News from NARRP

This content is generated by members for members. Please send us your news, reports, job announcements, manuals and personal updates that may be of interest to other members.

The National Association of Recreation Resource Planners

It's time to Vote

The NARRP Board of Directors has prepared a slate of candidates for 2010-11 elections. You can download the ballot and candidate statements and vote now, or choose to vote at the 2010 Symposium if you are attending.

If you are not attending the symposium, please cast your vote by 5:00 PM Friday, May 14.

Download the ballot: http://www.narrp.org/clubportal/clubdocs/1431/2010_Ballot.doc

Download the candidate statements:
http://www.narrp.org/clubportal/clubdocs/1431/2010_candidate_statements.pdf

NRPA Announces Release of GIS Model 1.0

NRPA is proud to announce the release of its new, GIS Model 1.0. The GIS Model allows you to make a list (inventory) of all the lands and facilities (assets) that you own, plan, manage, operate, and maintain. By providing standard attributes and values, the GIS Model makes it possible for better local, regional, and statewide management and planning of park and recreation resources. We have completed compiling the comments from the survey and incorporated your feedback into the standard.

The GIS Model can be downloaded at: www.nrpagisdata.org

View the webinar associated with the release:
http://www.nrpa.org/media/webinars/gis%20model/lib/playback.html

New Title From Solano Press Offers Comprehensive Guidance for Developing and Maintaining Trails

Trail Planning for California Communities
By Julie Bondurant and Laura Thompson

New from Solano Press Books, Trail Planning for California Communities provides essential guidance on planning, design, construction, funding, and maintenance of trails in California. The book details relevant policies, legislation, and successful trail projects that lend strong

support and provide a variety of tools for the planning and implementation of local trails.

As a comprehensive guide that can be used at all stages of the trail development process, Trail Planning for California Communities is an important reference for planners, advocates, developers, and managers of trails, both in California and beyond state boundaries.

In addition to reviewing federal and state policies and regulations authorizing trails, the book offers suggestions for developing trail plans, building the trail community, addressing legal responsibilities involved in land and easement acquisition, resolving liability issues, understanding basic trail design principles including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, complying with environmental review and permitting requirements, determining construction costs, developing funding strategies, and establishing a trail maintenance program.

Trail Planning for California Communities and other Solano Press titles on environmental, planning and land use topics are available online at www.solano.com or by contacting Solano Press Books at 800.931.9373 or spbooks@solano.com.

Authors:
Julie Bondurant, a licensed landscape architect and certified planner, is a Senior Park Planner with the East Bay Regional Park District. She has served on the San Francisco Bay Trail Project Board of Directors since 1990 and the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council Board of Directors from 1990 to 1999. Ms. Bondurant received a master's degree in landscape architecture from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Laura Thompson is the manager of the San Francisco Bay Trail Project, a nonprofit organization that coordinates the effort to complete a 500-mile continuous shoreline trail around San Francisco Bay. She received a Master's of Urban Planning and Policy from the University of Illinois in Chicago.

For more information: http://www.solano.com/processxml.asp?tid=TA&StyleSheet=title.xsl

Engaging Youth
Courtesy of the National Park Service

Even when the goal is to get people out to enjoy the real world of nature, it makes sense to start online*. Reaching out through social media can engage young people in a conversation about their needs, interests, and motivation for getting outside and getting involved. So, it's no surprise that youth-focused outdoor organizations emphasize their online presences through Twitter, Facebook fan pages, interactive websites, and blogs where youth provide the content. Young people are excited about using these tools to share their thoughts and shape the dialogue about getting youth outdoors.

Now, the Department of the Interior is joining that dialogue. Secretary Ken Salazar created the Office of Youth in the Great Outdoors to help coordinate the Department's efforts to employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving America's natural and cultural heritage. "This is an exciting opportunity," said Julie Rodriguez, Director of the new office. "Young people have such an amazing energy and insight into many of the challenges and problems we face as a nation and in individual communities. It's something that is too often overlooked or not utilized effectively."

This office brings the youth outreach efforts of each Interior bureau and agency under one umbrella. And soon, social media tools like Facebook and Twitter and a dedicated website will enable the agencies and the public to get information and engage in conversation about youth programs and events. Noting that such a conversation is a two-way street, Rodriguez says "We need to give young people a seat at the table and engage them in meaningful ways... not just as a target audience."

*According to the Kaiser Family Foundation study of media use in the lives of 8-18 year olds, the most popular computer activity for this age group is visiting social media sites like Facebook. Four out of ten young people are spending almost an hour on one or more of these sites every day.

Creating an Outdoor Nation
Courtesy of the National Park Service

Many of America's youth may have been absent from the national conversation about nature, conservation, and getting engaged in the outdoors. But no longer. Through the efforts of the Outdoor Foundation and coalition members such as the National Park Service, the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation, REI, and North Face, Outdoor Nation is inviting young people to join the conversation.

The idea behind Outdoor Nation is to empower young people (14-30) to make the world what they want it to be in terms of outdoors and conservation and give them opportunities to engage in the outdoors. Using Outdoor Nation's website, Facebook page, and Twitter account, the coalition is harnessing the power of social networks to find out why being outside matters to these youth. Because the agencies and organizations involved are part of these conversations, as well, young people who share their thoughts have the power to drive change and directly reach policy makers in a way they never could before.

In addition to the online presence, Outdoor Nation will kick-off "live" in Central Park, New York City, on June 19 and 20. The Outdoor Nation Festival (Saturday) will enable youth to celebrate an active and healthy outdoor lifestyle, along with a career fair to raise awareness of jobs and career paths in outdoor organizations and agencies.

The Outdoor Youth Summit (Sunday) will be a meeting of 500 young leaders from all 50 states who will champion the outdoors, help develop a national youth outdoor agenda, share ideas, and make new connections. The goal is to motivate and mobilize youth to reclaim the outdoors for their generation; and to create ambassadors who will share the message with their peers and take the message back to their communities and start raising awareness there, too.

"My hope is that the summit sparks a youth-led movement that gets young people outdoors and active," says Christine Fanning, Executive Director of The Outdoor Foundation. "In terms of evolution of Outdoor Nation, I hope that young people across the country reconnect with outdoors and that results in a healthier population and planet."

The partnerships that started this effort came together at the right moment. Two paths converged: the Mobilize GenWise Summit brought together young people in their 20s and 30s to brainstorm about engaging and mobilizing this generation; and the Outdoor Foundation was

recognizing that youth were missing from the conservation and nature movement.

"We've realized for a while that we need something like this," says Jamie Fields, Outdoor Recreation Planner with RTCA. "It's great that it's finally happening. We're finding new ways to connect to the earth and each other and keep healthy and fit. The bottom line: Go play outside, and bring a friend."

The Fallacy of Online Surveys: No Data Are Better Than Bad Data
Courtesy of Responsive Management

INTERNET OR ONLINE SURVEYS have become a popular and attractive way to measure opinions and attitudes of the general population and more specific groups within the general population. Although online surveys may seem to be more economical and easier to administer than traditional survey research methods, they pose several problems to obtaining scientifically valid and accurate results. A peer-reviewed article by Responsive Management staff published in the January-February 2010 issue of Human Dimensions of Wildlife details the specific issues surrounding the use of online surveys in human dimensions research. Reprints of the article can be ordered here. Responsive Management would like to thank Jerry Vaske of Colorado State University for his assistance with the Human Dimensions article and for granting us permission to distribute this popularized version of the article.

Mark Damian Duda
Executive Director

Background
Natural resource and outdoor recreation professionals have found that gathering information through public opinion and attitude survey research gives them a precise and useful picture of what their organization's constituents think, need, and expect of them. Armed with this valuable information, they have been able to meet the future with organizational planning that is based on insight and knowledge obtained through scientifically valid, unbiased research methods.

It's a fact that conducting such research costs money. And in the current financial climate, with budgets being cut and uncertainty regarding what the future holds, it makes sense for natural resource and outdoor recreation organizations to look for new ways to save money.

Online surveys are increasingly popular as an information-gathering tool. More and more online marketing companies offer online surveys at seemingly reasonable rates. Online surveys appear to be a great idea at first blush: they can be set up and administered in-house or contracted out, save time and money, and provide immediate results. But are online surveys a good idea? With few exceptions -- the main one being employee surveys where every single employee has access to the Internet -- for purposes of collecting scientifically valid, accurate, and legally defensible data, the answer at this time is no. Recent research conducted by Responsive Management and published in the peer-reviewed journal Human Dimensions of Wildlife shows that online surveys can produce inaccurate, unreliable, and biased data. There are four main reasons for this: sample validity, non-response bias, stakeholder bias, and unverified respondents.

Sample Validity
For a study to be unbiased, every member of the population under study must have an equal

chance of participating. When all members of the population under study have an equal likelihood of participating, probability sampling comes into play, and a relatively small sample size can yield results that accurately represent the entire population being studied.

For the most part, Internet surveys at this time cannot accomplish this, because there is no such thing as a representative sample of email addresses for various populations, including the general population and its subpopulations, such as registered voters, park visitors, or hunters and anglers. No "master list" of email addresses for any of these groups exists -- not all people within these populations have an email address or access to the Internet. One exception is an online survey of a closed population in which every member of that population has a verified email address and Internet access. An internal survey of an organization in which all potential respondents are known and have guaranteed Internet access, usually through their workplace, is an example of this. Responsive Management has conducted this type of study (mainly employee surveys) for natural resource agencies in the past and has obtained results with scientifically valid sampling methodologies to back up study findings.

When online surveys are accessible to anyone who visits a website, the researcher has no control over sample selection. These self-selected opinion polls result in a sample of people who decide to take the survey -- not a sample of scientifically selected respondents who represent the larger population. In this situation online survey results are biased because people who just happen to visit the website, people who are persuaded with a monetary or other incentive to sign up for the survey, people who have a vested interest in the survey results and want to influence them in a certain way, and people who are driven to the site by others are included in the sample. This results in a double bias, because this distortion is in addition to the basic sample already having excluded people who do not have Internet access.

Having access to a valid sample is the foundation for collecting data that truly represent the population being studied. Without a valid sample, every bit of data obtained thereafter is called into question.

Non-Response Bias
Non-response bias in online surveys is complicated by the most egregious form of self-selection. People who respond to a request to complete an online survey are likely to be more interested in or enthusiastic about the topic and therefore more willing to complete the survey, which biases the results. In fact, the very nature of the Internet, as an information-seeking tool, contributes to this form of bias. For example, if someone who is interested in the subject matter of a survey uses a search engine, such as Google, to seek out information on the subject, that person is more likely to find an online survey on that topic. In this way, more people with a heightened interest in the topic are driven to the online survey.

With a telephone survey, people are contacted who are not necessarily interested in the topic, and if they are not enthusiastic about completing the survey, a trained interviewer can encourage them to do so despite their disinterest, leading to results that represent the whole population being studied, not just those with an interest in the subject.

Another contributor to non-response bias in online surveys is spam and unsolicited mail filters. Users can set the degree of message filtering, and if the tolerance is set strictly enough, they may not even see a request to participate in an online survey because the filter will automatically "trash" the email request when it is delivered. This removes these individuals from the possibility of receiving an invitation to participate in an online survey.

Potential respondents to an email request to participate in an online survey may have more than one, and sometimes multiple, email addresses. It is impossible to know which is the primary address for an individual or even if the person checks the account on a regular basis for incoming mail.

Stakeholder Bias
Unless specific technical steps are taken with the survey to prevent it, people who have a vested interest in survey results can complete an online survey multiple times and urge others to complete the survey in order to influence the results. This is a common occurrence, especially regarding issues that elicit high levels of concern, such as, in the fish and wildlife context, when an agency wants to measure opinions on proposed regulation changes. Some Internet-savvy individuals have even written automated programs that repeatedly cast votes to influence a poll's results.

Even when safeguards against multiple responses are implemented, there are ways to work around them. If there is a protocol in place that limits survey completions to one per email address, it's easy to go online and open a new email account with a new address and then complete another survey through that email address. If access is limited to one survey completion per computer, completing another survey can be done on a separate computer, at a friend's home, in the workplace, or in a public library, for example. And in the case of online surveys where individuals have to sign up in order to participate, they can sign up under multiple names and email addresses and participate multiple times through each of those email addresses.

Unverified Respondents
Because of the inability to control who has access to online surveys, there is no way to verify who responds to them -- who they are, their demographic background, their location, and so on. As stated earlier, even when safeguards are implemented to control access to online surveys, there are multiple ways to circumvent those safeguards.

A complicating issue is when an organization offers incentives for completing online surveys. Whether it's a chance to win a prize, discounts on purchases, a gift certificate, or some other benefit, offering an incentive without having close control over the sample simply encourages multiple responses from a single person. If someone has a strong desire to win the item, he or she can find ways around any safeguards against multiple responses and complete several surveys, thereby increasing his or her chances of winning the item.

Examples
Three recent collaborative projects with state fish and wildlife agencies gave Responsive Management an opportunity to compare the results of online versus scientific telephone surveys within the same study topics.

North Carolina Sunday Hunting Study
Sunday hunting has been a controversial issue in North Carolina, with strong feelings among both supporters and opponents. To better understand the issue, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC), Virginia Tech, and Responsive Management collaborated on a study to assess public opinion on Sunday hunting. The study consisted of an online opinion poll, a telephone survey, and an economic analysis.

The online poll was developed and placed on the NCWRC website to elicit feedback on support or opposition to Sunday hunting. The online poll was developed primarily as an outlet for people

who wanted to be heard. At the same time, a scientific telephone survey was conducted by Responsive Management, Virginia Tech, and the NCWRC.

The results of the two surveys were markedly different. The online poll showed that 55% of respondents supported Sunday hunting, whereas 43% opposed it, and 2% had no clear opinion. The telephone survey showed that 25% of respondents supported Sunday hunting, whereas 65% opposed, and 10% had no clear opinion. These differences are well outside of any acceptable margin of error for a valid study.

The telephone survey, because it used a randomly generated sample of North Carolina residents, accurately reflected the opinions of the population as a whole. Because more than 1,000 individuals were interviewed, the sampling error was at most plus or minus 2.815 percentage points.

Far more people in the telephone survey of North Carolina residents opposed Sunday hunting compared to those who responded to the online poll. Only 25% of the telephone respondents supported Sunday hunting, whereas 55% of those who responded to the online poll supported it. The telephone survey found a fivefold increase as compared to the online poll in people who had no clear opinion on the subject of Sunday hunting. This indicates that far more people with a vested interest in the results completed the online poll; when the general population was scientifically surveyed, a truer number of North Carolinians who had no clear opinion was revealed. In short, had the NCWRC gone with the online poll results, it would have gotten an inaccurate read on what the public was thinking regarding Sunday hunting in the state.

"While I was not surprised that there were differences between the online interface and telephone survey results, given that the telephone survey used probability sampling and anyone who chose to could give their opinion online, I was somewhat surprised at the size of these differences," said Dain Palmer, Human Dimensions Biologist at the NCWRC.

Arizona Big Game Hunt Permit Tag Draw Study
In 2006 the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD) conducted an online survey to assess hunter attitudes toward the Arizona Big Game Hunt Permit Tag Draw, a topic with a high degree of interest to Arizona hunters. When the data collection for the online survey was completed, the AZGFD had doubts about its accuracy and worked with Responsive Management to conduct a non-response bias analysis. A telephone survey of the online survey non-respondents was conducted to assess non-response bias. In other words, those who were contacted by email but who did not respond were contacted by telephone and interviewed.

For the online survey, a link to the survey site was distributed by email to individuals who had provided an email address when applying for the 2006 Fall Big Game Draw. Duplicate and invalid email addresses were removed, and the survey was sent to a total of almost 60,000 Fall Big Game Draw applicants.

The online survey included a unique website address for each email address, which "closed" the survey to that respondent once he or she completed it. This ensured that multiple responses from a single email address did not occur and that a response from a specific email address could be tracked if necessary. For the telephone survey, people who did not respond to the email request were contacted and interviewed.

Responsive Management analyzed those who responded to the survey and those who did not and identified several statistically significant differences between the groups. Of the 766

variables analyzed in the study, differences for 312 variables -- 41% of the variables analyzed -- were statistically significant. This means that, on almost half of the variables where those who responded to the online survey were compared to those who did not respond, there was a meaningful difference between how they responded to the same question.

If both of these surveys were representative of the population group under study . . . there would be no statistically significant differences between how the people who responded to the email request answered the questions and how those who did not respond to the request answered the questions.

Why are these differences a problem? Simply because they exist. If both of these surveys were representative of the population group under study -- Arizona hunters who applied for the 2006 Fall Big Game Draw and provided an email address -- there would be no statistically significant differences between how the people who responded to the email request answered the questions and how those who did not respond to the request answered the questions. (This bias is in addition to the basic bias of omitting people who did not provide an email address when applying, as described in more detail in the South Carolina study discussed below.)

"Our initial reaction to the big game hunt permit study was that it validated what we had been hearing anecdotally for a long time from the general hunting community," said Ty Gray, an Assistant Director with the AZGFD. "Specifically, getting to go hunting or getting a permit tag were very important factors which both groups (Web and phone respondents) agreed on. However, as we started to look closer at some of the other variables, we saw that there were differences that indicated some bias with the online survey -- among those was who was more likely to respond to it."

Again, if this were a valid sample to begin with, there would be no statistically significant differences between these two groups. In short, there were major differences in responses, with the online survey providing biased and inaccurate data.

"Game and Fish commissioners regularly have to make important decisions under extreme pressure from special interest groups," said Bob Hernbrode, former chairman of the Arizona State Fish and Game Commission. "Valid social science such as this Arizona study often suggests significantly different outcomes than special interest input would suggest. We need to understand the potential of poorly designed studies and such things as non-response bias."

South Carolina Saltwater Fishing and Shellfishing Study
In 2009, Responsive Management and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) collaborated on a survey to assess participation in and opinions on saltwater fishing and shellfishing in South Carolina and to better understand the accuracy and potential of online surveys. Two different methodologies were used: a scientific survey conducted by telephone and a survey conducted via the Internet. This study is a best-case scenario regarding online surveys because it involved a closed population -- people who obtained a South Carolina Saltwater Recreational Fisheries License. If online surveys could produce accurate data, this would be the study that would prove it.

The researchers were able to test this because they had a base sample -- the entire database of Saltwater Recreational Fisheries License holders, including demographic and geographic information for each license holder -- that could be compared to both the telephone and online survey results. When the two methodologies were compared, the telephone survey yielded results that accurately reflected the entire population, whereas the online survey did not. This is

because the telephone survey included a greater proportion of the population under study than the online survey did. The telephone survey sample was randomly drawn from the entire population of people who held a Saltwater Recreational Fisheries License; for license holders who did not provide a telephone number, their telephone number was identified by reverse lookup. Therefore, every license holder had an equal chance of being contacted by telephone to take part in the survey. The online survey used a sample consisting of people who held Saltwater Recreational Fisheries Licenses who provided an email address when they purchased their licenses. This systematically excluded license holders who did not have computer access and license holders who chose not to provide an email address. While one might think this is not important, the results showed otherwise. Because of the systematic exclusion of these license holders, the results of the online survey were inaccurate from the outset.

This study is a best-case scenario regarding online surveys because it involved a closed population -- people who obtained a South Carolina Saltwater Recreational Fisheries License. If online surveys could produce accurate data, this would be the study that would prove it.

The information from the database indicated that, out of a total population of 103,000 license holders, the online survey had an original sample of approximately 16,100 license holders with email addresses, which produced 12,405 license holders in the sample after email addresses that were undeliverable were removed. Therefore, even before any contacts were made, the online survey had eliminated approximately 88% of the possible sample, and did so in a systematic way, which is the very definition of bias. In addition, there was a notable non-response bias: of the 12,405 license holders contacted by email, only 2,548, or 20.5%, responded to the online survey. These problems lead to a double bias: first, the exclusion of people with no email address, and second, exclusion of those who did not respond to the online survey.

With a scientifically selected sample, reducing the sample size to this degree would not be a problem, because the smaller sample would be representative of the population as a whole -- the methodology used to select the sample from the total population being studied would ensure that this would be the case, within a demonstrable sampling error. But in the case of a sample that is not scientifically generated, reducing the sample size in this way simply would bias the results even more -- the more the sample is reduced, the more biased it becomes.

Because they had access to the database of all license holders, which included demographic and geographic information, Responsive Management statisticians were able to determine that, from the outset, the respondents who provided email addresses were different from the sample as a whole. If the online sample had been valid, there would have been no statistically significant differences between the two -- each sample would have been consistent with and representative of the population as a whole: the 103,000 license holders being studied.

When the online survey was completed and the data were analyzed, the online survey respondents were found to be, in general, a more educated and affluent group, and were also disproportionately male. Of particular note, 5.7% of the online survey sample was female, whereas 19.9% of the telephone sample was female; in reality, 18.5% of the license holder database -- the actual number of license holders -- was female. The telephone results were therefore much closer to the truth than the online results. In fact, the online results were so far off the mark that they would have led to highly inaccurate findings, because females were not represented in the proportion that they should have been.

"When we initially saw the differences between the online and telephone surveys, we were not

too surprised that the results differed, simply due to the fact that only a small portion of license holders provide their email address on their saltwater fishing license application," said Julia Byrd of the SCDNR's Office of Fisheries Management. "Due to this, we thought the results of the online survey might be biased because certain demographic groups would be over- or underrepresented. This was shown in the results."

The Result
As a result of these problems, obtaining representative, unbiased, scientifically valid results from online surveys is not possible at this time, except in the case of the closed population surveys, such as with employee surveys, described earlier. This is because, from the outset, there is no such thing as a complete and valid sample -- some people are systematically excluded, which is the very definition of bias. In addition, there is no control over who completes the survey or how many times they complete the survey. These biases increase in a stepwise manner, starting out with the basic issue of excluding those without Internet access, then non-response bias, then stakeholder bias, then unverified respondents. As each of these becomes an issue, the data become farther and farther removed from being representative of the population as a whole.

For a more detailed look at these examples and more information on the drawbacks of online surveys in the context of human dimensions research, see Duda, M.D, & Nobile, J.L., "The Fallacy of Online Surveys: No Data Are Better Than Bad Data," Human Dimensions of Wildlife 15(1): 55-64.

Reprints of the article can be ordered here:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a919147188~db=all~jumptype=rss

A printable version of this email newsletter can be downloaded here:
http://www.responsivemanagement.com/download/RM_ENews/Online_Surveys.pdf

LWCF case study: Pennsylvania's Big Savage Tunnel
Courtesy of the Outdoor Industry Association

Editor's note: The article below is the first in an occasional series on how grants from the Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) have stimulated employment in the outdoor industry. If you know of other good examples, please forward the information to editor@outdoorindustry.org.

LWCF Grant: In 2001, a $2 million LWCF grant was awarded to help rehabilitate the 3,300-foot Big Savage Tunnel and extend the 132-mile Great Allegheny Passage (GAP) from Pittsburgh and into Maryland, where it connects with the C&O Towpath and ultimately Washington D.C. The $7 million project was completed in 2006. The tunnel was the most significant obstacle to completing the GAP, which has become a linchpin of economic development in rural Pennsylvania.

Impact: A survey of 120 businesses and 1,272 trail users along the GAP conducted in April and May of last year found that on average business owners indicated that one-quarter of their gross revenue could be directly attributed to trail users and two-thirds reported that they experienced at least some increase in gross revenue because of their proximity to the trail. Over one-quarter of all businesses that were surveyed mentioned that they have or plan to either expand their operations or hire additional staff because of the impact of the trail, according to a study based on the surveys.

The study projected that despite a worsening economy, sales attributable to the trail rose from $32.6 million in 2007 to $40.7 million in 2008 among business in the sample universe. Wages paid by those businesses, meanwhile, rose to $7.5 million from $6.3 million.

"Trails are hugely impactful in these small towns," said Cathy McCollom, director of The Trail Town Program, an economic development initiative along the GAP. "For central Pennsylvania — the Appalachian region between Pittsburgh and Philadelphia — it's really their economic future. Trails are really important to us, as are rivers."

The GAP and C&O Towpath have become a lifeline for rural communities, said John Hallas, superintendant of the 20,000-acre Ohiopyle State Park. Twenty-eight miles of the GAP run through the park and the town of Ohiopyle, where the largest employers are four outfitters that run restaurants, hotels, bike tours and whitewater rafting trips. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources used two grants totaling $670,000 to acquire 215 acres for the park in the late 1970s, according to The Trust for Public Land.

"A lot of communities tied to the steel industry in Pittsburgh in Southwestern Pennsylvania did not have the ability to attract outside companies the way Pittsburgh did," he said. "So after the last 15 to 20 years, ecotourism in smaller municipalities is what's driving the economy. Tourism is the entire economy of Ohiopyle and its all outdoors."

Click here to view the latest information on federal funding of the LWCF:
http://www.outdoorindustry.org/gov.issues.current.php?action=detail&issueID=6&categoryId=3

Job Announcement – National Park Service

Community Planner

Salary Range: 61,612.00 - 96,001.00 USD /year
Open Period: Monday, May 03, 2010 to Monday, May 17, 2010
Series & Grade: GS-0020-11/12
Position Information: Full Time Career/Career Conditional
Promotion Potential: 12
Duty Locations: few vacancies - Lakewood, CO
Who May Be Considered: United States Citizens
Job Announcement Number: NPS-WASO-CO-343306 BT DEU

Job Summary:
Experience your America and build a fulfilling career by joining the National Park
Service. Become a part of your mission to unite our past, our cultures and our special places, to establish important connections to the present and build a rich and lasting legacy for future generations.

This position is located in the Planning Division of the National Park Service (NPS) Denver Service Center (DSC). The Planning Division provides direct planning services to the parks and their partners, serves to innovate, test and refine best planning practices and helps build planning capability for the NPS planning program, and provides project and contract coordination and management services.

Duties
Responsible for performing a variety of duties including, but not limited to the following:

- Helping park staff, in collaboration with the public, to develop long-term, defensible strategies for managing visitor use and user capacity in parks.

- Applying the knowledge of applicable research related to visitor demographics, motivations, preferences, impacts, and benefits to help address complex visitor use management issues.

- Participating in all phases of the planning process for a variety of park projects.

- Serving as a visitor use project specialist on interdisciplinary project teams.

- Assembling and analyzing technical information related to the visitor use management discipline to support planning and compliance processes.

- Preparing recommendations regarding goals, objectives, and alternatives for planning and compliance projects.

- Assessing potential impacts on visitor opportunities and visitor experiences as a result of proposed management actions.

- Writing sections of planning and compliance documents.

- Representing the NPS in a variety of settings and to diverse audiences.

- Facilitating internal, public, and stakeholder meetings and workshops.

- Maintaining professional contacts and relationships within the field of visitor use management.

- Defining scopes of services and overseeing contracts for planning and scientific services.

For more information:
http://jobview.usajobs.gov/GetJob.aspx?JobID=87764605&JobTitle=Community+Planner&q=community+planner&where=lakewood+co&brd=3876&vw=b&FedEmp=N&FedPub=Y&x=0&y=0&AVSDM=2010-05-03+00%3a03%3a00

Job Announcement – USDA Forest Service

Natural Resources Specialist (Recreation)

Salary Range: 47,448.00 - 61,678.00 USD /year
Open Period: Friday, April 30, 2010 to Friday, May 14, 2010
Series & Grade: GS-0401-09/09
Position Information: Full Time Permanent - No time limit
Promotion Potential: 09
Duty Locations: 1 vacancy - McCall, ID
Who May Be Considered: US citizens

Job Announcement Number: ADS10-R4-MCALL-4528DP(PRB)

Job Summary:
Applications for this position are being processed through an on-line applicant assessment system that has been specifically configured for USDA Forest Service applicants. Even if you have already developed a resume in USAJOBS, you will need to access this on-line system to complete the application process. To obtain information about this position and TO APPLY, please click on http://www.avuecentral.com/vacancy.html?ref=FVQEV.

Duties
Plans and administers recreation program activities. Plans and administers recreation program activities. Makes or recommends recreation use planning and management decisions for conventional recreation projects of moderate difficulty. Based on evaluations of recreation areas and activities, recommends potential sites or areas for additional recreation use and planned development. Assists with other resource management activities by analyzing the impact of those resources on the recreation program. Plans and oversees construction of recreation trails, parking areas, trailhead facilities, and new access roads in consultation with engineering personnel. Compiles material and supply estimates for recreation facilities, maintenance, and operation. Drafts action plans for carrying out management decisions. Recommends and executes annual work plans for recreation resources. Assists in the development and administration of recreation special use programs in compliance with national guidelines and direction. Processes special use applications including on-the-ground investigation of site suitability, preparation of associated environmental assessment reports, and special use permits in final form for the supervisor's review. Assists to negotiate with private landowners and/or mining claimants to secure rights-of-way deeds or easements.

Participates in the development of natural resource plans and policies for the organization. Participates in the development of natural resource plans and policies for the organization. Provides input for the unit land management planning team. This includes coordinating with other natural resource disciplines, placing emphasis on resource coordination and specific project planning and execution. Provides input to or develops specific portions of annual program of work. Recommends, prepares or reviews annual operating plans and budgets. Prepares environmental analysis reports including impact of proposed recreational sites on other resources such as soil, water, timber, range, and wildlife.

Participates in, coordinates, and/or manages natural resources programs and projects. Participates in, coordinates, and/or manages natural resources programs and projects. Provides input to the natural resources management program by gathering, compiling, and analyzing data to determine needs. Either individually or through participation on interdisciplinary teams, studies and plans proposed resource management activities, and coordinates and/or implements approved resource management plans for projects related to minerals, lands, recreation, trails and other natural resource projects. Completes NEPA documentation and implements approved projects. Prepares contract specifications for assigned projects. Coordinates recreation resources management projects with other resource programs.

For more information:
http://jobview.usajobs.gov/GetJob.aspx?JobID=87818551&aid=90127670-4510&WT.mc_n=125