on limiting suburban sprawl; and the ability of individuals to develop a sense of self by allowing a connection to nature.

5.232. Grand Junction Leaders

Focus group participants listed a number of aspects that they appreciate about Grand Junction. Among those attributes mentioned, 100 percent felt that Grand Junction being a regional provider was “very important” to them (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant) which includes medical care, shopping/retail, Mesa State College, and activities to suit a variety of interests; 100 percent felt the sense of community was “very important” which includes the ‘big, but not too big’ size of the community, safety, and short commute times; while 50 percent felt that access to public lands was very important with the remaining 50 percent believing it was somewhat important. Access to public lands includes the abundance of public federal land near the city and access to open space and recreation. Other values listed by the participants include the mild weather, that it is family friendly, and the gateway status of Grand Junction.

Public lands play a large role in the participants’ view of Grand Junction. Public lands frame the city, thereby limiting its sprawl and encouraging compact development; it impacts who chooses to live here, especially outdoor recreation enthusiasts, which contributes to a community with shared interests; the lands provide economic opportunities to residents through industries such as extractive services, tourism and grazing; and the lands define the city because it is impossible to conceive of Grand Junction in any other area.

5.24 Glade Park

The participants were asked what they like about living in the Glade Park Community. They mentioned the isolation and open spaces as well as ranching and loyalty and affection to the community because of family historic ties as reasons they like living in Glade Park. Wildlife was also mentioned as a value. Several of these responses were then measured for intensity of importance through the use of i>clicker technology (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant) with the results that 90% felt open spaces were very important, while the group was split 50/50 in its response to open spaces with half saying it was very important and the other half indicating it was somewhat important. Other values measured include the presence of wildlife (80% felt that was very important while the remaining 20% thought it somewhat important) and family history (60% considered it very important, 10% considered it somewhat important and 30% indicated it was neither important nor unimportant). This last result is likely due to the mix of traditional land owners and new residents in the area as the community develops.

When asked a more open-ended question on how public lands has an impact on these previously mentioned values, the responses were mixed. While most indicated that they like the close proximity to public lands in their community, there was concern about access being denied in the future. It was mentioned that many older people use the roads and lands to get out of town; that the people in the Glade Park area also use the roads to access public lands; and their business depends on this access to public lands. This last statement was particularly true of ranchers grazing cattle on public lands, but participants also stressed that the multiple-use concept of public lands was important to them and there should also be room for recreation and outfitting as well. It was also noted that because there is so much public land surrounding the community of Glade Park, the ability for new people to move to the community is “minimized” because there is no place to buy. There was some discussion on whether that is a good thing (limited growth of population maintains small-town atmosphere and feeling of isolation) or a bad thing (reducing opportunity for community growth and others to enjoy community). The community members seemed to be largely in agreement that closing off access to public lands in the area would negatively affect their community’s identity.

5.25 Loma and Mack

The first question asked was why they like living in Loma and Mack. Several issues emerged. As is fitting with the economic drivers in the community, they suggested the rural lifestyle of farming and ranching is very important to them (88% indicating this was very important with only one person being neutral on the issue). Other issues related to the rural lifestyle include the fact that they are not under the control of Grand Junction (big city) or Fruita (unmanaged growth when asked what that meant). When polled 50% thought this very important, 25 % thought it important and 25% were neutral on the issue. Another related value to the rural lifestyle according to the participants was the quiet. When polled 3 out of 4 participants ranked this the highest value for importance. Finally, with no municipal government structure to support participants commented that the lower tax schedule is attractive with 56% indicating it is very important and 25 % remaining neutral on the value.

When asked how public lands impact these values the group suggested that public lands are necessary open space so hikers, bikers and horseback riders have a place to go. There was a strong theme throughout the entire Loma-Mack focus group about uncontrolled development that they perceive as happening in the neighboring community of Fruita. They are glad that public lands limit this in their area. The lands themselves aren’t developed and thus offer a break/retreat from this development.

They believe that the whole area is great for recreation, but care must be taken to keep ATV users and equestrian users from crossing paths on the trails. There were several other comments on recreation offered by the group at this point. They are concerned that the trails are mostly closed to ATV use, but open to mountain biking. They do not think there are many mountain bikers in the area (“this is not Fruita, they are all over there”). Despite some concerns about recreation planning, they think the landscape is perfect for recreation as Loma is the entrance to the canyon lands and the Kokopelli Trail, and has tremendous potential for recreation if “the BLM handles their management well.” It was noted at this point that recreation has a positive impact on the economy through sales and supplies, which in turn gives more opportunity to run the government on sales tax which will further reduce property taxes (previously indicated as a good thing). Loma is also benefiting from PILT payments which help them keep their taxes lower. The theme of taxes kept appearing throughout the focus group conversation in Loma and Mack and would have significant interest in the consideration of alternatives in the RMP process for these communities.

5.26 Mesa County

When asked what they value about living in Mesa County, the participants focused their comments on the benefits of surrounding public lands. Residents discussed the diversity of outdoor activities, their proximity and access to public lands and quiet use recreation. When asked to select the appropriate intensity level they felt for these values (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant) every participant believed that the diversity of outdoor activities was “very important” while 75 percent felt that the proximity and access to public lands was “very important” (the remaining 25% believed it was “somewhat important”). Support for quiet outdoor use was also valued with 25 percent finding it to be very important, 50 percent somewhat important and 25 percent believing it to be neither important nor unimportant. Other values included the premise that Mesa County is big, but not too big (75% very important; 25% somewhat important) and that the community’s culture is grounded in the surrounding landscape (50% very important; 25% somewhat important; 25% neither important nor unimportant).

The participants’ comments solidified the important role public lands play in Mesa County. Comments said that public land “is the reason why I live here” and public land “impacts where I choose to live.” The participants believed that public lands have several real impacts, including enhancing the quality of life for children by connecting them to reality and providing educational opportunities. Public lands are also thought to limit population growth and sprawl while attracting business interests.

5.27 Palisade

As a result of scheduling complications, two separate focus groups were held with leaders in Palisade, Colorado. The first meeting was held on March 2, 2009 (group A) and the second meeting was held on March 16, 2009 (group B). This section analyzes both focus groups together while separating them into their respective groups (the “A” and “B” group). This way, the results aren’t treated independently nor are they viewed as synonymous.

When the participants were asked what they like about living in Palisade, both groups discussed access to outdoor recreation. Group A specifically discussed the quality of life in Palisade because of

its relatively small size, density of people, small and friendly businesses, adequate infrastructure for tourism and beautiful scenery and viewscape. They also discussed the friendly, active and vibrant population that creates a sense of community different from other towns in the Grand Valley. The participants also discussed the plethora of festivals and community events. Comparatively, group B discussed the stunning scenery and unique agricultural resources such as Palisade orchards and wineries. Group B participants also discussed the remoteness of Palisade, the amount of public land in the region, the amount of shopping and culture/history/heritage. The participants also discussed the fact that Palisade is well positioned as a crossroads to the Rocky Mountain corridor with its mountains, deserts and rivers.

Both groups indicated the importance of the viewscape and access to public lands values. Group A ranked viewscape (100%= very important) and access to public lands (50%= very high, 50%= somewhat important) as being very important. Group B also found viewscape (75%= very important, 25%= neither important nor unimportant) and recreation (100%= very important) to be very important values. Other measures for group A include festivals (25%= very important, 75%= somewhat important), small-town feel/quality of life (100%= very important), and tourism (100%= very important). Comparatively, group B ranked agriculture (66%= very important, 33%= somewhat important), recreation (100%= very important), and shopping (25%= very important, 25%= somewhat important, 25%= neither important nor unimportant, 25%= unimportant).

When asked how the surrounding public lands impact the values listed above, both groups believe the presence of public lands are “huge” or “integral.” Group A said that the vistas have a strong psychological impact. Therefore, public lands should be managed appropriately. Participants also said that they bring a sense of security to the community because they are surrounded by public lands. The lands maintain a small-town feel, for example, because they limit sprawl. They did note, however, that their security depends on how the lands are managed. If managed poorly, participants fear the security they feel from public lands would be threatened. The lands were also recognized to offer recreational opportunities to residents, which is important because there are few entertainment options available to Palisade residents. However, how public lands are “used” is critical to their quality of life. Finally, public lands have an impact on tourism and the quality of water in the region.

Group B also mentioned the benefits public lands have on mental health as well as their positive impact on tourism (including international tourism). The participants also said that public lands contribute to the physical health of residents because approximately 95% of recreation is done on public lands. The lands were also recognized to provide an opportunity for discovery by residents and visitors. Because the participants said they were drawn to Palisade because of the public lands, they are frustrated by public land policies and public land management.

5.28 Gateway

The residents were asked why they like living in Gateway and several responses were offered including small-town feel, sense of community, and heritage connected to family that has lived in the area for generations. Other comments focused on the access to the night sky without light pollution, open spaces, the nature of the landscape and wildlife in the area, the lack of crowds and access to public lands on all sides. Several of these responses were then measured for intensity of importance through the use of i>clicker technology (where 5= very important; 4= somewhat important; 3= neither

important nor unimportant; 2= of little importance; 1= unimportant) with the results that over 60% felt the proximity to wildlife was very important and 75% indicated that open spaces were very important to them. Fewer felt the small-town community was very important (although over half still selected this as an option), and the same number polled access to public lands as very important.

When asked a more open-ended question about how public lands affect these values, it was suggested that they have a huge impact on these values. There was a strong sense of ownership of public lands and a sense of privilege to have such uncrowded access to public lands. This access and connection to the land enhances the sense of community as long as others don't trash the lands through littering, off-trail driving, and congregating in previously isolated places. They were also clear that the public lands provide traditional use economic opportunities for miners, timber workers, guides, hunters, ranchers and river rafting. Despite the strong sense of ownership on the public lands, it was remarked that public lands offer people the opportunity "to experience public lands even if they don't own it."

6. Concerns

Concerns refer to the 20 year vision participants have for their community, their vision for public lands, and the most important economic, social and environmental concerns that they believe must be addressed to meet their 20 year vision. The aggregate analysis (all participants' responses) is first discussed and is followed by the community results (data divided by community).

6.1. Concerns: Aggregate Results

As illustrated in Figure 5, there were 36 concerns identified and ranked by importance in the focus groups. These issues were first raised in an open-ended question asking participants to list the most important economic, social and environmental concerns over the next 15-20 years. Participants then assigned an importance value to select issues. Compared to the values section, there are fewer issues that span multiple communities and participants. Only one issue (health of public lands) was discussed by three communities. This indicates that residents are more likely to focus their attention on similar values but diverge when asked to identify concerns.

Figure 5. Concerns: Aggregate Focus Group Results

Issues	Participants N	Community N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Health of Public Lands	17	3	2	3	5	4.71
Social Spaces	17	2	2	3	5	4.12
Water	16	2	1	4	5	4.81
Trash	14	2	1	4	5	4.93
Oil and Gas Development	14	3	2	3	5	4.4
Jobs and Economic Growth	14	2	2	3	5	4.29
User Balance of Public Lands	13	2	1	4	5	4.92
Waste Ponds	12	1	1	4	5	4.92
Access	12	2	2	3	5	4.5
Horse Adoptions	12	1	2	3	5	4.5
Air Quality	11	2	1	4	5	4.45

Figure 5. Concerns: Aggregate Focus Group Results

Issues	Participants N	Community N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Sustainable Ranching	10	1	1	4	5	4.8
Economic Diversity	10	1	2	3	5	4.6
McInnis NCA	10	1	1	4	5	4.3
Agriculture	9	1	1	4	5	4.89
Closed Trails	9	1	1	4	5	4.78
WSA Proposals	9	1	1	4	5	4.67
Enforcement	9	1	2	3	5	4.67
Mining and Shale as Economic Help	9	1	3	2	5	4.56
Noxious Weeds	9	1	4	1	5	4.33
Solitude	8	1	2	3	5	4.13
Working on Public Lands	7	1	3	2	5	4.43
Physical Growth	6	1	1	4	5	4.83
Education	6	1	2	3	5	4.67
Stewardship	6	1	1	4	5	4.5
Regional Hub Status	6	1	2	3	5	4.33
Social Events	6	1	2	3	5	4
Downtown Core	5	1	1	4	5	4.6
Integration	5	1	1	4	5	4.6
Transportation	5	1	2	3	5	4.4
Green Energy	5	1	2	3	5	4.4
Federal Government Listen to Local Community	4	1	0	5	5	5
Place Identity	4	1	1	4	5	4.75
Housing Options	4	1	1	4	5	4.5
Wildlife	4	1	2	3	5	4.5
Attract Young Talent	4	1	0	4	4	4

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

6.2 Concerns: Community Results

There was little consensus across the communities relating to social, environmental and economic concerns as related to achieving their vision of public lands. This section discusses the 20 year vision of each community and their concerns that would inhibit them from achieving their vision. It also discusses each community's vision for public lands. Figure 6 lists the average value each community assigned to each concern.

Figure 6. Concerns: Results by Community

Issues	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Waste Ponds	4.92								4.92
Social Spaces	4.18					4.00			4.12
Horse Adoptions	4.50								4.50
Oil and Gas Development		3.80	4.60				4.90		4.40
Health of Public Lands		4.60	4.50			5.00			4.71
Trash		4.80			5.00				4.93
Green Energy		4.40							4.40
Jobs and Economic Growth		4.25	4.33						4.29
Economic Diversity			4.60						4.60
Attract Young Talent			4.00						4.00
Housing Options			4.50						4.50
Place Identity			4.75						4.75
User Balance of Public Lands			4.75		5.00				4.92
Sustainable Ranching				4.80					4.80
McInnis NCA				4.30					4.30
WSA Proposals				4.67					4.67
Water				4.90		4.67			4.81
Agriculture							4.89		4.89
Wildlife							4.50		4.50
Federal Government Listen to Local Community							5.00		5.00
Air Quality						4.50	4.40		4.45
Social Events						4.00			4.00
Education						4.67			4.67
Regional Hub Status						4.33			4.33
Physical Growth			4.83						4.83
Enforcement					4.67				4.67
Noxious Weeds					4.33				4.33
Closed Trails					4.78				4.78
Mining and Shale as Economic Help					4.56				4.56
Transportation							4.40		4.40
Downtown Core							4.60		4.60
Integration							4.60		4.60
Access		5.00						4.33	4.50

Figure 6. Concerns: Results by Community

Issues	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Working on Public Lands								4.43	4.43
Solitude								4.13	4.13
Stewardship								4.50	4.50

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

6.21 De Beque

When asked what they would like to see the community look like in 20 years, the participants took this as an exercise in dreaming. One called for a lake and hydro power plant on Roan Creek, another called for a golf course, and still others wanted to see preservation of agricultural land as an economic measure. Many thought the town would be much larger in 20 years, but that it is important to control growth. While it might be nice to have a few more businesses around, the town “does not want to be Clifton”. One way to avoid this is to build buildings that are structurally sound and designed well, not just endless rows of metal buildings.

The biggest concerns facing De Beque in the next 20 years according to this focus group are that they don’t just want to be a waste station for oil and gas development. This issue has social implications for the stigma attached, as well as, economic and environmental issues associated with it. They continued to “think big” with the desire for a waterfront park that could become a place to host an event such as a rodeo or motocross cycling event (45% felt this was very important, 27% said it was important to them). They believe this would have huge economic implications as well. Related to the concerns about becoming a waste station for the gas industry, they are very concerned about the wastewater ponds installed outside of town (92% polled that this was very important to them). Most of the concern here was due to the proximity of the public relating to aesthetics and potential public health issues. Finally there was some concern that the horse adoptions might end in the town of De Beque and moved somewhere else (58% felt this a very important concern and an additional 33% felt it was important as a concern). Although the town of De Beque doesn’t currently host wild horse adoptions, there seems to be some interest in doing so.

Looking forward, the challenges that need to be addressed by the community of De Beque, respecting public lands, took a very specific character. There was a request for more signage to help people know where to go. Another request was for gathering places on public lands in the area for horse watching and in the Goblin area as well. A request was made to keep the existing ATV trails and to add to them making several into loops of different lengths. There should also be stopping and resting areas in less sensitive habitat to keep people of more sensitive habitat. In general there were several requests voiced for greater access opportunities to public lands

6.22 Fruita

6.221 Fruita Community

In describing their community vision for the future, the participants emphasized the need for smart growth both inside Fruita and on public lands. When addressing smart city growth, participants are concerned that continued growth will drown out those aspects that drew them to Fruita in the first place. For example, one participant said he/she would like to see Fruita remain the same size, but recognizes this will not happen. As such, community leaders need to be proactive in planning for an expected doubling of the population. One idea that was forwarded was to build taller buildings downtown to accommodate the growth.

Other participants focused on smart planning for the surrounding public lands. Proactive planning is necessary if the growing population is to wisely use public lands. Without planning, users will engage in de facto planning through the building of their own trails, access points, etc. The need for greater cooperation between user groups and land managers was also highlighted as an important point for smart public lands planning. One participant, however, questioned the BLM's capacity to hear their concerns. A final concern expressed to see greater river access included in planning.

In identifying the most important social, environmental and economic concerns for their community, residents raised a number of issues. In dealing with social issues, participants expressed a desire to preserve the elements that make Fruita a desirable locale (80%= very important, 20%= neither important nor unimportant), which includes maintaining outdoor recreation in the area. Economic concerns included the development of green energy (60%= very important, 20%= somewhat important, 20%= neither important nor unimportant), oil and gas development (20%= very important, 40%= somewhat important, 40%= neither important nor unimportant), adequate jobs and job training that allows people to meet their employment needs (80%= somewhat important, 20%= neither important nor unimportant), as well as mitigating the impact of boom and bust economics. Environmental concerns included cleaning up trash and burnt cars in the desert (80%= very important, 20%= somewhat important) and becoming more aware of the damage the oil and gas industry has created. In the end, the vision for the future of public lands is to maintain access while mitigating the effects of heavy use (such as trash removal).

6.222 Fruita Leaders

In describing their 20 year vision for their community, one participant noted that Fruita had just completed its community plan. He/she noted that after significant public input, enhancing the small-town atmosphere while providing for economic vitality were the two major desires of the plan. The plan is available on Fruita's website.

The participants' vision for public lands includes issues such as an improved trail system, preserving open space and connectivity to public lands. One participant discussed the "gateway" status Fruita has to the open lands through the BLM and US Forest Service. Maintaining the open space is important to the gateway community because it is tied to the economic engine of the region. Their wish was to prevent the BLM closing access because of

increased on-the-ground administration growth will require. There was also a desire to see more ways for citizens to get to public lands by walking, riding and driving.

The participants identified, when asked, a number of social, environmental and economic challenges Fruita faces over the next 15 years. Among the social challenges Fruita faces, maintaining the small-town atmosphere, building strong neighborhoods, building neighborhood parks and maintaining a diversity of housing were listed. In discussing environmental challenges, making public lands accessible while preserving them (very important=100%) was very important to the participants who noted that access is a dominant issue in community meetings as well. They also noted that access was important to the economic health of the community as they are inextricably linked. A second environmental challenge was to examine the role of rural space in the community. Economic challenges that were discussed included economic development (very important=100%), maintaining downtown Fruita and growing outwards, managing growth and maintaining a diverse housing supply. Although many of the responses to this question do not deal with public lands or the BLM RMP process, it was clear from the focus group that public lands play a large role in the community's vision nonetheless.

6.23. Grand Junction

6.231 Grand Junction Community

In describing their 20 year vision of Grand Junction, some residents expressed a desire to see the maintenance of open space. One resident said that he/she would like to see public lands remain as primitive as possible. One way to do this would be to prevent the development of roads. Another resident said that the community will continue to grow and that this growth may be too much for the city. It was acknowledged that growth will put pressure on public lands as public lands will become more important to the growing population. One resident said that he/she hopes to be able to access public lands in 10 to 15 minutes as growth continues. Other residents discussed the importance of maintaining agriculture in the area, especially vineyards and orchards. Discussion linked the desire to become a destination center by promoting the area's agricultural resources and public lands through winemaking tours and mountain biking. It was also expressed that the community would prefer tourism dollars over oil and gas dollars. Finally, participants expressed the desire to maintain community businesses and independent and distinct communities such as Fruita.

In describing their vision for the surrounding public lands, participants focused on limiting the oil and gas development to small areas. Residents felt that oil and gas interests have received what they needed in the past. Another issue dealt with finding a way to implement grazing so it is sustainable and limited to certain areas. Other visions included the protection of riparian rights, increased resources to the BLM (including more employees, including scientists) to meet its needs, a more active management plan to handle the impact of regional growth on public lands, diversification of the ecosystem, greater use of public lands to meet the educational needs of public schools, and greater law enforcement to combat population pressures, litter and vandalism.

When asked to list social, economic and environmental concerns, residents primarily focused on economic and environmental concerns. Among the economic issues, 67 percent thought that the overdevelopment of oil and gas was a very important concern, while 33 percent felt it was somewhat important. There was a desire for decision-makers to consider the long-term impact of oil and gas and to look for regional planning for oil and gas development, rather than the piecemeal system that currently exists. Another 66 percent feel that economic diversity in the region is very important, 17 percent feel it somewhat important and 17 percent feel it was neither important nor unimportant. As part of this, agriculture, retail, tourism, and mineral extraction should be examined. Finally, 33 percent of participants feel that economic growth is very important while 67 percent felt it was somewhat important. One resident said that he/she desires to see growth pay for its own way. In discussing Environmental issues, 66 percent, while another 17 percent think it is somewhat important and another 17 percent believe it is neither important nor unimportant. A final environmental concern was the loss of open space.

6.232 Grand Junction Leaders

In explaining their 20 year vision, the leaders emphasized the impact anticipated growth will have on the community, surrounding public lands, and surrounding communities. As Grand Junction grows it will become an even more important regional destination defined with a denser population, thereby increasing the value of public lands to residents. This growth, however, should not come at the expense of surrounding communities. Finally, if Grand Junction will be the most livable city west of the Rockies by 2035 (as the participants desired), a transportation infrastructure must be developed including the airport and roads bordering BLM land.

When thinking about their vision for public lands, participants raised a number of diverse issues. First, a desire for a more local and community-focused management was expressed. Participants would like to see fewer national mandates and greater incorporation of citizen views in public lands decision-making. Participants also wished to see greater accommodation for a variety of user interests and greater access to certain sections of lands by improving the urban interface with public lands. There was also a desire for greater and easier land disposal between the community and BLM to accommodate the growing population. Finally, a focus on the role of fees in accessibility to public lands should also be examined.

Challenging this vision are several economic, social and environmental factors. The message of the group was the need for diversity. Economic challenges include attracting young talent/professionals (100%= somewhat important), which can be done by promoting the surrounding public lands and maintaining a diverse economy. Social challenges include maintaining diversity in the community (75%= very important, 25%= somewhat important), providing attainable housing (50%= very important, 50%= somewhat important), maintaining a sense of place and identity (75%= very important, 25%= somewhat important), and maintaining public safety. Environmental concerns include finding a way to balance user groups on public lands such as grazers and energy developers (75%= very important, 25%=

somewhat important), maintaining the agricultural roots of the area by stemming the loss of farmland, and recognizing the geographical features that make Grand Junction unique.

6.24. Glade Park

Community members were asked what their vision of the community might look like 15-20 years into the future. Several members expressed that they would like it to “see it the same.” When asked to elaborate on what that might mean one participant suggested that an emphasis on conservation and minimal public lands development would retain the current character that is important to him. Another suggested it could be kept the same by keeping housing restrictions to a minimum so “everyday people can afford to live here.” Another followed up on the need to keep open space and not subdivide 40 acre parcels because of the lack of available water (coming mostly from wells in the area). Limited access from the Grand Valley (only two points of access through the Colorado National Monument were mentioned) will also keep the rural character. A few members commented that they do not see much oil and gas development or ski resort development in the Glade Park community in the future, which they remarked is a good thing.

Following up on this question, participants were asked what they think are the most important social, environmental and economic issues Glade Park will face over the next 15-20 years. They were reluctant to divide the issues based on these categories because all of the issues they mentioned cut across all three categories. The most important issue raised according to their intensity responses was the issue of water and irrigation with 90% indicating that this issue is very important to them and the remaining 10% indicating it is somewhat important. Another salient issue for the community is the sustainability of ranching in the area with 80% indicating this is very important and the rest indicating it is somewhat important. It was remarked that ranching had made Glade Park what it is today and that the area had been singled out as one of the five areas in the state targeted for “saving ranching.” This concern was also linked to the Wilderness proposed areas around the community for fear that it would negatively impact ranching. The McGinnis Canyons NCA’s proximity to the community was also linked to this fear of negative impacts on ranching. When the intensity of these concerns was measured, 60% indicated that it is a very important concern and the remaining participants ranked it as somewhat important.

When asked to think ahead to how public lands in the area would affect this vision, participants responded by addressing the issue of access to public lands. While it was recognized that some roads should be closed seasonally to protect the resource, the maintenance of the road network in the community and the preservation of a range of access (easy for those who need it and tougher for those who want it) should be a top priority. It was noted that the diversity of access contributed positively to the sense of isolation. The comments supported the multiple-use concept of public lands with a value placed on the intermix of public and private land in the area. While participants were concerned that changes would be driven by land management decisions, clearly the most concerning issue was land swaps. It was suggested that technology could help inform the public of these changes and a local website was offered as a means to keep the community informed about land swaps.

6.25. Loma and Mack

Looking into the future, the communities of Loma and Mack have a 20 year plan that will be going before the Mesa County Planning Commission for approval in early April, 2009. They have been developing the plan for over a year. The plan development was contracted out to a firm from Nebraska. The community of Loma also went before the County government for sewer improvements and a chance to incorporate. Loma needs to have a certain number of rooftops to incorporate so it will be combining with Mack to use Mack's sewer services. They further suggested that they would like to see the area stay the way it is, agricultural and affordable. However, they recognize that the area is likely to grow in the next 15-20 years. One participant showed a great deal of concern that the area would become overrun with recreational users because of recent travel management decisions in the BLM Moab Field Office that closed a number of trails. Closure of trails to motorized and mechanized travel means that people will be coming to the Loma and Mack area to recreate, and we "ought to get ready for it."

The most significant concerns expressed in the next 15-20 years dealt with abuse of the land from excessive population and lack of enforcement of current rules, as well as user conflicts that might arise. When polled, 85% of the participants suggested enforcement of regulations was a very important concern to them. The participants hope for cooperation among user groups on trail building projects and trash clean-up as all user groups produce trash. There was concern that the signage in the area has been severely damaged, and that there are not enough signs for people to know where they are going on public land in the area. There was concern expressed over ATV and dirt bikes riding off-trail and destroying habitat. The signs could help more clearly mark this.

Other issues of significant concern include access to public lands both for vulnerable population groups such as the elderly and the economic impacts of limiting access. All participants ranked trail closure and its negative economic impact as important or very important to them. Comments indicate that they would prefer one user group to be favored over another. A Utah example of the loss of rock crawler traffic was used to illustrate the point of closures and the negative effect of those closures on the local economy. All participants agreed that we ought to keep the lands as multiple-use. They were also concerned that the BLM help maintain the economic base by supporting mining, oil, and oil shale. Seventy-seven percent of the participants found this to be a very important concern while 12% suggested that it is of little importance. The control of noxious weeds was also mentioned by 66% of the group as being a very important issue to them. Only 12 % suggested that it wasn't important at all to them.

Looking to the challenges that lay ahead for their communities, the focus group indicated that a key issue is the need for consistency in policy and application of BLM regulations on different populations. More concerns were expressed on the dependence of the community on BLM lands for traditional livelihoods such as hunting and ranching. There is some concern that the BLM has not opened up enough land to hunting to help the economy. There is a great deal of concern that the new administration will have too much of an impact on public lands policy. Such concerns are important to the community, but largely outside the RMP planning process. It is clear there is a great deal of frustration and distrust of government, particularly the federal government in this community. The same sentiments are found in De Beque and other rural communities we talked to during this focus group process.

6.26. Mesa County

When asked to describe their vision for Mesa County, the participants focused heavily on the impact of public lands. In other words, the participants believe that public lands will play a big role in shaping the future of Mesa County. Participants' vision of Mesa County is one where population is healthy and defined by smart planning and limiting sprawl; where the community is economically diverse and replete with high-paying jobs; where agriculture maintains a large role in the economy; where residents embrace land stewardship; and where a community embraces its past and remains optimistic about its future by developing a "can-do" spirit. Public lands have an impact on this vision by providing a natural barrier to sprawl, by assisting in attracting business ventures and young professionals, by providing an opportunity for agriculture interests, and by defining the culture of the region by tying the community to the lands.

Despite optimism for the future, participants expressed a number of economic, social and environmental concerns that may impede their vision. When discussing social concerns, 83 percent of the participants felt that education is a very important concern while 17 percent feel it is neither important nor unimportant. As well, maintaining social places such as casual gathering places in downtown Grand Junction and walking paths is very important to 50 percent of the respondents and somewhat important for the remaining 50 percent. Developing social cohesiveness through social events was warmly supported with 33 percent of the participants believing it is very important, somewhat important and neither important nor unimportant.

Topping the list of environmental concerns was maintaining the health of public lands with 100 percent of the participants believing this to be very important. Additional concerns include water rights (67% very important, 33% somewhat important), air quality (50% very important, 50% somewhat important), environmental education, the health impact of winter inversions, and increased wilderness areas. Economic concerns include the continued development of Mesa County as a regional hub (50% very important, 33% somewhat important, 17% neither important nor unimportant), educational standards in the region for a developed workforce; economic diversity and sustainability, the development of a viable agricultural industry, and economic opportunities so young adults don't leave the region. Education spanned social, environmental and economic concerns.

Participants feel that in order for Mesa County to achieve its vision and overcome the aforementioned challenges, public land management will need to emphasize diversity. This includes diverse and multiple access to public lands, diverse use of public lands (ranging from recreation to grazing), and diverse management of public lands where the land is not over-regulated. Participants also discussed their willingness to see how diversity will impact sensitive areas, such as wildlife.

6.27. Palisade

In describing its community's vision, group A described a larger community (with approximately 5,000 residents), with a diverse business environment, a healthy tourism base, a high-end agricultural industry, and a compact community with residential housing units and walkable streets. Other participants wished to retain the small-town feel without being anti-growth. In addition to these visions, others discussed a more diverse racial and cultural group, a more mature and educated society that accepts and supports the community vision, better integration of international residents, and strong buy-in for the community vision. Group B's vision also discussed a healthy agricultural industry, a healthy downtown core and small-town feel. The residents also discussed improved access

to recreational amenities through pedestrian and bicycle access points and high air quality to maintain visibility and viewscape.

In identifying the most important social, environmental and economic issues that will arise over the next 15-20 years the groups discussed the following issues. For social issues, both groups discussed the need to integrate the migrant population, specifically the Latino population, into the community. In fact, 60 percent of group B ranked integration as very important while the other 40 percent said it is somewhat important.

When discussing environmental issues, group A participants expressed a concern that they have been run over by the federal government when it comes to gas development. They said that 98% of the population is outraged at gas drilling, and official protests have not received a response. They believe that gas drilling was pre-determined despite the process that was taken to solicit input. The data from the focus group supports the contention that oil and gas development is very important with 100 percent ranking it as very important. They believe that an oil and gas town has a connotation that can have positive and negative connotations. While oil and gas can provide jobs, it doesn't fit the vision of the town of Palisade. In addition to threatening the watershed, 100 percent of the participants were also very concerned that drilling rigs would hamper the viewshed. Group A participants also discussed the amount of money that is brought into the region through hunting and fishing. They believe that hunting and fishing is important to the family. In fact, wildlife is thought to be very important to 75 percent of the participants and neither important nor unimportant to 25% of the participants. Finally, 100 percent of group A participants feel that the protection of agricultural land is very important.

Group B participants discussed air quality and transportation systems when discussing environmental concerns. Transportation was thought to be a very important concern to 60 percent of the participants while the other 40 percent were split between somewhat important and neither important nor unimportant. Specifically, transportation can have huge impacts on the environment depending on how it is tackled. This ranges from pedestrian access to irrigation canals, the interstate system and potential light rail lines.

Group A did not focus on any economic concerns, but group B did focus its economic concerns around maintaining a core downtown that provides entertainment opportunities and essential services (60%= very important, 40%= somewhat important) and a healthy agricultural industry that provides an abundance of unique products (80%= very important, 20%= somewhat important).

In describing their vision for public lands, group A participants discussed a variety of issues. Specifically, the desire to cooperate with the BLM on creating bike trails; increasing access points to the public lands while maintaining existing access points; providing access for diverse activities and trails for diverse activities such as ATV and horses; exhibiting sensitivity to watersheds and ecological areas (while not abolishing access to those areas); working to limit the impact oil rigs, roads and homes can have on the viewscape of residents; minimizing the extraction of oil and gas; focusing on hydrology; and realizing that the community doesn't want recreation to overrun the community, but rather to provide access to opportunities that would stimulate the economy and improve the quality of life for residents.

Group B, when answering the same question expressed a desire for greater customization to the management of public lands. Because different communities have different needs and interests, the management of public lands should reflect individual communities. The participants also discussed the idea of multiple-use. One participant expressed concern that multiple-use is a “cop-out” and wants to see greater prioritization of space and resources because multiple uses are in direct conflict with each other.

6.28 Gateway

When asked to describe their vision for Gateway’s future most commenters acknowledged that change will happen, but stressed that they would like to retain the “small-town feel” and they hope it won’t all be “resort.” Most participants seemed to be comfortable with managed growth and new amenities coming into the area. There was also concern that the BLM will start enterprising with the resort through land swaps to change the character of public lands in the area, or that land will go to those with money without the average person having an opportunity to buy it as well.

Over the next 15-20 years the participants foresee a number of concerns that planners should keep in mind. The most intense concern according to polling by i>clickers was the ability for people to continue to work and make their livelihoods on public lands (71% of the respondents considered this very important to them with only 14% indicating this is not that important). All participants indicated that proper stewardship of the land, so that groups don’t abuse it, is important or very important to them. Almost all participants (88%) also felt that it was important, or very important that habitat and open space is maintained for wildlife. Finally, there was a concern expressed that people responsibly use the land. This was specifically related to everything from trash on public lands to land swaps.

Although most of the responses to the previous question related to public land, when asked directly how their vision relates to public lands, the participants indicated a strong preference for the multiple-use mandate of the BLM. They also suggested that to maintain the value and experience of solitude, there needs to be more enforcement of vehicle restrictions, etc. This was particularly related to the seasonal closure of routes due to winter range and sensitive habitat for wildlife. Wildlife preservation and habitat protection was a particularly strong theme throughout the Gateway community meeting.

7. Outcomes

Outcomes refers to changes in the community that would result from BLM adoption of various resource management alternatives, the beneficial outcomes of participants’ visions, and the best way to produce beneficial outcomes. The aggregate analysis (all participants’ responses) is first discussed and is followed by the individual community results.

7.1. Outcomes: Aggregate Results

When asked in an open-ended question about their desired outcomes, participants listed 26 issues (Figure 7). The issue of heritage was raised in seven communities consisting of 55 total participants. Moreover, the improved physical, social and mental health of the community was raised in five communities consisting of 33 participants. Combined, this data shows that greater consensus was reached among the communities on a few narrowly focused outcomes than was reached on values and concerns.

Figure 7. Outcomes: Aggregate Focus Group Results

Issues	Participants N	Community N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Heritage	55	7	4	1	5	4.53
Health (Physical, Social, Mental)	33	5	4	1	5	4.55
Jobs/Economic Opportunities	18	3	2	3	5	4.56
Sense of Community	15	2	0	5	5	5
Responsible Use of Land	15	2	1	4	5	4.93
Family Time	12	1	2	3	5	4.58
Decrease Stress	12	1	2	3	5	4.5
Pride	11	1	1	4	5	4.73
Open Space/Privacy	10	1	0	5	5	5
Freedom	10	1	3	2	5	4.6
Balanced Use	10	1	3	2	5	4.6
Education About Ranching	10	1	1	4	5	4.5
Nice Place to Live	9	1	0	5	5	5
Multiple-Use	9	1	0	5	5	5
Consistency for Planning	9	1	2	3	5	4.78
Diversity	9	2	2	3	5	4.11
Economic Stability	6	1	1	4	5	4.67
Attract Talent	6	1	2	3	5	4.17
Relationships	6	1	3	2	5	4
Healthy Water Resources	5	1	0	5	5	5
Biodiversity	5	1	1	4	5	4.8
Clean Outdoors	5	1	2	3	5	4.6
Rabbit Hunting	5	1	4	1	5	3.6
No Fences	5	1	4	1	5	3.2
Small Town Life	4	1	0	5	5	5
Access	4	1	1	4	5	4.5

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

7.2 Outcomes: Community Results

In measuring outcomes, participants were asked to consider the impacts of an energy-heavy, resource protection-heavy and recreation-heavy Resource Management Plan in their visions. Participants were also asked to list any beneficial outcomes their vision would produce and then rank their importance using the aforementioned Likert Scale (see Figure 8). Finally, participants were asked what characteristics they would maintain or change to achieve their visions for public lands and produce their desired outcomes.

Figure 8. Outcomes: Results by Community

Issues	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
--------	-------------	--------	-------------------	---------------	--------------	----------------	----------	---------	-------

Figure 8. Outcomes: Results by Community

Issues	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Health (Physical, Social, Mental)	4.82	4.25	4.50			4.50	4.55		4.55
Pride	4.73								4.73
Family Time	4.58								4.58
Heritage	4.82		4.00	4.40	4.89	4.33	4.60	4.30	4.53
Decrease Stress	4.50								4.50
Rabbit Hunting		3.60							3.60
Jobs/Economic Opportunities		4.00	4.75		4.78				4.56
Diversity		4.20	4.00						4.11
Clean Outdoors		4.60							4.60
No Fences		3.20							3.20
Access			4.50						4.50
Sense of Community				5.00			5.00		5.00
Education About Ranching				4.50					4.50
Open Space/Privacy				5.00					5.00
Small Town Life							5.00		5.00
Relationships						4.00			4.00
Economic Stability						4.67			4.67
Nice Place to Live			5.00						5.00
Responsible Use of Land			5.00		4.89				4.93
Attract Talent			4.17						4.17
Biodiversity			4.80						4.80
Consistency for Planning					4.78				4.78
Multiple-Use					5.00				5.00
Healthy Water Resources							5.00		5.00
Freedom								4.60	4.60
Balanced Use								4.60	4.60

Note: 1= Unimportant, 2= Of Little Importance, 3= Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4= Somewhat Important, 5= Very Important

7.21. De Beque

When asked what effects their community would feel if the BLM emphasized recreation or energy development or resource preservation in the RMP revision most of the responses related to the energy development scenario. A few participants suggested that it would be a boom to the local economy while doing no harm to the environment. To illustrate this, a discussion ensued about seeing wildlife coming right up to the rigs and interacting on cleared land. If there was a heavy emphasis on recreation in the area, a new road would be needed because the town roads could not handle the increased volume of traffic. It was agreed that the increased volume of visitors to public lands would help out local stores with customers. There were few comments about the resource protection alternative beyond a general comment on the nutritious value of native plant species for grazing by horses or cattle. The suggestion was made to plant grasses with a higher nutritional value so more livestock could be grazed on it.

When asked what beneficial outcomes to themselves, their community or the environment could be derived from their vision, they highlighted the health benefits both mental and physical (82% rated this very important), and reduced stress levels (58% rated this very important while an additional 33% rated it important). Other beneficial outcomes to their vision include connections to the past (55% rated this very important, the rest ranked it as important) and family time (67% rated this very important and another 25% called it important). There were also a few less tangible outcomes such as a sense of pride (73% ranked this as very important), hope for the future and a realization of “how lucky you are to live in God’s country.”

In response to a question about what landscape characteristics and settings they would maintain or change to achieve their vision, the number one focus was access to public lands. They want access, but “not too much access”. They would like more places to gather, but they definitely do not want more management that interferes with personal freedoms.

7.22. Fruita

7.221 Fruita Residents

When asked what their community would look like if the BLM emphasized recreation, energy and resource protection in its upcoming RMP, the participants generally leaned towards emphasizing all three. In terms of recreation, a participant was concerned that one user-group would become so dominant that recreation would become unbalanced. Another participant claimed that all things being equal, recreation would improve the quality of life in the area. Another participant said that overemphasizing any of these would threaten his/her vision. Finally there was concern that prices would increase in the area if recreation and energy development were too heavily emphasized.

There are several beneficial outcomes that their vision provides in the region. Among these, clean outdoors (80%=very important, 20%= unimportant), the mental and physical health of residents (80%= very important, 20%= unimportant), diversity (40%= very important, 40%= somewhat important, 20%= unimportant), open space unimpeded by fences (40%= very important, 20%= neither important nor unimportant, 20%= little importance, 20%= unimportant) and jobs (20%= very important, 60%= somewhat important, 20%= neither important nor unimportant) were discussed.

To achieve their vision, participants expressed the concern that the administrative side of land management is making it difficult for individuals to enjoy the surrounding lands. There was a desire for a more streamlined management and permit process through the BLM, thereby eliminating burdensome paperwork requirements. There was also a desire to see more individual-government relationships. The discussion pointed to the premise that government is good when dealing with businesses, but when it comes to individuals, the government believes them to be incapable of making informed decisions. There was a concern that the BLM simply plays individuals lip service while forging ahead with predetermined policies. Finally, participants wished to see open land that is unrestricted to guns and hunters. The desire for cooperation between hunters and other recreationists was expressed.

7.222 Fruita Leaders

Of the three options (recreation, energy and resource protection), the participants clearly preferred a recreational emphasis in the new RMP. They believe an emphasis on recreation matches the community identity, would draw more people to Fruita for vacations, and would make Fruita a regional destination. Out of the three options, the benefits to Fruita are most clear, and the downfalls minimized, if recreation were to be emphasized.

On the other hand, energy has the potential for clear benefits, but it must be implemented properly. The risks, according to the group, far outweigh the benefits. Preservation also poses some problems because it is the exact opposite of access, something the community highly values. In the end, the participants believed that a clear line shouldn't be drawn between these alternatives because it will just divide the population into battling camps. The best way is to make them work together.

The participants believed that their vision would make Fruita a “cool place to live and play” (very important=100%), promote a healthy lifestyle (very important=66%, neither important nor unimportant=33%), rev the economic engine of the community through economic development (not to be confused with economic expansion), all while maintaining preservation and access to the lands.

7.23. Grand Junction

Because the question was added after these focus groups, Grand Junction residents were not asked to explore the impact a Resource Management Plan emphasizing energy, resource protection and recreation would have on their community. As such, this section focuses solely on the question of beneficial outcomes.

7.231 Grand Junction Residents

In describing the beneficial outcomes of their vision, the following topics were mentioned: nice place to live (100%= very important), sustainable management (100%= very important), biodiversity (80%= very important, 20%= somewhat important), health of the community (67%= very important, 33%= somewhat important), and attracting talent (33%= very important, 50%= somewhat important, 17%= neither important nor unimportant).

To achieve their vision, the residents suggested a more active public lands management as population increases. This includes better points of departure, signage on the trail, reserving marked trails for heavy-use trails; outhouses in heavily used areas; greater collaboration between user groups, and retention of primitive landscapes.

7.232 Grand Junction Leaders

Some desired outcomes of their vision include economic opportunities (75%= very important, 25% somewhat important), recreational accessibility (50%= very important, 50%= somewhat important), mental and physical health (50%= very important, 50%= somewhat important), social diversity (25%= very important, 50% somewhat important, 25%= neither important or somewhat important), and heritage (25% very important, 50% somewhat important, 25% neither important nor unimportant). Other beneficial outcomes include the feeling of safety and ability to get outside and exercise, and connecting children to the land.

To achieve their vision for public lands, participants suggested more interactive discussions with the community about which/how lands are used given population growth, increased enforcement of infractions on public lands such as illegal dumping, increased dialogue between federal and local BLM agencies so the local voice is clearly heard, ramping up the amount of collaborative ways in which the changing urban interface of public lands is dealt with, and the recognition that every interest cannot be satisfied.

7.24. Glade Park

When asked to consider the impact to the community if the RMP plan emphasized recreation or resource development or resource preservation, most comments centered around the recreational emphasis. It was suggested that recreation would increase the use of public lands unless the “BLM cracks down.” A recreational emphasis would negatively impact the quality of roads if mountain biking is encouraged, due to erosion and ruts in the roads. Recreation is likely to impact ranching as well, but this was not clarified as to how. There was a concern that recreation will lead to more trespassing issues and an increased strain on the volunteer fire department’s ability to respond. This is due to the higher demand on rescue services if recreation increases. More education was suggested as a solution to the growth of the population and the increased impact on public lands. Increased recreation use is also likely to lead to more trash on public lands. This was an important concern for many. One suggested solution was to increase the presence of BLM rangers in the area. The participants did not believe an emphasis on energy development would have much of an impact on the community because there are not very many energy resources in the area. There was a fear expressed that the resource protection emphasis would negatively affect hunting and ranching if it entailed closing access to public lands.

When asked about the desired benefits and outcomes their vision would have, the participants indicated that proper management would limit traffic. It was suggested that wildlife in the area is a personal benefit and that cattle drives can be educational. Privacy and solitude was again mentioned as a positive benefit and participants also reacted favorably to the sense of community despite diversity. It was noted that they are resolving these issues as they build a school in the community. Participants were concerned that there was too wide a range of wealth in the community. When

measured for intensity 100% of the respondents indicated that the sense of community in the area is of greatest concern to them as a beneficial outcome. The same number also indicated that the outcome of open space is very important to them. Other outcomes mentioned and measured included heritage and educating the public about ranching and protecting the ranching heritage in the area. In both cases the group was evenly divided between those indicating it is very important and those who indicated it is somewhat important. A brief discussion ensued after intensity was measured for the heritage outcome on concerns about the value of ranching in the area. The group's greatest concern was that growth in the area might limit ranching, and negatively impact wildlife and agriculture if access is denied. There are many benefits to ranching expressed including open space and wildlife preservation. It was feared that new members of the community might not be able to see the value of ranching for the community.

The next question asked what characteristics of BLM managed lands they would specifically maintain or change to achieve their vision. The first and strongest response centered on the issue of access and roads, and a related concern about the mapping of the roads. Maps can be useful, but the roads on the map must be maintained, and if the map calls a route closed it should be closed. Maps and a presence of BLM personnel would both be helpful to educate the public about the roads, and where they can and cannot travel. These maps can also be linked to the Glade Park website, if available, to address these concerns regarding trespass and degradation of the resource when people travel where they are not supposed to.

7.25. Loma and Mack

When asked what would happen to their community if the RMP had a heavy emphasis on recreation or energy development or resource protection, the focus group participants seemed to react most strongly to the emphasis on recreation. If there is too much emphasis on recreation at the cost of energy development or other uses, Loma will suffer economically. BLM should honor current energy commitments including oil shale. The focus on recreation would lead to more people coming and more start-up businesses. This might lead to increased sales and tax revenue, but it will cost the community in terms of loss of solitude and the decline of agriculture (two values ranked very high earlier in the focus group). On the positive side, an increase in population would help the economy through building and home repairs. The housing theme carried over to the conversation about an energy development scenario. This is especially relevant to these communities due to their close proximity to the new coal mine and other energy resources. This would impact not only the demand for housing but the wear and tear on infrastructure such as roads. Despite these costs it was believed that energy development would help protect the economic base of these communities. If there is a significant emphasis on energy development it was suggested that the BLM would have to surrender some of its lands to accommodate the growth in the area as a result of the development. Finally, there were a few that favored a resource protection alternative because they saw it as an increase in regulations on the land (already seen as burdensome). They also believed that resource preservation would limit access (especially if new Wilderness areas were designated). Access was a key issue here, particularly "consistent" access.

The beneficial outcomes that they felt would be derived from their vision included consistency for planning (85% very important), multiple-use public lands (all agreed this was very important - the

highest rank), a sound economic base (75% very important, 25% important), heritage connections (85% very important) and finally, the responsible use of the land (85% very important).

7.26. Mesa County

When asked to speculate what impact an energy-heavy, recreation-heavy and resource protection-heavy RMP would have on Mesa County the respondents eschewed the idea that an should emphasize any single issue over another. Because they believe that energy, recreation and resource protection cannot be disentangled, they would prefer to see all three issues emphasized in an RMP.

In the end, the participants believe that their vision for the community would produce several beneficial outcomes. Among these, economic stability and maintaining the mental/physical health of the community are the most important outcomes to the participants with 66 percent believing these two issues are very important. Other outcomes include protecting Mesa County's heritage (50% very important, 33% somewhat important, 16% neither important nor unimportant), the health of interpersonal relationships and social connections (50% very important, 16% somewhat important, 16% neither important nor unimportant, 16% of little importance), more lifestyle choices, and balanced and expanded opportunities for Mesa County residents.

To achieve their vision for public lands, participants believe that land use managers should focus their efforts on maintaining a healthy and stable ecosystem; limit the number of users in certain areas of public lands; educate the public on the proper use of public lands including etiquette and endangered species; and provide more interpretative opportunities for users.

7.27. Palisade

When asked to describe the impact of a recreation, energy and resource protection emphasis in the RMP on their community, group A participants expressed an interest in balancing all three. However, they recognized that recreation or resource protection would benefit the town and wise energy development would also be acceptable. For recreation, a non-motorized emphasis would be preferable because motorized activities increase noise, pollution, deterioration of trails and have an impact on area wildlife. One participant said that a recreation emphasis would attract a younger, less affluent population. An energy emphasis would increase the size of the community while increasing land values and housing prices. Resource protection, despite being a positive emphasis, would lead to slower growth of the community. Overall, there was recognition that any decision the BLM makes can have an impact on Palisade and that the BLM should work with the community when making these decisions.

Group B participants believed that recreation would provide a sustainable, year-round, economically appealing emphasis that wouldn't inhibit the viewscape. Energy, on the other hand would harm the watershed, be susceptible to the boom and bust cycle of the industry, harm the viewscape of the area, and negatively impact the wildlife habitat of the area. It was expressed that residents don't like the idea of an energy heavy RMP. Resource protection would help the scenery and preserve the past by preserving archaeological resources, but it could also decrease use and access and lead to more users creating their own unauthorized trails.

The benefits of group A's vision includes improved physical health (50%= very important, 50%= somewhat important), mental health (75%= very important, 25%= neither important nor unimportant), social health through social interaction (75%= very important, 25%= somewhat important) and the maintenance of small-town life (100%= very important).

Group B participants discussed the impact their vision has on the physical and mental health of the community (100%= very important), self sustainability, uniqueness (having own little place in the valley); a well-rounded community that provides a variety of recreational opportunities, businesses such as orchards, wineries, and agritourism (100%= very important), cultural heritage through interpretations and (ideally) a museum displaying the historic resources of the area (60%= very important; 40%= somewhat important), a well-positioned agricultural industry; healthy and adequate water resources, especially for the agriculture industry and recreation (100%= very important).

To achieve their vision, group A participants would provide more defined attractions to further their goal of agritourism while creating a stronger management focus to help mitigate the negative impacts increased tourism has on public lands. This stronger management focus would require that the BLM defines who the users of public lands are, what the users expect from the BLM, and create a transparent process for making reasonable decisions.

7.28. Gateway

The focus group was asked what might happen to the Gateway community if the RMP revision took a particular emphasis such as energy development or recreation, or resource protection. In response to the recreation scenario, there were concerns that it would seriously cost the community because "livestock operations, hunting, mining or anything that is profitable on public lands would disappear." Participants also believe that a recreation emphasis would increase the demand for services that the community would have to provide including emergency services and law enforcement, but it would also increase the number of businesses in the community. They are concerned that there would be a loss of wildlife as a result of increased traffic, especially those traveling fast early and late in the day. The increased volume of recreation activity would also have a detrimental effect on habitat and cause the game to be hesitant to venture into open space to graze. Other concerns expressed with a recreation emphasis include the clash with other uses such as energy development, and the need for the BLM to increase its administrative commitment to the area for trail construction and maintenance as well as signage. There was a concern that this would stretch the limited resources of the BLM for the entire field office. Most of the concerns relating to the energy development emphasis center around planning for the development. It was the opinion of several that if energy development was done "the right way" there would be little or no impact. Others suggested that they would prefer uranium energy development to oil and gas because of its minimized impact and traditional association with the area. If the RMP has a resource protection emphasis in the area, it was suggested that it would help recreation as the area would become a destination point especially with additional Wilderness designation. On the other hand, if trails are closed to protect resources this might negatively affect livestock jobs and recreation in the area.

Next, participants were asked what beneficial outcome emerges from their vision of their community and public lands. The overwhelming concern based on their comments seems to be freedom and the multiple-use of public lands. When polled, 80% suggested that promoting the value of freedom is

very important to them and 80% also placed the strongest emphasis possible on balanced use of land. It was suggested that different users would check each other. There was also a strong sentiment (60% very important and 30% important) attached to the idea of a connection to the history and lifestyle of the area. It is feared that too much Wilderness creates limited access which threatens or goes against these strongly held goals.

When asked to be more specific about what character settings for the landscape that they would maintain or change they suggested that the BLM not advertise public lands as much because it attracts too many people. They also recommended allowing wood cutting to help healthy stands of trees, which led to a side discussion on the difficulties and restrictions on vehicles in the current tree cutting permit process.

7.3: BLM Actions: As listed in Appendix 11, a number of action items were requested by the communities. Some action items fall under the jurisdiction of the BLM while others do not. This report lists all action items listed by the communities and indicates if the action item falls under the jurisdiction of the BLM and RMP revision. If an action item falls under the jurisdiction of the GJFO, the action item is categorized into the most relevant planning issue category. Approximately 90 percent of the action items are coded as being relevant to the BLM's jurisdiction and revision of the RMP.

8. Collaboration

A final component of the focus groups was to identify the appropriate collaborative role for local governments, businesses, tourism industry, and community residents in the planning and managing of public lands.

8.1. Collaboration: Aggregate Results

As illustrated in Figure 6, the results show significant support for community involvement in both planning (Mean= 4.41) and management (Mean= 3.49). Overall, participants were more receptive to the idea of collaboration in planning rather than management.

Figure 9: Role of Collaborative Partners in Planning and Managing of Public Lands

Question	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Local Government Planning	72	4	1	5	3.97
Business Planning	73	4	1	5	3.49
Tourism Planning	73	4	1	5	3.49
Community Residents Planning	73	4	1	5	4.41
Local Government Management	73	4	1	5	2.93
Business Management	73	4	1	5	2.62
Tourism Management	72	4	1	5	2.47
Community Residents	71	4	1	5	3.49

Management					
------------	--	--	--	--	--

Question: “What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLM’s land managing partners in managing and planning for federal public lands?”

Note: 1= Never, 2= Rare, 3= Occasional, 4= Frequent, 5= Significant

As illustrated in Figure 10, there are a number of additional groups that were identified by participants. These groups range from the national citizenry to agricultural interests.

Figure 10: Potential Collaborating Partners: Aggregate Results

Potential Collaborating Partners	Number of Communities that Mentioned Group
Educational Institutions (local schools and MSC)	4
Individual User Groups	4
National Citizens	3
States	3
Colorado Department of Wildlife	2
Organized Advocacy Groups	2
Agricultural Interests	1
Colorado National Monument	1
COPMOBA	1
Counties	1
Emergency Services	1
Environmental Groups	1
Expert Groups (Sierra Club)	1
Extraction Industries	1
Federal Agencies	1
Friends of the Mustang	1
Groups with Conditional Use and Special Permits	1
Non-Profit Groups (i.e. Boy Scouts)	1
Other Government Agencies	1
Powderhorn Resort	1

Figure 10: Potential Collaborating Partners: Aggregate Results

Potential Collaborating Partners	Number of Communities that Mentioned Group
Professional Associations	1
Public Interest Groups	1
Riverfront Commission	1
Scientists	1
Senior Citizens	1
Small Communities	1
Tribal Interests	1
United States Forest Service	1
Urban Trails	1
Visitors to the Region	1
Volunteer Fire Department	1
Western Slope ATV	1
Wild Horse Council	1
Wildlife Groups	1
Youth	1

8.2. Collaboration: Community Results

The results for each community are illustrated in Figure 10.

Figure 11. Collaborating Partners: Results by Community

Collaborating Partner	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Local Government Planning	3.64	4.13	4.10	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.56	3.67	3.97
Business Planning	4.00	3.25	2.70	2.60	4.78	2.67	3.56	4.10	3.49
Tourism Planning	3.33	3.71	3.60	2.80	3.56	3.67	4.11	3.40	3.49
Community Residents Planning	4.82	3.88	4.30	4.30	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.40	4.41

Figure 11. Collaborating Partners: Results by Community

Collaborating Partner	De Beque	Fruita	Grand Junction	Glade Park	Loma Mack	Mesa County	Palisade	Gateway	Total
Local Government Management	2.25	3.00	2.70	3.40	3.11	3.00	3.44	2.78	2.93
Business Management	3.08	2.50	1.60	2.00	4.00	2.17	2.44	3.00	2.62
Tourism Management	2.25	2.86	2.10	2.00	2.33	3.17	2.78	2.78	2.47
Community Residents Management	3.60	3.50	2.50	3.67	4.56	3.83	2.56	3.90	3.49

8.21. De Beque

Like all other community assessment focus groups, the De Beque focus group participants were also asked to rate their preferences for collaborative partner roles in the planning and management of public lands. Participants thought that the greatest role in planning should go to community residents with 91% of the respondents indicating that the role for residents should be significant (the highest rating). This can be compared to the significant percentages for the other groups, local government (36%), businesses (45%), and tourism (17%). Curiously, 18% indicated that local government should never be involved in planning, and 9% said business should never be involved in planning. In the area of management, residents once again expressed support for involvement (30% significant and 20% frequently, with 10% suggesting they should never be involved in management). Nevertheless the average support for involvement fell. Only business received support for significant involvement in management of public lands (17%). Local Government is not expected to be involved in management according to 42% of the respondents (which is the most common response). Tourism also had negatives but it was far less likely to show up in the “never participate” column (25%). When asked why it is so important to have citizen involvement it was replied that “we know what we want to have happen out there, and if we have a say, then we will get what we want.” Other groups not polled but mentioned include Western Slope ATV, the Friends of the Mustang, and the Wild Horse council.

8.22. Fruita

8.221 Fruita Residents

When asked who should be involved in the planning and management of public lands, the participants leaned heavily towards community residents. In fact, 60 percent of the participants said that community residents should play a “significant role” in planning while the other 40% believe they should have a “frequent role.” When compared to the other groups (local governments, businesses, tourism industry), only local governments showed as

much support to be involved in the planning process (40%= significant, 40%= occasional). However, when it comes to managing the land, participants are not as supportive of community involvement. Only 20% believe community residents should be “significantly” involved in management with 40% believing they should have frequent and occasional involvement. On the other hand, 100 percent of the participants believe local government should be “occasionally” involved in the management of public lands. Other groups that the participants identified include visitors to the region and organized advocacy groups.

8.222 Fruita Leaders

The results show that local governments should be the most active in planning (significant=66%, occasional=33%) followed by tourism (significant=33%, frequent=66%), community residents (significant=33%, frequent=33%, occasional=33%) and businesses (significant= 33%, occasional= 33%). In managing the lands, no single group stands out. Businesses and the tourism industry have the same support (frequent=66%, occasional=33%) followed by local government (frequent= 33%, occasional=66%) and community residents (frequent=33%, occasional=33%, rare=33%). One participant said that the democratic process requires that community residents become highly involved in planning, but that management is a different function. Moreover, it was stated that the definition of “community” is difficult to define and that the BLM should place a stronger emphasis on defining the communities it serves.

Other groups the participants noted should be included in these discussions include national citizens, states, counties, individual user groups (such as rafters and bikers), and professional associations (such as the City Managers League, National Parks and Recreation Association). They believe that in the end, more input is always valuable.

8.23. Grand Junction

8.231 Grand Junction Residents

For involvement in planning, community residents received the most support (67%= significant, 33%= frequent), followed by local governments (17% significant, 67%= frequent, 17%= rare), tourism industry (83%= frequent, 17%= occasional), and business (50%= occasional, 50%= rare). Community residents were also thought to play the largest role in managing public lands (17%= significant, 50%=occasional, 33%= rare). Other groups include: local governments (50%= occasional, 50%= rare), business (67%= rare, 33% never), tourism industry (33%= frequent, 67%= rare), and community residents.

Other groups that were mentioned as collaborating partners include scientists (especially in land management), state government (land management), agricultural interests, the national population, other government agencies, environmental groups, and educational groups such as Mesa State College and public schools.

8.232 Grand Junction Leaders

The results show that Grand Junction leaders exhibit the greatest level of support for local governments. The results show that 50 percent of the participants think local governments should have a “significant” level of involvement in planning while 50 percent feel it should be frequent. Comparatively, the results show lukewarm support for planning by other sectors: business (25%= frequent, 50% occasional, 25% rare), tourism (25%= significant, 50% occasional, 25% rare), and community residents (75%= frequent, 25% occasional). As for management, local government also leads in level of support with 100 percent believing it should have an “occasional” role. Comparatively, the other groups received little support: business (50%= rare, 50%= never), tourism industry (25% rare, 75% never) and community residents (25% never, 75% rare). The participants feel that it would be difficult to get the community involved.

Other collaborating partners the participants identified include non-profit groups such as boy/girl scouts, COPMOBA and other organized user groups, tribal interests, extraction industries, educational institutions such as Mesa State College and public schools and senior citizens. Residents also suggested that the BLM revise the way it collects information that doesn’t require lengthy meetings because people simply don’t have the time.

8.24. Glade Park

Most think there is a frequent role for local government in the planning process, less so for the local business community. This term “business community” confused the group as it lacked context in the area, so it was operationalized to represent ranchers. This led to a separate set of assessments for the ranching community. There was a strong feeling that they should be involved in the process significantly (60% of respondents) or frequently (40%). Unlike the other queries that indicate a diminishment between participation in planning and participation in management, the values for ranching participation in management remained strong (40%= significant) and (30%= frequently). Other interesting results of the participation question in planning and management came from responses to the proper role of community residents in these areas. Eighty percent suggested that the role of community residents in the planning process should be significant, and 30% suggested the role of community citizens in the management of public lands should be significant while another 30% suggested that it should be frequent. When asked about these results, it was suggested that community involvement should be strong because they are the ones on the land every day. Participants seemed to be more interested in providing input in planning rather than day-to-day management activities. Other collaborating partners mentioned by the participants include CDOW, Glade Park Volunteer Fire Department, the USFS and the Colorado National Monument.

8.25. Loma and Mack

In Loma and Mack, business was defined in this focus group by the participants to be agriculture and energy industries. Every participant rated the role of business so defined as significant (75%) or frequent (25%) in the planning process. While 70% maintained these rankings for business’ role in management, the emphasis and frequency of their role decreased across the board. The role of the tourism industry was less defined in the planning and management of public lands. There was at least a 10 % decrease in each choice with a greater emphasis on less involvement of the tourism industry in the management process. Most notable was the response to the role of community residents in

the planning and managing of public lands. All nine participants think that residents should be significantly involved (the highest rating) in planning, and that support remained at 70% for having a significant role to play managing public lands by community residents. When asked, participants indicated that they know the land as well as anybody. Follow-up questions to better understand what participants meant when they indicated that there should be a significant role for community residents in the actual management of public lands suggests that activities such as trail-building, clean-up, conservation, and policing of the area as well as oversight and evaluation of BLM managers are important roles for citizens to play.

The last question was intended to capture any partnerships in planning and management that might have been missed by earlier discussion. Immediately it was suggested that the BLM needs to start partnering better with local schools. The BLM needs to reach out to the younger generation, but must do so from a variety of perspectives. It was noted that there are no younger people at the meetings and they would like to see them more involved in the process. There was some concern expressed that if too many interests were represented at “the table” it would be unmanageable as the BLM tried to please all. User groups should be consulted for collaboration in both planning and management.

8.26. Mesa County

The participants were most favorable of community involvement in planning (33%= significant, 33%= frequent, 33%= occasional). Other results show support for the role of tourism (16%= significant, 50%= frequent, 16%= occasional, 16%= rare), and local government (16%= significant, 33%= frequent, 50%= occasional) being involved in planning. Less support was shown for the role of business in planning (66%= occasional, 33%= rare).

Participants also expressed a desire for the community to be involved in the management of public lands (16%= significant, 50%= frequent, 33%= occasional). Support was also shown for the tourism industry (16%= significant, 66%= occasional, 16%= rare). Receiving less support was local government (16%= frequent, 66%= occasional, 16%= rare) and business (16%= occasional, 83%= rare).

8.27. Palisade

When looking at the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLM’s land managing partners, the results indicate:

Figure 12: Palisade Collaborating Partners Results

Local Government	Group A	Group B
Planning	50%= significant 25%= frequent 25%= occasional	80%= significant 20%= frequent
Management	75%= occasional	40%= significant

	25%= rare	20%= frequent 40%= occasional
Businesses		
Planning	100%= occasional	20%= significant 60%= frequent 20%= occasional
Management	50%= rare 50%= never	40%= frequent 40%= occasional 20%= rare
Tourism Industry		
Planning	25%= significant 25%= frequent 50%= occasional	60%= significant 20%= frequent 20%= occasional
Management	50%= occasional 25%= rare 25%= never	40%= frequent 50%= occasional 25%= rare
Community Residents		
Planning	25%= significant 50%= frequent 25%= occasional	60%= significant 40%= frequent
Management	25%= occasional 50%= rare 25%= never	20%= significant 40%= occasional 40%= rare

Other partners listed by the two groups include the state, expert groups such as the Sierra Club or other organized groups (such as motorized groups and Trout Unlimited) because all groups need to have the opportunity to participate and the results need to be transparent. Other groups include small

communities such as Mesa, Powderhorn Resort, youth groups (although not necessarily the school district), wildlife groups, and nonprofit groups that aren't aimed at wildlife (such as Urban Trails and the riverfront commission).

8.28. Gateway

The results show that 50 percent of the group indicated that citizens should be significantly involved in the planning process while another 40 percent thought citizens should be frequently involved in the planning process. Fewer (only 20%) thought citizens should be significantly involved in management, but 50% thought that involvement should be frequent. When further pressed to explain how they interpreted "management" or why there was such a need for citizen involvement they indicated that because the plans are always evolving, the people must stay connected to the decision making because the people are the ones that have to live with decisions made. They also felt that residents are closer to the issues and understand them better than a decision maker in a distant area, such as New Jersey, who might not know the land. Participants expressed a note of caution on citizen management because the citizens change overtime and this may have a significant impact on management. Responses to the other categories of collaborative partners indicate lukewarm support for local government's role in planning (only 50% indicated it should be frequent or more often) and even less support for local government's role in management (only 30% indicated it should be frequent or significant). Response for business involvement was marginally better with 80% indicating that it should be frequent or significant in the planning stage, but only 30 percent indicating that it should be frequent and 10percent indicating that there is no role at all for business in management of public lands. The greatest division in the group came when asked about the role for the tourism industry in planning, and management of BLM lands. Forty percent thought it should be significantly involved in planning while 20 percent said it should have no role at all. This division continued when asked about tourism's involvement in management with every choice from significant involvement (10%) to no involvement (20%) was selected by some members of the group.

When asked about other collaborating partners that could or should be involved in either planning or management, the group had several suggestions. They suggested that the general public, not just community residents, should be involved. In keeping with the emphasis on wildlife in the Gateway group, CDOW was suggested as an important partner in both planning and managing public lands. Groups with conditional use and special use permits as well as other federal agencies and schools were also mentioned. The desire to include schools both K-12 and higher education surfaced in over half of all the focus groups in the area. This might be an untapped or underutilized potential partnership. Other groups mentioned as potential partners include recreation clubs, public interest groups and emergency services.

9. Findings

1. The Value of Public Land: Regardless of the community, public lands are a vital component of what citizens enjoy about living in their community. The most frequently discussed values- wildlife, access, small-town atmosphere, quiet/isolation, open space and recreation- are all related to public lands. The same is true for concerns- health of public lands, social spaces, water, trash, oil and gas development, jobs and economic growth, and user balance of public lands. While some connections to public lands may not be as readily apparent as others, they are nonetheless visible. For example, the small-town atmosphere of many

communities is protected by surrounding public lands as it prevents significant population increases. It is clear that public land both attracts and maintains residents and increases the quality of life in the Grand Junction Field Office.

2. A Tailored Approach to Managing Public Lands: In most cases the character of a community is shaped by its surrounding public lands. From Fruita's recreational destinations to Glade Park's ranching community, public lands shape the communities they surround. Because citizens are attracted to the character of their communities, they have a strong desire to maintain it. The result is a lack of consensus among the communities, which complicates the management of those lands. The different interests and intensity preferences among the communities suggest that a tailored management approach for each community is preferable to a one-size-fits-all management approach. Without a carefully tailored approach, the communities may feel as though the BLM is threatening their quality of life and the character of their communities. Please reference the above individual community write-ups for a more detailed discussion.

3. Conflicting Viewpoints: Even within communities there are conflicts over what is desired. For example, the experiences ATV users and quiet users seek are contradictory. Yet, because the participants believe that public lands should provide opportunities for multiple users, they expressed a desire for multiple-use management. Specifically, participants expressed a desire for a tailored multiple-use approach that reflects community values, addresses the concerns of community members, and helps the community achieve its outcomes.

4. Economic Opportunities: Given the diversity of communities and public lands in the BLM GJFO, there are a diverse range of economic opportunities directly tied to public lands. These include agri-tourism, ranching, extractive resources development, tourism, attracting business, and recreation services (just to name a few). Not all of these economic opportunities appear in each community. In fact, the uniqueness of the local economic opportunities on public land contributes to the unique characteristics of the distinctive communities. There can be conflict among these opportunities and the BLM should tailor the management of its lands to prevent and/or manage conflict.

5. Regional Hub: Grand Junction is a regional hub and there is recognition that the management of public lands can impact the city and surrounding communities. This impact can be felt in numerous ways from acting as a natural barrier to growth, to encouraging high-density development, attracting young talent to the region, and attracting businesses. In turn, because Grand Junction is the regional hub, what happens in Grand Junction has an impact on surrounding communities. As a result, the BLM should factor this into its decision making process.

6. Educational Outreach: There was a desire by participants to see a conscientious effort by the BLM to engage in educational outreach. Educating citizens about public lands, the challenges of managing these lands, and stewardship was important to many communities. Beginning this process with children (in tandem with public schools) will help correct many of the problems witnessed on public lands such as trash and ad-hoc trail building. In turn, this will lessen the burden on the BLM which is perceived to be stretched as a result of inadequate funding. This would help ameliorate public relations problems that may persist in the GJFO while giving communities a more focused understanding of how the BLM can appropriately help them achieve their visions.

7. Collaboration: Beyond outreach, there is a clear desire for collaboration between the BLM and various partners. The two groups that received the most support as collaborators are community residents and local governments. There was greater support for collaboration in the planning process than there was in the management of public lands. Also, a number of additional partners were identified as ones the BLM should consider when planning and managing public lands.

8. Identifying Areas of Action: Because of budgetary concerns, as well as a defined jurisdiction, the BLM cannot address every action desired by focus group participants. As such, the BLM should be judicious when identifying areas of action. Its emphasis should be on collaborating with other jurisdictions and partners to ensure that its management actions can have the greatest impact in helping communities achieve their vision.

Appendix

Appendix 1. Values: Rural and Grand Valley Communities

Given the diversity among the communities in which focus groups were conducted, the above results are sorted into Grand Valley and rural communities. Grand Valley communities include Grand Junction, Palisade, Fruita and Mesa County.

	Rural			Grand Valley Communities			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Recreational Access	5.00	0	7	4.67	1	3	4.90	1	10
Small Town	4.32	3	19	4.42	4	12	4.35	4	31
Wildlife	4.80	1	30	4.00	3	5	4.69	3	35
Sense of Community	4.11	2	9	5.00	0	4	4.38	2	13
Access	3.86	4	7	4.81	1	26	4.61	4	33
Viewscape				4.31	4	13	4.31	4	13
Recreation				5.00	0	13	5.00	0	13
Regional Provider				5.00	0	4	5.00	0	4
Open Space	4.65	3	17				4.65	3	17
Quiet/Isolation	4.53	3	19	4.00	2	4	4.43	3	23
Family History	4.30	2	10				4.30	2	10
Ranching	4.60	3	10				4.60	3	10
Festivals				4.29	1	7	4.29	1	7
Tourism				4.50	1	4	4.50	1	4
Big But Not Too Big				4.67	1	9	4.67	1	9
Culture Guided by Landscape				4.25	2	4	4.25	2	4
Variety of Ecosystems				4.80	1	5	4.80	1	5
Non-Motorized Access				4.60	1	5	4.60	1	5
Not Grand Junction	4.25	2	8				4.25	2	8
Lower Taxes	4.38	2	8				4.38	2	8
Agriculture	4.78	2	9	4.67	1	3	4.75	2	12
Shopping				4.50	1	4	4.50	1	4
History/Heritage				3.67	1	3	3.67	1	3

Appendix 2. Concerns: Rural and Grand Valley Communities

	Rural			Grand Valley Communities			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Waste Ponds	4.92	1	12				4.92	1	12
Social Spaces	4.18	2	11	4.00	2	6	4.12	2	17
Horse Sales	4.50	2	12				4.50	2	12
Oil and Gas Development				4.40	2	14	4.40	2	14
Health of Public Lands				4.71	2	17	4.71	2	17
Trash	5.00	0	9	4.80	1	5	4.93	1	14
Green Energy				4.40	2	5	4.40	2	5
Jobs and Economic Growth				4.29	2	14	4.29	2	14
Economic Diversity				4.60	2	10	4.60	2	10
Attract Young Talent				4.00	0	4	4.00	0	4
Housing Options				4.50	1	4	4.50	1	4
Place Identity				4.75	1	4	4.75	1	4
User Balance of Public Lands	5.00	0	9	4.75	1	4	4.92	1	13
Sustainable Ranching	4.80	1	10				4.80	1	10
McInnis NCA	4.30	1	10				4.30	1	10
WSA Proposals	4.67	1	9				4.67	1	9
Water	4.90	1	10	4.67	1	6	4.81	1	16
Agriculture				4.89	1	9	4.89	1	9
Wildlife				4.50	2	4	4.50	2	4
Federal Government Listen to Local Community				5.00	0	4	5.00	0	4
Air Quality				4.45	1	11	4.45	1	11
Social Events				4.00	2	6	4.00	2	6
Education				4.67	2	6	4.67	2	6
Regional Hub Status				4.33	2	6	4.33	2	6
Physical Growth				4.83	1	6	4.83	1	6
Enforcement	4.67	2	9				4.67	2	9
Noxious Weeds	4.33	4	9				4.33	4	9
Closed Trails	4.78	1	9				4.78	1	9
Mining and Shale as Economic Help	4.56	3	9				4.56	3	9
Transportation				4.40	2	5	4.40	2	5
Downtown Core				4.60	1	5	4.60	1	5
Integration				4.60	1	5	4.60	1	5
Access	4.33	2	9	5.00	0	3	4.50	2	12
Working on Public Lands	4.43	3	7				4.43	3	7
2AI Solitude	4.13	2	8				4.13	2	8
2AJ Stewardship	4.50	1	6				4.50	1	6

Appendix 3. Outcomes: Rural and Grand Valley Communities

	Rural			Grand Valley Communities			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Health (Physical, Social, Mental)	4.82	1	11	4.42	4	22	4.55	4	33
Pride	4.73	1	11				4.73	1	11
Family Time	4.58	2	12				4.58	2	12
Heritage	4.60	4	40	4.33	2	15	4.53	4	55
Decrease Stress	4.50	2	12				4.50	2	12
Rabbit Hunting				3.60	4	5	3.60	4	5
Jobs/Economic Opportunities	4.78	1	9	4.33	2	9	4.56	2	18
Diversity				4.11	2	9	4.11	2	9
Clean Outdoors				4.60	2	5	4.60	2	5
No Fences				3.20	4	5	3.20	4	5
Access				4.50	1	4	4.50	1	4
Sense of Community	5.00	0	10	5.00	0	5	5.00	0	15
Education About Ranching	4.50	1	10				4.50	1	10
Open Space/Privacy	5.00	0	10				5.00	0	10
Small Town Life				5.00	0	4	5.00	0	4
Relationships				4.00	3	6	4.00	3	6
Economic Stability				4.67	1	6	4.67	1	6
Nice Place to Live				5.00	0	9	5.00	0	9
Responsible Use of Land	4.89	1	9	5.00	0	6	4.93	1	15
Attract Talent				4.17	2	6	4.17	2	6
Biodiversity				4.80	1	5	4.80	1	5
Consistency for Planning	4.78	2	9				4.78	2	9
Multiple-Use	5.00	0	9				5.00	0	9
Healthy Water Resources				5.00	0	5	5.00	0	5
Freedom	4.60	3	10				4.60	3	10
Balanced Use	4.60	3	10				4.60	3	10

Appendix 4. Collaboration: Rural and Grand Valley Communities

	Rural			Grand Valley Communities			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Local Planning	3.82	4	39	4.15	3	33	3.97	4	72
Business Planning	3.85	4	40	3.06	3	33	3.49	4	73
Tourism Planning	3.27	4	41	3.78	3	32	3.49	4	73
Community Planning	4.63	4	40	4.15	4	33	4.41	4	73
Local Management	2.85	4	40	3.03	3	33	2.93	4	73
Business Management	3.00	4	40	2.15	3	33	2.62	4	73
Tourism Management	2.33	4	40	2.66	4	32	2.47	4	72
Community Management	3.92	4	38	3.00	4	33	3.49	4	71

Appendix 5. Values: Group Type

	Resident			Leader			Mixed Group			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
1A Recreational Access				4.67	1	3	5.00	0	7	4.90	1	10
1B Small Town	3.60	4	5	5.00	0	7	4.32	3	19	4.35	4	31
1C Wildlife	4.00	3	5				4.80	1	30	4.69	3	35
1D Sense of Community				5.00	0	4	4.11	2	9	4.38	2	13
1E Access	5.00	0	10	4.67	1	12	4.18	4	11	4.61	4	33
1F Viewscape	3.60	4	5	4.75	2	8				4.31	4	13
1G Recreation	5.00	0	5	5.00	0	4	5.00	0	4	5.00	0	13
1H Regional Provider				5.00	0	4				5.00	0	4
1I Open Space							4.65	3	17	4.65	3	17
1J Quiet/Isolation							4.43	3	23	4.43	3	23
1K Family History							4.30	2	10	4.30	2	10
1L Ranching							4.60	3	10	4.60	3	10
1M Festivals				4.29	1	7				4.29	1	7
1N Tourism				4.50	1	4				4.50	1	4
1O Big But Not Too Big	4.60	1	5				4.75	1	4	4.67	1	9
1P Culture Guided by Landscape							4.25	2	4	4.25	2	4
1Q Variety of Ecosystems	4.80	1	5							4.80	1	5
1R Non-Motorized Access	4.60	1	5							4.60	1	5
1S Not Grand Junction							4.25	2	8	4.25	2	8
1T Lower Taxes							4.38	2	8	4.38	2	8
1U Agriculture				4.67	1	3	4.78	2	9	4.75	2	12
1V Shopping				4.50	1	4				4.50	1	4
1W History/Heritage				3.67	1	3				3.67	1	3

Appendix 6. Concerns: Group Type

	Resident			Leader			Mixed Group			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
2A Waste Ponds							4.92	1	12	4.92	1	12
2B Social Spaces							4.12	2	17	4.12	2	17
2C Horse Sales							4.50	2	12	4.50	2	12
2D Oil and Gas Development	4.20	2	10	4.90	0	4				4.40	2	14
2E Health of Public Lands	4.55	2	11				5.00	0	6	4.71	2	17
2F Trash	4.80	1	5				5.00	0	9	4.93	1	14
2G Green Energy	4.40	2	5							4.40	2	5
2H Jobs and Economic Growth	4.09	2	11	5.00	0	3				4.29	2	14
2I Economic Diversity	4.50	2	6	4.75	1	4				4.60	2	10
2J Attract Young Talent				4.00	0	4				4.00	0	4
2K Housing Options				4.50	1	4				4.50	1	4
2L Place Identity				4.75	1	4				4.75	1	4
2M User Balance of Public Lands				4.75	1	4	5.00	0	9	4.92	1	13
2N Sustainable Ranching							4.80	1	10	4.80	1	10
2O McInnis NCA							4.30	1	10	4.30	1	10
2P WSA Proposals							4.67	1	9	4.67	1	9
2Q Water							4.81	1	16	4.81	1	16
2R Agriculture				4.89	1	9				4.89	1	9
2S Wildlife				4.50	2	4				4.50	2	4
2T Federal Govt Listen to Local Community				5.00	0	4				5.00	0	4
2U Air Quality				4.40	1	5	4.50	1	6	4.45	1	11
2V Social Events							4.00	2	6	4.00	2	6
2W Education							4.67	2	6	4.67	2	6
2X Regional Hub Status							4.33	2	6	4.33	2	6
2Y Physical Growth	4.83	1	6							4.83	1	6
2Z Enforcement							4.67	2	9	4.67	2	9
2AA Noxious Weeds							4.33	4	9	4.33	4	9
2AB Closed Trails							4.78	1	9	4.78	1	9
2AC Mining and Shale as Economic Help							4.56	3	9	4.56	3	9
2AD Transportation				4.40	2	5				4.40	2	5
2AE Downtown Core				4.60	1	5				4.60	1	5
2AF Integration				4.60	1	5				4.60	1	5

Appendix 6. Concerns: Group Type

	Resident			Leader			Mixed Group			Total		
2AG Access				5.00	0	3	4.33	2	9	4.50	2	12
2AH Working on Public Lands							4.43	3	7	4.43	3	7
2AI Solitude							4.13	2	8	4.13	2	8
2AJ Stewardship							4.50	1	6	4.50	1	6

Appendix 7. Outcomes: Group Type

	Resident			Leader			Mixed Group			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
3A Health (Physical, Social, Mental)	4.20	4	5	4.47	2	11	4.71	2	17	4.55	4	33
3B Pride							4.73	1	11	4.73	1	11
3C Family Time							4.58	2	12	4.58	2	12
3D Heritage				4.33	2	9	4.57	4	46	4.53	4	55
3E Decrease Stress							4.50	2	12	4.50	2	12
3F Rabbit Hunting	3.60	4	5							3.60	4	5
3G Jobs/Economic Opportunities	4.00	2	5	4.75	1	4	4.78	1	9	4.56	2	18
3H Diversity	4.20	2	5	4.00	2	4				4.11	2	9
3I Clean Outdoors	4.60	2	5							4.60	2	5
3J No Fences	3.20	4	5							3.20	4	5
3K Access				4.50	1	4				4.50	1	4
3L Sense of Community				5.00	0	5	5.00	0	10	5.00	0	15
3M Education About Ranching							4.50	1	10	4.50	1	10
3N Open Space/Privacy							5.00	0	10	5.00	0	10
3O Small Town Life				5.00	0	4				5.00	0	4
3P Relationships							4.00	3	6	4.00	3	6
3Q Economic Stability							4.67	1	6	4.67	1	6
3R Nice Place to Live	5.00	0	6	5.00	0	3				5.00	0	9
3S Responsible Use of Land	5.00	0	6				4.89	1	9	4.93	1	15
3T Attract Talent	4.17	2	6							4.17	2	6
3U Biodiversity	4.80	1	5							4.80	1	5
3V Consistency for Planning							4.78	2	9	4.78	2	9
3W Multiple-Use							5.00	0	9	5.00	0	9
3X Healthy Water Resources				5.00	0	5				5.00	0	5
3Y Freedom							4.60	3	10	4.60	3	10
3Z Balanced Use							4.60	3	10	4.60	3	10

Appendix 8. Collaboration: Group Type

	Resident			Leader			Mixed Group			Total		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Local Planning	3.82	3	11	4.56	2	16	3.80	4	45	3.97	4	72
Business Planning	2.73	1	11	3.44	3	16	3.70	4	46	3.49	4	73
Tourism Planning	3.60	1	10	3.94	3	16	3.32	4	47	3.49	4	73
Community Planning	4.27	4	11	4.13	2	16	4.54	4	46	4.41	4	73
Local Management	2.64	1	11	3.31	3	16	2.87	4	46	2.93	4	73
Business Management	1.82	2	11	2.38	3	16	2.89	4	46	2.62	4	73
Tourism Management	2.60	3	10	2.50	3	16	2.43	4	46	2.47	4	72
Community Management	3.36	3	11	2.44	4	16	3.91	4	44	3.49	4	71

Appendix 9: Focus Group Script

Introduction:

Good evening/afternoon, my name is Tim Casey, I am a professor of Political Science at Mesa State College and the field coordinator for The Natural Resource and Land Policy Institute at Mesa State. We have been asked by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to help them understand the hopes and vision of the communities in and around the Grand Junction Field Office as they relate to public lands. The BLM Grand Junction Field Office is currently undergoing a revision of its Resource Management Plan (RMP), this is the document that will guide management decisions on 1.2 million acres of public lands around us for the next 20 years. Your participation in this focus group is a critical part of this planning process. I want to thank you for your willingness to spend some time with us to better understand the community's needs regarding BLM public lands. Your participation in this focus group is entirely voluntary, and you are welcome to leave at any point, or simply choose not to answer a question if you don't want to. Your answers to these questions will remain anonymous, but the responses in this focus group will be part of the public administrative record of the RMP process. The entire focus group experience should take about an hour, and there are some snacks in the back that you are welcome to go and get at anytime. Are there any questions so far?

As part of the focus group process, we will be using the "clickers" that you were handed when you came in. Please turn your clicker units on at the top when we ask for you to record your input through the "clicker". You can do so by pressing the on/off button at the bottom of the clicker unit until the power light at the top of the unit stays on. When you push a letter choice (A-E) it will be recorded anonymously by the receiver unit plugged into my laptop. We can then display the results on the overhead to facilitate further discussion. You are free to change your selection until I close the voting, which I will announce before I do it. We will not be using the clickers on every question, but they are an effective tool for us to be able to assess the intensity of your concerns regarding issues that are raised. My assistant _____, is a student at Mesa State and I have asked him/her to join us today and take notes on your responses. Because your comments are important to us, we have also set up a microphone to record the conversation so that we can go back and make sure we didn't miss anything. Are there any questions over how we will proceed?

Okay, then let us begin.

Q1: What are the things you like about living in your community?

(List these on the PowerPoint as they are mentioned, once many issues are raised, the facilitator will group similar responses for the follow-up clicker question)

For this next set of questions we will be using the i>clickers, please turn your unit on.

Q1.5: Issue : _____ *(Repeat 3-5 times for clusters of issues identified above)*

On a scale of A-E, how important is this issue to you

A= Unimportant

B= Of Little Importance

C= Neither Important nor Unimportant

D= Somewhat important

E= Very Important

Q2: How do public lands in the area affect the quality of life issues you just described?

Q3: Describe your vision for your community's future....the way it should be 20 years from now.

Q4: Communities and local governments are always being challenged to effectively manage the community's resources, the environment, and social and economic well-being.

Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL and ECONOMIC values/concerns for public officials, residents, and stakeholders to recognize/address to achieve your community vision?

(list answers on power point slide labeled "concerns")

Once again, we will be using the clickers. Be sure your clickers are turned on. I will list one of the concerns you raised, and you will rate how important that concern is to you as it relates to your vision for the next 20 years in the area.

Q4.5: Concerns: _____ *(Repeat 3-5 times for clusters of concerns identified above)*

On a scale of A-E, how important is this concern to you?

A= Unimportant

B= Of Little Importance

C= Neither Important nor Unimportant

D= Somewhat Important

E= Very Important

Q5: Thinking about: 1) your community vision and 2) the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead, describe your VISION FOR THE SURROUNDING PUBLIC LANDS administered by the BLM.

Q6: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes (social, environmental, economic etc.) that your vision provides?

(list the outcomes mentioned on a power point slide titled "beneficial outcomes")

Using the clickers to record your response, I will list a few of the outcomes you mentioned and you indicate how important those outcomes are to you in the next 20 years. Be sure your unit is turned on.

Q6.5: Outcome:_____ *(Repeat 3-5 times for clusters of outcomes identified above)*

On a scale of A-E, how important is this outcome to you?

A= Unimportant

B= Of Little Importance

C= Neither Important nor Unimportant

D= Somewhat important

E= Very Important

Land managers produce different outcomes by maintaining or changing the landscape. Specifically the:

- 1) Physical characteristics of the landscape (natural-looking to highly modified)
- 2) Social characteristics of the landscape (includes the way people use the area and the amount of users), and
- 3) Administrative/managerial characteristics of how the land is managed (including active vs. passive management or the levels of regulations).

Q7: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands and produce your desired outcomes?

Q8: Keeping in mind the physical, social and administrative landscape characteristics you just mentioned, what management, marketing, administrative and monitoring actions need to be undertaken to create the landscape that will produce the desired outcomes you identified?

(These actions can include:

1. Actions to maintain/change the landscape characteristics or land health.
2. Allowable uses or allocations that are acceptable, restricted or prohibited on public lands and mineral estates.)

Q9: Finally, what do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLM's land managing partners in managing and planning for federal public lands?

1. Local Governments
2. Businesses
3. Tourism Industry
4. Community Residents
5. Others

Each should be assessed for a collaborative role in managing, planning or both. In order to do this efficiently, turn on your clickers again and for each select one of the following choices.

A = Planning

B = Managing

C= Both planning and managing

D= Neither planning nor managing

E = I don't know

(record these on a generic ppt slide titled "Collaborative Partner: _____" followed by the choices A-E listed above)

Q10: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning:

1. Public Lands
2. The land use planning process, or
3. This small group discussion.

Thank you for your time and participation in our focus group. Your responses are vital to a successful RMP planning process that takes account of the hopes and concerns of the communities that are affected by public lands nearby. These responses will be compiled with the responses of other focus groups we are conducting in the area. We will report the results to the BLM, which will incorporate those responses into its development of alternatives. Later in the year, there will be a public process to review those alternatives, then a plan will be developed, followed by further public comment period and a record of decision implementing the new RMP in 2010. We encourage you to stay active in the process throughout. Our report on this community assessment will be available on the BLM's Website (GJFO RMP page). Thank you again for your time. Have a good day.

Appendix 10: Action Items by Community

Action Items	Community	Group	Management Unit	Planning Issue Category	In RMP
Access to public lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
ATV riding access	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Picnic access	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Access to show public lands to visitors	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Access to maps for public lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
More informational signs concerning public lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Keep ATV trails and develop more trails into different lengthened loops	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Develop pull-off areas on trails/roads to protect lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Maintain roads	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
More access to lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
More roads for recreational access	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Maintain and Develop access but not too much access.	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Make public lands accessible while preserving them	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain access to public lands	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Improve trail system to avoid off trail activity	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Connect community of Fruita to public lands by trail system (diverse use, biking, hiking)	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Make Kingsview Road more connected to river for bikes	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley and M. Canyons NCA	1	Yes
Trail growth should match population growth	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Improve river access	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley and M. Canyons NCA	1	Yes
Do not close trails	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Diversify access to public lands	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain easy access to public land by car from valley	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Increase trailheads	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes

Increase signage on trails close to town for new population	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain some areas with limited signage and access	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain roads for access to lands	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Maintain roads for elderly transportation	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Maintain access to public lands	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Close some roads during certain times of the year to prevent damage (i.e. wet roads)	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Provide range of access from easy to difficult	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Retain diversity of roads (ATV, pickup trucks, cars) as it contributes to isolation	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Analyze effects of mountain biking trail grooves on the environment because of erosion	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Minimize traffic to the area	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Provide maps of the BLM lands	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Maintain roads	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Maintain roads listed on the maps so public will know if they are travelable	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	1	Yes
Keep horse trails separate from ATV trails	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Work with user groups on building trails	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Provide access for the elderly	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Provide for better signage	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Fix broken signs	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain access to public lands	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Complete riverfront walkway area	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Create more diverse access to public lands	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Maintain and improve access to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Connect pedestrians in Palisade to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley, Grand Mesa Slopes and Roan Creek	1	Yes

Increase pedestrian and bicycle access from community to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley, Grand Mesa Slopes and Roan Creek	1	Yes
Build trail system linking Palisade to De Beque	Palisade	Leader	Roan Creek	1	Yes
Cooperate with communities when developing trails	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley and Grand Mesa Slopes	1	Yes
Increase access points to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes	1	Yes
More trail connectivity to public lands from communities	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley , Grand Mesa Slopes, and Roan Creek	1	Yes
Develop bike trails from Palisade to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	1	Yes
Keep access to public lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	1	Yes
Maintain access to public lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	1	Yes
More management of lands by BLM through signs, trails	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	1	Yes
Consider realistically the impacts of oil and gas development	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley and Roan Creek	2	Yes
Consider the long-term impact of oil and gas development	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley and Roan Creek	2	Yes
Keep oil and gas development to a minimum	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	2	Yes
Maintain economic base by supporting mining, oil and oil shale	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	2	Yes
Respond to community concerns about gas development	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley and Roan Creek	2	Yes
Do not drill in viewshed	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley and Roan Creek	2	Yes
Nominal extraction of oil and gas	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	2	Yes
Smart Energy Development	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	2	Yes
Recreational Opportunities	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	3	Yes
More multiple-use opportunities	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	3	Yes
Recreational emphasis would have best effect on Fruita	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Consider multiple types of river users	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley and M. Canyons NCA	3	Yes
Preserve recreational element of area	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	3	Yes

Be able to accommodate multiple users	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley and Bangs Canyon	3	Yes
Maintain remote settings	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley and Bangs Canyon	3	Yes
Maintain multiple-use management	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	3	Yes
Provide places to go for hikers, bikers and horseback riders	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley and M. Canyons NCA and Bookcliffs	3	Yes
Maintain recreation opportunities	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Manage land wisely to provide for recreational opportunities given Loma's location	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley and M. Canyons NCA and Bookcliffs	3	Yes
BLM should look at the impact Moab BLM decisions have on the area, especially the restriction of recreation in Moab	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Manage for multiple-use	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Limit number of people in certain areas	Mesa County	Mixed	M. Canyons NCA and Bookcliffs	3	Yes
Increase recreational opportunities for families	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley , Grand Mesa Slopes, and Roan Creek	3	Yes
Create opportunities to recreate on public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley , Grand Mesa Slopes, and Roan Creek	3	Yes
Prioritize space and resources for conflicting user groups	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley , Grand Mesa Slopes	3	Yes
Non-motorized emphasis in Palisade area	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley , Grand Mesa Slopes, and Roan Creek	3	Yes
Recreational emphasis in RMP would be most beneficial to Palisade	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Diversify recreational opportunities	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	3	Yes
Preserve solitude	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	3	Yes
Plan for multiple uses on public lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	3	Yes
Maintain solitude on public lands through stricter enforcement	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	3	Yes
Keep agricultural land	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	4	Yes

Do not trash the fringe of the community	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Acquire BLM lands for community growth	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Streamline the process of public lands disposal	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Minimize impacts of growth on public lands	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Promote more open space	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Maintain open space	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	4	Yes
Educate the public about trading or selling public lands	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	4	Yes
Maintain open space on public lands	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Limit urban sprawl by containing it with surrounding public lands	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Pursue land disposal of public lands in "useless" land (esp. east of airport)	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Protect viewshed	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley, Bangs Canyon and BookCliffs	4	Yes
Contain urban sprawl	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Maintain open spaces	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	4	Yes
Stop land swaps that allow development in viewshed	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley, Bangs Canyon, Roan Creek and BookCliffs	4	Yes
Maintain open space	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	4	Yes
Minimize development of resort areas	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	4	Yes
Manage for population growth	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	4	Yes
Discourage BLM from selling land to "big money" unless average person has an opportunity for the land as well	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	4	Yes
Wildlife	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	5	Yes
Open land unrestricted to guns and hunting	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	5	Yes
Maintain wildlife	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	5	Yes
Preserve wildlife habitat	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	5	Yes
Maintain opportunities for hunting and fishing	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	5	Yes
Improve wildlife habitat	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	5	Yes
Keep rich wildlife	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	5	Yes

Maintain habitat for wildlife	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	5	Yes
Develop an area for events such as rodeo/motocross	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	Yes
More gathering places, especially for horses	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	Yes
Maintain Gobblins area	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	Yes
More gathering places	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	Yes
Develop picnic areas or shelters with collected fees	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	Yes
Resource protection should be balanced within reason	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	6	Yes
Manage some areas for community (local) use	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley and Bangs Canyon	6	Yes
Develop SRMA for Grand Mesa Slopes	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes	6	Yes
Maintain existing roadless areas	Grand Junction	Resident	Bangs Canyon and Bookcliffs	7	Yes
Proposed wilderness areas would have an adverse impact on area because of impact on ranching	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	7	Yes
No more wilderness	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	7	Yes
More WSAs	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	7	Yes
Minimize wilderness areas because it cuts off access	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	7	Yes
Like to see a lake	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	8	Yes
Protect riparian areas	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	8	Yes
Provide public education about how to behave in wild thereby reducing need for emergency services	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	8	Yes
Maintain water quality in watershed on public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	8	Yes
Increase sensitivity to watershed issues	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes	8	Yes
Do not drill or build roads in watershed	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes	8	Yes
Manage energy development to avoid water pollution	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes and Roan Creek	8	Yes
Educate population on threatened and endangered species	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	9	Yes
Address noxious weeds	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	10	Yes

Allow woodcutting to maintain health of trees	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	10	Yes
Maintain air quality standards	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	11	Yes
Use grasses on public lands that are more nutritious for livestock	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	12	Yes
Allow presence of agriculture on public lands to remain	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	12	Yes
Manage grazing for sustainability	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	12	Yes
Maintain ranching	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	12	Yes
Management plan should include grazing	Mesa County	Mixed	All units	12	Yes
Heritage is linked to public lands	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	13	Yes
Maintain agricultural roots of the area	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	13	Yes
Maintain heritage through ranching	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	13	Yes
Connect to heritage through ranching	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	13	Yes
Preserve archeological resources	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	13	Yes
More interpretive displays for heritage resources	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	13	Yes
Maintain lifestyle and history of area	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	13	Yes
Attract/develop business	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	14	Yes
Provide for economic vitality	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Rely more on tourist dollars than energy resource development	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Don't give away the tax base	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Maintain link of public lands to economy (ranching, recreation)	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	14	Yes
Maintain agriculture	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley and Bookcliffs	14	Yes
Open hunting lands because it is important to economy	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley and Bookcliffs	14	Yes
Maintain rural atmosphere while managing for a good recreational area to support economic base of community	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Increase opportunities for social interaction	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	14	Yes
More diverse agricultural base	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Maximize resources available to community	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Diversify economic activity	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	Yes

Increase racial and cultural diversity	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Support agriculture (esp. fruit-growing)	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	Yes
Allow land to provide income to sectors (miners, timber, trail guides, hunters, ranchers, river rafters)	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	14	Yes
Allow for continued economic benefits of land (mining)	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	14	Yes
Don't want to be disposal area for oil and gas industry	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	15	Yes
No oil and gas disposal ponds near the public	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	15	Yes
Regulate natural gas development with focus on water quality and public health	Palisade	Leader	Grand Mesa Slopes and Roan Creek	15	Yes
Minimize management in area by BLM because it takes away personal freedom	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	96	Yes
Fees should be fair	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	96	Yes
Improve democratic process of decision-making	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Eliminate burnt cars and trash in desert	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Balance approach to recreation, energy development and resource preservation	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Streamline the permit process	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Minimize fencing	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Potential user fees	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Avoid lengthy public meetings by focusing meetings on specific issues	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Notify people ahead of time of the content and length of the meetings	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Consider animals and plants not just people in decision-making process	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Increase scientific staff at BLM	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Increase enforcement of rules on public lands	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Increase active management of resources based on increased populations	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Build outhouses in heavily used areas	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	Yes

Assist community with roads that butt up to public land	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	96	Yes
Analyze the impact of BLM lands on the volunteer fire department	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	96	Yes
Send BLM ranger to the area intermittently	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	96	Yes
Provide for law enforcement on public lands, especially for illegal ATV/dirt bike trail building	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Trash cleanup	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Do not show preferential treatment to a single user-group	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
BLM should be consistent in its decisions	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Don't change vision every 9 years; need consistency and planning	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Minimize regulations	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Balance approach to recreation, energy development and resource preservation	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Reduce adversarial nature of public lands decision-making on BLM lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Greater customization of approach to public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Balance approach to recreation, energy development and resource preservation	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Increase well-defined attractions on BLM lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Develop a more transparent process for decision-making	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
More clearly define user groups	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Manage lands according to RMP, not according to exceptions	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Cleanup trash on public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Create a citizen's commission for public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	96	Yes
Prevent land abuse (trash, illegal roads)	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes
Prevent abuse of land	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes
Assist local fire, police and ambulance departments which respond to public lands emergencies	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes

More resources devoted to BLM to manage lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes
Freedom to use public lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes
Better synchronization of BLM regulations and permits (get tree cutting permit but can't drive to bring it back once cut)	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	96	Yes
BLM explain rules and regulations	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	97	Yes
BLM engage in public education about how managing public land	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	97	Yes
Increase communication with communities	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Post changes to the management of public land (such as land swaps) through new technologies such as gladepark.com	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	97	Yes
Public education on public lands stewardship (trash, proper trail use)	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	97	Yes
Educate public about the importance of ranching and ranching heritage	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	97	Yes
Increase public land stewardship	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Educate people on how to use public lands	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Develop more interpretive opportunities	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Promote a public land use ethic	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Communicate BLM plans to communities	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Educate youth to understand stewardship of public lands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	97	Yes
Develop proper land stewardship	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	97	Yes
Include Western Slope ATV as a collaborating partner	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	98	Yes
Include Friends of the Mustangs as a collaborating partner	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	98	Yes
Include Wild Horses Council as a collaborating partner	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	98	Yes
Greater opportunity for collaborative partnerships with local government and organizations	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
More cooperation between user groups and land managers	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Listen to the public not just business and government leaders	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	98	Yes

Engage larger public (not just locals) in the planning process	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	98	Yes
More regional decision-making ability	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Having the community have more of an impact on the decision making of the BLM	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Increase the amount of collaborative ways to deal with the changing interface of public-private land	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
BLM ought to be talking with the tourism industry	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Letting the people who are recreating have input in the process	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Engage organized groups in planning process	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Develop senior citizen volunteer opportunities on public land	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Encourage user groups to work together	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Engage citizens beyond the local area in the planning process	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Include CDOW as a collaborating partner	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	98	Yes
Include Colorado National Monument as a collaborating partner	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	98	Yes
Include the Forest Service as a collaborating partner	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	98	Yes
Include the Volunteer Fire Department as a collaborating partner	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	98	Yes
Include schools as collaborating partners	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Too many collaborators can put pressure on the BLM to satisfy all groups	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Include environmental groups, farmers, and ranchers as collaborating partners	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Include user groups as collaborating partners	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Include youth as collaborating partner	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Include interest groups as collaborating partners	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes

Engage more people in public lands management process	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Develop volunteer programs	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Develop more partnerships with education providers K-12 and colleges	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Engage ranching community in planning process	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Increase partnerships with other agencies and experts to better meet public demands	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Involve a wide variety of groups in the management/decision-making process	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Give organized groups an opportunity to participate	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Engage wildlife groups in planning process	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Engage other non-profit organizations (i.e. Riverfront Commission) in planning process	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	98	Yes
Allow community to help manage public lands	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include CDOW as a collaborating partner	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include groups with conditional use permits as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include other federal agencies as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include schools as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include recreational clubs as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include public interest groups as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Include emergency services as collaborating partners	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Better communication between BLM and community on meetings	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	98	Yes
Recognize the unique geographical diversity of the area	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	99	Yes
Protect diversity of ecosystems	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	99	Yes
Maintain a healthy ecosystem	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	99	Yes

Develop transportation in valley	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	1	No
Develop airport resource	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	1	No
Develop a light rail system for the valley	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	1	No
Have a hydro plant	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	2	No
No development of ski areas	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	3	No
Control growth of town	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	4	No
Not controlled but smarter growth (i.e. taller buildings downtown)	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	4	No
Maintain rural lifestyle	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	4	No
Limit urban sprawl by concentrating growth in urban cores	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	4	No
Grow community of Palisade to about 5000 people	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	4	No
Increased use of conservation easement to protect agriculture	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	4	No
Smart-development of the city	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	4	No
Golf course	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	No
Develop a waterfront park	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	6	No
Maintain ownership of water rights in the valley	Mesa County	Mixed	Grand Valley	8	No
Job training that allows people to meet their needs	Fruita	Resident	Grand Valley	14	No
Promote local businesses rather than national chain stores	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	14	No
Retain the community feel that currently exists	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	14	No
Maintain affordability of the area	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	14	No
Integrate racial and cultural diversity (esp. migrant population)	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	No
Better integrate Latino community	Palisade	Leader	Grand Valley	14	No
Develop a regional plan rather than a piecemeal approach	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	96	No
More consistency in the Department of Interior so one President of the U.S. cannot impact policies	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	96	No
More amenities and better housing	De Beque	Mixed	Roan Creek	99	No
Enhance small town atmosphere	Fruita	Leader	Grand Valley	99	No

Expand Mesa State College	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	99	No
Provide adequate housing	Grand Junction	Leader	Grand Valley	99	No
Take steps to preserve orchards	Grand Junction	Resident	Grand Valley	99	No
Keep housing restrictions to a minimum for affordable housing	Glade Park	Mixed	Glade Park	99	No
Prevent Loma from turning into Fruita, especially dense housing	Loma & Mack	Mixed	Grand Valley	99	No
Build nursing home	Gateway	Mixed	Gateway	99	No

Key: 1= Travel Management; 2= Energy Development; 3= Recreation Management; 4= Lands & Realty/Community Growth and Expansion; 5= Fish and Wildlife; 6= Special Designation Areas; 7= Wilderness Study Areas and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics; 8= Water, Soil, and Riparian Areas; 9= Special Status Species Management; 10= Vegetation Management; 11= Air Quality; 12= Livestock Grazing; 13= Cultural, Heritage, and Paleontological Resources and Native American Religious Concerns; 14= Social and Economic Considerations; 15= Public Health and Safety; 16= Noise; 17= Drought Management/Climate Change; 96=BLM Administrative Actions; 97= Education and Outreach; 98= Collaborating Partners; 99= Miscellaneous.

Appendix 11: Focus Group Notes by Community

GJ Leaders Notes

Date: February 23, 2009

Location: Grand Junction Municipal Building

Number of Attendees: 5

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntary.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Having federal land near the city.
 - Access to open space and recreation.
 - Mild weather.
 - Overall size of community.
 - Large enough to have what you need.
 - Not so large that you commute long distance.
 - Having college here.
 - Adds culture and education.
 - Adds to knowledge base.
 - Strong medical community.
 - Shopping and retail.
 - Something for everyone.
 - Family friendly.
 - Generally feels safe.
 - Economic driver.
 - Gateway to Colorado/adventure.
 - *Regional provider:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Sense of community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Access to public land:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*

- Public lands sort of frame us due to the compactness.
- Has a bearing on who moves here.
 - Outdoor enthusiasts more likely to move here.
 - Like people tend to move here.
- Economic opportunity brings people here.
- Extractive industries help to define community.
- To summarize, public lands help to define the community.
- You could not have a Grand Junction in another area.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future.*
 - Importance as a regional center will grow.
 - We will become more compact.
 - We anticipate an influx in population.
 - While we accommodate that population, the public lands become even more important.
 - As a place to just get out.
 - To sustain the community and to maintain the quality of life.
 - Grand Junction will become the most livable city west of the Rockies by 2035.
 - It is important not to trash the fringe of our communities because of potential growth.
 - It is important for transportation to grow with the community.
 - Provides connection to outside the world.
 - Our airport and roads border BLM land.
 - Thus they will have an impact.
 - College will have to grow with it.
 - Needs a balanced approach.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic?*
 - *Economic*
 - Diversification.
 - Attraction of young talent.
 - What does it take to attract young professionals?
 - *Social*
 - Public safety.
 - Increasing polarization of view points that does not lead to constructive outcomes.
 - Sort of reduces cultural diversity.
 - Providing adequate housing.
 - *Environmental*
 - Coexisting uses of public resources.
 - Mineral extraction, recreation, grazing, etc.
 - Ability to maintain agricultural roots of the area.
 - Recognizing geographical features that make us unique.
 - *Measurements*
 - *Q1: Diversity in Community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
 - *Q2: Attracting Talent:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%

- *Q3: Housing:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q3: Sense of Identity:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
- *Q4: Balancing User Groups:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*
 - More regional decision making ability.
 - Individual field offices having a stronger input.
 - Having the community have more of an impact on the decision making of the BLM.
 - Be able to accommodate multiple users.
 - Being able to potentially acquire BLM lands for community growth.
 - Potentially streamlining this process.
 - Land disposal issues.
 - That there is diverse accessibility to the lands.
 - Urban interfacing.
 - As the communities grow, how will this change and be managed?
 - Potential for fee by use.
 - Will BLM institute these?
 - Will the fees remain here?
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes?*
 - Recreational accessibility would help with health.
 - Both mentally and physically.
 - Improve economic diversity.
 - Provides opportunities for supporting businesses.
 - Feeling of safety.
 - You want to feel safe on public agency.
 - Increase diversity of community.
 - Attracting younger people.
 - People with more diverse interests.
 - Wild land/urban interface.
 - Cultural preservation.
 - So that new residents can understand how this community got to where it is.
 - The ability to get outside.
 - Exercise.
 - Connecting to nature/outdoors.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%

- B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=25%
- *Q2: Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q3: Economic opportunity:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
- *Q4: Social diversity:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=25%
- *Q5: Access:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
 - More interactive discussion with community.
 - About which lands used in what fashion.
 - There have to be parcels for all experiences.
 - Will become more important as population grows.
 - How do you mix all these together and still make it work?
 - Ramp up the amount of collaborative ways we deal with the changing interface.
 - Clearly you cannot make everyone happy.
 - However...
 - If I know that I have places I can engage in the types of activities.
 - I will be much happier overall.
- *Measurements*
 - *Local Governments*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=50%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=100%

- D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Businesses*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=25%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management
 - A. Never=50%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Tourism Industry*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=25%
 - The BLM ought to be talking with the tourism industry.
 - Letting the people who are recreating have input in the process.
 - Management
 - A. Never=75%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Community residents*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=25%
 - D. Frequent=75%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - I do not think you can get community to be significantly involved in the process.
 - It is also a national thing.
 - Management
 - A. Never=25%
 - B. Rare=75%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Feels that it becomes sort of self policing.
 - Occasionally call for volunteers.
 - *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - Non-profit groups:
 - Boy scouts/Girl scouts

- COPMOBA.
 - Stakeholders.
 - Organized groups.
 - See these groups as more in the planning process.
 - Tribal.
 1. Because of heritage issues.
 - Extraction industries.
 - Educational.
 - College and public schools.
 - How it interfaces with learning.
 - Seniors Citizens.
 - As potential volunteers.
 - As users.
- *Question: Other issues/ comments/ suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*
 - What is the possibility of getting the results from this study?
 - There has to be a better way to get information from people than committing them to 3 and 4 day public meetings.
 - Perhaps do more specific targeting of the issues.
 - People just do not have the time.
 - Perhaps parceling this information to the public so they can go to the specific meeting.

GJ Community Meeting

Date: February 23, 2009

Location: Grand Junction Municipal Building

Number of Attendees: 5

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Easy access to outdoor recreation
 - Variety of ecosystems
 - Non-motorized public access
 - Amenities, but not over-crowded
- *Measurements:*
 - Big, but not too big:
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=60%
 - Access to outdoor recreation:
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - Variety of ecosystems:
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
 - Non-motorized public access:
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=60%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - Availability of solitude.
 - Not necessarily crowded.
 - Wilderness.
 - Unimproved land.
 - Accessibility of the land.

- Self discovery.
 - Land not necessarily signed.
 - Allows for the individual to find his own path.
- Public land constrains urban sprawl.
- Sense of self.
 - Allows for a connection with nature.
 - Land = big...I = small.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - From a public lands perspective, I would like to see it remain road less.
 - No new development.
 - Perhaps some development into the public lands.
 - Allows for a presence of agriculture to remain.
 - I would like to see it look like it did 10 years ago.
 - Less growth.
 - The growth is becoming too much.
 - I hope that I can still drive 10-15 minutes and access public lands.
 - I would like to see distinct communities...Palisade, Fruita, Grand Junction, etc.
 - Like the idea of seven distributed areas.
 - Different areas keep their character.
 - Local businesses rather than national chain stores.
 - Kind of cool to be a destination to some extent.
 - Wine making, mountain biking.
 - Steps need to be taken to preserve the orchards.
 - The Redlands used to have good orchards and now it is nothing.
 - Would rather have tourist dollars than oil and gas dollars.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social*
 - *Economic*
 - Oil and gas over-development
 - Diversity
 - Consider long term impacts
 - Regional plan rather than piece meal system
 - Do not give away tax base
 - Growth pays its own way
 - *Environmental*
 - Do not be people centered
 - Also animals & plants
 - Open space
 - Loss of farmland
 - Manage growth
- *Measurements*
 - *Q1 Physical Growth*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=17%
 - E. Very Important=83%

- *Q2 Economic Growth*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=67%
 - E. Very Important=33%
- *Q3 Oil & Gas Development*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=67%
- *Q4 Economic Diversity*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=17%
 - E. Very Important=66%
 - It is important that agriculture is a part of it.
 - Also retail, tourism, mineral, etc.
 - Agriculture includes everything.
 - Winery, grazing, etc.
- *Q5 People not the only focus - landscape matters*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=17%
 - E. Very Important=66%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead describe your vision for the surrounding public lands:*
 - Grazing.
 - A place for it but it has to be done right.
 - Has to manage so that it is sustainable.
 - Prevent over-grazing.
 - Does not have to be everywhere.
 - Protection of riparian areas.
 - Oil & gas has been a 90/10 balance.
 - It seems that they f get what they need.
 - More people = more pressure on resources.
 - Increased need for more/better management.
 - Overall diversity for the entire ecosystem.
 - More employees at the BLM.
 - Need scientists that are studying rather than managers that are reacting.
 - More enforcement.
 - Due to population pressures.
 - Overuse has resulted in litter and destruction of areas.
 - Public lands become an opportunity for public education.

- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes?*
 - A nice place to live.
 - Sustainably managed lands.
 - Healthy community.
 - Public lands work to draw professionals/talent.
 - Biodiversity
 - Intact habitat
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1 Nice place to live:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q2 Sustainable management:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q3 Health of the community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=67%
 - *Q4 Attracting talent:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=33%
 - *Q5 Biodiversity:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for public lands?*
 - Adequate routes currently exist for the recreating that I like to do.
 - As more people begin to use the area, more active management will be needed.
 - Points of departure.
 - Signage on the trail.
 - For new people and to keep people on the trail.
 - Maybe have places closer to town/heavier used areas have marked trails.

- While places less used left unmarked for those who want to explore.
 - Important to have areas that are less accessible.
 - Outhouses in heavily used areas.
 - Intensively manage heavily used/close to town lands.
 - But do not forget the areas that are not near human interaction.
 - We cannot keep adding a new user group every 10-15 years.
 - Rather than take it from wildlife make it work with other groups.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
- *Measurements:*
- *Local Governments-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=17%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=67%
 - E. Significant=17%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management
 - A. Never=33%
 - B. Rare=67%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Tourism Industry*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=17%
 - D. Frequent=83%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=67%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=0%

- *Community Residents*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=67%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=33%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=17%
- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*
 - Scientists
 - State government
 - Agriculture
 - Larger residents-national community
 - Other agencies
 - Environmental groups
 - Educational groups
 - Mesa State College & Public Schools
- Like the idea of the smaller focus group.
 - Allows a conversation to develop.

Fruita General Public Meeting

Date: February 24, 2009

Location: Fruita Civic Center

Number of Attendees: 5

- *Introduction*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker.*
 - Used to gage intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Tons of wildlife around the area
 - I love to hunt.
 - 1.2 million acres of open land.
 - Variety of outdoor activities.
 - Rafting
 - Shooting
 - Fishing
 - Access to open/public land.
 - Multiple uses of the land.
 - It is not Grand Junction.
 - Yet it is close to Grand Junction.
 - Un-obscured views.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1 Access:*
 1. Unimportant=0%
 2. Of Little Importance=0%
 3. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 4. Somewhat Important=0%
 5. Very Important=100%
 - *Q2 Wildlife/Hunting:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=20%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=40%
 - *Q3 Small town atmosphere:*
 - A. Unimportant=20%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=60%
 - E. Very Important=20%
 - *Q4 Views:*
 - A. Unimportant=20%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%

- E. Very Important=40%
- *Q5 Variety of outdoor activities:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - They allow you to get away from it all.
 - Penultimate thing.
 - It provides a geographic restriction to excessive growth.
 - Pivotal to our small town atmosphere.
 - At the same time it has contributed to growth.
 - Through tourism and such or so forth
 - Given everything we like about it, it is sort of silly to not expect everyone else to like it.
 -
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - Not controlled growth, but smarter growth
 - You could build taller buildings downtown.
 - My vision would be to keep it the same size, but I know this won't happen.
 - I do not want to see areas close-down.
 - There has to be some smart planning for the public lands.
 - They need to be proactive, which leads the users to do their own planning.
 - Population in the area is going to double again.
 - Yet land managers have no desire to double the amount of available trails.
 - Which leads to users making their own trails/access
 - It is awesome that they want to hear this, but does anybody at the BLM care?
 - There needs to be more cooperation between user groups and land managers
 - River access.
 - We need to think about the different types of users of the river.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social*
 - Preserve those elements that make Fruita desirable
 - Recreation
 - *Economic*
 - Oil and gas
 - Boom and bust economics
 - Green energy
 - Having job training that allows for people to meet their needs
 - Wind energy
 - *Environmental-*
 - Trash
 - Burnt cars in desert
 - Trash in desert
 - Be more aware of the damage the oil and gas industry has created
 - *Measurements*

- *Q1 Oil & Gas*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=40%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=20%
- *Q2 Preserve the Elements*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=80%
- *Q3 Trash on Public Lands*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
- *Q4 Green Energy*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=60%
- *Q5 Jobs & Training*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
 - D. Somewhat Important=80%
 - E. Very Important=0%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead describe your vision for the surrounding public lands:*
 - The same, enjoyed and appreciated.
 - Without the refrigerators and trash.
 - No closure.
 - This is not management.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation*
 - It is scary because one group can get so dominant that it can lobby and get the access it desires.
 - I also like the idea of having our lands for recreation.
 - This is not about management.
 - I cannot only run my business. I also have to be a part of the community, develop trails.
 - It needs to be balanced. Rather than only leaning one way or the other.
 - It threatens my vision if anyone of these is overemphasized.

- Cost of everything goes up as a result of increases in recreation and energy development.
- All things being equal, recreation generally improves the quality of life for the area.

- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes?*

- Health.
 - Mental, physical and otherwise.
- Clean outdoors.
- Jobs.
- Growth we like.
- Diversity.
- Rabbit dinners.

- *Measurements:*

- *Q1 Jobs:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
- D. Somewhat Important=60%
- E. Very Important=20%

- *Q2 Health:*

- A. Unimportant=20%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=80%

- *Q3 Diversity:*

- A. Unimportant=20%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=40%
- E. Very Important=40%

- *Q4 Clean Outdoors:*

- A. Unimportant=20%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=80%

- *Q5 No Fences:*

- A. Unimportant=20%
- B. Of Little Importance=20%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=40%

- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*

- Heavy management through the permit process.
 - All the paper work.

- Perhaps streamlining the process.
- The administrative side of the land is getting too complicated to enjoy the lands.
- More activities means more jobs.
- Government is good at dealing with businesses.
 - However, the individual or the general public has very little say.
 - Most of what it does provide is a dog and pony show.
 - It feels that the general public is incapable of the decisions needed.
- Open land unrestricted to guns and hunting.
 - Hunters and recreational users can coexist.
 - They are smart enough to figure it out.
 - Fences restrict hunters, particularly rabbit hunting.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=60%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=40%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional =100%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=100%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management
 - A. Never= 20%
 - B. Rare=60%
 - C. Occasional=20%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Tourism Industry*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=75%
 - D. Frequent=25%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management
 - A. Never=20%
 - B. Rare=20%
 - C. Occasional=60%

- D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Community Residents*
 - Planning
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=60%
 - Management
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=20%
 - *Others*
 - Visitors
 - It's not just our public land, it belongs to everyone.
 - Every sport has an organized advocacy group.
- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*
 - Using the land to its best potential while keeping in mind social, environmental, and economic factors.
 - Geological uniqueness.

Mesa County Leaders Meeting

Date: February 27, 2009

Location: Mesa County Annex Building

Number of Attendees: 6

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gage intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Big enough, yet not too big.
 - Huge diversity of outdoor activities.
 - You can be at 5,000 ft and in the same day be at 10,000ft.
 - Remote locations.
 - Walk out your back door and be in a area that is set aside for hiking and/or fishing.
 - Close proximity to open space.
 - Community and culture is very much grounded in the landscape.
 - The area has a lot of potential for quiet use recreation.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1 Big not too big:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
 - *Q2 Diversity of outdoors:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q3 Community grounded in landscape:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q4 Access/proximity:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
 - *Q5 Quiet Use/Wilderness Area:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important nor Unimportant=25%
- D. Somewhat Important=50%
- E. Very Important=25%

- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*

- They are the reason I live here.
 - Because I have access to those lands.
 - They impact both where I choose to live and where my house is.
- They enhance the value of living here.
- Enhance the quality of life of our children.
- They connect us to reality.
 - Whereas video games are not real.
- They offer wildlife habitat.
 - They are very important to our economic and social aspects of being here.
- They play a significant role in attracting businesses to locate here.
 - This is our main pitch.
- They are an educational tool.
- They place a limit on sprawl.

- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*

- Big, not too big.
- Economically diverse.
- A place where there are more job opportunities.
 - Better paying.
- Maintain much of the traditional feel of the area.
- Hope that agriculture is a major part of the economy.
- A can-do place, a place that figures out how you can do things.
 - An example is skateboarding in the community.
- We want to be in a place where we are in control of our own fate.
- It would be nice if agriculture was the predominant money maker.
- Having public lands managed in a way that preserves wildlife habitat.
- It would be nice to see more public land stewardship.
 - It would be nice to see the general public more engaged.
- Looking at sprawl.
 - Limit it.
 - Concentrate in urban cores.

- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*

- *Social:*
 - Education.
 - More opportunities for social interaction.
 - Social cohesiveness.

- Maintaining small town character while still being a major metropolitan area.
 - Self-sufficient.
 - Having a casual gathering place.
 - Downtown for example.
 - Completing river walkway area.
- *Environmental:*
- Education.
 - Winter inversions.
 - Cause repertory problems.
 - Maintain ownership of our water rights in the valley.
 - State and health of our public lands.
 - Would like to see more Wilderness Areas.
- *Economic:*
- Education.
 - Work on how we can make agriculture more viable.
 - Diversity and sustainability is critical.
 - More economic opportunities so kids can make a good living here.
- *Measurements:*
- *Q1 Air Quality:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q2 Water:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=67%
 - *Q3 Social Events:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=33%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=33%
 - *Q4 Social Places:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q5 Education:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=83%

- *Q6 Regional Hub:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q7 Health of Public Lands:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%

• *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*

- Diverse access to public lands.
- Important to think about multiple access.
 - Improves diversity.
- It is important to look at how diverse access will affect wildlife.
- Would like to see public lands managed to include grazing.
 - This provides a significant economic boost to the area.
- Have some areas managed for community use.
 - Places the locals know.
- Not overly regulated.
- The areas of public lands that are basically useless should be turned over to private uses.
- The area east of the airport could be a great place to expand.

Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?

- If you emphasized any one of these it would upset balance and sensibility.
- With regard to the economy it is hard to say how it would be affected.
- Need to ask how we can do these things together.
- We have the ability to do much more in all three if these categories.
- Would like to see integrating these and finding a balance between them.
- It has to have an emphasis by geographical areas.
 - The alternatives should be focused on an area.
- *Recreation:*
 - Will make the community more attractive.
- *Energy:*
 - If the coal mine opened in Fruita, you could still have trails and recreation use.

- *Resource:*

- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*

- Balanced and expanded opportunities.
- Stable economic structure.
 - If we really work on maintaining the land and wildlife.
 - This provides a stable economic structure.
- Sustainable way of life.
- Health.
- Protection of our heritage.
- More lifestyle choices.
- Health of interpersonal relationships.
 - Social connections from a diverse place.

Measurements:

- *Q1 Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=17%
 - D. Somewhat Important=17%
 - E. Very Important=66%
- *Q2 Relationships:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=16%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=16%
 - D. Somewhat Important=16%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q3 Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=16%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q4 Economic Stability:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=66%

- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*

- Maintain a healthy ecosystem.
 - Stable.
- Limit number of people in certain areas.
- Education on how to use public lands.
 - Etiquette.
 - Recreation users and energy development.

- How to have low impact behavior.
- Have more interpretative opportunities.
- Improvements might have developmental impact, but they have also reduced the impact.
- The agency should promote a public land use ethic.
- Education of threatened and endangered species.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=16%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=16%
 - C. Occasional=66%
 - D. Frequent=16%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=33%
 - C. Occasional=66%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=83%
 - C. Occasional=16%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Tourism Industry:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=16%
 - C. Occasional=16%
 - D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=16%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=16%

- C. Occasional=66%
- D. Frequent=0%
- E. Significant=16%

- *Community Residents:*

- Planning:
 - A. Never= 0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=33%
- Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=16%
 - There is a need for volunteers.
 - Taking ownership.
 - Emotional ownership.

- *Others:*

- User groups.
- Academia.
 - Scientific community.
- Local schools.
 - K-12 schools.
- Ranching community.
- State & federal government.
- Mining, oil and gas industry.
 - Capture the businesses from outside the area that have an impact on the area.
- Tourists themselves.
- Airport.

- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*

- What other kinds of focus groups have you put together?

Glade Park Community Meeting

Date: March 3, 2009

Location: Glade Park Community Center

Number of Attendees: 10

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Isolation
 - Ranching
 - Open Space
 - Wildlife
 - Loyalty and affection to the community through family history
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Open Space:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=10%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=90%
 - *Q2: Isolation:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q3: Wildlife:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
 - *Q4: Family History:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=30%
 - D. Somewhat Important=10%
 - E. Very Important=60%
 - *Q5: Ranching:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=10%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%

D. Somewhat Important=10%

E. Very Important=80%

- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - “Minimize parts of it.” If you want to move here there may be no place to buy because a lot of public land.
 - Business depends on public land.
 - There are ranchers that graze on the public lands.
 1. The multiple uses concept is important on public lands.
 1. Recreation is important, outfitting.
 - The roads issue is important; there is talk about closing things off, keeping access to areas for recreation.
 - For humans to have use of lands depends on roads.
 - A lot of older people use the roads and lands to get out of town.
 - The people that live up here get to use the public lands.
 - Access to public lands improves public lands.
 - There is a large percentage of BLM land around here.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - Would like to see it the same.
 - With emphasis on conservation and public lands development will be kept to a minimum and there is a good chance it will look the same.
 - In keeping it the same, she hopes that the housing restrictions will be kept to a minimum so everyday people can afford to live here.
 - This is a very friendly community.
 - There are a lot of limits on water which is why there is a 40 acre limit that can't be split.
 - It deals with the wells.
 - There are two access points to the monument which will keep the area the same because of the access.
 - The north, west and south of town is bounded by public lands.
 1. Does not see much gas and oil development here, which is a plus.
 1. No ski areas coming in either.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social:*
 - *Environmental:*
 - Water
 1. This is also an economic issue
 - Ranching should remain because it has made Glade Park the community it is today. This issue covers all three values (social, environmental and economic).
 1. This is one of the five areas in the state that was targeted for saving ranching.
 - McGinnis Canyons will change things in all three areas. This type of land makes this area what it is because we won't see many changes in Glade Park.
 - There are several proposed Wilderness Areas that would have an adverse impact on this area because it would impact ranching. This would cut across all three areas.
 1. This would hurt ranching, hunting and recreation.
 1. Recreation cuts across all three areas as well because of outfitting, guiding, social, etc.

- *Economic:*
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Sustainable Ranching:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
 - *Q2: McGinnis Canyons NCA:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=70%
 - E. Very Important=30%
 - *Q3: WSA Proposals:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=66%
 - *Q4: Water Wells/Irrigation:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=10%
 - E. Very Important=90%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*
 - Would support multiple use.
 - There are some roads that should be closed during certain parts of the year because they can be damaged because they become too wet, etc.
 - There should be a range of access such as easy access for people that need it, tougher access for those who want it.
 - Talking about access, maybe some help with roadwork if community butts up to public land.
 - Public land is intermixed with the community.
 - People are used to the status quo and there is fear after things in the past that something will sweep through and there will be big changes.
 - With technology, there would be a way to post changes to public land through things such as land swaps.
 - These swaps happen and it takes off land we can hunt on.
 - 1. A participant has "gladepark.com" where these decisions can be posted.
 - Regarding the roads, different levels of access. Some are maintained for pickup trucks, some are maintained for four wheelers. She likes the diversity of roads because it contributes to the isolation. This will allow people to get to the level of isolation they wish because not everyone can hike.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize recreation, energy development, and resource protection?*
 - Recreation will be an increasing use of the land unless the BLM cracks down.
 - Resource protection should be balanced within reason.

- Energy is not likely because not much here.
 - Emphasizing any of the three would change the character of Glade Park
 - Resource protection would hurt ranching, hunting recreation
 - Resource protection can help hunting.
 - Resource protection deals with access. This may hurt or diminish access but may also improve the isolation.
 - One participant is curious about the long-term effects of mountain biking because it creates grooves. In a few years will this create an environmental challenge?
 - This can increase erosion
 1. ATV's
 - Recreation can strain fire department
 - This is a volunteer department and would strain the service
 1. People come and recreate and use the services which strains the budget.
 - Recreation is impacting ranching
 - More trespassing.
 - Private land is not marked here.
 - Recreation would decrease isolation.
 - Public education about how to behave in the wild.
 - A BLM ranger would be nice every once in a while
 - It has been a while since one was been here.
 - More education on how not to tear the roads up, the trash...
 - Trash is a big issue.
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - Traffic is minimized.
 - Wildlife at elevation is good for you.
 - Some people like cattle drives and they can be educational.
 - Privacy, solitude and space.
 - Sense of community despite its diversity. The community is working on building a school.
 - There is a huge range of wealth and income in Glade Park.

Measurements:

- *Q1: Sense of Community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Q2: Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=10%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - Viability of ranching can hurt the heritage.
 - Ranching is an important component to the community
 - Wildlife will be impacted.
 - Development will be impacted.
 - Access issues to public lands would hurt agriculture.

- There is a huge amount of pressure that is not here tonight, that does not really understand the importance of ranching for an area. Grazing has a positive environmental effect, ranching keeps the land open to wildlife.
 1. Elk and wildlife use to come here but then houses were built and stopped their migration to this area.
 1. Ranching preserves open space.
 - *Q3: Educating Public about Ranching and Ranching Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q4: Open Space and Privacy:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
 - The biggest thing is access.
 - Road issues.
 - Maps would be useful in educating the public.
 - The link to the resource map on The Glade Park website goes away because BLM does not have a big budget. She wants people to have maps of the area so people know where to go and the lay of the land.
 - How do you enforce if people are just wandering around?
 - BLM ranger can enforce but also be a source of information.
 - If there is increased information about the area, need to help people with access issues because access may prove difficult to some.
 - If roads are maintained more people will come in, if not, fewer people will come. This can be a mixed blessing.
 - It would be nice if the roads on the maps were maintained so we knew if the roads are travelable. If the map shows a road is closed then it should be closed.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=20%
 - D. Frequent=60%
 - E. Significant=20%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=10%
 - B. Rare=0%

- C. Occasional=40%
- D. Frequent=40%
- E. Significant=10%

○ *Businesses:*

- Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=10%
 - E. Significant=0%
- Management: A4;B2;C4
 - A. Never=40%
 - B. Rare=20%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%

1. The definition of business is confusing to the group and the group does not know necessarily what it means. In town or out of town?

○ *Tourism Industry:*

- Planning:
 - A. Never=10%
 - B. Rare=20%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=20%
 - E. Significant=0%
- Management:
 - A. Never=30%
 - B. Rare=40%
 - C. Occasional=30%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%

○ *Community Residents:*

- Planning:
 - A. Never=10%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=10%
 - D. Frequent=10%
 - E. Significant=70%
- Management:
 - A. Never=11%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=11%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=33%

1. They feel community should be strong because the residents are on the ground every day.
2. They want to provide input but not manage day-to-day activities.
3. One resident wants community to be defined as Glade Park community, not Mesa County community.

○ *Others:*

- Ranching was voted on:

- Ranching Planning Vote:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=60%

- Ranching Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=30%
 - D. Frequent=30%
 - E. Significant=40%
 - 1. Ranchers are not experts in everything, but are experts in ranching.
 - 2. Ranchers are the best stewards of the land.
- Volunteer Fire Department.
- DOW.
- Colorado National Monument.
 - 1. This is important because access to GJ is through the monument.
- Forest Service.

- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*
 - How flexible is the RMP when new issues arise after it has been written?
 - What are the guidelines for trading or selling BLM land?
 - Do they let people know when they are going to dispose of land?
 - The newspaper is not the best way to get the information for public lands because some people live far away from the store.
 - Community offered to use its website to post BLM notices.

Palisade Leaders Meeting

Date: March 2, 2009

Location: Palisade Community Center

Number of Attendees: 4

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Quality of life.
 - This means the density of people, relatively small size, the juxtaposition of people and agriculture, small and friendly businesses, just enough infrastructures to house tourism and handy to be close to public lands, beautiful scenery, viewscape is important.
 - Active and vibrant population that is very friendly.
 - Proximity to outdoor recreation.
 - The sense of community is different than other towns in the valley.
 - The town is very welcoming.
 - Festivals and community events.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Festivals:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=75%
 - E. Very Important=25%
 - *Q2: Viewscape:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Unimportant=100%
 - *Q3: Proximity of accessing public lands:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important= 50%
 - *Q4: Quality of Life –Small Town Feel:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q5: Tourism:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%

C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%

D. Somewhat Important=50%

E. Unimportant=50%

- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - Public lands are an integral part of quality of life here; without them or managed differently, it would have a dramatic impact.
 - The vista has a positive psychological impact.
 - I do not live here, but work here so looking at it from a different perspective.
 - Public lands are a critical aspect of marketing tourism and maintaining the small-town feel because there are not sprawl issues because surrounded by public lands.
 1. From a management and public services standpoint, they provide access to quality water.
 - Bring a sense of security to the community because surrounded by public lands.
 - However, assumption is that public lands will remain exactly as they are now, but not necessarily the case.
 1. As a resource manager you want to maximize the resources available to the town.
 1. Could say public lands have had a negative impact because the presence of natural gas has threatened the tourism market and the quality of the water.
 - The lands offer recreational opportunities to him and the family. This is important because there are not a lot of other types of entertainment.
 - The idea of “use” of public lands is critical because, whether they open to bikes, conservation, or otherwise they will have a huge impact on quality of life.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - A larger community, somewhere in the 5,000 range; greater diversity of smaller businesses; healthier year-round tourist base; increased health; improvement in agricultural production especially high-end agriculture such as fruit and wine which fits the unique aspects of this geography and climate; more residential units; compact community; a community that is conducive to pedestrians; a community that can support necessary public infrastructure from a financial approach; retain small-town feel without being anti-growth.
 - More diversity in racial and cultural diversity.
 - Maintain easy access to public lands.
 - A lot of the first point is in the community plan.
 - Would like to see a more mature and educated society and one that accepts and supports the community vision.
 1. Wants community cohesiveness to community vision.
 - This diversity issue is important because Palisade is thought to be backward in a homogenous way.
 - This community is diverse with visitor workers from other countries and would like to see them better integrated into the community. He believes they may feel awkward integrating themselves into the community.
 - Maybe the beginnings of a progressive leadership and the masses have not come together to adopt the progressive view.
 - Did not know that the community had not bought into the community vision because his neighbors do.
 - Maybe there is buy-in or simply consent or tolerance. Maybe there is not true buy-in. Rather it is benign tolerance.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - Social-

- Integration of the migrant population because it will be necessary economically, important to agricultural industry.
- *Environmental-*
 - The large majority feel as though they have been run over by the federal government especially with gas. Ninety-eight of population is outraged at gas drilling and he sent in official protest but never received a response.
 1. This gas drilling was a pre-determined outcome at the start and they went through the process (which is fair) but the outcome was pre-determined. Feels as though trampled by the federal government.
 1. Can fault the process because they are using a 20 year old RMP that has conflicting goals for the watershed because it was mineral extraction and clean water which is contradictive.
 - The process surrounding federal lands decisions has been adversarial as opposed to other lands.
 - How much money is brought into the local economies, approximately 35 million a year is brought into Mesa County through hunting and fishing, but no one really talks about it.
 1. This is also a social issue because hunting and fishing is important to the family.
 - Protection of agricultural land surrounding Palisade through conservational easements (MAY HAVE MISSED SOME OF THE LANGUAGE).
- *Economic-*
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Agricultural Land:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q2: Wildlife: (both heritage, environmental and economic driver)*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=75%
 - *Q3: How Important is Gas Development:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 1. Oil and gas town has a connotation, sometimes positive connotation such as jobs; but there is a difference between tourist town and gas town. Gas is important to the economy of Palisade, but gas impacts all three (economy, social and environmental).
 1. Often said, if De Beque looks to Parachute it will see itself in five years and Palisade does not want to look at De Beque and see what Palisade will look like in five years because this is not the vision of the town of Palisade.
 1. Wildlife is not important here.

2. It is not just the watershed that is important, they were predicting rigs within the viewscape, which is important. Hence see Q4.

- *Q4: Gas Drilling in Viewshed:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - 1. This does not mean they want to see rigs in the view.
 - 1. If you talk to an ecologist he would discuss the impact of drilling on the ecosystem, which means there is a lot at stake here.
- *Q5: Federal Government Listens to the Local Community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*
 - Greater customization in their approach to public lands management. Must recognize that the world, country and Western Slope is more complicated. Discussions have been taking place in an old paradigm which emphasizes sameness, but the communities here are very different and the federal government, because it is dealing with a large area that is more diverse has failed to adapt to this. It is not good enough to understand differences between resort towns and the rest of Colorado.
 - Would like to see the RMP take into account:
 - Too often have used the term multiple use to the point it is a value. However, “multiple uses” are in direct conflict. As public land managers, multiple-use is a “cop-out”. There is a conflict between motorized and non-motorized use because there is not enough space for all activities. Wants prioritization of space and resources.
 - We have all seen sign of “land of many uses”, but this is not the way to manage public lands. There are seasonal, climate, elevation differences, etc., and the federal agencies need to do a better job partnering with other agencies/experts to segregate the land to get 90% of people happy with how land is being used. Have ability to do it, but no one is leading the charge to do this.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - Recreation or resource protection the town could survive well into the future, and a combination would be OK. Wise energy development would also be acceptable. A dominant energy plan and minimizing resource and recreation would be unacceptable.
 - Energy is not a crisis yet and if it becomes one then we can talk about it.
 - Non-motorized emphasis would be preferable to his vision because motorized detracts from his non-motorized experience because of noise and pollution, startling animals, deterioration of trails
 - This is fascinating question. If emphasize recreation, Palisade will get younger, less affluent because recreational industry brings the same kind of economics; if energy were emphasis, the community would be larger, land values increase, housing prices increase; resource protection on first glance is a positive thing, but not sure because it would lead to slower growth of the community.
 - What does resource protection mean? Like a wilderness area? This matters to the impact.
 - There must be a balance of the three.
 - The question is how impactful would any decision by the BLM have on Palisade? Small or large impact?

- Let us say the emphasis on biking in Fruita changed the character of the town, but it did not stop Fruita from becoming a mini-suburb of Grand Junction (although this is not fair to say).
- Federal resource protection changed, to a significant effect, what Palisade would look like with a White Water Park. If the park was created, but it did not get built because of resource protection, it would have changed the character of the town.
 - The park would have engendered a culture around the park.
- I hope this is changing, but has impression that towns. have found out about decisions after they were already made. Therefore it does not pay to visualize the future unless you work with the BLM to frame the impact BLM decisions on your future.
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - Socially it is a return to greater social interaction, knowing your neighbor, the antithesis of suburbia; it is denser development rather than sprawling development; economically the rural agriculture benefits the industry and downtown and individuals
 - We will truly have a small-town life. Other towns say this, but the town has made decisions to prevent growth. Palisade will only be as big as dictated by the comprehensive plan.
 - Active healthy lifestyle and friendly community.

Measurements:

- *Q1: Physical Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Q2: Mental Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=75%
- *Q3: Social Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=75%
- *Q4: Small town Life:*
 - A. Unimportant:
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
 - More defined attractions would further goal of agriculture-tourism. Torn with this because it will attract people who will ruin it. For example, biking trails will attract more bikers but make the trails more densely populated.
 - A stronger management focus will help Palisade develop into what its vision is.

- The BLM will be wise to help define what the users are. What do the users expect from the BLM? You cannot manage well if you say yes to everyone and must come up with a transparent process of making reasonable decisions.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant= 66%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=75%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=100%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=50%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Tourism Industry:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=25%
 - E. Significant=25%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=25%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=50%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Community Residents:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=25%

- D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=25%
- Management:
 - A. Never=25%
 - B. Rare=50%
 - C. Occasional=25%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - 1. Interpreting results of All above Votes: Involving people in planning allows educating them and it allows for expertise to be introduced.
 2. Began by thinking there was no reason for business to be involved in planning, but changed mind because different decisions may be made if business is more active.
- Others:
 - State.
 - Other sources of expertise such as the Sierra Club or other organized interest groups such as kayakers, motorized groups, Trout Unlimited, etc.
 - All groups need to have the opportunity to participate and results need to be transparent.
- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public lands and the use thereof?*
 - Curious about timeline of the process.
 - Mentioned Fruita in discussions several times; decisions in one part of the valley can have large impact such as increased rail traffic.
 - Quick comment on approach federal government takes to public lands. There is a sense that it is not partnering with the community during the planning process despite the lip service to partnership. BLM attempted to create a way to discuss gas development in the watershed, but need to push it further to find way to more aggressively mitigate the impacts of its decisions. There was no partnership in Whitewater Park decision and it was very adversarial.

De Beque Community Meeting

Date: March 4, 2009

Location: De Beque Town Hall

Number of Attendees: 12

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gage intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Openness
 - Small town
 - Wildlife
 - Far from Grand Junction. but not too far
 - Knowing the majority of people
 - Sense of community
 - Recreational opportunities
 - Hunting
 - Wild horses
 - *Measurements*

Q1 Recreational opportunities:

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=100%

Q2 Small town:

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=8%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=16%
- D. Somewhat Important=8%
- E. Very Important=64%

Q3 Wildlife:

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=9%
- E. Very Important=91%

Q4 Sense of community:

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=22%
- D. Somewhat=44%
- E. Very Important=33%

- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - The public lands allow the lifestyle.
 - If public land were not accessible, would not be the same.
 - Loss of the other things mentioned.
 - Public lands allow:
 - Wild horse days.
 - ATV rides.
 - Picnics.
 - All of these allow a sense of community.
 - Pride of being able to show the surrounding area.
 - Many people come into town hall to get maps for public lands.
 - Being so close to the public lands adds to the character of the town.
 - Public lands are an important part of the heritage of the area.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future...the way it should be 20 years from now.*
 - I would like to see a lake.
 - Have a hydro plant.
 - I would like to see us keep our agricultural land.
 - Town will be much larger.
 - It is important to control the growth in some fashion.
 - It would be nice to have a few more businesses in the area.
 - Town does not want to be like Clifton.
 - A few more amenities, better housing.
 - Better plan for the community than other local areas.
 - Buildings that are structurally sound and designed well.
 - We do not just want metal building after metal building.
 - Golf Course.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social-*
 - We do not want to be the disposal for the oil and gas industry
 - This is social because the town doesn't want to have the identity of being labeled as this. It is also environmental and economic.
 - We would like to have a waterfront park.
 - We do not have a place where we can have an event.
 - This is also an economic factor.
 - This could also be a place for rodeo and motocross events.
 - *Environmental-*
 - No oil and gas disposal ponds.
 - If they have to have these, put them away from the public.
 - They are ugly and they are unhealthy.
 - *Economic-*
 - Architecture.
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Q1 Waste ponds:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%

- D. Somewhat Important=8%
 - E. Very Important=92%
- *Q2 Events space/ park:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=27%
 - D. Somewhat Important=27%
 - E. Very Important=45%
- *Q3 Horse sales:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=8%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=58%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead, describe your vision for the surrounding public lands:*
 - More informational signs.
 - Where you are, where to go, and how to get there, for example.
 - Gathering places.
 - Linked to the horses.
 - It would be nice to see the Gobblins area maintained so it does not get destroyed.
 - Also gathering place.
 - I would like to keep our ATV trails.
 - More trails would be nice.
 - It would be nice if these trails were made into different-length loops.
 - It would be nice to have areas that are made for stopping.
 - This could aid in protecting the land by keeping people off sensitive areas.
 - They could rest/communicate in less sensitive areas.
 - The oil and gas industry has been pretty good about giving room for ATVs and other areas.
 - The roads are maintained better than they used to be.
 - More multiple-use opportunities.
 - Having more access to the lands.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation-*
 - We need another road.
 - Town's roads are not big enough.
 - Help for businesses if more folks were on the land.
 - *Energy Development-*
 - It could help local businesses.
 - What will it do to the open land out there?
 - It is not going to have a negative impact on the environment.
 - The wildlife comes right up to the rigs.
 - *Resource Protection-*
 - Native plants are not as nutritious as other plants.
 - If they could use grasses that are more nutritious, then more livestock could be raised on it.

- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - Better mental health.
 - Lower stress level
 - A link to the past and nature.
 - Good for families.
 - Good for physical health.
 - If it is done right, there is hope for the future.
 - A sense of pride.
 - Makes you realize how lucky you are to live in God's country.

Measurements:

- *Q1 Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=18%
 - E. Very Important=82%
- *Q2 Pride:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=27%
 - E. Very Important=73%
- *Q3 Family time:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=8%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=67%
- *Q4 Connection to the past:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=45%
 - E. Very important=55%
- *Q5 Stress:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=8%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=58%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
 - Access to the area.
 - But not too much access.
 - It would be nice to have more places to stop and gather.
 - We do not want to have a lot more management because it takes away from personal freedom.
 - The area is going to change no matter what.
 - It is important to get ahead of it before it happens.

- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=18%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=18%
 - D. Frequent=17%
 - E. Significant=36%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=42%
 - B. Rare=8%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=17%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=9%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=18%
 - D. Frequent=27%
 - E. Significant=45%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=8%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=17%
 - E. Significant=17%
 - *Tourism Industry-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=25%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=25%
 - E. Significant=17%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=25%
 - B. Rare=33%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=8%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Community Residents-*
 - Planning:

- A. Never=0%
- B. Rare=0%
- C. Occasional=9%
- D. Frequent=0%
- E. Significant=91%

- Management:

- A. Never=10%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=20%
 - E. Significant=30%

- We know what we want to have happen out there.
 - If we have a say, then we will get what we want.
 - You cannot have 10,000 managers.

- Others-

- How big of a role should the BLM be in the planning process?
 - A. Never=27%
 - B. Rare=34%
 - C. Occasional=27%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=9%

- Western Slope ATV.
 - Friends of the Mustangs.
 - Wild Horses council.

- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*

- Fees should be more fairly priced.
 - It would be nice to see some picnic areas or shelters that result from our fees.
 - BLM would be doing themselves a favor if they would start explaining their rules and regulations.
 - They need to do some more public education on how they are trying to manage the land.

Gateway Meeting

Date: March 10, 2009

Location: GJFO Planning Area

Number of Attendees: 10

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Response: It is home
 - I was raised here and the whole area is home. When I go out, it is somewhere I have been before and have memories of.
 - Small town.
 - It is a community, which is different from being lost in the crowd in the big city.
 - Open space and elbow room.
 - Not crowded.
 - Access to public lands.
 - Abundant number of rocks and hills, brush, trees.
 - 1. Rich wildlife.
 - Night sky that is not light polluted.
 - *Measurements*
 - *Q1: Open Space:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=14%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=14%
 - E. Very Important=71%
 - *Q2: Small Town Community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=14%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=28%
 - E. Very Important=56%
 - *Q3: Access to Public Lands:*
 - A. Unimportant=14%
 - B. Of Little Importance=14%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=14%
 - E. Very Important=56%
 - *Q4: Wildlife:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=66%

-
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - Response: You can leave your private property and go onto public land and you feel like you own it all.
 - You are allowed to access places that do not belong to anyone else.
 - You share the lands with the community:
 - This enhances the community feel as long as people do not abuse the land by leaving trash behind, driving where there is not a road, or congregating in places that were once isolated.
 - Provides income to miners, timber workers, trail guides, hunters, and ranchers.
 - Many people river raft.
 - Gives people the opportunity to experience lands even if they do not own them.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - It does not consist entirely of resort areas.
 - The atmosphere in the community would have a “small-town” feel to it.
 - Retain all the values that they mentioned when discussing the benefits of living here.
 - Would like to see more amenities, but still retain small-town feel.
 - The creation of a nursing home.
 - Much time has been put into making a community plan by property owners as of late.
 - Things will develop but they want development but for things to be the same.
 - The management for population growth.
 - Hope not to see all of the BLM land given to “big money” unless the average person has an opportunity for the land as well.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns:*
 - *Social-*
 - Preserving what the community is attracted to, such as solitude.
 - Abuse of land can ultimately lead to the closure of the land (this is an environmental and economic concern as well).
 - *Environmental-*
 - Responsible use of land (this is a social and economic concern as well) through trash and land swaps.
 - Proper land stewardship so public lands can be used and groups do not abuse the lands.
 - Maintaining the habitat and the open land is important for wildlife.
 - *Economic-*
 - People can continue to get economic benefits from the land.
 1. Example is mining.
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Habitat:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=11%
 - D. Somewhat Important=44%
 - E. Very Important=44%
 - *Q2: People can work on public land:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=14%

- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=14%
 - E. Very Important=71%
- *Q3: Solitude:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=13%
 - D. Somewhat Important=62%
 - E. Very Important=25%
- *Q4: Stewardship:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=50%
 - E. Very Important=50%
- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead describe your vision for the surrounding public lands:*
 - People will still be able to use them.
 - The lands need to stay in multiple-uses.
 - To maintain solitude there needs to be more enforcement of vehicles.
 - When people can access certain lands is a big issue, such as now when wildlife are down from high country grazing and people disturbing them.
 1. This comes back to good stewardship.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation-*
 - This would cost the community because livestock operation, hunting, mining, or anything that is profitable on public lands would disappear.
 - Increase the demand for services.
 - Increase the number of businesses.
 - Loss of wildlife as a result of more traffic because people tend to drive fast late at night and early in the morning.
 - More people in the woods means the game will be more hesitant to venture into the open lands.
 - It could alter the habitat.
 - It could impact energy development because recreation and energy would knock heads.
 - Place a big demand on ambulance and fire department which is already struggling for help.
 - Increase need for law enforcement.
 - Would require a larger commitment from BLM on managing the lands through trails, signs, which will stress the resources of the BLM.
 - *Energy Development-*
 - Recreation people would complain.
 - If the wrong emphasis is placed on energy development, it could destroy the area. If it is developed correctly, there is nothing wrong with it.
 1. This could hurt the small town feel if not done wisely, but could help the community by providing demand for support services.
 1. The development needs to be responsible.

- Depending on the type of energy that is being developed, such as uranium, which has a small impact as opposed to oil and gas.
- *Resource Protection-*
 - This would increase recreation by creating the area as a destination point.
 - Depends on the type of closures because it could hurt livestock, jobs and recreation.
- *What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - If you keep it multiple use, it represents what the country is all about.
 - The BLM is trying to cut people out and my vision would emphasize freedom.
 - Different people will check the other.
 - This area is full of history and her vision gives people who don't have the Gateway lifestyle the chance to see the lifestyle.
 - People need to see the openness.
 - Wilderness eliminates people from accessing an area whereas multiple use allows access for all areas.

Measurements:

- *Q1: Freedom:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=10%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=10%
 - E. Very Important=80%
- *Q2: Balanced Use:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=10%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=10%
 - E. Very Important=80%
- *Q3: Connection to History:*
 - A. Unimportant=10%
 - B. Of Little Importance=00%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=30%
 - E. Very Important=60%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
 - Not advertise public lands as much.
 - Allowing wood cutting would help the health of the trees.
 - Multiple-use lands.
 - If you want to get a tree permit from the BLM there are many regulations on driving vehicles to get the tree.
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%

- B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=44%
 - D. Frequent=44%
 - E. Significant=11%
- *Management:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=33%
 - C. Occasional=55%
 - D. Frequent=11%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Businesses in the area-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=20%
 - D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=30%
 - *Management:*
 - A. Never=11%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=44%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Tourism Industry-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=20%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=40%
 - *Managements:*
 - A. Never=22%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=44%
 - D. Frequent=11%
 - E. Significant=11%
- *Community Residents-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=10%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=50%
 - *Management:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=30%
 - D. Frequent=50%
 - E. Significant=20%
 1. Because plans evolve, community residents must help.
 2. People have to live with their decisions.

3. Need to be careful with community management because communities change and this could have an impact on the management.
 4. Decisions of what happens in Gateway should not be made in New Jersey.
- *Others-*
 - The general public as opposed to the community residents as required by law.
 - Division of wildlife.
 - Any groups that have conditional use permits for public lands.
 - People who have special use permits.
 - Other federal agencies.
 - People who have mining claims, which may be classified under special use permits.
 - Schools.
 - Recreational clubs.
 - Public interest groups.
 - Emergency services.
 - *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*
 - Better communication that the meetings are going on. The trails and roads meeting was poorly attended and this one was poorly advertised.
 - Now that the delivery of the newspaper isn't delivered to rural areas it is more difficult to advertise.
 1. Signs in post office sometimes work but some people in canyon have mail delivered elsewhere or at home.
 1. Mailings and phone calls work.

Palisade Leaders Meeting

Date: March 16, 2009

Location: Palisade Community Center

Number of Attendees: 6

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Stunning scenery.
 - Agricultural aspects, both from an orchard and winery standpoint, there are some unique things here that make Palisade unique, in the Grand Valley and Colorado in general.
 - The Grand Valley is a wonderful crossroads that the Rocky Mountain corridor has to offer from mountains, desert, and rivers.
 - Remoteness as SLC and Denver and Las Vegas are at a great distance.
 - Access.
 - Amount of public land in the region.
 - Agreed
 - Shopping.
 - Culture, because it is an agricultural community with much history and heritage that is being tapped into.
 - Recreation.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Agriculture:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=33%
 - D. Somewhat Important= %
 - E. Very Important=66%
 - *Q2: Scenery-Viewscape:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=75%
 - *Q3: Access to Public Lands:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q4: Recreation:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%

- D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Q5: Shopping:*
 - A. Unimportant=25%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=25%
 - E. Very Important=25%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - Public lands are huge. It seems that a majority of public is attracted to the area because of public lands.
 - Public lands are not a distraction to the people who are not drawn to the outdoors
 - Huge for visitors and international visitors because they are fascinated by open space.
 - Public lands are positive because they are there for discovery for visitors and nearby residents.
 - Contribute to physical and mental health. About 95% of recreation by the respondent is done on public lands.
 - There is also a degree of frustration of public land policy and public land management.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - Agricultural for certain with improved access to commercial and recreational amenities. This means more pedestrian and bicycle access.
 - Wants distinct feel of Palisade to emerge.
 - Want a healthy and vibrant core downtown.
 - It is critical that the air quality remain high because it affects things from visibility, viewscape, etc.
 - Hopefully Palisade still retains its small-town, agricultural atmosphere which remains the draw of the community and attracts visitors.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social-*
 - Need to address the dichotomy that exists with the Latino community.
 1. The Latino community is a critical part of the agricultural aspect but remained marginalized. There is not much in the way of integration of Latino community and he expects increased number of Latinos.
 - *Environmental-*
 - Air Quality.
 - Transportation is huge from pedestrian access, canals, irrigation, links to De Beque, interstate systems. How the valley will deal with increased population in the future is a main concern.
 - A light rail line to connect the communities would keep traffic in line. This would also improve tourism.
 - *Economic-*
 - Core downtown that addresses social issues such as entertainment, necessary services.
 1. One benefit Palisade has is GJ is next door which gives Palisade residents necessary/important amenities.
 - Agriculture is concerned to the green movement and the risks it poses to the agricultural community.
 - Palisade's abundance of unique products is important from art, fruit, wine, etc.

- *Measurements-*

- *Q1: Transportation:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=20%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=60%

- *Q2: Air Quality:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=60%
 - E. Very Important=40%

- *Q3: Downtown Core:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=60%

- *Q4: Integration:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=40%
 - E. Very Important=60%

- *Q5: Agriculture:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%

- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*

- Bike trails. Palisade cannot get cooperation with BLM to create the trails. It is an easy interface to link Palisade to public lands and they are not asking for millions of trails.
 - This is a source of frustration.
 - Access to the public land and usage of public land which means increasing access points and keeping the ones they already have.
 - Hiking trails. Access to public lands through hiking, horse, ATV is important.
 - There must be sensitivity to watersheds and ecological areas, but access should not be stopped because of these.
 - No oil rigs, within view of residents, to protect viewscape.
 - Roads could impact the viewscape as well.
 - Building homes can also impact the viewscape if BLM begins trading land.
 - Nominal extraction of gas and oil.
 - Hydrology is a huge issue in the watershed.

- The motivation of the community is not to have recreation overrun the community, but some well designed access areas would stimulate the economy and improve the community.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation:*
 - This would be more sustainable because recreation would not go away.
 - Recreation would provide year-round activities.
 - Recreation would increase certain businesses.
 - Recreation would be more visually appealing.
 - *Energy:*
 - Energy would destroy their watershed.
 - Energy would be a short-term gain as a boom and bust cycle.
 - Energy would trash the area.
 - Energy would impact the viewscape.
 - Energy could negatively impact wildlife habitat. On Grand Mesa Slopes there is an abundance of deer and elk wintering grounds.
 - Basically, the residents do not like the idea of energy heavy RMP.
 - *Resource:*
 - Resource Protection would help scenery.
 - Resource Protection preserves the past by preserving archaeological resources.
 - Resource Protection could decrease use and access if it is made more difficult.
 - Resource Protection could close access points by allowing key areas to be cut off from the area thereby decreasing access.
 - There are a few who feel that Palisade is being fought on bike trails because Fruita users created own trails which has hurt Palisade.
- *Question: Supplemental question from Tim Casey about the Grand Mesa Slopes and idea about it becoming a special recreation management zone or the watershed area:*
 - The BLM uses that land as if land is its own private playground.
 - Grand Mesa Slopes is a huge area and some people use it as their own back-yard. The BLM has asked not to promote anything until interface is created between Palisade and BLM.
 - There is interest among Palisade residents about the Grand Mesa Slopes.
 - The needs of Palisade are small and request is modest.
 - Palisade residents are frustrated especially when they see the responsiveness of the BLM to Gateway because of Gateway's resort.
 - There is plenty of opportunity concerning recreation. Residents were in charge of Whitewater Park but were rejected.
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - Physical and Mental health.
 - Self-sustainability, uniqueness, having own little place in the valley.
 - Well-rounded.
 - Orchards, wineries, agriculture tourism, wine tastings, etc. To have diverse recreational opportunities is beneficial.
 1. This will lead a well-rounded quality of life.
 - Residents do not want the bust and boom anymore. Variety and diversity add to the sustainability of the region.
 - Cultural heritage.
 - Interpretations are a very important aspect to the past.
 - Procurement of historic resources will hopefully lead to a museum.

- This area began with an emphasis on agriculture. The question, then, for the BLM, is what impact will it have on the agriculture of the area?
 - Considering agriculture uses 80% of the water in Colorado, if the BLM continues on pushing energy, the pollution of water and use by energy companies could destroy agriculture.
 1. Economic development through the exploitation of resources, no checks and balances, and the energy companies desire to pump out resources as quickly as possible, will dry every farm in the valley.
- Healthy water will also help recreationists.

Measurements:

- *Q1:Health:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q2: Healthy Water Resource:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 - *Q3: Cultural Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=20%
 - E. Very Important=80%
 - *Q4: Well Rounded Community:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
-
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*

 - *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments:*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=20%

- E. Significant=80%
- Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=20%
 - E. Significant=40%
- *Businesses:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=20%
 - D. Frequent=60%
 - E. Significant=20%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=20%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Tourism Industry:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=20%
 - D. Frequent=20%
 - E. Significant=60%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=20%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Community Residents:*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=40%
 - E. Significant=60%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=40%
 - C. Occasional=40%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=20%
- *Others:*
 - The BLM should manage based on its plan
 - Public lands are public and would like to see public do trash cleanup,
 - A citizen commission could get people involved as stakeholders and would feel more responsible to public lands.

- Other groups include:
 1. Other small communities such as Mesa and Powderhorn. There are many people in Mesa that use Palisade as part of their recreation opportunities.
 1. A dream would be to have a hiking trail connect Palisade to Mesa (the community).
 2. Youth, not necessarily a school district.
 1. Can use school district, but more focused on getting youth to take stewardship of the land.
 3. Wildlife groups.
 4. Nonprofit groups that are not aimed at wildlife such as “Urban Trails” and the “Riverfront Commission”.
- *Questions: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public lands and the use thereof and this discussion:*

Loma-Mack Meeting

Date: March 19, 2009

Location: Loma Elementary School

Number of Attendees: 10

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily
 - Resident explained that we should leave a copy of the results in the library.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gauge intensity rate
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - Rural lifestyle
 - Farming, ranching
 - Not under jurisdiction of Grand Junction people.
 - Not part of that mentality.
 - Not Fruita.
 - Lower taxation schedule.
 - Quiet.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Quiet:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=11%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=11%
 - E. Very Important=77%
 - *Q2: Not GJ or Fruita:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Importance=25%
 - E. Very Important=50%
 - *Q3: Lower Taxes:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=25%
 - D. Somewhat Important=12%
 - E. Very Important=62%
 - *Q4: Rural/ Agriculture:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=11%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=88%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*
 - Public lands are open space
 - Hikers, bikers, horseback riders

- Places to go
 - Hunting, fishing, a place to get away from the value
 - ATV restriction affects ATV riders.
 - Those with handicaps could be helped with access to public lands.
 1. A lot of access is not ATV now, instead it is horses and bikes, and not a lot of people ride bikes here.
 - Public land is not developed.
 - Fruita now is nothing but houses, but must have room for everybody.
 - Likes that horse trails are separate from ATV trails.
 - The whole area is great for recreation.
 - Loma is the entrance to the canyon land and the Kokopelli trail and has tremendous opportunity for recreation and if BLM handles its management wisely, its management could have a strong impact on the area.
 - Recreation here impacts business in the valley through sales, supply.
 - The more opportunities to use sales tax to run the government, the more it alleviates property taxes.
 1. Loma is getting PILT, which helps keep taxes down in the area.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - There is a plan in the making that will go before the planning commission on April 5th. It is a 20 year plan.
 - This plan has been going on over one year. The plan was contracted out to a Nebraska firm. The town went before the county for sewer improvements and a chance to incorporate. To incorporate you need to have a certain number of rooftops for taxes and support of a sewer district. Loma will try and incorporate with Mack and use its sewer services.
 1. They are still getting feedback at this point.
 1. So, improvement of infrastructure.
 - Would like to see the area stay the way it is, agriculturally based, and affordable.
 - Plan maintains the rural integrity while providing the number of necessary rooftops to pay back the county for its sewer.
 - The population is going to grow, unfortunately. Numerous Moab bikers are coming here.
 - Moab, according to one resident, says that the Moab BLM office is closing a significant amount of land to recreation. Foot or horseback will be primary recreation. People have stopped going to Moab because they cannot ride the trails. This means that Loma-Mack needs to do something now.
 - *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think that are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social:*
 - Cooperation on building trails between user groups is a social benefit.
 1. On Grand Mesa, the snowmobilers pack the trails for cross country skiers.
 - Access for elderly.
 - In 20 years would hate to see this area like Moab. Enforcement over the resources must be maintained. Dirt bikes and ATVs that do not stay on trails need to be enforced.
 1. Signage is a big part of this because there are not enough signs.
 1. Every single sign is broken.
 1. If you fix signs, after a while, people will leave the signs alone.
 1. If there are enough people to police the area it should happen.

- *Environmental:*

- Need to protect the environment, does not want the land to be trashed. However, the land should not be restricted for a small few to use. Being a trails coordinator for an ATV club the participant sees groups leave trash. All user groups litter.
- Noxious weeds. There are only two workers in the participants office in Mesa County to handle this.

- *Economic:*

- Anytime you close an area to access, there is an economic impact
- The showing of preferential treatment to different user group must not occur.
 1. This BLM office got a rude awakening at Granite - because this BLM office needs to maintain the area and must access the land through Moab.
 1. The economic impact is huge because the rock crawler industry which is huge moved out of Utah to Nevada. This has a huge economic impact.
- All want multiple uses.
- Need to maintain economic base by supporting mining, oil, oil shale.

- *Measurements:*

- *Q1 Trash:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=100%

1. An example is in Gateway where trash has been left out and it will soon look like Loma.

- *Q2: Enforcement:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=11%
- D. Somewhat Important=11%
- E. Very Important=77%

- *Q3: Noxious Weeds:*

- A. Unimportant=11%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=22%
- E. Very Important=66%

- *Q4: Closed Trails as an Economic Problem:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=22%
- E. Very Important=77%

- *Q5: Mining and Shale as Economic Help:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=11%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=11%
- E. Very Important=77%

- *Q6: Cooperation Among User Groups:*

- A. Unimportant=0%
- B. Of Little Importance=0%
- C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
- D. Somewhat Important=0%
- E. Very Important=100%

- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead:*
 - The prevailing attitude I run in to, there is a small group that wants no one on the lands, there is a small group that built a house on land and does not want to share, and there are groups that say a road has been here for years, but it is not a sustainable road, and they do not want to close it down. Do not close a whole area because one group wants something.
 - Consistency is an important issue.
 - 1. This office is affected by national office.
 - Access to hunting lands has been a problem and BLM needs to open up some hunting lands because hunting is a tremendous economic base for the area.
 - As a rancher, the four wheelers ride on land trespassing.
 - Law enforcement and signage would help cut it down.
 - 1. When cattle prices were really low, hunters kept the ranchers in business.
 - 1. The other side to this is that large groups of outfitters backed by corporations buy up land and restrict access to only that group.
 - 1. This is a consistency issue again.
 - No more Wilderness.
 - Would like to see consistency through the Department of the Interior so a new president cannot impact policies. Would like more consistency in Department of Interior. The BLM people would even like consistency because BLM has to change direction with new administrations and the public must push the government for consistency.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation:*
 - It would hamper Loma economically without multiple uses, especially energy (shale). BLM must honor energy permits such as shale. Hunting and trails as well.
 - More people, more people starting a business; increased population; increase in sales; increase in development; agriculture will decline.
 - Economics could be helped and we would see increased housing.
 - 1. Homebuilding, repair would go up.
 - *Energy:*
 - Increased housing in Loma-Mack because of proximity; changes in infrastructure such as roads (which would require more cooperation among government agencies).
 - Need to protect economic base and energy would help this.
 - The BLM needs to surrender some of its lands to accommodate potential growth in the area from energy development.
 - *Resource Protection:*
 - To fix an old reservoir today it is nearly impossible given all of the paper work. Resource protection would increase regulations on land.
 - Decreased access.
 - 1. This is important because it must be consistent access.
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - A sound economic base; a good recreational area while still keeping the rural atmosphere.

- McGinnis Canyon used to be open to use, but now it isn't. Their vision would be helped by allowing responsible use of the land.
- Multiple uses, such as ranching.
- Connection to heritage through ranching.
- Cannot change vision every nine years; needs consistency and planning (planned growth).

Measurements:

- *Q1: Consistency for Planning:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=11%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=88%
- *Q2: Multiple-Use:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
- *Q3: Heritage:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=11%
 - E. Very Important=88%
- *Q4: Sound Economic Base:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=22%
 - E. Very Important=77%
- *Q5: Responsible Use of the Land:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=11%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=88%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for public lands?*
 - (skipped this section)
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=11%
 - D. Frequent=44%
 - E. Significant=33%
 - *Management:*

- A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=66%
 - D. Frequent=22%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Businesses (Agriculture and Energy)-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=22%
 - E. Significant=77%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=11%
 - C. Occasional=11%
 - D. Frequent=44%
 - E. Significant=33%
- *Tourism Industry-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=11%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=22%
 - Management:
 - A. Never=22%
 - B. Rare=44%
 - C. Occasional=11%
 - D. Frequent=22%
 - E. Significant=0%
- *Community Residents-*
 - Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=100%
 1. We know the land as well as anybody.
 - Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=11%
 - D. Frequent=22%
 - E. Significant=66%
 1. What would some of these roles look like?
 1. Cleanup
 2. Trail building
 3. Conservation
 4. Policing the area
 5. Oversight and evaluation of the BLM

- *Others:*

- BLM does not have a program to go into the schools. They may go to the college, but not the schools.
 - 1. This includes all schools (including charter).
 - 1. It needs to reach out to younger generation but CANNOT teach one side of an issue.
- Too many people at the table can complicate things and put too much pressure on the BLM to satisfy all groups.
- Environmental groups, farmers, ranchers, could be used as categories of who to invite.
- User groups.
- There are no young people attending this meeting and would like to see some younger people attend these meetings.
- Organized interest groups.

- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use thereof and this discussion:*

Fruita Leaders Meeting

Date: April 22, 2009

Location: Fruita Civic Center

Number of Attendees: 3

- *Introduction:*
 - Participation is voluntarily.
- *Explanation of iClicker:*
 - Used to gage intensity rate.
- *Question: What are the things you like about living in your community?*
 - The small town atmosphere.
 - The outdoor recreation.
 - Like the idea of being close to the mountains and desert. This is the idea of a diverse terrain.
 - Way cool events such as the Fat Tire Festival.
 - Amenities are close. Within 10 minutes can be at the biggest mall within 500 miles or at an NCA.
 - The river.
 - History of the area.
 - Dinosaur remains.
- *Measurements:*
 - *Q1: Small Town Atmosphere:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important= 100%
 - *Q2: Outdoor Recreation:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=33%
 - E. Very Important=66%
 - *Q3Events:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=66%
 - E. Very Important=33%
 - *Q4 History:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=33%
 - D. Somewhat Important=66%
 - E. Very Important=0%
- *Question: How do public lands have an impact on the previously mentioned values?*

- Having open land means you have a place to do recreation on open space, minimal traffic and the big-city feel.
- That is what attracts people to this area; to be away from Denver and to have opportunities to mountain bike, hike, and be away. This is important for tourism as well.
- If I am going to show off the area to friends I will show off the public lands and the ease of access to those lands impresses those you are showing the land off to.
- Helps cut down on smog and keeps air clean.
- Attracts people to live here, but that harms small-town atmosphere by threatening it.
- *Question: Describe your vision for your community's future:*
 - Just finished the community plan that had a lot of public input. It had:
 - Enhance small town atmosphere; provide for economic vitality were two major cruxes.
 - People want to work, live and play in Fruita.
 1. The community plan is on the website under planning.
 1. The community can accommodate about 35,000 people.
- *Question: Over the next 15-20 years, what do you think are the most important social, environmental and economic values and concerns?*
 - *Social-*
 - Small town atmosphere.
 - Strong neighborhoods.
 - Neighborhood parks.
 - Diversity of housing so filthy rich are not sole residents.
 - *Environmental-*
 - They are going through a parks plan now to examine rural space.
 - Making public lands accessible while preserving them.
 - *Economic -*
 - Economic development.
 - Leave downtown as it stands no but grow outwards.
 - Managed population growth.
 - Diversity of housing fits here too.
 - *Measurements-*
 - *Q1: Access to Open Space:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%
 1. Maintaining access constantly comes up in community meetings.
 2. Access is critical because the community uses the public lands and is therefore critical to the economic health of the community.
 - *Q2: Economic Development:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=100%

- *Question: Thinking about your community vision and the social, environmental and economic challenges that lie ahead describe your vision for the surrounding public lands:*
 - Would like to see the trail system improved because it will prevent people from getting off the trails and destroying other land.
 - Fruita is identified as the official gateway community for the BLM to the NCA and to the Monument for the Park Service. As a gateway community Fruita is concerned with open space because it is the largest economic engine. Preserving it is important.
 - In North Fruita Desert Plan, mineral extraction is equally important as is recreation, which doesn't help the community, but hurts its economic engine (open space).
 1. On the ground for administration, the BLM responds to the increased demand for access by limiting it because it drains the BLM's limited services.
 - Connectivity is important for Fruita. Getting people who are in Fruita out to the lands is key for the area. A walkable area to the public lands would help.
 - For example, Kings View Road goes to the river but making it more connected through bikes would be beneficial.
- *Question: What would your community look like in the future if the BLM were to emphasize Recreation, Energy Development, and Resource Protection?*
 - *Recreation-*
 - Of the three, this is the preferable option. It would be great for Fruita because it matches the community identity (mountain biking, hiking, rafting, and four-wheeling).
 1. It would draw more people into the community for vacations.
 2. Makes Fruita a regional destination.
 - It wouldn't affect the population all that much.
 - For any of the three, the benefits of recreation are clear and downfalls are difficult to identify and may not be that bad. Energy development, however, if done poorly, is easy to identify the negatives.
 - *Energy-*
 - If done well, there are clear benefits; but if not done well it could have clearly negative effect.
 - *Resource Protection-*
 - Access is important which is the opposite of access, but without preservation there is no demand for access. The manager's trick is to balance this.
 - Alternatives that are clearly one of the three (energy, recreation or preservation) would just divide participants into group with proponents and opponents, so it should not be that clear of a line.
- *Question: What are the desired or beneficial outcomes that your vision provides?*
 - Makes it a cool place to live and play.
 - Promotes active and healthy lifestyles.
 - Good economics because it brings outside dollars to the community.
 - Vision for community is economic development, not expansion.
 - A good balanced plan helps with preservation because it can keep people in certain areas.

Measurements:

- *Q1: Healthy Lifestyles:*
 - A. Unimportant=0%
 - B. Of Little Importance=0%
 - C. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=33%
 - D. Somewhat Important=0%
 - E. Very Important=66%

- *Q2: Cool Place to Live:*
 1. Unimportant=0%
 2. Of Little Importance=0%
 3. Neither Important Nor Unimportant=0%
 4. Somewhat Important=0%
 5. Very Important=100%
- *Question: What characteristics would you specifically maintain or change to achieve your vision for Public Lands?*
- *Question: What do you believe are the appropriate collaborative roles for each of the BLMs land managing?*
 - *Measurements:*
 - *Local Governments-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=66%
 - *Management:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=66%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Businesses-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=66%
 - D. Frequent=0%
 - E. Significant=33%
 - *Management:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=66%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Tourism Industry-*
 - *Planning:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=0%
 - D. Frequent=66%
 - E. Significant=33%
 - *Management:*
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=66%
 - E. Significant=0%
 - *Community Residents-*

- Planning:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=0%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=33%
- Management:
 - A. Never=0%
 - B. Rare=33%
 - C. Occasional=33%
 - D. Frequent=33%
 - E. Significant=0%
 1. One participant believes democratic principles should be highly involved in planning, but management is a different function.
 1. The BLM does not listen to Fruita residents/city on the public lands that reside outside of their community, such as Gateway or Bangs Canyon. The respondent thinks this makes it difficult to identify who the “community” is and that the BLM should make this clear.
- Others-
 - National citizens.
 - State.
 - Counties.
 - Individual user groups (rafters, bikers).
 - Professional associations (city managers league, National parks and recreation association as well as Colorado Parks and Recreation Association).
 - More input is always good.
- *Question: Other issues/comments/suggestions concerning public land, the use there of and this discussion:*



1100 North Avenue
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501
mesastate.edu