



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

FS 02-03

May, 2002

**THE ROLE OF THE BUREAU OF LAND  
MANAGEMENT IN THE PROVISION OF  
OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES  
IN THE WEST**

Paul Gentle<sup>1</sup>, John Bergstrom<sup>1</sup>, Carter Betz<sup>2</sup>, Mike Bowker<sup>2</sup>,  
H. Ken Cordell<sup>2</sup>, Don English<sup>2</sup>, and Jeff Teasley<sup>1</sup>

**THE ROLE OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE PROVISION  
OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE WEST**

Paul Gentle<sup>1</sup>, John Bergstrom<sup>1</sup>, Carter Betz<sup>2</sup>, Mike Bowker<sup>2</sup>,  
H. Ken Cordell<sup>2</sup>, Don English<sup>2</sup>, and Jeff Teasley<sup>1</sup>

---

Dept. of Agricultural & Applied Economics  
College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences  
The University of Georgia

---

(1) Former Post Doctoral Fellow, Professor and Research Coordinator, respectively, in the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

(2) Research Social Scientists and Recreation Planner, respectively, USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Athens, Georgia

# **THE ROLE OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE PROVISION OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE WEST**

## **Abstract**

Future demand projections reported in this paper indicate a steady increase in demand for outdoor recreational opportunities in U.S. regions where BLM lands are located. From a supply perspective, BLM lands represent “prime targets” for meeting increased recreational demand in the western U.S. The BLM will face the challenge of balancing increased recreation use with other multiple uses, and minimizing the negative environmental impacts of increased recreation use such as damages caused by motorized vehicles, horses and foot traffic. In the future, the BLM will also face management challenges related to financing the provision of increased recreational opportunities.

## **Introduction**

Because outdoor recreation demand increases with population growth, it is a widely held opinion that the need for outdoor recreational land will only expand as time progresses (Cordell, 1999; Peterson, 1996). Therefore, there is an increasing importance in assessing all avenues of outdoor recreational opportunities, including areas served by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). When the BLM was created it was primarily an agency that administered public land for grazing, mining and timber harvesting. Later the mission was broadened to also emphasize recreational opportunities. The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) described in Cordell, 1999 includes information pertaining to recreational use and demand in regions administered by the BLM.<sup>1</sup> This article provides an overview of the BLM and examines the present demand for outdoor recreation in those Western states where the BLM continues to play a major role in resource management. Projections are made of future demand for recreation in those states, and implications of these projections are discussed.

## **Overview of the Bureau of Land Management**

Two agencies were ancestors to the BLM. Congress established the General Land Office (GLO) to administer the public domain in 1812. The U.S Grazing Service was created in 1934 (Schmitt et al., 1999). During President Truman's tenure in office, there was a "massive reorganization in government," part of which was the establishment of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in 1946 as an agency of the Department of Interior. The BLM was given responsibility to administer 778 million acres of the public domain taking over functions previously handled by the General Land Office and the U. S. Grazing Service<sup>2</sup>. When the BLM was established, some critics labeled it socialism, while other opponents tried unsuccessfully to

have the duties transferred to the Department of Agriculture (Clawson, 1983; Ganzel, 1987; Gates, 1976; Mogren, 1981; Richardson, 1980; Robbins, 1976; Schmitt, 1999; World Book, 1995).

The advent of the BLM brought in more "professionally trained scientists" than what had been present with the staff of the General Land Office.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, this new agency "was to be less centralized in Washington than the General Land Office" (Mogren, 1981). For years, BLM land was regarded primarily as a source for timber, forage, energy and mineral resources. Yet, prior to the formation of the BLM, there were already federal efforts made to manage these lands for recreational use. For example, during its eight year life, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) constructed a limited number of recreational facilities on land now administered by the BLM (Peterson, 1996).

One might argue that federal management of land provides better protection for recreation interests than local government management. For example, if public lands now managed by the BLM had been transferred to the control of states and counties in the 1940s instead of the BLM, regional and national recreation interests would likely not be able to compete with local and state timber, mining and grazing interests (Lehman, 1995). Until the last few decades federal land programs outside of the National Park Service were concerned almost entirely on making land available for extractive industries. Now, the provision of recreational opportunities on public lands including BLM lands has increased in importance. National totals of BLM outdoor recreation for 1993 included 429 million recreation visitor hours. Of this total, 47 million and 19 million visitor hours were for hunting and fishing respectively (Peterson, 1996).

The increased emphasis on provision of recreational opportunities by the BLM over time is also reflected administratively within the BLM. For years, the BLM was primarily viewed as a

place for timber, livestock forage, mineral and energy resources. However in the last two decades of this century, these lands have become of increasing value for “their environmental resources, significant cultural resources, recreation opportunities and in an increasing urban nation, their vast open spaces” (Schmitt et al., 1999). For example, the BLM along with the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service manage what are termed National Recreation Areas (NRAs) through a multiple use policy. Multiple use management with recreation representing a major use is reflected in BLM management of 176 million acres located in the lower forty-eight states and about 80 million acres of land in Alaska (BLM, 1990; Culhane, 1981; Holmes, 1973; Miller, 1987). However, despite the increasing demand for recreational use of BLM lands, Nelson (1995) notes a greater federal expenditure on forage products for livestock as compared to expenditures targeted to recreation and wildlife.

In terms of expenditures by recreational users themselves, user fees associated with recreational use of public rangelands remain very low. For example, in 1981, BLM received \$900,000 in revenues from recreational and wildlife uses, though total direct and indirect costs for these uses were approximately \$107 million. The majority of recreationists on rangelands pay no fee or other charge at all (Nelson, 1995).

If so desired, there are several alternative methods that the BLM could employ to increase revenues from recreational use of BLM lands. For example, people entering BLM rangelands could be required to purchase an annual "public land access stamp". In limited access areas with well-defined entry points, recreational fees could be charged at the gate and collected directly on a per visitor basis. Such fees could be used to limit congestion (Nelson, 1995). A technique to increase the availability of recreational opportunities on BLM lands, on a fee or no-fee basis, would be to classify some land as conservation areas, rather than wilderness areas. Conservation

areas would allow greater road access than wilderness areas, which would likely increase recreational use (Nelson, 1995).

### **Recreation Surveys**

The importance of surveys and data documenting recreation demand and supply has long been recognized (e.g., Cicchetti, 1972). The lack of such data can have serious policy and management consequences. For instance, "The BLM had been omitted from the Wilderness Act -- 1964 PL 88-577 because the BLM had failed to make a timely inventory of recreation, wildlife, and wilderness values" (Peterson, 1996).

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA); PL 94-579) "most importantly... made the Wilderness Act of 1964 applicable to BLM lands" (Peterson, 1996). The FLPMA is the most important legislation involving outdoor recreation in the BLM areas. It specifies that "the 450 million BLM acres are to be retained in federal ownership and managed under multiple use and sustained yield" (Peterson, 1996). This language means that the agency is to manage the public land to accommodate many uses, while protecting the long-term health of the land (Schmitt, 1999). The Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965 provides for uniform policies in regard to recreation, fish and wildlife benefits, as well as elevated recreational uses of BLM areas on par with other land uses (Peterson, 1996).

Resource management for outdoor recreation requires the inventorying of resources and an assessment of public demand. The breadth of appeal to outdoor recreation for people of all ages, incomes, occupations, and preferences also needs to be inventoried (Clawson, 1971). Such an inventory for private and public lands including BLM areas is provided in results of the 1994-95 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment or NSRE (Cordell, 1999). The BLM was



a sponsor of the 1994-95 NSRE because of the agency's desire to obtain data to inform management and policy decisions related to recreation management of BLM areas.

In order to have numbers of sampled individuals sufficiently large enough for statistical analysis, it was necessary to combine the 1994-95 NSRE data into multistate regions. The BLM western states area was broken into four regions for analysis purposes. The Northern Rockies consists of Idaho, Montana and Wyoming; the Pacific Northwest region is composed of Oregon, Alaska and Washington; the Pacific Southwest region is made up of California and Nevada; the Southern Rockies region consists of Arizona, Colorado, Utah and New Mexico.

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of U.S. population participating in some form of outdoor recreation by activity type by BLM regions as defined in this paper. Table 2 shows the average days and numbers of trips per activity by BLM region. It should be noted that the results reported in Tables 1 and 2 refer to total recreation use on private and public lands, not just BLM lands. It should be also be noted that because the BLM regions do not compose all of the states in the U.S., national totals are not the sum of the four BLM regional areas.

In Tables 1 and 2, there are some activity categories that display more divergence in one region than in others. For eight activity categories, there is little divergence in participation between regions, while five categories proved to be the exception. The highest percentage of population participating in snow and ice activities is in the Northern Rockies as would be expected from a climate perspective. The Pacific Southwest had the lowest participation in camping and hunting activities. Participation in hunting was highest in the Northern Rockies. Finally, the Northern Rockies and Northern Pacific regions had greater participation in boating activities as compared to the Southern Rockies and Southern Pacific regions.

There are many outdoor recreational opportunities on BLM public lands, including

chances for experiencing “undeveloped, wild nature” settings. Among these are hiking, fishing, camping, hunting, white water rafting, hang gliding, wildlife viewing, driving for pleasure, horseback riding (Schmitt et al., 1999). Bowker et al. (1999) have developed future demand projections for a number of outdoor activities through the year 2050. Tables 3 and 4 shows demand projections indexed from 1995 for activities of current and likely future interest on BLM lands to the year 2050. While the projections developed by Bowker et al. (1999) are for demand on both private and public lands collectively, these results do indicate the magnitude of future recreation demand in BLM regions that could, for instance, result in increased recreation use pressure on BLM lands.

### **BLM Recreational Opportunities and Future Considerations**

Results from the NSRE (Cordell et al, 1999) and future demand projections estimated by Bowker et al. (1999) show widespread current and growing future participation in outdoor recreation including activities that combine recreation with education. This is an especially salient fact for the BLM, given that there are more than 180,000 prehistoric and historical sites found on BLM public lands. Examples include the Garnet Ghost town in Montana (circa 1895); the Anasazi Heritage Center Museum in Dolores, Colorado; the Cleveland Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry in Utah with close to 10,000 bones from 14 species of Jurassic animals; and permanent recreation visitor centers in Arizona and California.

Future demand projections for outdoor recreation reported in this paper indicate an increasing desire on the part of people in the BLM regions defined in this paper to engage in outdoor recreation. From a supply perspective, BLM lands represent “prime targets” for meeting increased recreational demand, particularly considering that approximately 40 percent of BLM

lands are in the vicinity of a day's drive from the 16 major western urban areas (Schmitt et al., 1999).

BLM lands are already experiencing a large increase in recreational use and pressure. In just the three year period from 1994 to 1997, recreational use of BLM public lands increased by 9 million visits (51 million visits in 1994 grew to 60 million in 1997). Such an increase in demand for outdoor recreation in BLM areas makes it imperative that resources are not overused to the point of where damage or impairment occurs. To counter damage or impairment problems related to increased recreational use, the BLM is starting the issuance of permits and conducting educational programs - - *Leave No Trace and Tread Lightly* principles are part of those educational programs (Schmitt et al., 1999).

In 1989, the BLM developed a long-term plan, *Recreation 2000: A Strategic Plan*. An update to that plan came was produced in 1994 and termed *Recreation 2000 Update*. Since provision for outdoor recreation is now a recognized policy goal of the BLM, recreation demand and supply is an important area of analysis for the agency on par with demand and supply analysis for commodities such as mineral and grazing resources.

An important part of future BLM recreation management and policy is the financial support of BLM recreation areas. Table 5 summarizes NSRE results describing respondent's attitudes with respect to financing of recreational facilities on public lands including BLM lands. An interesting facet is that recreationists believe campgrounds need to be financed by user fees more than by taxes. Thus, there appears to be opportunities for "pay as you go" financing of BLM recreational opportunities.

## **Summary and Conclusions**

With the end of the Roosevelt era and the installation of the succeeding Truman administration and its concomitant government reorganization, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) came into being. It was primarily conceived as an organization to help the activities of extractive industries - mining, grazing, and timber harvesting. However, even during the New Deal, the Civilian Conservation Corps laid the groundwork for providing recreational facilities on lands that would eventually be administered by the BLM. Providing for the outdoor recreational needs of a growing population is now a major consideration and concern for agencies like the BLM who are responsible to managing the vast national public land base.

National Survey of Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) results and separate recreation demand projections show large participation rates in outdoor recreation and growing demand trends well into the future. In the western U.S., increasing demands for outdoor recreation and the relatively close proximity of BLM lands to major urban centers will likely increase pressure in the future to increase recreational opportunities on BLM lands. The BLM will face the challenge of balancing this increased recreation with other multiple uses, and minimizing the negative environmental impacts of increased recreation use such as damages caused by motorized vehicles, horses and pack animals and foot traffic.

In the future, the BLM will also face management challenges related to financing the provision of increased recreational opportunities. The balance-the-budget policy of the federal government that has taken hold in recent years suggests that the BLM probably cannot count on substantial increases in federal budgets to support its management activities. NSRE survey results specific to the regions administered by the BLM indicate that recreation users are willing to pay fees for services. Whether one is examining lands managed by the BLM or other federal land management agencies, the current and likely growing importance of managing for recreational

opportunities within the multiple-use management paradigm is evident.

### **Endnotes**

- (1) The Bureau of Land Management was a contributor and supporter of the 1994-95 NSRE project.
- (2) Klyza (1996) provides a good summary of the history concerning changing policies concerning grazing fees on BLM lands.
- (3) Republican criticism of the BLM subsided after the Democrats resumed control of Congress in the elections of November, 1948 (Richardson, 1980). During the Nixon Administration, a plan to combine the BLM and the Forest Service into a department of natural resources was derailed by Watergate. An effort to absorb the Forest Service in the Department of the Interior was also abandoned by the Carter Administration due to the lack of Congressional support.
- (4) The first such survey was begun in 1960 by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC). Initially, the survey was termed the National Recreation Survey (NRS). Later the name was changed to the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE), "to reflect the growing interest and emphasis on how people of the United States view their natural environment" (Cordell et al, 1996). Although it has great value, the survey has suffered from a lack of continuity in funding, sponsorship, composition, and methodology. The latest survey (1994-95) was coordinated by the U.S. Forest Service's Outdoor Recreation and Wilderness Assessment Group, with some degree of financial or in-kind resource sponsorship of eleven different groups: USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, US Army Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USDA Economic Research Service, US Environmental Protection Agency, National Park Agency, University of Georgia, Indiana University, Georgia Southern and the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association of America (Cordell et al, 1997a; Cordell et al, 1996). Cordell, et al, (1997b) provides further detail on the methodology.

## References

- BLM, (1990), *American River National Recreation Area Feasibility Study*, Sacramento, California: U. S. Department of Interior - Bureau of Land Management.
- Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English and H.K Cordell. "Projections of Outdoor Recreation Participation to 2050." in H. Ken Cordell, ed., *Outdoor Recreation in American Life : A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends*, Champaign, Illinois: Sagamore Press, 1999
- Cicchetti, Charles Joseph, (1972) "A Review of the Empirical Analyses that Have been Based upon the National Recreation Surveys," *Journal of Leisure Research*, 4, 2: 90-107.
- Clawson, Marion, (1971). *The Bureau of Land Management*, New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Clawson, Marion. (1983). *The Federal Lands Revisited*, Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.
- Cordell, H. Ken (General editor), *Outdoor Recreation in American Life : A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends*, Champaign, Illinois: Sagamore Press, 1999.
- Cordell, H. Ken, McDonald, Barbara, Briggs, J. Alden, Teasley, R. Jeff, Biesterfeldt, Robert, Bergstrom, John, & Mou, Sheila (1997a), *Emerging Markets for Outdoor Recreation in the United States*, Athens, GA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.
- Cordell, H. Ken, R. Jeff Teasley, John C. Bergstrom, Paul Gentle, Mike Brown, (1997b) *Outdoor Recreation in the Western United States: Results from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment -- NSRE*, Athens, Georgia: Environmental Resources Assessment Group.
- Cordell, H.K., B.L. McDonald, B. Lewis, M. Miles, J. Martin and J. Bason (1996). "United States of America." in G. Cushman, A.J. Veal and J. Zuzanek, *World Leisure Participation*, Tucson, Arizona: CAB International.
- Culhane, Paul J., (1981), *Public Lands Politics: Interest Group Influence on the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management*, Baltimore: Resources for the Future.
- Ganzel, Richard. (1987). "Ideology and the Politics of Public Lands," in *Federal Lands Policy*, edited by Foss, Phillip O., New York: Greenwood Press.
- Gates, Paul W., (1976) "Overview of American Land Policy," *Agricultural History*, 50, 1:213-229.
- Holmes, Eldon F., (1973) "Multi-Objective Planning in the Bureau of Land Management,"

*Proceedings of Outdoor Recreation and Environmental Quality*, by Western Resources Conference, 1972. Fort Collins, Colorado: Environmental Resources Center, Colorado State University.

Klyza, Christopher McGory, (1996) *Who Controls the Public Lands?*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lehmann, Scott, (1995). *Privatizing Public Lands*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Mogren, Paul Andrew, (1981), *The Development of a Philosophy of Land Reservation on General Land Office, United States Forest Service, and National Park Service Lands 1787 to 1947, Doctoral Dissertation*, Provo?, Utah: University of Utah.

Miller, Richard O., (1987) "Multiple Use in the Bureau of Land Management: The Biases of Pluralism Revisited," in *Federal Land Policy*, edited by Foss, Phillip, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Nelson, Robert H., (1995) *Public Lands and Private Rights: The Failure of Scientific Management*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Peterson, Gene, (1996). *Pioneering Outdoor Recreation: For the Bureau of Land Management*, McClean, Virginia: Public Lands Foundation.

Richardson, Elmo (1980). *BLM's Billion-Dollar Checkerboard: Managing the O & C Lands*, Santa Cruz, California: Forest History Society.

Robbins, Roy M., (1976) *Our Landed Heritage: The Public Domain, 1776-1970*, Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Schmitt, Rodger, Michelle Dawson, Hal Hallett and Cal McCluskey (1999) "Outdoor Recreation and the Bureau of Land Management." in H. Ken Cordell, ed., *Outdoor Recreation in American Life : A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends*, Champaign, Illinois: Sagamore Press, 1999, pp. 50-54.

World Book, (1995), "Land Management, Bureau of," *World Book Encyclopedia*, Chicago: World Book.

Table 1. Percent and Number (millions) of U.S. Population 16 years and older participating in outdoor recreation, by activity, 1994-95 (source: NSRE)

Activity Category	National		Northern Rockies		Pacific Northwest		Pacific Southwest		Southern Rockies	
	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)
<b>Fitness:</b> Running/jogging, Bicycling, Long distance biking, Walking	68.32	136.9	71.76	1.19	72.33	4.57	68.53	16.26	72.11	5.46
<b>Individual sports:</b> Golf, Tennis	22.01	44.1	20.64	0.34	21.17	1.34	21.94	5.2	23.15	1.75
<b>Outdoor team sports:</b> Baseball, Softball, Football, Basketball, Soccer, Volleyball, Handball	26.44	53	21.9	0.36	22.72	1.44	25.92	6.15	26.36	2
<b>Outdoor spectator:</b> Concerts, Sporting events	58.68	117.6	60.59	1.01	55.94	3.53	57.91	13.74	61.78	4.68
<b>Viewing or studying:</b> Nature centers, Visitor centers, Prehistoric sites, Historic site, Bird watching, Wildlife viewing, Fish viewing, Other wildlife viewing, Sightseeing, Visiting a beach or waterside, Nature study near water	76.18	152.6	82.31	1.37	82.25	5.2	76.05	18.04	81.92	6.2
<b>Snow and Ice:</b> Ice skating, Snowboarding Sledding	18.12	36.3	30.04	0.5	23.03	1.45	18	4.27	22.35	1.69
<b>Camping:</b> Camping in Developed Area, RV Developed camping, Tent developed camping, Primitive area camping, Other camping	26.35	52.80	47.35	0.79	45.07	2.85	32.17	7.63	41.48	3.14
<b>Hunting:</b> Big game hunting, Small game hunting, Migratory bird	9.29	18.60	24.52	0.41	10.76	0.68	4.09	0.97	10.18	0.77



Table 1 (continued)

Activity Category	National		Northern Rockies		Pacific Northwest		Pacific Southwest		Southern Rockies	
	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)	Percent	Number (millions)
<b>Fishing:</b> Freshwater fishing, Saltwater fishing, Warmwater fishing, Coldwater fishing, Ice fishing, Anadromous fishing, Catch and release fishing	28.89	57.9	41.05	0.68	29.5	1.86	21.91	5.2	28.87	2.19
<b>Boating:</b> Sailing, Canoeing, Close-tip canoeing, Open-tip canoeing, Kayaking, Rowing, Floating/rafting, Motor boating, Water skiing, Jet skiing, Sailboarding/windsurfing	28.99	58.1	33.08	0.55	32.46	2.05	25.32	6.01	24.33	1.84
<b>Swimming:</b> Surfing, Swimming/pool, Downhill skiing, Cross-country skiing, Cross-country skiing/groomed trails, Cross-country skiing/ungroomed trails, Back country cross-country skiing, Snowmobiling	54.22	108.6	47.4	0.79	48.47	3.06	53.92	12.79	52.86	4.00
<b>Outdoor Adventure:</b> Hiking, Hiking to summit, Orienteering, Backpacking, Backpacking to summit, Mountain Caving, Off-road vehicle driving, Horseback riding, Horseback riding on trails	36.76	73.6	56.18	0.93	50.02	3.16	43.21	10.25	53.57	4.06
<b>Traditional Social Activities:</b> Yard games, Picnicking, Family gathering, Swimming/lake, river, ocean, Snorkeling/scuba	67.82	135.9	75.27	1.25	72.66	4.59	66.4	15.75	73.3	5.55

Note: For details concerning individual activities, see Cordell et al, 1997b

Table 2. Mean Number days and trips per year participating in outdoor recreation, by activity category, 1994-95 (source: NSRE).

Activity Category	National		Northern Rockies		Pacific Northwest		Pacific Southwest		Southern Rockies	
	Mean Trips	Mean Days	Mean Trips	Mean Days	Mean Trips	Mean Days	Mean Trips	Mean Days	Mean Trips	Mean Days
Fitness Category	9.6	166.2	7.6	153.3	10.5	161.3	11	169.8	11.9	178.8
Individual Sport Activity Category										
Outdoor Team Sport Activity Category										
Outdoor Spectator Activity Category	3.2		2.4		2.7		4.1		3.6	
Viewing Activity Category	53.6	220.5	50.3	229	56.4	242.5	52	193.4	46.7	210.4
Snow and Ice Activity Category	11.5	24.3	18.9	28	18.5	29.7	14.3	20.2	14.1	21.6
Camping Activity Category	9.5	19.9	11.1	20.9	10.5	22.2	8.9	20.3	9.1	18.6
Hunting Activity Category	22.6	35.9	24.7	35.3	26.9	39.1	22.6	34.5	18	26.3
Fishing Activity Category	48.5	88.1	44.8	86.6	47	82.2	42.3	69.4	37.3	68.9
Boating Activity Category	34.7	69.4	27.1	48	31.6	61.2	38.6	66.6	23.7	40.9
Swimming Activity Category	40.6	81.2	15.1	34.5	17.1	40.4	50.3	98.1	15.8	49.5
Outdoor Adventure Activities Category	43.7	91.8	42.1	98	53	116.3	41.8	361.7	54.5	102.1
Traditional Social Activities Category	11.6	17.6	11.2	18.3	12.4	18.6	12.9	102.1	13	19.6

Note: Blank cells indicate instances where data was not available.

Table 3. Future Demand Projections Indexed from 1995 in the Rocky Mountain Region (source: Bowker et al. 1999)

	1995 Use		2000 Index		2010 Index		2020 Index		2030 Index		2040 Index		2050 Index	
	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days
Hiking	62.90	87.80	1.04	1.04	1.12	1.12	1.21	1.20	1.30	1.28	1.37	1.36	1.50	1.44
Backpacking	8.70	14.50	1.03	1.00	1.07	1.03	1.13	1.07	1.21	1.11	1.25	1.17	1.38	1.24
Horseback Riding	23.00	48.20	1.01	1.00	1.05	1.06	1.11	1.14	1.21	1.22	1.38	1.34	1.66	1.51
Off-Road Driving	47.90	57.30	1.04	1.04	1.08	1.12	1.14	1.20	1.20	1.29	1.26	1.40	1.40	1.54
Primitive Camping	21.30	34.60	1.04	1.01	1.06	1.09	1.11	1.15	1.15	1.22	1.21	1.26	1.20	1.29
Rock Climbing	8.70	8.30	1.05	1.01	1.05	1.04	1.07	1.06	1.11	1.09	1.16	1.14	1.24	1.19
Biking	115.30	180.30	1.05	1.04	1.10	1.13	1.17	1.21	1.26	1.29	1.36	1.36	1.48	1.42
Developed Camping	19.10	39.30	1.04	1.04	1.14	1.14	1.25	1.25	1.35	1.35	1.44	1.43	1.51	1.50
Family Gathering	70.40	92.30	1.04	1.06	1.08	1.18	1.14	1.30	1.20	1.42	1.26	1.54	1.40	1.65
Picnicking	70.40	92.30	1.01	1.05	0.99	1.17	1.00	1.29	1.03	1.40	1.08	1.48	1.16	1.54
Sightseeing	95.00	163.30	1.07	1.08	1.23	1.24	1.40	1.41	1.57	1.58	1.66	1.73	1.90	1.85
Visiting Historic Places	-	38.70	-	1.07	-	1.23	-	1.40	-	1.57	-	1.72	-	1.84
Walking	-	1077.70	-	1.06	-	1.15	-	1.24	-	1.32	-	1.37	-	1.40
Rafting/Floating	5.30	6.70	1.06	1.06	1.17	1.11	1.32	1.17	1.52	1.26	1.79	1.41	2.17	1.64
Hunting	26.60	34.50	1.09	1.00	1.06	1.05	1.12	1.10	1.19	1.15	1.26	1.18	1.35	1.22
Fishing	61.40	76.00	1.08	1.05	1.14	1.16	1.23	1.28	1.32	1.40	1.39	1.50	1.46	1.59
Non-consumptive Wildlife Activities	180.60	578.90	1.08	1.09	1.11	1.28	1.16	1.49	1.21	1.68	1.26	1.84	1.30	1.94

Blanks indicate insufficient data to estimate projections.

Table 4. Future Demand Projections Indexed from 1995 in the Pacific Region (source: Bowker et al. 1999)

	1995 Use		2000 Index		2010 Index		2020 Index		2030 Index		2040 Index		2050 Index	
	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days	Trips	Days
Hiking	135.90	192.80	1.07	1.07	1.25	1.20	1.42	1.31	1.58	1.41	1.70	1.52	1.87	1.62
Backpacking	19.70	36.40	1.09	1.03	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.17	1.14	1.22	1.22	1.25	1.22	1.26
Horseback														
Riding	38.00	76.70	1.00	1.00	1.18	1.10	1.37	1.21	1.59	1.34	1.82	1.49	2.09	1.70
Off-Road														
Driving	61.60	98.90	1.06	1.05	1.15	1.09	1.27	1.13	1.38	1.18	1.48	1.28	1.60	1.42
Primitive														
Camping	27.60	57.50	1.06	1.07	1.11	1.26	14.18	1.46	1.24	1.67	1.28	1.88	1.29	2.08
Rock														
Climbing	8.30	9.90	1.06	1.03	1.09	1.07	1.14	1.09	1.23	1.14	1.40	1.25	1.65	1.42
Biking	250.40	400.90	1.14	1.04	1.10	1.13	1.17	1.21	1.26	1.29	1.36	1.36	1.48	1.42
Developed														
Camping	45.30	92.90	1.03	1.07	1.11	1.23	1.19	1.39	1.26	1.56	1.33	1.73	1.41	1.88
Family														
Gathering	144.20	180.40	1.07	1.07	1.17	1.19	1.30	1.29	1.43	1.40	1.53	1.54	1.66	1.71
Picnicking	144.20	180.40	1.06	1.06	1.15	1.21	1.26	1.35	1.38	1.48	1.08	1.48	1.16	1.54
Sightseeing	225.20	363.50	1.11	1.12	1.36	1.38	1.62	1.67	1.89	1.98	2.03	2.29	2.38	2.59
Visiting Historic														
Places	-	68.40	-	1.09	-	1.23	-	1.37	-	1.52	-	1.70	-	1.89
Walking	-	2340.60	-	1.09	-	1.22	-	1.34	-	1.46	-	1.58	-	1.68
Rafting/Floating	8.70	11.40	1.07	1.06	1.27	1.27	1.49	1.51	1.71	1.75	1.82	1.97	2.04	2.16
Hunting	26.00	36.00	1.05	0.94	0.86	0.95	0.82	0.96	0.77	0.95	0.69	0.88	0.62	0.81
Fishing	98.50	119.10	1.09	1.05	1.10	1.16	1.15	1.25	1.89	1.33	1.27	1.40	1.22	1.44
Non-														
consumptive	212.80	838.50	1.03	1.10	1.23	1.33	1.39	1.58	1.53	1.82	1.61	2.01	1.62	2.14
Wildlife														
Activities														

Blanks indicate insufficient data to estimate projections.

Table 5 Public attitudes for financing services and facilities on public lands, 1994-95 (source: NSRE)

Facility or Service	Source of Funding	Bureau of Land Management Region			
		Northern Rockies	Pacific Northwest	Pacific Southwest	Southwest
Visitor Centers	User Fees	33.9	26.1	30.8	35.5
	Taxes	18.9	39.6	27.9	28.9
	Both	44.5	29.9	35.8	34.4
	Don't Know	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	2.6	2.8	3.8	1.1
Special Exhibits & Presentations	User Fees	49.4	44.9	45.7	46.1
	Taxes	7.2	15.0	10.1	15.3
	Both	34.8	33.4	38.2	37.2
	Don't Know	2.2	1.0	0.3	0.6
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	6.4	5.7	5.6	0.7
Trails	User Fees	25.9	27.8	24.5	27.8
	Taxes	31.8	37.4	35.5	33.0
	Both	28.3	30.1	34.5	34.9
	Don't Know	2.2	1.9	0.7	2.9
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	11.9	2.8	4.8	1.4
Picnic Areas	User Fees	29.9	27.9	19.7	28.2
	Taxes	21.4	34.9	40.1	37.3
	Both	34.7	32.5	37.1	33.1
	Don't Know	2.2	1.0	0.2	1.1
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	11.9	3.8	3.0	0.2
Campgrounds	User Fees	39.8	51.2	38.1	44.4
	Taxes	6.3	10.0	17.6	16.3
	Both	42.0	35.9	41.5	38.3
	Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	11.9	2.8	2.8	0.2
Restrooms	User Fees	23.1	21.1	13.9	17.9
	Taxes	34.5	47.4	50.3	50.7
	Both	28.5	28.8	32.5	29.9
	Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
	R/DK <sup>1</sup>	13.9	2.8	3.3	0.5

<sup>1</sup>This signifies either that the person did not respond or did not know.