

Janice K. Brewer  
Governor

Bryan Martyn  
Executive Director



Board Members

Alan Everett, Sedona, *Chair*  
Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail  
Mark Brnovich, Phoenix  
R. J. Cardin, Phoenix  
Kay Daggett, Sierra Vista  
Larry Landry, Phoenix  
Vanessa Hickman,  
State Land Commissioner

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING  
of  
THE STATE RECREATIONAL TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(SRTAC)**

A meeting open to the public was held on **Friday, April 18, 2014 beginning at 1 pm at the Carnegie Library, 1011 West Washington St., Phoenix 85007.**

**This meeting meets the requirement of the Federal Recreational Trails Program (RTP) to convene at least annually a diverse group of motorized and non-motorized recreational trail users representing public interests.** Public comments were taken. The Committee will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

**AGENDA**

**(The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda.)**

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL – 1:15PM**

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Marshall Gerston, Dirt Bike  
Laddie Cox, Hiking  
Bernadine McCollum, Equestrian  
Linda Slay, Equestrian  
Robert Quinn, Dirt Bike / ATV  
Bill Nash, ATV/UTV  
Claire Miller, City of Scottsdale / All  
Connie Lane, Forest Service / All  
Dave Williams, ATV/UTV  
Rick Kesselman, Hiking  
Dave Moore, 4-Wheel Drive  
Craig Stevens, Equestrian  
Thomas McArthur, Dirt Bike  
Angela Villa, Hiking / Equestrian  
Patrick Kell, Mountain Bike  
Bill Gibson, BLM / All

Jeff Gursh, Dirt Bike / ATV  
Barry Krayner, Dirt Bike / ATV  
Dan Shein, Hiking  
Nick Lund, Mountain Bike / Hiking  
Jackie Keller, Hiking  
Becky Antle, 4-Wheel Drive  
Laurel Arndt, Mountain Bike (via phone)  
Matthew Roberts, Am Conservation Experience  
Michael Sanders, ADOT  
Robert Baldwin, RTP Manager  
Katie Valeros, State Parks Planner  
Jeff Prince, State Parks OHV Program  
Kent Ennis, State Parks Deputy Director  
Dawn Collins, R&PP Section Chief  
Paul Katz, State Parks Counsel  
Laurie Hachtel, State Parks Counsel

**C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Chair stated during the public meeting, the Chair may afford any person the opportunity to present statements, with or without the opportunity to present them

orally. Those wishing to address the Committee must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. Each presentation will be allowed not more than five minutes. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or re-schedule the matter for further consideration at a later time. Comments pertinent to agenda items may be discussed during the discussion for that item.

Jeff Gursh, Executive Director, Education, Grants and Agreements, Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition read the following letter:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important funding source and how it is distributed.

It is our understanding that, due to the large amount of uncommitted funds in the OHV fund, State Parks is considering taking additional funds from the OHV (motorized) side of the RTP fund and moving it to the Non-Motorized side, which has been short of funds for some time now.

We would ask for the following stipulations:

- \*This would be a “rare” movement of RTP funds. Not a general practice.
- \*No more than 50% of the OHV RTP funds be moved to the non-motorized side.
- \*That the funded projects have a 1 year completion date.
- \*That any unused funds at the end of completion date be returned to the OHV side of the RTP fund.
- \*That this “sharing” of RTP funds between motorized and non-motorized work both ways, should either recreation show a similar need for funding in the future.
- \* We ask that any “sharing “ of future funds, be restricted to the RTP funding.
- \*Finally, that Agencies and groups that regularly apply for these OHV (motorized) RTP funds be notified and allowed to comment on RTP fund movement before approval. (Same would apply to shared non-motorized RTP funds.)

AZOHVC and its members, at our own expense, have worked diligently to protect the OHV project funds from legislative sweeps and other losses. These protected OHV funds have made it possible to consider the sharing of OHV / RTP funds.

There was no discussion.

#### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **1. Approval of Minutes from the April 26, 2013 meeting.**

Motion: Linda Slay, Second: Bernadine McCollum

No changes or additions. Approved unanimous.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. 2015 State Trails Plan – (No RTP funds are used in compiling this plan.)**

Megha Budruk, Ph.D., Principal Investigator and Kathleen Andereck, Ph.D. Co-Principal Investigator from the Parks and Recreation Management Program, School of Community Resources and Development, College of Public Programs, Arizona State University discussed their survey techniques and presented some early results from the surveys for the 2015 State Trails Plan. Dr. Budruk made the presentation from the following outline.

#### **Study Background**

- Arizona State Parks prepares a State Trails plan every 5 years
- Purpose: To conduct an analysis of motorized and non-motorized trail usage and needs in Arizona
- Findings will be used to inform *Arizona Trails 2015: State Motorized and Non-motorized Trails Plan*
- The plan provides Arizona State Parks and all land management agencies with information and will help Arizona State Parks to develop grant criteria and direct expenditures for trails

#### **Research Methods**

- Random sample of Arizona households
  - O'Neil Associates, Inc.
  - Stratified random sampling from state divided into 8 strata
  - Telephone contact (RDD)
  - N = 4818
  - Response rate 37.8%
- Targeted sample of users
  - Qualtrics
  - Purposive sampling
  - Email link was sent to involved users of trails
  - N = 200
  - Response rate 39%

#### **Research Methods**

- Classification based on response to two questions on use of Motorized and Non-motorized trails
  - Non user - both answers "No" (N = 2997)

- Mixed user - both as “Yes” (N = 476)
- Motorized user - first as “Yes” and second as “No” (N = 148)
- Non-motorized user- first as “No” and second as “Yes” (N = 1197)

### **Data analysis**

- SPSS 22 and Microsoft Excel 2010
- Data rounded to one decimal place

### **Results**

- Demographics
- Gender
  - Even split (Telephonic)
  - Approx. 85% males (Targeted)
- Residency
  - Overall, 90% were a full time AZ resident
- Race/Ethnicity
  - Overall, 85% were White/not of Hispanic origin
- Education
  - Targeted sample had a higher percent (78.3%) of college educated than the Telephonic sample (30%)

### **Satisfaction and Quality of Life**

- Overall, 94% (Telephonic) and 80% (Targeted) were either very satisfied or satisfied with non-motorized trails
- Overall, 76% (Telephonic) and 70% (Targeted) were either very satisfied or satisfied with motorized trails
- When asked how important recreational trails are to overall quality of life, 100% of motorized users (Targeted) said very or somewhat important
- Likewise with non-motorized users (Targeted)
- Estimates of Recreational Use
- About 13% (Telephonic) and 83% (Targeted) respondents had used a trail for motorized recreation during their time in AZ
- About 35% (Telephonic) and 92% (Targeted) respondents had used a trail for non-motorized recreation during their time in AZ

### **Information Sources**

- Paper maps were by far the information source used most often by both the telephonic and targeted samples, and all types of users (motorized, non-motorized and mixed user)

### **Perceptions of Environmental Conditions**

The top three environmental concerns for non-motorized and motorized users are:

1. Litter or trash dumping
2. Erosion
3. Decreased wildlife sightings

### **Perceptions of Social Conditions**

The top three social concerns for non-motorized users are:

- Telephonic
  1. Vandalism
  2. Urban development limiting trail access or use
  3. Lack of trail ethics by other users
- Targeted
  1. Urban development limiting trail access or use
  2. Vandalism
  3. Target shooting

The top three social concerns for motorized users are:

- Telephonic
  1. Closure of trails
  2. Vandalism
  3. Urban development limiting trail access or use
- Targeted
  1. Closure of trails
  2. Urban development limiting trail access or use
  3. Lack of trail ethics by other users

### **Perceptions of Social Conditions**

In general respondents do not experience recreation conflict with other trail users

1. However, 17% of non-motorized and 32% of motorized (Telephonic) respondents said they experienced conflict with ATV's or "quad riders" somewhat or very often
  - a. 28% of non-motorized and 18% of motorized (Targeted) respondents said they experienced conflict with ATV's or "quad riders" somewhat or very often

### **Trail Users' Planning and Management Priorities**

2. When asked about what was important, given that managers had limited resources to develop and maintain trails:
3. The top three issues for non-motorized (Telephonic) users were:
  - a. Mitigating damage to the surrounding trails
  - b. Providing educational programs that promote safe and responsible recreation
  - c. Providing trail maps and information
4. The top three issues for motorized (Telephonic) users were:
  - a. Providing educational programs that promote safe and responsible recreation
  - b. Routine upkeep of existing motorized trails, routes and areas
  - c. Keeping existing trails in good condition

### **Trail Users' Planning and Management Priorities**

5. When asked, given limited funding, which one management priority is the most important:
    - a. Non-motorized users reported "keep existing trails in good condition"
    - b. Motorized users reported "acquiring land for trails and trail access"
- Trail Users Management Preferences (Funding Priorities)
  - Telephonic – Non-motorized users: 1) mitigating damage to areas surrounding the trails, 2) providing educational programs that promote safe and responsible recreation, and 3) providing trail maps and information
  - Telephonic – Motorized users: 1) Providing educational programs that promote safe and responsible recreation, 2) Routine upkeep of existing motorized trails, routes and areas, 3) keeping existing trails in good condition

## Trail Users Management Preferences (Funding Priorities):

### Telephonic

- Keeping existing trails in good condition (~31%)
- Acquiring lands for trails and trail access (~11.5%)
- Developing support facilities such as restrooms, parking (~11.1%)

Targeted

### Targeted

- Acquiring lands for trails and trail access (~30%)
- Establish new motorized, trails, and areas (~22%)
- Keeping existing trails in good condition (~14%)
- Volunteering

Telephonic

Targeted

## **Summary and Conclusions**

- Respondents are generally very satisfied with recreational trail opportunities and feel that trails enhance their quality of life
- Paper maps are the most used information source across non-motorized and motorized users
- Trail users have concerns about impacts to the environmental and social conditions, especially regarding urban development limiting trail access or use and vandalism (non-motorized users) as well as closure of trails (motorized users)
- Trail users' priorities are to "keep existing trails in good condition" and "acquiring land for trails and trail access"

Budruk and Andereck responded to questions:

Lund asked how targeted list was determined.

Collins responded that State Parks staff provided names from Parks records and solicited names from advisory committee members.

Kesselman asked how the telephonic respondents were chose.

Andereck indicated it is from random dialing process.

Keller asked about distribution of calls around the state.

Andereck responded that all parts of the state are targeted.

Male speaker requested copy of questions.

Andereck said this information will be included in the final plan.

## **2. Discuss the Federal Recreational Trails Program (RTP) –**

Baldwin used the following charts to explain the difference between apportionment and obligation authority. He explained how motorized and non-motorized portions of the apportionment are divided equally and are drawn down from each year until that year is fully expended. He also explained that because the obligation authority is less than the apportionment, all apportioned funds will never be spent. In fact, within a year or two an entire year's apportionment may lapse before it can be obligated.

The discussion included a description of the process for moving the ending balances from each apportionment year forward to the next OA year (state fiscal year) for obligation before they lapse at the end of September.

Non-motorized trail grants will be offered in January each year. Motorized grants are offered in January and July each year.

## **F. REPORTS**

1. The 2014 OHVAG Chair and/or designees will report on the Statewide OHV Program projects and accomplishments from 2013.

Jeff Prince reported that in 2013 State Parks conducted two motorized grant cycles. OHVAG conducted five meetings around the state to address motorized issues. He developed "Trail Talks" to meet with the public at their recreation sites and share insights. One OHVAG meeting was held in conjunction with the Outlaw ATV Jamboree in Springerville/Eagar, an annual event that attracts ATV enthusiasts from all over the USA. This was an opportunity for the Group to see how OHV activity can be an economic driver in small communities. OHVAG members participated in the Overland Expo in May at Mormon Lake. It is one of the largest OHV recreation & trade show and training events in the country. OHVAG provided some good information for the targeted lists that were discussed earlier.

2. The 2014 ASCOT Chair and/or designees will report on the non-motorized trails projects and accomplishments from 2013.

Lund reported that the ASCOT State Trail System Subcommittee has been looking at the status of the State Trail System and continued maintenance of that database. The current system has become unruly with over 800 trails and the intent of the legislation to select "significant" trails will be evaluated over the next year and new criteria for new trail system will be developed. Several trails systems have followed the TRACKS example to make trail use safer by providing GPS coordinates at strategic trail locations to assist distressed users in getting help quickly. The State Parks Board endorsed the program and suggested that other trail system managers incorporate the program. The cost is minimal as volunteers do all of the work installing the location markers and coordinating the responses through local first responders.



Gibson reminded everyone that ASCOT supported two national trails conferences hosted in Arizona. The International Trails Symposium was held at Ft. McDowell in April and the Scenic & Historic Trail Conference was held in Tucson in November.

The TRACKS group received a national award for community service at the American Trails ITS.

**G. ADJOURNMENT – 2:55 PM**

