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SCORP Executive Summary

AN OVERVIEW OF ARIZONA’S 2018 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

This update of Arizona’s Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) is in accordance with the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act, enacted in 1964 to encourage the provision of greater recreation opportunities for American citizens. Arizona receives annual congressional appropriations from LWCF, administered through the Arizona State Parks and Trails Board to fund state and local government sponsored outdoor recreation projects.

The 2018 SCORP is Arizona’s Outdoor Recreation Policy Plan

SCORP’s Key Objectives

- Establish outdoor recreation priorities for Arizona.
- Set evaluation criteria to allocate the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants.
- Protect, conserve, and manage Arizona’s public lands, recreation spaces, and unique places for current and future generations.
- Encourage a highly integrated and connected outdoor recreation system throughout Arizona.
- Ensure Arizona’s diverse and growing population has access to outdoor recreation spaces and opportunities to enjoy a range of recreation activities.
- Communicate linkages between outdoor recreation, individual wellness benefits, community health, and a thriving economy.
- Elevate public participation and engagement in outdoor recreation planning initiatives and issues.
The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) has identified conservation, social equity and health and wellness as the three key impacts of Parks and Recreation agencies across the nation, regardless of size or jurisdiction.

By providing parks and recreation opportunities that are accessible and include all community members regardless of race, ethnicity, age, income level or ability, agencies contribute to community cohesion, and reductions in crime. In order to address social equity, our second pillar focuses specifically on Accessibility and Inclusion. This pillar will be incorporated into Arizona grant rating and priorities to ensure that funding is distributed to projects in locations with the greatest need, whether due to lack of local supply, lack of grant writing or other funding resources, or other factors.

Finally, parks and recreation agencies contribute to the health and wellness of citizens and visitors. Because these health benefits extend beyond the individual to also contribute to healthy, integrated, engaged, economically vital communities, this pillar was changed to “Thriving Individuals and Communities” in this document.

Arizona’s statewide recreation priority issues are largely consistent with these pillars; however, the implementation of the Arizona Management System, a statewide initiative, requires the application of best business practices and lean management principles to make government processes more efficient, reduce waste and enhance customer satisfaction.

In order to include these efforts, Arizona State Parks and Trails added another pillar to the organizational structure of this document - Optimizing System Vitality.

Optimizing system vitality encompasses the responsible use of existing resources to maximize opportunities for constituents and visitors, in addition to seeking additional funding sources and innovative means of achieving long term sustainability and vitality while adapting to changing economic times. The four pillars are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.
ARIZONA’S PRIORITY OUTDOOR RECREATION ISSUES

Each state’s plan must identify outdoor recreation issues of statewide importance. The priority issues were identified through the SCORP planning process, an online survey of recreation providers, a focus group of millennial participants, and public input obtained via social media, a web survey, and feedback at public meetings throughout the process. The 2018 SCORP Working Group, State Parks staff, and Arizona State University researchers analyzed the data and information to identify the following priority issues, which are the means to strengthening the four pillars of outdoor recreation in Arizona.

2018 SCORP Priority Issues

- Preservation and Conservation
- Accessibility and Inclusion
- Engagement
- Collaboration and Partnerships
- Marketing, Communication and Education Opportunities
- Funding

The priority issues, recommendations for actions related to these issues and example projects that could be funded by the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) or other grants funds are described further in Chapter 5.

The SCORP process revealed three additional important themes that emerged from the data which should be considered. These themes inform many of the priority issues, and therefore it was deemed appropriate to discuss them separately.

1. Technology in providing outdoor recreation,
2. Including today’s youth in outdoor recreation
3. Connectivity – both in the physical world – connecting parks, trails and communities - as well as in social and ecological systems embedded within all of the outdoor recreation issues.

More on these themes can be found in Chapter 3.
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

This 2018 update of Arizona’s Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) is intended to guide outdoor recreation managers and decision-makers on policy and funding issues. While local, state and federal agencies have their own detailed management plans used to guide development, operation, land and resource management, the SCORP promotes a holistic, statewide view. It provides decision-makers and outdoor recreation managers with a thoughtful analysis of the most significant outdoor recreation issues facing Arizona today and suggests strategies to address these issues during the next five years.

1.1 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

1.1.1 Background and Legal Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land and Water Conservation Fund Act 1964</th>
<th>Land and Water Conservation Fund in Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed by Congress in 1964, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act (P.L. 85-578) was created to provide funds for the acquisition and development of public lands to meet the needs of all Americans for outdoor recreation and open space. Since its inception, the Fund has successfully conserved nearly 3 million acres of public lands nationwide, including Grand Canyon National Park and created more than 41,000 state and local park recreation facilities. Using revenues from offshore oil and gas receipts, funds are allocated through a federal program and a stateside matching grant program.</td>
<td>From acquiring land for and building hiking and biking trails, to improving community parks, playgrounds and ball fields, the LWCF State Side is a 50:50 matching program that is the primary federal investment tool to ensure that citizens have easy access to public open spaces in perpetuity. From 1965- 2014, the State Side fund has made significant contributions to improving outdoor recreation nationwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The federal program funds the purchase of federal agency land and water areas for conservation and recreation purposes. Congress appropriates these funds directly to federal agencies on an annual basis.</td>
<td>• $4.1 billion, matched for a total of $8.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The stateside matching grants program assists state and local governments in acquiring, renovating, developing, and expanding high quality outdoor recreation areas and facilities.</td>
<td>• Over 40,000 grants approved to state and local governments nationwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10,600 grants supporting the purchase and/or protection of 3 million acres of recreation lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 26,420 grants for development of recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2,760 grants for redevelopment of older recreation facilities including improved access for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 641 state planning grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arizona’s stateside LWCF share is based on a formula comprised of land area and population factors. As Arizona’s population has increased over the years so has the need for outdoor recreation resources. As Figure 1 shows, LWCF apportionments have varied drastically over time. For example, in 1979, Arizona received nearly $5 million dollars making it the largest LWCF apportionment since the beginning of the program, whereas 20 years later in 1999, Arizona received no stateside LWCF allocations.
Since the beginning of the LWCF in Arizona, more than 755 LWCF grants were awarded totaling $63,258,937, with a leveraged amount of $125,358,937, making a significant contribution to investments in Arizona’s outdoors.

Figure 1. LWCF Annual Apportionments to Arizona 1965-2016
Figure 2. LWCF Project and Funding Per County

LWCF Projects and Funding Per County
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1.3 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

The LWCF Act of 1965 stipulates that each state is required to complete an approved outdoor recreation plan or “SCORP” every five years to be eligible for LWCF stateside allocations. Each state’s SCORP guides how stateside LWCF apportionments are granted to eligible recipients for new acquisitions and development projects pertaining to outdoor recreation. The SCORP must address statewide outdoor recreation issues including recreation supply and demand, a sufficiently detailed strategy for obligation of LWCF monies (Open Project Selection Process), identify wetlands that need priority protection, and provide ample opportunity for public involvement.

The SCORP is not a site-specific plan nor is it intended to address every outdoor recreation issue in Arizona. Rather it is meant as an information resource to assist in decision-making for recreation providers across the state. The SCORP identifies existing resources and systems, general outdoor recreation and related tourism participation trends, issues and problems, and provides recommendations for strategic solutions to those problems. Local and regional planning, research and cooperation are strongly encouraged to complement the information contained in the SCORP in order to satisfy the outdoor recreation needs in Arizona.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of SCORP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Guidelines outline two general purposes of the SCORP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Guide the use of LWCF funds for local government and state recreation agencies by identifying public and agency preferences and priorities for outdoor recreation activities and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify outdoor recreation issues of statewide importance and those issues that will be addressed through LWCF funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the SCORP to tie outdoor recreation projects to state outdoor recreation priorities may aid an organization in applying for and receiving alternative funding from outside sources. Projects that directly address the SCORP’s Open Project Selection Process priorities are more likely to receive LWCF funding in the State of Arizona.
Chapter 2 ARIZONA AT A GLANCE

2.1 CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

By 2030, Arizona is projected to be the Nation’s tenth largest state in population with 10.7 million residents. With this growth, the makeup of Arizona’s population is also predicted to change substantially over the next few decades, becoming older, younger, and more diverse which may influence the demand for different types of outdoor recreation (Center for the Future of Arizona, 2015). Demographic trends can be drivers of recreation choices where one’s race, ethnicity, gender, income, and education level as well as proximity to the outdoors is highly indicative of recreation choices, participation level, and consumption (Cordell, 2012). Providers were asked if the demographics of their users had changed within the last five years with 41% responding “Yes” (Figure 3).

2.2 PHYSICAL SETTING

Located in the American Southwest, Arizona is a land of extremes. Temperatures fluctuate wildly from night to day as well as seasonally. Monsoon clouds unleash furious torrents of precipitation and the ground can go from cracked and parched to flooded in a matter of minutes. There is incredible diversity to be discovered from the state’s high plateaus, rugged mountains, vast grasslands, and lush riparian valleys. In fact, nearly all the world’s biomes from tundra on the San Francisco Peaks to deciduous temperate forests can be found within the Grand Canyon State, with the sole exception of tropical rainforests (see Figure 4). Overall, Arizona is one of the driest and sunniest states in the country and is the only state where all four North American deserts types are found (The Arizona Experience, 2016).

Like many other western states, a significant portion of the landscape is public land. These public lands include national, state, and regional parks, forests, wildlife refuges, monuments, wilderness areas, cultural and historic sites in both urban and rural settings. Arizona’s public lands support an array of activities including tourism and outdoor recreation while also providing ecosystem services such as clean air and water. The unique patchwork of diverse landscapes, parks and protected areas, and public lands not only provide picturesque scenery but also directly contribute to Arizona’s economy.

Studies consistently demonstrate the important role parks and protected areas play in improving community and individual health and well-being through access to the outdoors and recreation opportunities. Many factors influence the outdoor recreation opportunities in a particular area including climate, landscape, accessibility, and population demographics.
Biotic Communities of Arizona

Source: Brown and Lowe 1979, as digitized by The Nature Conservancy 2004

Figure 4. Map of Arizona’s Biomes
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Outdoor recreation areas are a key component of healthy communities and have profound economic, environmental, and individual health benefits. Arizonans recognize the uniqueness of public spaces and the incredible value of outdoor recreation opportunities which are found throughout the Grand Canyon State. With over two thirds of the population originating from elsewhere, the motto of the state could be “I chose to live here” (Center for the Future of Arizona, 2015). Protection of the unique natural features of the state are a priority for residents, who identified the protection of the state’s natural environment, water supplies, and open spaces as top priorities in the 2009 Gallop Arizona Poll (Center for the Future of Arizona, 2015).

However, it is not only residents that directly benefit from Arizona’s public spaces but visitors from all over the world come to the state for its unique landscapes and outdoor experiences. Arizona is a major destination site for over 42 million domestic and international visitors each year (AOT, 2016). According to the Arizona Office of Tourism (AOT), one in five visitors to Arizona make a point of visiting a state or national park and 17% go hiking or backpacking while they are here. After shopping and fine dining, outdoor recreation activities are the top experiences desired by Arizona visitors.

### 2.3 Tourism and Outdoor Recreation

As one of Arizona's strongest economic drivers, the travel and tourism industry is integral to the state's vitality. No other Arizona industry produces the same type of economic benefits that positively impacts all 15 counties. Ranked the #1 export-oriented industry in Arizona in 2015, travel and tourism activity creates an economic cycle of increased visitation, greater travel spending, faster job creation, potential commerce opportunities and higher tax revenues, all of which contribute to the growth and development of the state.

#### 2.3.1 Outdoor Recreation: A Cornerstone of the Tourism Industry in Arizona

This love for the Arizona outdoors and its tourism offerings translates into vital economic benefit for the state and its residents. Visitors inject $57.5 million per day into the state’s economy. This impact is felt more acutely in rural areas where tourism makes up a larger share of economic activity, and outdoor recreation is a key draw for these areas. Direct travel spending makes up more than 15% of state transaction privilege taxes in rural areas compared to about 8% in urban cores. These benefits contribute to thriving communities.
In order to better understand what residents and visitors do when they recreate outdoors, outdoor recreation providers were asked to complete a survey. Providers were asked to indicate the outdoor recreation activities that users currently participated in at the sites which they managed and were then asked to indicate the expected future participation.

The top 5 outdoor recreation activities with the highest net potential future growth for the state of Arizona as indicated by the providers surveyed (Figure 6) were participation in 1) technology enabled outdoor recreation, 2) nature study or environmental education activities, 3) visiting wilderness areas or nature preserves, 4) non-motorized activities such as paddle sports, including kayaking, stand-up paddle boarding (SUP), etc., tubing, sailing, or swimming in a lake or stream, and 5) visiting developed natural and/or cultural features such as a park, botanical garden, scenic feature or archaeological site. The net potential growth was calculated by subtracting the current participation from the expected future participation, which were measured on a 5-point scale (1=no participation to 5=high participation). It is important to note that although greater growth is expected in the activities identified in the graph above, some of these activities, such as technology enabled outdoor recreation, have lower reported participation currently. Although these activities are expected to increase the most in the future, the percent of the population expected to engage in technology enabled recreation may continue to be significantly less than the percent of the population that engages in some more traditional outdoor activities which may experience less growth.
These findings were somewhat consistent with the Outdoor Foundation’s 2015 top growing trends which included paddle sports, kayaking activities (including river, sea, and fishing), traditional and non-traditional triathlon, adventure racing, and trail-running (Outdoor Foundation, 2016). Nationwide, SUP was the most rapidly growing activity in the outdoor industry with participation increasing 26% between 2012 and 2015 (Outdoor Foundation, 2016).
2.3.2 Promoting Outdoor Recreation in Arizona

The Arizona Office of Tourism (AOT) markets Arizona as a world-class leisure travel destination to domestic and international visitors. Outdoor recreation has always held a primary role in AOT’s campaign imagery and messaging. This marketing effort helps to address one of the statewide issues identified. Across groups, there was agreement that Arizona recreational assets are unknown to many residents and visitors and enhanced marketing efforts will inform recreationists of choices available to them.

AOT’s campaigns target specific audiences including international visitors and out-of-state domestic visitors. The Summer Campaign encourages Arizona residents and those in nearby drive markets, particularly in urban areas, to explore the rest of the state. The drive market is defined as interstate visitors who at some point during their trip, use a vehicle to access Arizona destinations. Examples of some nearby drive markets are California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah. In FY17, AOT partnered directly with Arizona State Parks and Trails to produce a summer campaign highlighting State Parks to Arizona residents.

Table 1. AOT Visitor Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident US</th>
<th>Overseas*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Nights Stayed in Arizona</strong></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Party Size</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Party Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$817</td>
<td>$4,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$57,780</td>
<td>$73,300</td>
<td>$85,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>42 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overseas does not include Mexican and Canadian Visitors
2.3.3 Programs Promoting Outdoor Recreation

The following is a list of programs which heavily draw upon and promote Arizona’s natural wonders and outdoor recreation opportunities:

- **Official State Visitor Guide** – published annually, this magazine features detailed travel information and high-quality photography.

- **Official State Visitor Map.**

- **VisitArizona.com** – AOT’s official consumer travel website. The site includes content and articles specifically designated as “Outdoor Adventure.” Additionally, more than 250 businesses listed on the site are directly related to outdoor recreation.

- **Arizona’s Recreation and Cultural Sites Map** – Information found on the map details where travelers can boat, fish, raft, canoe, swim, camp, hike, or view wildlife.

- **Co-Op Marketing Program** – open to rural destination marketing organizations as well as Arizona State Parks and Trails, this funds-matching program assists destinations in promoting their travel offerings.

- **IMAX/Expedia Campaign** promoting the National Parks Centennial (2016).
2.4 LAND BASED RECREATION IN ARIZONA

The 2018 SCORP outdoor recreation provider survey identified the eleven most frequent activities that take place on public lands in Arizona.

**Eleven Most Frequent Activities That Take Place on Public Lands in Arizona**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving a motorized vehicle on maintained roads for recreational purposes such as sightseeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or driving for pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking, jogging, backpacking, trail running or walking a dog*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent, RV camping or cabin rentals*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road driving an ATV, dirt bike, snowmobile, or 4-wheel drive vehicle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting developed natural and/or cultural features such as a park, botanical garden, scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feature or archaeological site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting wilderness area or nature preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized water activities such as motor boating, water skiing, jet skiing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized water activities such as paddle sports (kayaking, stand up paddle boarding, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubing, sailing or swimming in a lake or stream*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized trail activities such as bicycling, road biking, mountain biking, skateboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or horseback riding*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the activities above are either very general (#1) or are generally combined with other activities (#s 5, 6 & 7) and therefore not been the focus of additional inquiry. Recent literature, plans or studies were sought for the remaining groups of activities (indicated with asterisks).

Briefly summarized below are the economic benefits of activity participation, trends over time and the demographics of participants, where available. The authors acknowledge that the list below is not exhaustive; however, whenever possible links are provided to updated studies and information regarding these and other activities for reader reference.

2.4.1 Non-motorized Trail Recreation

Many Arizonans and visitors experience the natural beauty of Arizona by hiking, backpacking, running, mountain biking, or riding a horse on trails. Non-motorized trails are accessible year-round and allow users to experience a wide variety of different environments using many different modes of transportation. Trails make communities more livable and walkable, improve the economies of surrounding communities by drawing in visitors, and improve the health of residents by providing healthy and safe alternatives to driving, according to AmericanTrails.org, (MacDonald, 2011). However, one study conducted in Ohio indicated that factors that contribute to greater trail use include: 1) higher population density, 2) easy access from neighborhoods, 3) connection to other trails and 4) longer trails.
Trails are developed, maintained and managed by many federal, state, county, city/town and non-profit entities and serve to not only provide recreation opportunities, but also connect communities and generate economic opportunities at the local level.

According to a 2017 study by the Outdoor Industry Association (2017), nationally, $184.5 billion was spent on outdoor recreation products, including gear, apparel, etc. In addition, $702.3 billion was spent on outdoor recreation related trips and travel. Every year, Americans spend more on outdoor recreation than they do on pharmaceuticals and fuel combined. This spending support 7.6 million American jobs and an estimated $125 billion in tax revenues. Trails related gear spending alone was estimated to be $25 billion, trip related expenses were estimated to be more than $176 billion, for a total estimated $201 billion. This level of spending is estimated to support 1.7 million jobs, generate $60.7 billion in wages, $14 billion in federal taxes and $13 billion in state and local taxes. Trail related activities that were included in the Outdoor Industry Association study include: hiking, backpacking, running on trails, horseback riding and mountaineering.

The Arizona Trails 2015 Plan, an information filled report, conducted every five years, includes data collected from a random sample of non-motorized trail users.

Table 2. Percentage of ‘All Trail Users’ Participating in a Non-motorized Trail Activity 2015 AZ Trails Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Motorized Trail Activity*</th>
<th>2015 % All Trail Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail Hiking</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback Riding</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing/Kayaking</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Country Skiing/Snowshoeing</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all non-motorized trail users and mixed trail users who also use non-motorized trails.

Some of the most popular non-motorized activities on Arizona Trails are: 1) hiking, 2) backpacking, 3) mountain biking, and 4) horseback riding. Trail hiking still comprises the largest trail user group in Arizona. The percentages listed in the table above are conservative estimates of trail use, as they do not include children under age 18 or the large number of tourists and visitors that travel to Arizona each year and participate in each activity. Consistent with Arizona’s data,
there has been a 13% increase in national trail use from 2015 to 2016, and a 7% increase when compared to rates three years ago (Outdoor Industry Association, 2017). Backpacking, or overnight hiking, is the second largest non-motorized trail activity in the state. Arizona still has plenty of remote primitive areas and wilderness opportunities for the adventurous to explore. Nationally, backpacking has increased 12% compared to participation three years ago.

Figure 8. National Participation Rates for Hiking, Backpacking, and Mountain Biking

*All participation numbers in this graph are in the thousands (000).

In addition to the priorities of the Arizona Trails 2015 Plan, Arizona State Parks and Trails is committed to connecting communities through trails. The Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS), is a prime example of a city-wide non-motorized, shared-use trail network managed for use by bicyclists, walkers, hikers, runners, cross-country skiers and other users. FUTS trails offer an incredibly diverse range of experiences; some trails are located along busy streets, while others traverse beautiful natural places. This connectivity increases residents and non-residents opportunities for healthy outdoor recreation within the city while linking communities and businesses along the path.

The FUTS currently includes 55 trails, which connect to an additional 300 trails, (including the Arizona Trail – an 800-mile trail that stretches from Utah to Mexico - as well as to 17 other trails on federal and county lands). The trails in the FUTS are used for both recreation and transportation, and enhance communities by providing safe alternatives to auto use, provide health benefits to residents, and increase property values of surrounding sites. The system connects neighborhoods, shopping, places of employment, schools, parks, open space and surrounding national forests. This system also offers opportunities for transportation between outlying communities and the city center. The overall master plan, which includes continual public input, proposes 77 miles of future trails, to complete a planned system of 132 miles.
2.4.2 Bicycling

With the long tradition of hiking and horseback riding in Arizona, mountain bicyclists are a relatively new user group. Bicycling (including road cycling, mountain biking and BMX biking) is in the top five most popular outdoor recreation activities for adults ages 25 and older nationally, and is also the second favorite activity of these adults, with an average of 76 outings per cyclist and 1.4 billion total outings nationally (Outdoor Industry Association, 2017).

National surveys of recreation participation illustrate that BMX biking has grown 87% in the last 10 years. Mountain biking has increased by 28% during the same time period and road biking has decreased by 2%. In addition, in an era when parents and recreation providers are struggling to get youth outside, the Outdoor Industry reports that, nationally, bicycling (BMX, mountain and road) is the second most popular activity that youth 6-24 years old engage in, and is also their second favorite activity, topped only by running, jogging and trail running. For adult recreationists, bicycling is the 4th most popular activity, but their 2nd favorite. Nationally, bicycling on the road and off-road along with skateboarding resulted in an estimated $13 billion in spending on gear, accessories and vehicles, $82 billion on trip-related expenses for a total of $96 billion annually. This level of spending resulted in an estimated 847,559 jobs, $28 billion in salaries and wages, $57 billion in federal taxes and $6.2 billion in state and local taxes.

In Arizona, providers expect that there will be more mountain bike use on trails that they manage in the future. A recent economic impact study conducted by the Arizona Department of Transportation estimated that 250 annual cycling events in the state attract approximately 14,000 out-of-state participants. When one takes into account the travel parties who come to the state with the participant, it is estimated that bicycle events draw approximately 36,500 visitors to the state annually, with an estimated economic impact of $30.6 million annually and supporting 404 jobs. This estimate of impact is necessarily conservative, as 39,000 Arizonans take part in these same events, not to mention the variety of other more informal events. An additional estimated $57.6 million was spent at bicycle shops by out-of-state visitors, supporting an additional 317 jobs. The estimated spending of both local and out-of-state customers at all stores that sell bicycles, parts and service is $114 million.

Arizona offers many opportunities for road and trail cycling throughout the state. For example, Sedona and the Verde Valley have become well known destinations for mountain biking and road riding. The Red Rock Ranger District in and around Sedona has over 250 miles of multi-use trails for hikers, mountain bikers, trail runners and equestrians. Many residents access the trails from trailheads in their neighborhood. Riders from around the world come to mountain bike Sedona’s challenging trails and view the spectacular scenery up close. The annual Sedona Mountain Bike Festival is held adjacent to the Sedona Bike Skills Park and brings in several thousand riders each March. Local non-profit groups donate time and funds to help maintain the trails around Sedona and the Verde Valley.

Road riders take advantage of interconnecting highways and county roads throughout the Verde Valley to create riding loops of various lengths. The 4,500-foot elevation of Sedona attracts road and mountain bike racing teams for training. Mingus Mountain offers road riders a 4,000-foot vertical climb on State Route 89A. Bike lanes on State Route 179 provide safety for a scenic road ride through the red rocks. This road is an exceptional traveling experience and has been designated an All-American Road.

However, one issue that is a challenge for land managers is the creation and continued use of illegal trails (also called wildcat trails) created by mountain bikers on public lands. These trails may be unsustainable, may constitute trespass and may have no legal standing to ensure their continued existence. A further complication is the continued communication of the location of these trails through applications, such as Strava, which do not identify whether trails are legal trails designated and built by land managers or wildcat trails. This omission may result in the continued or increased use of wildcat trails on public lands.
2.4.3 Horseback Riding on Trails

Equestrians also have a rich history in Arizona. Horses are an integral part of the history of the western United States. The Arizona Trails 2015 Plan estimates that 16.5% of adult resident non-motorized trail users are equestrians. Trail riding is a popular activity throughout the state and there are many ‘horse camps’ with multiple loop trails situated in both desert and forest environments.

The American Horse Council estimated that 3.9 of the 9.2 million horses in the U.S. are used exclusively or primarily for recreation. One study conducted in Minnesota in 2011 found that the average survey respondent took 33 trips per year to ride horses on trails in the state. Three-quarters of these trips were taken within 30 minutes of the respondent’s home, indicating that, for this population, equestrian trails may contribute more to quality of life for residents than economic impacts for the community. However, a second study in the same state in 2009 found that although trails are not large income generators, their location in rural communities contribute necessary dollars to host communities. The authors also stated that the majority of trail related spending occurred as a result of horseback riding expenses such as the purchases of new horses, new equipment, boarding, feed, veterinary fees, etc. These fees accounted for 59% of all equipment spending in the state.

One study conducted in Kentucky identified valued trail attributes for rural, horseback riding day trips. Findings indicated that riders were willing to pay to access longer trails – up to $2 per mile more. In addition, riders were willing to pay an additional $23 to access trails with scenic views. Less experienced survey participants preferred to use trails that were limited to equestrian use and were willing to pay to access these trails, whereas this was less true for experienced riders. Riders liked longer trails better than shorter ones and were willing to pay an additional $2 per mile per trip in entrance fees to use these trails.

For these and all other non-motorized activities that take place on trails, the 2015 Trails Plan also includes recommendations and action strategies generated from data collected from trail users, land managers and others to protect and enhance trails throughout the state from both trail users and providers. Below are the priorities that emerged from the most recent 2015 Trails Plan.

Table 3. Arizona Trail Plan Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 AZ Trail Plan Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Level Priorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motorized</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect access to trails/acquire land for public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and renovate existing trails and routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide and install trail/route signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and designate motorized trails, routes and areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Level Priorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop support facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide maps and trails/route information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate and restore damage to areas surrounding trails, routes and areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Level Priorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of environmental/cultural clearance and compliance activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase on-the-ground management presence and law enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4.4 Camping Recreation

Many public land managing agencies provide opportunities for visitors to “get away from it all” by camping outdoors. In Arizona, national, state, and county parks offer opportunities to commune with nature in spots ranging from completely undeveloped to developed. In addition, camping appears to be gaining popularity among younger generations. For example, a recently released study found that millennials appear to be camping in larger numbers than would be expected given the proportion of this group in the population (KOA, 2017).

According to a recently released study of the general population conducted by Kampgrounds of America (KOA), an estimated 61% of households include someone who camps in the household and 3.4 million households have started camping in the last three years. Also, this study suggests that the number of campers taking 3 or more trips per year has increased by 36% since 2014. Interestingly, and consistent with the national focus on accessibility and inclusion in parks and recreation, a greater percentage of non-white millennials have started camping in the past three years when compared to white millennials. While out camping, millennials tend to prefer more active recreation, such as mountain biking, hiking or backpacking highlighting the importance of connectivity between parks, campgrounds, and trails. There has also been an increase in the participation of young, Asian campers in the recent past.

Although technology was not deemed necessary by nearly two-thirds of teens, approximately 37% of all U.S. campers reported that access to technology allows them to extend their camping trips. This study also found that approximately two-thirds of households in the west (including Arizona) camp at least occasionally. In 2016, approximately one-fourth of all campers self-identified as Black, Latino, Asian or some other ethnicity. More than one-half (51%) of survey respondents had children in their household. This is to be expected as the average age of campers decreases. Millennials and Generation Xers now represent a larger percent of campers than these groups had in the past.

Another study conducted by Outdoor Industry Association in 2013 suggested that 85% of American campers had been introduced to camping sometime between birth and 15 years old. Thus, although millennials are becoming new campers in greater numbers than would be expected, it is important to note that the best way to foster a love for the outdoors and recreation activities is early exposure. This study found that tents were the preferred type of shelter. When asked about their motivation, first-time campers engaged in this activity because they love the outdoors and want to “escape the grind.” The average age of the survey respondents was 32 years old.

Figure 9. National Camping Participation Rates

![National Participation Rates 2006 - 2016](image-url)

*All participation numbers in this graph are in the thousands (000).
2.4.5 Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation

Arizona State Parks and Trails manages the statewide Off-Highway Vehicle program. The agency receives 60% of OHV Recreation Fund monies, which are generated through a percentage of gas tax fees associated with OHV use in the state, as well as a registration sticker fee, to administer a grant program and support responsible OHV recreation in the state. Arizona Game & Fish Department receives a portion of the OHV Recreation Fund monies to administer OHV-related education and for OHV law enforcement activities, and the Arizona State Land Department receives a percent of the monies for mitigation efforts related to OHV recreation on State Trust Lands. One requirement of this program is a Trails Plan, which is to be submitted every 5 years and guides the distribution of the OHV Recreation Funds to the projects of greatest need. The 2015 Trails Plan was conducted for this purpose and is the main source for the information below.

According to the 2015 Trails Plan, 13% of adult Arizona residents have used a motorized trail at least once during their time in Arizona. Almost one-half (48%) of these respondents reported that trails are very important to their quality of life. The table below represents responses only from those who reported that 50% or more of their trail use in Arizona has been spent using a motorized vehicle. More than two-thirds (66%) of off-highway vehicle participants use quad or all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) more than once per year, nearly two-thirds (64%) use 4-wheel drive or other high clearance vehicles more than once per year, more than half (52%) use motorized trail or dirt bikes more than once per year, more than one-quarter (27%) use utility terrain vehicles (UTVs, also known as side by sides) or modified golf carts more than once per year, 14% go rock crawling more than once per year, nearly 10% use a dune buggy or sand rail more than once per year, and nearly 3% use snowmobiles more than once per year. One-third of these respondents are very satisfied with trails, and another 43% are somewhat satisfied with motorized trails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephonic Motorized Users Participation in a Motorized Trail Activity</th>
<th>Low Use</th>
<th>Moderate Use</th>
<th>High Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4WD/other high clearance vehicle</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad or all-terrain vehicle driving</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized trail biking/dirt biking</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock crawling</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility terrain vehicle/modified golf cart (side by side)</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dune buggy or sand rail driving</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OHV program is currently conducting an inventory of Off-highway Vehicles (OHV) trails in the state. In this process, it has become clear that OHV recreation opportunities in Arizona are abundant. Having one of the most diversified geographies of all states presents OHV enthusiasts almost endless opportunities to explore the backroads, old mining trails, sand dunes and other historical locations.

As OHV recreation has grown in popularity, manufacturers of OHV vehicles have engineered vehicles to seat more people. This has caused a shift in what used to be primarily an individual, male dominated sport into an activity enjoyed by the entire family. In years past, a family would have to buy four individual machines now and can now buy just one.

Table 5. Arizona New Off-Highway Motorcycle and ATV Retail Sales Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ATVs</th>
<th>Off-Highway Motorcycles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>5,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>6,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>7,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>10,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10,672</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>14,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>14,629</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>20,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17,435</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>23,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>6,341</td>
<td>24,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20,102</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>27,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>21,262</td>
<td>7,463</td>
<td>28,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25,825</td>
<td>8,583</td>
<td>34,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28,073</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>37,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19,042</td>
<td>6,993</td>
<td>26,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10,189</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>14,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>14,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>6,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>4,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>4,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>5,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shift in OHV recreation from an individual sport to a family activity has also had a tremendous impact on the Arizona economy. Now that families are buying off-highway vehicles, there is more need to purchase the supporting supplies that accompany the activity. OHV recreation encourages purchasing everything from specialized apparel such as helmets, gloves, and eye protection, to utility trailers for towing vehicles to recreational vehicles used for camping. In addition, this expansion of OHV users has resulted in more OHV related education being provided by Arizona State Parks and Trails, the OHV Ambassadors, a volunteer group of OHV users, and the Arizona Game & Fish Department to encourage responsible use of trails and natural and cultural resource protection.

Arizona has also begun to see OHV-related business, conventions, and rallies come to various areas of the state. Within the past two years, one of the largest OHV trade shows took place in Scottsdale, Arizona. OHV rallies also draw riders to rural areas of the state as well. Rallies are common in Lake Havasu in the winter months and Springerville/Eager in the summer months. The Mormon Lake area, near Flagstaff, hosts the Overland Off-Road Expo and a Utility Task Vehicle (UTV) rally every year. It is not unusual for OHV rallies to bring in upwards of 200 families to small communities throughout the state.

OHV recreationists also use OHVs to access outdoor recreation sites. For example, according to the 2015 Trails Plan, more than two-thirds (68%) of “core” motorized trail users (those who spend more than 50% of their time on trails engaged in motorized recreation) use OHVs on unpaved roads to access or get to campgrounds or picnic areas. To support the growth of OHV recreation opportunities, Arizona State Parks and Trails and other recreation providers could attract OHV campers to recreation areas in popular riding locations. For example, state parks such as Buckskin Mountain, River Island, and Cattail Cove are well positioned to host OHV campers wishing to explore the numerous authorized OHV trails in the Parker Strip and Lake Havasu area.
Table 6. Used Motorized Vehicle on Unpaved Roads to Access or Get to Recreation Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephonic Motorized Users: Used Motorized Vehicle on Unpaved Roads to Access or Get to Recreational sites</th>
<th>Low Use</th>
<th>Moderate Use</th>
<th>High Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go sightseeing/driving for pleasure</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping or picnicking areas</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailheads</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic or archaeological sites</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife viewing/bird watching area</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting or fishing area</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of recreation areas</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in the table 6 above, OHV recreation can be combined with other forms of recreation. On a typical fall or spring day at River Island State Park outside Parker, AZ, it is not usual to see a group of RVs camping together take off in their UTVs for a trip to the Desert Bar only to return several hours later and put kayaks into the Colorado River for an evening trip down river or they can often be seen on the hiking trails that are part of the River Island and Buckskin Mountain State Parks.

Other opportunities to support OHV recreation activities, such as the OHV Show Me Rides currently offered by the Arizona OHV Ambassadors through the AZ State Parks OHV Program, offer riders a chance to get to know popular OHV riding areas around Arizona. The impact of these type of events can be seen from a recent Show Me Ride event conducted at the Boulders OHV area outside of Phoenix which attracted 11 families. Nearly every family left the event with a check list of safety/maintenance items to be purchased and a list of locations where they could enjoy designated trails all around the state for OHV recreation. Afterwards, attendees of the Show Me Ride reportedly showed up in destinations as far as 300 miles away to explore the State’s OHV recreation opportunities.
2.5 WATER BASED RECREATION IN ARIZONA

Arizona has a variety of rivers, natural lakes and reservoirs that provide opportunities for boating, swimming, water skiing, and fishing. The state can be divided up into four water-based recreation regions; Colorado River, Northern, Central, and Southern.

**The Colorado River**
The largest and most popular waterway, running along the north Utah boarder down the west side of Arizona from Nevada to California and exiting the state at the Mexico border. This river is used by many Arizonans and Californians.

**The Northern Region**
Includes many lakes in the Coconino National Forest such as Upper Lake Mary, Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest with Luna Lake and Willow Springs, White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation with Big Lake and Reservation Lake, Arizona State Parks and Trails with Lyman Lake and Fool Hollow Lake, and Clear Creek Reservoir in Navajo County.

**The Central Region**
Includes waterways run by the Tonto National Forest such as Roosevelt Lake, Apache Lake, Canyon Lake and Saguaro Lake on the Salt River, and Horseshoe Lake and Bartlett Lake on the Verde River. Arizona State Parks and Trails manages Alamo Lake, and Lake Pleasant is run by Maricopa County Parks and Recreation.

**The Southern Region**
Includes San Carlos Lake, run by the San Carlos Apache Tribe, Patagonia Lake and Roper Lake are Arizona State Parks and Trails, and the Coronado National Forest has the popular Parker Canyon Lake and Peña Blanca Lake.

Arizona’s Northern, Central, and Southern Region lakes and reservoirs tend to be much more remote than the Colorado River. Because they are inland these lakes and reservoirs are very popular for fishing, camping, boating, picnicking, and enjoying the great outdoors primarily for Arizonans.

2.5.1 Arizona Watercraft Survey

The Arizona Game & Fish Department (AGFD), and the Arizona State Parks and Trails Board (ASPTB) conduct a study with boaters from Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah every three years that provides information about recreational watercraft usage patterns on Arizona's lakes and rivers. This information provides essential safety, development, recreation and tourism related information and also helps to direct the spending of State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF) monies. SLIF monies are generated through motor vehicle fuel tax attributed to watercraft usage in the state.

- 17% of registered watercraft owners in Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah used their boats in Arizona during a given 30-day period between April 2015 and April 2016. This percentage has increased since 2012, when 13% of users reported boating on Arizona waterways in the last 30 days.
- 46.5% used their boat on an Arizona waterway during the last year, an increase when compared to 42.5% in 2012.

Total boat use days in 2016 were 3,455,589, a 20% increase over boat use days recorded in 2012. Similar to the prior five studies, Figure 17 shows Mohave County is the dominant boating location in Arizona with 43.6% of total boat use days – down from 50.3% in 2012. The study also reveals increased boat use in Maricopa County (+48%), and La Paz County (+60%) in 2016. Approximately seven-tenths (71%) of boat use days on Arizona lakes and waterways are accounted
for by Arizona boaters, while 23% are accounted for by California boaters. Person use days also increased from 13,406,815 in 2012 to 15,201,231 in 2016, a 13% increase. Arizonans account for the largest share of person use days – 67.6% (up from 52.8% in 2012), followed by California boaters (26.1% down from 36.1% in 2012).

Survey Questions

- Boater spending was up in 2016 ($415 in 2016 compared to $316 in 2012). The typical Arizona boater spends $329 per day compared to $694 for California boaters, $213 for Nevada boaters, and $600 for Utah boaters. Lake Havasu is the most utilized boating destination in Mohave County in terms of both boat use days and person use days. In a recent economic impact study conducted by Lake Havasu City (2016), it was estimated that boaters spend more than $154 million in Lake Havasu City while boating. This spending supports an estimated 2,057 local jobs, adds more than $63 million in local income and more than $30 million in local, state and federal taxes.

- Boaters were asked how important they feel each of six SLIF funding functions are. The four highest rated functions (rated very or somewhat important by roughly eight out of ten boaters or more) were: 1) the construction of recreation support facilities such as restrooms, campgrounds and picnic tables; 2) the construction of water-based boating facilities such as marinas, launch ramps and piers; 3) the construction of first-aid stations and other safety facilities; and 4) the purchasing of law enforcement and safety equipment such as patrol boats, radios and lights. These four functions have remained at the top of the importance list over the past six studies. Public restrooms and launch ramps were the two facilities that boaters reported were most needed at their favorite lake.

- A question was asked to determine boaters’ single favorite boating activity. Eleven different boating activities were evaluated, the top three activities were: 1) fishing; 2) general pleasure boating; and 3) water skiing (Figure 10). Providing first aid stations (42%) and marking submerged rocks and other hazards (39%) are two law enforcement activities which boaters would most like to see increased at their favorite lake or river.

- More than one-third (34%) of Arizona boaters also own at least one of the following non-motorized watercraft: raft, kayak, stand up paddle board or canoe.

- Consistent with national trends on the use of stand-up paddle boards (SUPs) and kayaks, more than one-half of Arizona boaters (53%) said that they have seen more of the non-motorized watercraft identified above on Arizona’s lakes and rivers over the past year or two. The majority of Arizona boat owners also reported that the non-motorized watercraft had no impact on their personal recreation activities, therefore user conflict with non-motorized watercraft does not seem to be an issue for the boaters surveyed.
2.6 WILDLIFE-RELATED RECREATION IN ARIZONA

Updated by Joe Yarchin, Watchable Wildlife Project Coordinator, Arizona Game and Fish Department

Key sources of information for this section include: The 2011 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation – Arizona (USFWS, 2011) and 2016 Trends in Outdoor Recreation, Arizona Game and Fish Department. The purpose of this study was to examine general patterns of wildlife-related recreation and attitudes toward wildlife-related issues within the Arizona constituency. The core group of questions pertains to participation in wildlife-related recreation, and frequency of participation.

Introduction

Arizona has varied habitats that support over 800 native species as well as a significant amount of state and federal lands. As a result of this abundant and diverse wildlife and the large amount of public lands, hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing are important outdoor recreation activities for many resident and non-resident outdoor enthusiasts.

Arizona has a long tradition of providing recreational opportunities for all types of wildlife recreation. The priority of the Arizona Game and Fish Department is to maintain and enhance programs for conservation of wildlife resources. The funding for this management is acquired through fees charged to hunters, anglers and trappers and a federal excise tax on hunting and fishing equipment. Other funding sources include Arizona Lottery (Heritage Fund) and tribal gaming revenues (Wildlife Conservation Fund).

Economic Importance of Hunting and Fishing in Arizona

Fishing and hunting recreation generates spending that has a powerful effect on Arizona’s economy. The 2011 National Survey found state residents and nonresidents expended a total of $755 million, $338 million and $936 million from fishing, hunting and wildlife watching respectively (Table 2).

Table 7. Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife Watching Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fishing</th>
<th>Hunting</th>
<th>Wildlife Watching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Participants**</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Residents**</td>
<td>533,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days Participating</td>
<td>4.8 million</td>
<td>2.6 million</td>
<td>12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$755 million</td>
<td>$338 million</td>
<td>$936 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per Participant</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
<td>$583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Over 16 years old

In 2011, each of 637,000 anglers spent an average of $561 on trip-related expenses. The average trip-related expenditure of 269,000 hunters was $554. The combined spending from hunting and fishing created a total economic impact (sum of the expenditures plus numerous direct, indirect, and induced impacts) of over $1.1 billion to the state of Arizona.
The National Survey recorded 2011 expenditures made by 1.6 million wildlife viewing recreationists. The average of the trip-related expenditures for away from home participants was $516 per person. The total economic impact equaled $1.3 billion in Arizona.

Total expenditures by participants in the three wildlife-related activities were relatively stable for hunting and wildlife watching between 2001 and 2011. Angler spending jumped between 2001 and 2006 and remained high through 2011 (Figure 7).

Arizona Trends
The Arizona Game & Fish Department surveys Arizona residents biennially to measure trends in wildlife-related recreation (Figure 12.). Activities included wildlife viewing (at home and trips more than one mile to watch wildlife), off highway vehicle (OHV) use, fishing, hunting, and boating.

Figure 13. Participation in Wildlife-related Recreation as a Percentage of the Arizona Population

Source: 2016 Trends in Outdoor Recreation, Arizona Game and Fish Department.
In the past, per capita participation in outdoor wildlife-related recreation has generally declined as a result of the growth of the general population outpacing the growth of recreationists (Figure 12). This phenomenon is illustrated by both hunting and fishing. In some activities, such as OHV recreation, there is also a decline in actual numbers of recreationists. In 2016, in all activities except watching wildlife at home and boating recreation there was a slight increase in participation.

Figures 13 and 14 show trends in numbers of wildlife-related recreation participants in 2001, 2006 and 2011. Numbers of participants increased between 2001 and 2011 for all three groups of outdoor enthusiasts, but were most consistent for wildlife watchers.

Participation in Wildlife-Related Recreation
In 2011, 2.1 million Arizona residents and non-residents 16 years old and older fished, hunted or watched wildlife in Arizona. The sum of anglers, hunters and wildlife watchers exceeds the total number in wildlife-related recreation because many of the individuals engaged in more than one wildlife-related activity.
Participation - Hunting
The Trends Survey reported a large majority of Arizonans strongly support wildlife-related recreation; 82% support legal, regulated hunting, and 92% support legal, regulated fishing. However, the motivations of the recreationist strongly affect the acceptability rating of the respondent.

Since the initiation of trend data collection, Arizona has experienced an average reduction of hunters of 0.6% annually. The National Survey and the 2012-16 Trend Surveys suggest hunting may have experienced a recovery or halt to the declining trend.

In 2011, resident hunters accounted for 83% of the hunters in Arizona. Seventeen percent of hunters were non-residents (Figure 16.). Residents and non-residents hunted an average of 10 days in 2011.

Participation - Fishing
Although the actual numbers of anglers have declined in the past, there has been an increase since 2010. In 2011, 84% of the participants were residents and 16% were non-residents. Non-residents fished 14% of all fishing days in the state that year. On average, Arizona anglers in 2013 spent 21 days fishing.

Participation - Off-Highway Vehicle
Although OHV participation was not as high as the 28% use by Arizonans in 2012, there was an apparent increase in use in 2016 from 2014. As with boating, OHV recreation seems to be tied to the economic conditions contemporary to the study timeframe.

Participation - Wildlife Viewing
Since 1991, the National Surveys have collected data only for those activities where the primary purpose was wildlife watching. Two types of wildlife watching activity are reported: (1) more than one mile away from home and (2) one mile or less from home.
The 2011 National Survey found 78% of wildlife watchers in Arizona enjoyed their activities close to home. The 732,000 people participating in away from home activities made up 47% of all wildlife watchers in Arizona. Arizonans spent nearly 7.7 million days engaged in away from home wildlife watching activities in the state. In addition, 39% of Arizonans who participate in around the home wildlife watching also enjoyed watching wildlife away from home (Figure 14.).

The Trends Surveys show since 2006, Arizonans have participated in wildlife viewing more than any other wildlife-related activity, particularly when viewing from home or in neighborhoods is included (Figure 18.). In 2016, a little less than 50% watched wildlife within 1 mile of their residence and over 25% of Arizonans made a trip with the primary purpose of viewing or photographing wildlife. The variability of this activity is higher than other recreational pursuits. This variation suggests wildlife viewing is not as central to the lifestyle of its participants because participation appears to be contingent upon external factors such as disposable income, consumer confidence, etc.

Table 8. 2011 Selected Characteristics of Arizona Resident Anglers, Hunters, and Wildlife Watchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Population 16 Years and Older</th>
<th>Anglers</th>
<th>% Who Participated</th>
<th>% of Anglers</th>
<th>Hunters</th>
<th>% Who Participated</th>
<th>% of Hunters</th>
<th>Wildlife (WL) Watchers</th>
<th>% Who Participated</th>
<th>% of WL Watchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Estimate based on small sample size.
* Sample size too small to report data reliably.

While outdoor recreation is normally associated with activities such as hiking, fishing, and camping, historic preservation also plays an important role. From walking tours of historic neighborhoods to visits to archaeological parks, historic preservation acts as an economic driver to spur cultural heritage tourism. This is particularly effective for driving tourism to rural Arizona. For example, a 2012-2013 Survey of Tourism in Cochise County by Northern Arizona University found that over 70% of visitors were very interested in visiting heritage sites associated with Old West History (Cochise County Visitor Survey, 2014).

Historic communities like Bisbee, Tombstone, and Seligman continue to thrive because of cultural heritage tourism. Bisbee is one of several Arizona communities that has become an arts center by utilizing the unique character of the town’s historic buildings to attract artists. Tombstone, on the other hand, survives and thrives due to its connection to Arizona’s Wild West past. Seligman capitalizes on its location on Historic Route 66. Other communities such as Cottonwood, Clifton, and Nogales are working to capture the cultural heritage traveler by using preservation to revitalize their downtowns.

All of these communities aid outdoor recreation by providing accommodations in their communities, providing sites to visit and learn about the area’s past, and giving visitors reasons to stay longer in their respective regions. Bisbee and Tombstone, for example, are located near an array of public lands that allow activities such as hiking in the Huachuca Mountains, birding at the San Pedro Riparian Preserve, fishing at Parker Canyon Lake or riding ATVs along the Ghost Town Trail.

National Parks
An examination of the parks and properties managed by the National Park Service in Arizona shows the importance of preservation. Twelve of the twenty-two national parks, monuments and historic sites in Arizona celebrate the State’s history and protect priceless cultural resources. These sites garner nearly 2 million visitors a year.
Grand Canyon National Park is by far the most visited National Park in Arizona – receiving over 5.5 million visitors in 2015. While the Grand Canyon, a geologic wonder, is the primary draw for tourists, there are also seven National Historic Landmarks on the park, as shown in Figure 19. Historic sites include: El Tovar Hotel, Grand Canyon Railroad Depot, Grand Canyon Lodge, Grand Canyon Park Operations Building, the Grand Canyon Power House, and Grand Canyon Village with 257 contributing properties, as well as the buildings designed by famed architect Mary Colter.

Figure 20. National Historic Park Visitation

Local Identity and Economic Impact
Many communities that utilize historic preservation to attract visitors are also focusing on the development of outdoor recreation to enhance the visitor experience and prolong visits. For decades, Tombstone has focused the story of its community around the OK Corral gunfight to encourage economic growth. In order to expand its visitor base and appeal to a broader range of tourists, the town is identifying alternative stories and means of expanding its economic base. In recent years, Tombstone has cleared and opened an old mine for tourism. Outdoor activities have started to develop such as birding, hiking, horseback riding, and jeep tours.

Communities like Bisbee, Jerome, and Tubac use their historic structures to attract artists who in turn have converted these old towns into artist communities and popular weekend getaway destinations. USA Today voted Bisbee the Best Historic Small Town in 2016 while in Sunset Magazine picked it as the Best Small Town of 2016.

Niche Markets
In recent years tourism has become more focused on niche markets, which includes tourist destinations like ghost towns, historic cemeteries, historic trails, historic vehicle routes, and dark tourism. Below are some examples in Arizona of niche markets.

Ghost Towns
- Fairbank
- Pearce
- Contention City
- Chloride
- Ruby

Historic Cemeteries
- Pioneer and Military Memorial Park
- Pinal City Cemetery
- Adamsville Cemetery
- Harshaw Mexican Cemetery
- Hi Jolly Cemetery Historic Monument & Park

Historic Trails
- Juan Bautiste de Anza Historic Trail
- Old Spanish National Historic Trail
- El Camino del Diablo
- Beale Wagon Road
- Butterfield Mail Route

Historic Vehicle Routes
- Route 66
- US 80
- Apache Trail
- State Route 83
- State Route 82

Dark Tourism
- Yuma Territorial Prison
- Titan Missile Museum
- Skeleton Canyon
- OK Corral Gunfight Site
- Battle of Picacho Pass
Archaeological Sites

Arizona is gifted with a long and diverse history, beginning about 12,000 years ago. Remnants of the cultures that occupied Arizona can be found throughout the state. These archaeological sites tell the story of Arizona’s past.

Examples of our prehistoric and historic past range from ancient petroglyphs and melted adobe or stone house mounds, to historic period cement building foundations and roads, bridges, and dams. These sites may be features along, or destinations of trails; they may exist in a park or recreation area that provides other outdoor recreation opportunities, or may be protected and managed as a specific site. It is important that members of the recreating public are taught to respect and protect sites and artifacts that they may experience during their recreation experience, as they are non-renewable cultural resources and once they are gone, they are gone forever. To help preserve important pieces of Arizona’s history in the outdoors, please visit http://azstateparks.com/SHPO/etiquette.html.
2.8 PUBLIC LAND IN ARIZONA

2.8.1 Outdoor Recreation Providers

In total, approximately 82% of lands in Arizona are managed by various tribes, federal and state agencies, many of whom are responsible for providing for both the outdoor recreation needs of the state’s residents as well as for the protection and preservation of land for future generations.

While many Arizonans travel away from home to enjoy the vast opportunities provided by Arizona’s public lands, local governments provide most residents with daily accessible outdoor recreation opportunities and programs. Many of the 15 counties in Arizona operate their own parks as well. These regional parks may contain lakes, recreation and aquatic centers, environmental education opportunities, miles of trails, camping, and event venues.

Nonprofit organizations and private businesses deliver recreational activities not provided by government agencies. Local nonprofit organizations such as Riordan Action Network or Friends of Tubac Presidio State Historic Park, partner with government organization to manage museums and restore historic sites. The Nature Conservancy and other national organizations aid in acquiring and managing more remote natural and cultural areas. Private businesses such as tour guides, outfitters, and rental companies offer a wide range of services to the recreating public.

Figure 21. Arizona’s Outdoor Recreation Providers
As discussed earlier, Gallup Poll data, collected regularly since 2009 for the Center for the Future of Arizona, indicates that the balance between population growth and preservation of open spaces is important to residents of the state. There are many organizations, public and private, that serve to provide opportunities to recreate outdoors while protecting Arizona’s scenic, special places. Some of the public land management organizations which provide recreation opportunities in the state are noted below.

Figure 22. Arizona State Parks and Trails Map

Note: Arizona State Parks and Trails does not manage the trails listed in the map above. However, the agency does coordinate both motorized and non-motorized statewide trails programs, administer advisory committees that represent motorized and non-motorized trail users and land managers from around the state to develop and fund trail priorities. The agency also distributes funds to support building trails, connecting trails, marketing and signing trails and the maintenance of trails.
2.8.2 Arizona State Parks and Trails

MISSION: Managing and conserving Arizona’s natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our parks and through our partners.

VISION: Arizona State Parks and Trails is indispensable to the economies, communities, and environments of Arizona.

WHAT WE DO: For over half a century, more than thirty exceptional parks have been preserved, enhanced, and protected for the enjoyment of locals and visitors across the state of Arizona. These lands, lakes, rivers, historic buildings, and rich natural areas offer recreational and educational opportunities to individuals, families, businesses, and communities.

Arizona State Parks and Trails not only promotes physical, spiritual, and mental health and wellness within communities and the state, but are strong economic drivers as well. Arizona State Parks and Trails secures funding for recreational and educational programs, drives increased local visitation and provides financial resources to recreational programs and partners throughout the state. Helping to drive the economy, enhance and protect local communities and cultures, Arizona State Parks and Trails are representations of pride throughout our state.

Arizona became the 48th State of the United States on February 14, 1912, making it one of the youngest states. This is also true for the Arizona State Parks and Trails system, established in 1957.

60TH Anniversary - Arizona State Parks and Trails recently experienced a milestone - proudly celebrating its 60th “Diamond” Anniversary in 2017! During the last 60 years the agency has grown to include management of Arizona’s 35 parks and statewide recreation programs. Arizona State Parks and Trails hosted events throughout the year to celebrate Arizona and its parks. The agency will continue to offer events and initiatives that will strengthen communities through economic growth, improved public health, social equity and natural resource conservation.

2.8.8 Arizona Game and Fish Department

MISSION: To conserve Arizona’s diverse wildlife resources and manage for safe, compatible outdoor recreation opportunities for current and future generations.

WHAT WE DO: The Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD) is entrusted with managing and conserving more than 800 wildlife species. The Arizona Game and Fish Commission is responsible for establishing policies and rules for the management, preservation, and harvest of Arizona's wildlife.
2.8.3 National Park Service

MISSION: The National Park Service (NPS) preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.

WHAT WE DO: Since 1916, NPS has been entrusted to oversee the Nation’s 417 National Park System units which include national parks, historical battlefields, preserves, monuments, and other designations spanning more than 84 million acres in every state and extend into territories including Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam. Within Arizona, the National Park Service has responsibility for 25 National Park System units located throughout the state:

- **Canyon de Chelly NM**, Navajo Nation (managed in cooperation with the Navajo Nation)
- **Casa Grande Ruins NM**, Coolidge
- **Chiracahua NM**, Willcox
- **Coronado NM**, Hereford
- **Fort Bowie NHS**, Willcox
- **Glen Canyon NRA**, Page
- **Grand Canyon NP**, Grand Canyon
- **Grand Canyon-Parashant NM**, Northern AZ
- **Hohokam Pima NM**, (under Tribal ownership on the Gila River Indian Reservation)
- **Hubbell Trading Post NHS**, Ganado
- **Juan Bautista de Anza NHT**, AZ & CA
- **Lake Mead NRA**, AZ & NV
- **Montezuma Castle NM**, Camp Verde
- **Navajo NM**, Black Mesa
- **Old Spanish NHT**, AZ, CA, CO, NV, NM, UT
- **Organ Pipe Cactus NM**, Ajo
- **Petrified Forest NP**, Holbrook
- **Pipe Spring NM**, Fredonia
- **Saguaro NP**, Tucson
- **Sunset Crater Volcano NM**, Flagstaff
- **Tonto NM**, Roosevelt
- **Tumacacori NHP**, Tumacacori
- **Tuzigoot NM**, Clarkdale
- **Walnut Canyon NM**, Flagstaff
- **Wupatki NM**, Flagstaff

Arizona also boasts one National Heritage area, 45 National Historic Landmarks and 10 National Natural Landmarks.

Through programs like the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program and Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance program, the National Park Service works with local communities to build trails and playgrounds, return historic buildings to productive use, protect watersheds, recognize and promote local history, and introduce the next generation to stewardship opportunities. To see more of the National Park Service’s impact in Arizona, go to [www.nps.gov/arizona](http://www.nps.gov/arizona)

"National parks are the best idea we ever had. Absolutely American, absolutely democratic, they reflect us at our best rather than our worst." – Wallace Stegner
2.8.4 Bureau of Land Management

MISSION: The BLM is responsible for managing the nation’s public lands and resources in a combination of ways which best serve the needs of the American people. The BLM balances recreational, commercial, scientific and cultural interests and strives for long-term protection of renewable and nonrenewable resources, including range, timber, minerals, recreation, watershed, fish and wildlife, wilderness and natural, scenic, scientific and cultural values. It is the mission of the BLM to sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

WHAT WE DO: BLM Arizona is responsible for administering 12.2 million acres of public lands and another 17.5 million subsurface acres of locatable, leaseable, and salable minerals. BLM offices across the state manage many land-use activities to enable important economic benefits, while also sustaining natural and cultural resource values for future generations of Americans. Through meaningful engagement with our diverse partners and stakeholders, BLM Arizona conducts responsible public land stewardship with creativity and innovation.

2.8.5 U.S. Forest Service

MISSION: The mission of the U.S. Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation’s forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations.

WHAT WE DO: The U.S. Forest Service is a multi-faceted agency that manages and protects 154 national forests and 20 grasslands in 43 states and Puerto Rico. Boasting an elite wildland firefighting team and the world’s largest forestry research organization, Forest Service experts provide technical and financial help to state and local government agencies, businesses, private landowners and work government-to-government with tribes to help protect and manage non-federal forest and associated range and watershed lands.

The Forest Service augments their work through partnerships with public and private agencies that help plant trees, improve trails, educate the public, and improve conditions in wildland/urban interfaces and rural areas, and also promotes sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation internationally.

Arizona lies within U.S. Forest Service Southwestern Region which totals 20.6 million acres. There are six national forests in Arizona totaling 11.25 million acres. The Southwestern Region has a Sustainable Recreation Strategy, which focuses on building strong public engagement and support, community by community.

Table 9. National Forests in Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Forest</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino National Forest</td>
<td>1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado National Forest</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaibab National Forest</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott National Forest</td>
<td>1.25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto National Forest</td>
<td>2.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.6 American Indian Tribe and Nation Lands

MISSION: Although missions vary by tribe, most tribal recreation departments strive to increase opportunities and safe facilities to encourage physical fitness and health for tribal community members of all ages. Many tribes also provide unique, high quality educational, cultural and recreational opportunities for visitors.

WHAT WE DO: The twenty-two recognized American Indian tribes and nations in Arizona account for a significant portion (28%) of land in Arizona. These sovereign entities have long provided visitors the opportunity to learn about their unique and individual cultures through outdoor events such as festivals, arts and crafts shows, and tours. While fishing and camping have been popular outdoor activities at tribally managed lakes, many tribes have also capitalized on their ability to provide other outdoor recreation such as skiing, rodeos, guided hunts, and other activities. Most recreational uses of tribal lands require a permit or use of a tribal guide.

2.8.7 Arizona State Land Department

MISSION: To manage State Trust lands and resources to enhance value and optimize economic return for the Trust beneficiaries, consistent with sound business management principles, prudent stewardship, and conservation needs supporting socio-economic goals for citizens here today and future generations. To act in the best interest of Trust for the enrichment of the beneficiaries and preserve the long-term value of the State’s Trust lands.

WHAT DO WE DO: Arizona has approximately 9.28 million surface acres and 9 million subsurface acres of Trust lands. Scattered throughout the State, the Trust lands are extremely diverse in character, ranging from Sonoran Desert lands, desert grasslands, and riparian areas in the southern half of the state, to the mountains, forests and Colorado Plateau regions of northern Arizona.

State Trust Lands are not public lands, but are instead the subject of a public Trust created to support the education of our children. The Trust accomplishes this mission in a number of ways, including, through its sale and lease of Trust lands for grazing, agriculture, municipal, school site, residential, commercial and open space purposes. Recreationists can, however, buy permits that allow access and use of State Trust Lands for recreation purposes. Because providing outdoor recreation opportunities is not the primary purpose of the State Land Department, the infrastructure, information and operations staff and management that occurs on other public lands is not available on State Trust Lands. Notable open spaces that were once State Trust land include the areas of the Phoenix Mountain Preserves, Squaw Peak, the White Tanks, South Mountain, Papago Park, Buenos Aries National Wildlife Refuge, Catalina State Park and Picacho Peak State Park.
Chapter 3 SCORP DEVELOPMENT

3.1 PLANNING PROCESS

The process used to develop Arizona’s 2018 SCORP included a guidance of the process and generation of statewide issues by a working group, a web-based provider survey, a millennial focus group, trend research, and public input and review.

Figure 23. Timeline of SCORP Development and Planning Process
3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 Working Group

The Arizona 2018 SCORP was developed under the guidance of a 16-member working group of outdoor recreation, natural resource, and conservation leaders from local, state, and federal governmental agencies, non-profit friend’s groups, and private organizations from around the state. Participants were selected to represent geographical diversity and a broad spectrum of perspectives pertaining to outdoor recreation and natural resource management.

The Working Group convened twice between May 2016 and November 2016 and communicated via email to identify, discuss, and prioritize statewide outdoor recreation issues. A subgroup meeting was convened in late November 2016 to set the priority issue for the 2018 SCORP. Working Group members also reviewed the Provider Survey and provided feedback on analysis of the data collected from the Provider Survey and the Focus Group.

3.2.2 Provider Survey and Public Input

A comprehensive questionnaire was developed which included issues highlighted by the Working Group. The questionnaire also included some questions from the 2008 and 2013 SCORP Provider Surveys, in an effort to analyze longitudinal data trends amongst recreation providers in Arizona. Modeled after the 2008 and 2013 methodologies, the questionnaire was administered online, made available to 322 participants, and open for a total of three weeks. With a 54% response rate, recreation providers from around the state weighed in on current outdoor recreation opportunities, issues, concerns and priorities.

Public input was sought utilizing social media and a short survey administered on the Arizona State Parks and Trails website. A series of questions regarding important outdoor recreation issues in Arizona were posted on Arizona State Park’s Facebook page and website throughout October, 2016. Responses were gathered, grouped into themes, and analyzed by Arizona State University researchers. In addition, SCORP updates were provided at open public meetings throughout the process and the draft document was available to the public for comment beginning in March, 2017.

3.2.3 Focus Group

Declining youth engagement in outdoor recreation activities has been a focus of many outdoor recreation organizations, public land management agencies, and health professionals nationwide. Today’s youth are spending less time in nature than generations past resulting in negative mental and physical health outcomes and a decreased connection with the natural world (Louv, 2016; Outdoor Recreation Foundation, 2016; Pergams & Zaraci, 2006). In an effort to better understand outdoor recreation barriers, motivations, and preferences of youth, a focus group of millennials was held in September, 2016 composed of 13 individuals between 18-25 years of age. Data was collected and analyzed by ASU researchers.

### Outdoor Recreation Related Issues and Themes

**Focus Group Themes**
- Technologically enabled recreationist
- Information gap between providers and millennials
- Wellbeing benefits – social, physical, mental
- Social media is an important tool

**Online Public Input**
- Preservation & conservation of resources
- Safety
- Urban green spaces
- Fiscal responsibility
- Access
- Maintenance of facilities & infrastructure
- Stewardship & long term sustainability
- Environmental ethics, education, and early exposure
- Communication & Marketing

3.2.4 Public Comment

The draft SCORP was available for public comment from March 12, 2017 to April 5, 2017. The document was downloadable from ASPT website and hardcopies were made available upon request.

The final 2018 SCORP will be presented to the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission in 2017 for its adoption and recommendation to the Arizona State Parks and Trails Board.
3.3 EMERGENT THEMES

Each state’s plan must identify outdoor recreation issues of statewide importance based upon, but not limited to, input from public participation. ASPT and ASU worked to collect data utilizing varying methods described above in order to determine the priority issues related to outdoor recreation in Arizona, and to evaluate how these priorities fit with the national pillars of parks and recreation agencies identified by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA). During this process, three important themes emerged from the data which were integrated in all aspects of the planning process from identifying priority issues to developing rating criteria. For this reason, the emergent themes were included as an integral and separate component of Arizona’s 2018 SCORP and should be considered. These included the use of technology in outdoor recreation, youth participation in outdoor recreation, and connectivity of the physical, social and ecological systems which are embedded within all of the outdoor recreation issues identified for the 2018 SCORP.

3.3.1 Technology

The use and integration of technology within the outdoor recreation industry is not a new topic. To better understand what types of technology providers often used, we asked outdoor recreation providers how much their agency or organization had utilized certain technologies. Most respondents reporting having used social media and an online reservation system and very few providers utilized audio tours, virtual reality, or drones (Figure 22).

Survey Question: How much has your agency used the following technologies in the last 5 years to engage constituents, market your services and provide outdoor recreation opportunities from (1) Never to (5) Always?
Providers were also asked to specify what they used social media and other technologies for. Most reported utilizing social media to provide information to, to identify, and to engage stakeholders and constituents while fewer agencies and organizations reported using mobile applications and emerging technologies as means of engagement (Figure 23).

Survey Question: Social media (Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram) and other technologies have influenced every aspect of our personal and professional lives, including our jobs of managing parks and open space. The following question is designed to identify how each of the technologies below are used by your agency to provide outdoor recreation opportunities. How would you rate your agreement with the following statements on a scale from (1) Never to (5) Always?

Survey Question: Technology is an important part of outdoor recreation. Some technologies may enhance outdoor experiences, while others may diminish them. Please indicate which technologies enhance and which diminish the outdoor experiences your agency provides from (1) Diminish to (3) Neutral to (5) Enhance.

Providers and users alike often contemplate whether the use of technology hinders or improves the outdoor recreation experience. Outdoor recreation survey respondents reported that digital cameras, Global Positioning Systems (GPS), video cameras including GoPro’s, availability of Wi-Fi at the site, and utilizing a cell phone for Internet access enhanced the outdoor recreation experience for users (Figure 24). This was also consistent with responses within the focus group, where participants reported utilizing their phones for taking pictures, listening to music, and using online maps to enhance their experiences. Alternatively, providers reported that the use of drones, talking on a cell phone, use of virtual reality and tablets to access Wi-Fi, and listening to music actually diminished the outdoor experience to some degree. Although we did not ask this same question directly during the public online input period, several comments submitted referenced the need for increased and improved digitized trail maps, recreation specific mobile applications, and electronic fee-stations. Additionally, technology developed to help users identify recreation opportunities, such as applications, can also fail to differentiate between land manager approved
or supported recreation opportunities and illegal opportunities, such as wildcat trails or geocaching in sensitive areas.

3.3.2 Today’s Youth

Another overarching theme which plays a role in all of the priority issues centered on today’s younger generations. Questions ranged from how best to engage youth in outdoor recreation, what their recreation preferences were, and how to market to the younger demographic. Nationwide, youth participation in outdoor recreation is declining overall with “just hanging out or playing outside” and engaging in physical activities including biking, walking, jogging, skateboarding having the highest participation rate (Cordell, 2012).

This should be particularly worrisome considering the 2014 United States Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Youth reports that children and youth (6-15) in the U.S. do not meet the minimum standards of 60 minutes a day of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity. The report also found that sedentary behavior amongst American children and youth is very high and physical activity levels are low (Dentro et al, 2014). The underserving of youth, particularly with physical and health related opportunities amongst our state’s recreation providers is an issue that needs to be addressed within Arizona. As informed from our research and the literature, early exposure to nature can have a lasting impact on one’s lifelong propensity to recreate outdoors.

We asked the providers, the public, and group of individuals ranging in age from 18-25 specific questions related to today’s youth.

“What do you think about the future of recreation for today's youth?”

“If we don’t show them how to get out and enjoy it now, they'll see no reason to protect it in the future.”

“Outdoor recreation is essential for today's kids to de-stress and have them connect with the real world, away from their electronics. Also getting them out walking and hiking will give them exercise since there is less physical education and recess in schools now.”

“I hope that the next generation will keep watch over these special places and protect them. From the beautiful mountains to the Grand Canyon to the mighty lakes and wondrous forests.”

Providers were asked to rate the current level of youth engagement in each of the activities within their respective agencies or organizations, from not at all (1) to always (5). Figure 26 shows that many agencies had volunteer, training, and educational opportunities for youth; however, few organizations engaged youth in civic activities, public hearings, or even health related programs and activities.
Survey Question: Youth participation is vital for effective programs and young people are important stakeholders in decisions regarding future use of natural resources. Below is a list of activities that youth can participate in, on behalf of agencies. Please rate the current level of youth engagement in each of these activities in your agency from (1) Not at all to (5) Always.

Providers were also asked to rate the extent to which their agency currently provides opportunities for teenagers from (1) Not at all to (5) Very much. Although the responses show room for improvement by providing more opportunities for teenagers across the state, opportunities provided by urban providers are significantly lower (p<.05 level) than rural and statewide providers (Figure 27).

Recreation providers were then asked how much their agency utilized youth participation and feedback in each of the following areas from (1) Not at all to (5) Always. As Figure 28 shows, all responses were below 3 indicating that youth participation and disengagement is a real issue in Arizona’s outdoor recreation future which needs to be addressed to successfully cultivate the next generation of outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

Survey Question: How much does your agency utilize youth participation and feedback in each of the following areas from (1) Not at all to (5) Always?
3.3.3 Connectivity

From creating physical linkages between the state’s vast network of water trails, hiking, and horseback riding trails to encouraging neighboring communities to connect through shared economic, educational, and marketing opportunities, the concept of connectivity was prevalent throughout Arizona’s 2018 SCORP planning process. Arizona’s outdoor recreation provider agencies and organizations rely heavily on partnerships, collaboration, and networking to provide world class opportunities to the state’s residents and visitors year around. These linkages, physical, economic, and collaborative, should be enhanced to create greater efficiencies, focused messaging, and alignment of strategies as they pertain to maintaining and improving recreation activities and opportunities across the state. This theme is reflected in the priority issues below. This emerging theme addresses a larger issue of the need for linkages on all levels and in all ways: physical, geographical, across managing jurisdictions, as well as relationally between people and organizations.

An example of the need for physical connectivity was received during the public comment period. One member of the public noted that physically connecting outdoor recreation resources and increasing accessibility via multiple modes of transportation (e.g., hiking, walking, biking) would encourage healthy behaviors and outcomes.

Recreation providers were asked to provide information on the current extent of their collaboration with various types of organizations, and what types of collaboration they most frequently engaged with each type of organization. More specifically, Figure 29 shows five different levels of collaboration indicating the level of interdependence from none, networking, cooperation, coordination, and collaboration among 11 types of organizations. For example, 52% of outdoor recreation provider reported collaboration with volunteers, while 23% coordinate with volunteers, 17% cooperate with volunteers, 3% network, and 4% had no working relationship. The next highest reported collaboration was with federal agencies (39%), followed by non-profit groups (31%), state agencies (29%) and friends’ groups (29%). The figure shows that the respondents had the lowest level of collaboration with tribal agencies, as 50% respondents did not have any working relationship with tribal agencies.
Recreation providers were then asked to rate their expected future need to work with various organizations from (1) low need to (5) high need. Volunteers, Federal, County, State, and Nonprofit organizations are the most anticipated future partner entities as seen in Figure 30.

Figure 31. Expected Future Need to Work with Various Organizations
Chapter 4 THE FOUR PILLARS OF RECREATION

The National Recreation and Parks Association has identified three pillars that summarize the key impacts of park and recreation agencies: Conservation, Social Equity and Health and Wellness. The pillar of conservation illustrates the role served by parks and recreation agencies in protecting open spaces, scenic beauty, natural and cultural resources for the benefit of citizens now and in the future. Social equity reflects the role that parks and recreation agencies play in providing programs, facilities, and sites for the benefit of all citizens, regardless of racial/ethnic, religious, sexual identity or other group membership. Social equity is also associated with ensuring access to recreation resources to those in communities who are underserved. Finally, the pillar of health and wellness reflects the role that park and recreation agencies play in providing programs and facilities that provide opportunities to develop and practice healthy behaviors. In addition, outdoor recreation has been associated with increased cognitive functioning as well.

After the statewide recreation issues in Arizona were identified, it became clear that these issues were not only largely consistent with these national pillars, but built and strengthened them. Three changes were made to the organizing structure of the national pillars to make them even more applicable to the SCORP effort in Arizona. First, in 2015, the Arizona Management System (AMS) was implemented across state agencies. The AMS is a method of data-based decision-making used to identify waste and inefficiencies in processes, to propose and to prioritize potential solutions, to measure results to determine if proposed solutions are resulting in increased efficiency and customer satisfaction, and either to sustain positive changes or to identify why implemented solutions did not have the desired effect and trying something else. This method of identifying barriers to optimal functioning has come along at a time when all parks and recreation agencies are being challenged to do more with less, to be self-supporting as much as possible, and to be more transparent and responsive to customer feedback. Some of the statewide priorities are consistent with the AMS principles and did not fit as well into the 3 NRPA pillars, so a fourth pillar was added to reflect this new way of doing business – Optimizing System Vitality.
Optimizing System Vitality includes the responsible use of existing resources, which is ensured by heightened transparency and increased accountability, as well as the identification and pursuit of new, innovative, and creative methods of funding, operating and maintaining existing and new parks and recreation facilities, sites and programs.

Second, the SCORP Working group identified accessibility and inclusion as one of the priority issues to be addressed in Arizona. The concepts of accessibility and inclusion provide more targeted, specific methods of addressing the NRPA concept of social equity. Therefore, NRPA’s pillar of social equity was changed this document to reflect the feedback of Arizonans and their leadership, while continuing to place importance on ensuring that all citizens have high quality outdoor recreation facilities and programs available to them that meet their needs, as well as those of their families and communities.

In addition, the data collected for the SCORP revealed the importance of parks and recreation agencies to communities. A community’s social fabric and economic health is bolstered by thriving, vibrant parks and recreation programs and facilities that support residents in healthy behaviors, but also contribute to healthy relationships within families, neighborhoods, and the larger community. To better reflect this emphasis, the pillar of Health and Wellness was altered to identify the role of parks and recreation agencies in creating and supporting Thriving Individuals and Communities.

These pillars are being used in this SCORP to organize the document and communicate the link between the national focus of parks and recreation agencies and statewide priorities.

4.1 CONSERVATION

Our research shows that conserving the state’s public lands, conservation areas, and parks for current and future generations is of the utmost importance. Working group members, recreation providers, and focus group participants identified several issues of statewide importance which have been grouped under the conservation pillar of recreation in Arizona. Furthermore, Arizona residents identified protecting Arizona’s natural environment, water supplies, and open spaces as top priorities in the Gallop Arizona Poll beginning in 2009 (Center for the Future of Arizona, 2015). Population growth, the expanding urban/rural interface, and a diversifying population are increasing the need for outdoor recreation spaces and natural and cultural resources to be protected, maintained, and accessible. These areas include contiguous and connected open space, forests, deserts, wetlands, unique ecosystems, and endemic species of our state.

4.1.1 Benefits of Parks and Protected Areas

Taking a broad view of the benefits of parks, protected areas and open space, research shows various types of benefits, including personal, social, environmental, and economic. Individual, social, and economic benefits are discussed in more depth under the next three pillars. Parks and open space provide many environmental benefits and ecosystem services such as filtration of pollutants from soil and water, buffering of air pollutants, moderation of climatic changes, conservation of soil and water, pollution of food crops and other plants, and preservation of genetic diversity through habitat connectivity (Nyaupane, 2011). Parks and protected areas also
provide habitat for hundreds of wildlife species in Arizona including rare and endangered species as well as popular game species important for hunting and species watched recreationally. These benefits result in direct economic contributions to state and local economies. Arizona’s iconic landscapes also support a large tourism and outdoor recreation industry benefiting local communities economically. Furthermore, open space contributes to a broader environmental protection effort by educating people about the environment and creating awareness.

4.1.2 Data

Recreation providers were asked a series of questions related to natural resource management to understand how agencies and organizations prioritized issues of preservation, conservation, stewardship, accessibility, and sustainability in Arizona. Providers were asked to rate the importance of several natural resource related issues and priorities from their agency’s perspective, from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The statements with the highest rankings demonstrate the importance of preserving the state’s rivers/water, forests, deserts, and open space, long term stewardship and sustainability of resources, as well as utilizing sustainability measures and environmentally friendly building practices for new development and renovations (Figure 31).

Figure 32. Importance of Issues Related to Resource Protection
Arizona State Parks and Trails asked online participants on Facebook as well as the ASPT website to weigh in on what they considered to be the most important issues in outdoor recreation in Arizona receiving 658 “likes”, 89 “shares” and 100 comments on Facebook with an additional 51 responses on the ASPT website. Preservation, conservation, stewardship, sustainability, green spaces, environmental ethics, and access were prominent themes heard from the public related to conservation.

“What do you think are the most important issues in outdoor recreation in Arizona?”

“I love Arizona and having a safe, clean area to hike and explore is important. Arizona is truly beautiful and offers many different types of geography to experience. Each of us need to respect this and protect it as we enjoy it!”

“I think one very important area of concern is awareness of what amazing resources are available through our parks services and keeping them available for future generations!”

“Stewardship of our parks, natural and cultural resources. Maintenance. Stop the deferred maintenance to balance budgets.”
4.1.3 National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan

Arizona’s Wetland Priorities

Wetlands are transitional lands between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. Wetlands must meet at least one of the following:

- At least periodically the land supports predominately hydrophytes;
- The substrates are predominately undrained hydric soil; and/or
- The substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year.

All wetland types found in Arizona are scarce because the state’s wetlands have been naturally decreasing in area and abundance in the last 140 years. Therefore, all wetland types are considered eligible for acquisition or other protection under the LWCF program. The 1986 Emergency Wetlands Resources Act (Public Law 99-645, S. 303) requires states to address wetlands protection in their five-year SCORP documents. The SCORP wetlands component must

- Be consistent with the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan developed by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service;
- Be based on consultation with the state’s fish and game management and wetlands protection agency(ies); and
- Include a description of priority wetlands planning and funding under the Land and Water Conservation program.

Wetlands acquisition priorities listed in this plan represent no change from those appearing in the 1988, 1994, 2003, 2008 and 2013 SCORP Wetland Addendums. These priorities are based on NPS and the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP) guidelines. Acquisition priorities for general wetland types in Arizona were also determined by consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and the Arizona Game and Fish Department in relation to the nation’s priority listings in the NWPCP (Table 11).

Priority consideration will be given to the following (all weighted equally):

- Wetland types least protected by regulation or preservation (public or private).
- Wetland types that have been destroyed, altered or degraded within the state.
- Regions within the state with the least number of wetlands protected by regulation or preservation (public or private).
- Wetland sites subject to identifiable threat of loss or degradation.
- Wetland sites with diverse functions and values and/or high or special values for specific wetlands.
- Wetland sites that are contiguous to protected areas of public land, provide corridors, or enhance the functions and values of adjacent wetlands.

Table 10. Priority Wetland Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWPCP</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine emergent</td>
<td>Palustrine emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine forested</td>
<td>Palustrine forested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Riparian</td>
<td>Lower Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine scrub/shrub</td>
<td>Palustrine scrub/shrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine intertidal emergent</td>
<td>*Palustrine open water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine intertidal forested</td>
<td>*Lacustrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine intertidal scrub/shrub</td>
<td>Riverine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine intertidal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine intertidal non-vegetated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine subtidal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacustrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine open water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine unconsolidated shore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine non-vegetated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Naturally occurring wetland types
Types of Wetlands in Arizona

According to a 2012 Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) report, the lacustrine, palustrine, and riverine systems were evenly distributed throughout the state (https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/SupMapInf/R02Y12P04.pdf). Each type represents roughly a third of the total wetlands acreage of the state. Riverine wetlands were slightly more prominent representing 36% of wetlands statewide (Table 12).

Table 11. Arizona Prominent Wetland Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Wetlands</th>
<th>Total (Square Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacustrine</td>
<td>272.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine</td>
<td>289.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverine</td>
<td>315.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>877.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits of Wetlands

Wetlands have long been recognized as critical to a clean, properly functioning environment and to ecosystem health. They provide a protective buffer for our towns and cities against floods and storm surges. Ecological benefits include contributions to water quality, life-sustaining habitat to hundreds of species, and aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem connections. In addition, the nation’s wetlands provide economic, ecological, and cultural benefits and enable societies to continue to function and thrive.

Beyond protection of existing wetlands, wetland acreage can be increased by creating new wetlands or by restoring former wetlands lost to drainage. In many cases, the necessary soils and seed stock still exist, and wetlands flourish once more as soon as the hydrology is restored. Agencies can restore wetlands by modifying the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a wetland site.

Benefits of Partnerships for Wetland Protection

More than 85% of wetlands are located on privately-held land. Therefore, the effectiveness of federal efforts to improve the health, quality and use of the nation’s wetlands will be greatly enhanced by expanding public-private partnerships. The array of public-private partnerships that have developed over recent years has strengthened the stewardship efforts at the federal level.

Federal wetland projects often involve partnerships of state and local governments and nongovernmental and private organizations seeking to acquire wetland habitat. These acquisitions may be incorporated into the FWS National Wildlife Refuge System or into a state’s protected area system, or they may be included in holdings protected by a nonprofit conservation organization (e.g., The Nature Conservancy).

For instance, the Wetlands Reserve Easement Program, a voluntary, federal program through the Natural Resource Conservation Service, supports voluntarily protection, restoration and enhancement of critical wetlands on private and tribal agricultural land nationwide. Another example of a wetland conservation partnership is the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Wetland Program Development grant program. In 2014, the San Carlos Apache tribe were awarded nearly $89,000 to continue development of a Wetland Program Plan, to conduct baseline monitoring of wetlands, and to develop compensatory mitigation tools. In 2012, Prescott College was awarded nearly $150,000 to provide sub-grants for education programs for secondary schools, non-profits, etc. to teach about protecting Arizona’s waters, including wetlands and riparian habitats.

Wetland Protection Activities and Next Steps

In 2012 the ADEQ reported that Arizona had inventoried less than half of the state’s wetlands. Today, all Arizona’s wetlands have been fully inventoried on a database found on the USFWS website (USFWS, 2017). The ADEQ continues to map Arizona wetlands as a resource for protecting them. ADEQ’s future work includes:

- Digital mapping of tribal areas;
- Ground truth during growing season; and
- Further develop wetland program with goals of restoration, education, and protection of critical wetland resources.
4.2 ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSION

Accessibility and inclusion - ensuring equal access to parks and public spaces and programs for everyone in the community is foundational to building and fostering healthy communities (NRPA, 2017). Several priority issues identified by the 2018 SCORP Working Group fell underneath the umbrella of accessibility and inclusion, including engagement while other priority issues can be effectively addressed through the lens of accessibility and inclusion, including education opportunities, and partnerships and collaborations. Arizona’s population is growing and diversifying culturally, ethnically, economically, and demographically. Providing outdoor recreation opportunities to all people regardless their race, ethnicity, age, income level, or ability has been a core principle of Arizona State Parks and Trails and should be a critical responsibility of all outdoor recreation providers. In addition, available alternative funds should be directed to those communities with the most need. This can be defined as those with less recreational facilities or programs available or who can show that their community has the greatest need for the project.
4.2.1 Benefits

The social benefits of providing outdoor recreation opportunities and access to open space, parks, and protected areas are numerous. Arizona’s State Parks and Trails have been shown to enhance community health and economic viability, individual health and wellness including overall quality of life, and promote community connections (Arizona State Parks, 2015). Furthermore, research has shown that close access to parks and open space can lead to increased physical activity in children and adults, reducing the likelihood of obesity and other health related illnesses, saving significant associated healthcare costs (Trust for Public Land, 2009). In several U.S. cities, the benefits of improving access to parks included reduced crime rates (County of Los Angeles, 2011; Kansas City Parks and Recreation Department, 2009), increased sense of community attachment, and increased economic benefits (Trust for Public Land, 2009).

The benefits of accessibility and inclusion to public parks and recreation are many, including:

- Public enjoyment and engagement. Where parks and open space are plentiful and recreation services strong, residents enjoy the closest attachment and engagement within their communities; and studies indicate higher levels of local gross domestic product and economic well-being;

- Quality recreation time with family and friends. Parks and recreation services provide a space and a reason to enjoy quality time, relaxation, and fun among family members and friends, thus strengthening the social and familial bonds that provide balance and satisfaction in life;

- Improvement of mental and physical health. Parks and recreation can reduce the impacts of chronic diseases, especially in such vulnerable populations as children, seniors, and the underserved; and

- Measurable decreases in rates of crime and other detrimental activities. Communities are safer as a result of a wholesome atmosphere created by well-managed parks and recreation services in communities through healthy activities and programming for all people.

(Source: National Recreation and Park Association (2017b).)

4.2.2 Data

Accessibility and inclusion was a primary issue identified by the SCORP Working Group. This does not necessarily mean that all providers can be all things to all community members; however, it does mean that recreation providers collectively need to assess how well served the entire community is. Working Group members acknowledged that a better understanding of the recreation needs, barriers, and preferences of all community members was needed before specific issues of accessibility and inclusion could be identified and addressed. Therefore, it is our recommendation that new projects should assess and address the needs of the communities which they intend to serve.

Figure 33. Importance vs. Opportunities Provided to Diverse Groups

Arizona’s outdoor recreation providers were asked to rate the extent to which their agency provides opportunities for, or met the needs of, ethnically diverse groups, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer (LGBTQ) individuals and communities, low income users, visitors with disabilities, children and youth, teenagers, large groups, families, and seniors from (1) Not at all to (5) Very much. They were then asked to rate how important provision of these opportunities or meeting the needs of these groups was to their agency from (1) Not at all to (5) Very much (Figure 33). Results (Figure 32) show that families, seniors, those with disabilities, and large groups (top right
quadrant) were determined to be important to serve as well as where providers reported the most opportunities (above mid-range on the scale for both variables). The top left quadrant represents groups of high importance to serve; however, there were less opportunities available for these groups consisting of children and teenagers specifically. The bottom left quadrant shows the groups that are considered to be underserved by providers due to the low amount of opportunities serving low income, ethnic and the LGBTQ communities. Although most of these groups were deemed important (score at or just below 3.5 on a scale of 5 on importance), there were less opportunities made available by Arizona providers. Based on the providers survey, although the LGBTQ communities were placed at low importance (just over 2.5), they were the most underserved group. The lack of opportunities directly provided to low income, ethnically diverse, and LGBTQ communities by outdoor recreation providers presents an opportunity for future collaboration with partners, friend’s groups, and other agencies to fill this gap. Please note that the scale on the graph is truncated in order to show relatively small differences in detail.

Finally, rural providers report providing relatively more opportunities for most groups, except seniors. For large groups, the mean response is the same between rural and urban providers (Figure 34).
4.3 INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY WELLNESS

Research continually points to the benefits of outdoor recreation on human health and well-being. Due in part to the increased rise in adult and childhood obesity rates caused by inactivity, empirical studies conducted over the past 10 years have assessed the health benefits of outdoor recreation with evidence strongly demonstrating positive mental and physical benefits of outdoor recreation. Public parks and outdoor recreation activities also positively benefit local communities whose wellness can be assessed in economic terms.

4.3.1 Benefits

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) report, backed by empirical research, shows that residents who have access to parks and open space (e.g., biking and walking trails) consequently enjoy better mental and physical health. Parks and open space also enhance the quality of life of residents and visitors. Parks and open space make neighborhoods more livable; offer recreation opportunities for at-risk youth, low-income children, and families; and create a sense of community (Sherer, 2003). Research also demonstrates that access to parks and open space has been linked to reductions in crime, including juvenile delinquency (Sherer, 2003). Parks and open space, which also function as soundscapes in urban areas, play a vital role in noise absorption resulting in better acoustic comfort.

Parks and open space plays a vital role in economic vitality of communities. Nature-based recreation and tourism activities, which take place in national parks, protected rivers, scenic lands, wildlife habitats, and recreational open space, account for between 10-20% of the $5.8 trillion U.S. tourism industry (World Travel and Tourism Council [WTTC], 2010). Parks and open space support a $1.25 trillion tourism industry in the United States (Office of Travel and Tourism Industries [OTTI], 2010). The presence of open space also affects the value of adjacent lands, termed “enhancement value.” Developers also realize that providing open space within residential developments is increasingly important. Cities have also used their urban open space to revitalize inner cities by organizing public events such as concerts and public fairs that help bring people to the cities and increase retail sales, which also have “benefit chain of casualty” as one type of benefit can lead to other subsequent benefits (see Nyaupane, 2011).
4.3.2 Data

Recreation providers were asked to rate their agreement with the statement “My agency provides economic opportunities in the surrounding areas” on a scale of (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. Approximately one-third of providers neither agreed nor disagree with the statement, while more than one-half of providers agreed (Figure 34). Providers of statewide recreation and non-profits had lower mean scores on this question when compared to federal and local providers (Figure 35).

In contrast, 74% of visitors to Arizona State Parks in FY14 agreed that local economies depend upon State Parks and only 22% neither agreed nor disagreed. Interestingly, a greater percentage of visitors to statewide recreation facilities recognized the economic benefits of recreation areas, whereas providers themselves may not be as aware of these benefits.
4.4 OPTIMIZING CAPACITY AND VITALITY

As traditional sources of funding and budgets shrink, public land managing agencies are being challenged to identify non-traditional, alternative funding sources. However, in addition to funding, agencies are increasingly being tasked with increasing the strategic and responsible investment made with existing resources in order to responsibly manage maintenance and growth. More agencies are using business tools to assess return on investment of resource allocation and to identify waste and inefficiencies in processes and improve or eliminate waste to improve the customer experience.

4.4.1 Funding and Economic Impacts

Recreation providers were asked to estimate the percentage of how much funding their agency receives from each of the following sources. Nearly one-quarter of providers stated that they receive funding from the federal government and two-out of ten receive funding from donations (Figure 37). More than one out of ten respondents also receive funding through grants. Figure 38 shows the source of funding breakdown by agency providers. For example, the figure show 41% of nonprofit providers funding comes from donations.
Almost nine out of ten respondents indicated that their agency seeks alternative funding opportunities (Figure 38), which could be grants, partnerships, and other non-traditional funding methods.

On a scale of 1-Not important to 5-Very important, providers were asked to rate funding issues (Figure 40). Consistent with other statewide plans (see Trails Plan 2015), mean scores indicate that funding existing facilities, operations and maintenance, recreation and interpretive programs and habitat preservation and restoration is important to providers. However, also important is funding the acquisition of new parks and open space and developing new facilities.
4.4.2 Partnerships and Collaboration

SCORP Work Group members emphasized that the path forward for recreation and conservation agencies must include creative partnerships and collaboration. In addition to traditional or existing partnerships, the group recommended more of these resource-leveraging relationships in the areas of marketing, advocacy, and resource management. While accomplishing tasks through partnerships takes a significant time commitment to build, strengthen, and maintain relationships, the benefit is that works gets done by qualified individuals in innovative ways. One example of a partnership that supports park development is a relationship between Arizona State Parks and Trails, Lake Havasu City and Komick Enterprises. This $350 million development will include Havasu Riviera State Park and neighboring residential and recreational facilities.

Figure 41 shows that provider agencies collaborate with federal agencies primarily on co-management (27%), funding and grants (23%), and resource monitoring (21%). Collaborations with state agencies occurs primarily for funding and grants (29%) (Figure 42). The data shows opportunities to increase partnerships and collaborations beyond funding and grants in areas such as volunteering, training and educational workshops, and data sharing.
4.4.3 Grant Programs

Arizona State Parks and Trails Grants

More than $4 million is available annually to Arizona communities, resource managers and agencies to preserve and enhance Arizona’s significant natural open space, and recreational resources. Arizona State Parks and Trails is responsible for administering Land and Water Conservation Fund and other federal and state programs such as the Growing Smarter Program, state Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund Program, and federal Recreational Trails Program (RTP).

The administration of these grants includes the development of application guidelines and grant rating systems informed by public and provider input, the execution of project agreements, and the subsequent monitoring of compliance.

To assist with this responsibility, the Grants staff works with the following advisory committees:

- Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission (AORCC)
- Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG)
- Arizona State Commission on Trails (ASCOT)

These three advisory committees consist of non-motorized trail users and land managers, motorized recreation users, and outdoor recreation professionals and users. These groups review and provide feedback on projects and recommend funding.

The purpose of the Growing Smarter State Trust Land Acquisition Grant Program was to fund grants to projects that conserve open spaces in or near urban areas and other areas experiencing high growth pressures. Between 2001 and 2014, a total of $231,131,181 was awarded in Growing Smarter grants. These monies have benefited urbanites beloved areas such as Tortolita Mountain in Pima County, Flagstaff’s Observatory Mesa and the signature McDowell Mountains in Phoenix.

Recreational Trails Program

In 2016 alone, the RTP funded 21 trail related projects totaling $1,684,560. The RTP provides federal funds to the states to develop and maintain recreational trails, trail-related facilities and education for motorized, non-motorized and diverse uses. The program provides funds for all kinds of recreational trail uses, such as pedestrian uses (hiking, running, wheelchair use), bicycling, in-line skating, equestrian use, cross-country skiing, snow-mobiling, off-road motorcycling, all-terrain vehicle riding, four-wheel driving, or using other off-road motorized vehicles.

Non-Motorized Recreation

From 2007 to 2015, there have been 61 non-motorized projects. An example of a non-motorized project that has received funds is Sophie's Flat located in the scenic Sonoran Desert five miles’ northeast of Wickenburg. Easy access to nearby communities makes this a popular spot each year for thousands of equestrians, hikers and mountain bikers.

The BLM, Wickenburg Conservation Foundation, and community volunteers work together to maintain and improve the trails. An RTP grant funded major trail repairs after a season of torrential rains.

This grant was vital to keep the 15-mile trail a main contributor to Wickenburg’s recreational economic base. The trailhead offers a restroom, interpretive kiosk and ample parking for horse trailers and vehicles. Maps are available and trails are well marked. The trailhead also serves as an open classroom for nature-based family and student programs such as interpretive hikes, desert survival, astronomy, geocaching and more. Education programs are hosted and funded by the Wickenburg Outdoor Education Partnership and grants.
Motorized Recreation

Motorized recreation in Arizona receives support from federal RTP as well as the State Off-Highway Recreation (OHV) Recreation Fund. The OHV Recreation Fund provides a set percentage (0.55%) of license taxes on motor vehicle fuel from the Highway User Revenue Fund for OHV management. In 2009, new OHV legislation was enacted to provide additional funds to support law enforcement and facility development. This legislation created an indicia (sticker) for vehicles weighing under 1800 pounds and designed primarily for travel over unimproved terrain. The OHV sticker is distributed through the Department of Motor Vehicles and the $25 cost is added to the OHV Recreation Fund. State Parks receives 60% of the money in the Fund for projects. Approximately $1.5 million is available annually through Arizona State Parks for OHV projects. From 2007 to 2015, almost $12 million were awarded to 119 different projects that help fund rehabilitation for over miles of trails, development of new trailhead facilities, promotion of safety education, law enforcement support, and financial aid for trail planning for future trails (Table 10).

Table 12. ASPT Awarded Competitive Grants from FY2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
<th>Grant Dollars Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,538,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$6,066,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program; Non-motorized</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$3,733,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program; Motorized</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$5,747,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program; Diverse*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$1,660,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Diverse indicates that the grant could be used for a project with both motorized and non-motorized trail uses.
Partner Agency Grants

Arizona Game & Fish

Heritage Fund Grants
Heritage Fund money comes from Arizona Lottery ticket sales and was established by voter initiative in 1990. Heritage funding goes toward conservation efforts such as protecting endangered species, educating students and the general public about wildlife and the outdoors, and creating new opportunities for outdoor recreation.

The Heritage Fund Grant Program was established by the Arizona Game and Fish Department in 1992 as part of the overall Heritage Fund program. Since inception, the department has had the opportunity to award more than $14 million through the Heritage Fund grants program and support more than 700 projects throughout the state.

http://www.azgfd.com/Wildlife/HeritageFund/grantapply

Local Sportsmen’s Group Grant Program
The purpose of the Local Sportsmen's Group grant program is to help local sportsmen’s groups fund projects that promote wildlife conservation through hunter, angler, shooter and trapper recruitment and retention. The program awards grant funds to eligible projects through a competitive application process each year.

“The Local Sportsmen’s Group grant program is an investment in local organizations that, day in and day out, are teaching people how to be safe, ethical and responsible hunter-angler conservationists,” Program Manager, Doug Burt said. “Additionally, our focus is on ‘retaining’ participants, not just developing awareness and one-time experiences by applying the Adoption Sequence to this grant program and our existing Outdoors Skills Network.”

http://www.azgfd.gov/i_e/local_sportsmens.shtml

The Outdoor Foundation
The Outdoor Foundation's Corporate Philanthropy Programs allow brands and businesses to create consumer-facing giving campaigns that align with business goals while increasing outdoor recreation and spurring community engagement.

http://www.outdoorfoundation.org/philanthropy.about.html

Cabela’s Outdoor Fund
The goal is to ensure future generations can enjoy the activities of hunting, fishing, camping and recreational shooting. Efforts that focus on the recruitment, retention and re-activation of hunters, anglers, campers and recreational shooters are priority. Funding for the program comes from customers who decide to “round up” at Cabela’s stores to contribute to the Cabela’s Outdoor Fund.

http://www.cabelas.com/category/Outdoor-Fund/112097880.uts

Greenfield’s Outdoor Fitness: Go Greenfields Grants
The purpose of this program is to provide parks nationwide with an opportunity to provide their communities with fitness opportunities that virtually anyone can use for free at any time. Projects should coincide with the funding agency's mission to provide accessible fitness opportunities to youth, underserved communities, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities. The funding agency aims to support communities as they strive to build a better quality of life for their citizens.


Many other federal organizations offer grant opportunities for which Arizona cities, towns, etc. are eligible, including the following:
Chapter 5 PRIORITY ISSUES

5.1 PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION

Protection of Arizona’s natural and cultural resources, public lands, recreation areas, and scenic landscapes are increasingly necessary and a high priority. Human activities, including population growth and urbanization, increase the demand for recreation areas and place more pressure on resources. Additionally, naturally occurring events exacerbated by human activities, such as wildfire, flooding, erosion, and the spread of invasive species, increase the need for long term stewardship of resources. Funding for ongoing maintenance and operation of existing facilities is often scarce and sufficient fiscal resources need to be dedicated to the backlog of projects in Arizona.

Furthermore, conservation strategies and partnerships as well as stewardship standards need to adopt accepted best practices and utilize the best available science. For example, partnerships such as those between public land managing agencies and American Indian tribes, increase timely communication about projects initiated on public lands. This in turn results in a process that includes tribal involvement through all phases of the project, and includes culturally sensitive and appropriate mitigation measures if necessary. An additional example of a potentially fruitful partnership to conserve natural resources would be with the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Although the organization does not support recreation specifically, they designate Critical Conservation Areas and regional priorities, thus encouraging stakeholders to come together to address common natural resources goals while improving or maintaining agricultural productivity.

Protection of Arizona’s natural and cultural resources, public lands, recreation areas, and scenic landscapes are increasingly necessary and a high priority.

Types of project that could be funded under Preservation and Conservation

1. Acquiring property to preserve natural and cultural resources, open space, wetlands, and recreational opportunities in critical habitat, high growth areas and conservation priority areas.
2. Mitigation projects that are effected by natural disasters, overuse, illegal activity or vandalism.
3. Upgrading current recreational facilities using resource conservation technology (i.e. alternative energy, water saving techniques, recycling, etc.).
4. Developing or renovating facilities and trails to make them more sustainable.
5. Funding studies to determine carrying capacity of current recreational facilities.
6. Projects that result in the planning, design, and construction of legal and sustainable trails by agencies and local jurisdictions so that they can appropriately meet growing demand.
7. Development of apps that identify legal trail routes or recreation opportunities versus unauthorized recreation opportunities or wildcat trail routes.

EXAMPLES: Upgrading outdated electrical lighting, campground shower facilities using water saving devices, rainwater collection methods, providing native shade trees to outdoor recreation facilities, redefine trail routes to minimize grade to prevent erosion, etc.
5.2 ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSION

Arizona’s growing population is changing, becoming older, younger, and more diverse ethnically and culturally. These demographic trends may require changes in how outdoor recreation opportunities are provided and what facilities are necessary to meet the changing needs. Providers need to ensure that they have enough opportunities for children, teenagers, seniors, and culturally diverse user groups. Further research needs to be completed to better understand the needs, barriers, and preferences of Arizona’s population as it pertains to outdoor recreation. Public input of current users as well as potential users will help identify these needs for future planning efforts, resource allocation, and project development. Collaboration in research and planning efforts may reduce financial and staff burden and benefit multiple outdoor recreation providers.

Demographic trends may require changes in how outdoor recreation opportunities are provided and what facilities are necessary to meet the changing needs.

Types of project that could be funded under this category

1. Projects that increase accessibility to recreational facilities in underserved communities.
2. Projects that provide signage/printed material in multiple language or format related to recreational facilities.
3. Projects and/or studies that seek to understand the needs, barriers, and preferences of the community which they serve.
4. Projects that upgrade existing recreational facilities to accessible standards.

EXAMPLES: ADA paths, buildings, bathrooms, signs, campsites, picnic areas, swimming pools, parking areas, braille documents, large print trail maps, brochures, etc.
5.3 ENGAGEMENT

One of the most important issues to emerge from the Working Group, Focus Group, and Providers Survey was the need for increased public engagement to support and advocate for the protection and sustainable management of our state’s unique outdoor recreation resources. Engagement entails active participation or the act of becoming involved in an effort. For the purposes of the 2018 SCORP, engagement was intentionally differentiated from other priority issues such as marketing and communication which are means of engagement.

Communities, individuals, and especially youth need to be proactively engaged politically and socially to ensure that the resources and opportunities provided to the public are adequately funded, maintained, and improved upon to meet their needs. In the wake of ongoing budget cuts, land management agencies and outdoor recreation providers currently engage volunteers to manage an ever-growing backlog of maintenance projects, collect data and other forms of citizen science, and lead educational initiatives. However, these efforts only capture a small amount of the full engagement potential.

The Outdoor Recreation Providers’ survey indicated that there are limited engagement opportunities for youth beyond volunteerism and education. Organizations and agencies need to work with partners to seek innovative means of culturally appropriate engagement for members of their communities, particularly youth, in planning processes, recreation development, and experiential learning opportunities to foster a sense of ownership and stewardship for the recreation resources.

**Types of project that could be funded under this category**

1. Projects that are innovative and effectively engage youth and underserved groups within the community.

2. Projects that include and engage underserved groups including low income, ethnically diverse, and/or LGBTQ and community members throughout the planning, development, and long-term stewardship process.

3. Projects that involve education/training for youth as it relates to outdoor recreation facilities whether it be going to the schools or having the schools come to these areas.

4. Projects that provide recreational opportunities for youth.

**EXAMPLES:** *Leave No Trace* training, interpretive programs for school age groups, OHV safety program for youth, playgrounds, splash pads, training program for volunteers at recreational facilities.

**Communities, individuals, and especially youth need to be proactively engaged politically and socially to ensure that the resources and opportunities provided to the public are adequately funded, maintained, and improved upon to meet their needs.**
5.4 COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

Arizona’s recreation lands are managed by a patchwork of federal and state agencies, tribes, local jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and land owners which often creates confusion amongst users, missed opportunities, and inefficient use of resources. Users often are unaware of or unable to differentiate between land management agencies, determine which passes are required for recreation, and observe appropriate regulations and restrictions on varying landscapes. Increased collaboration and partnerships between agencies, communities, volunteers, and other collaborators for marketing, resource management, safety, and maintenance can increase efficiency, effectiveness, and provide a better service to the user.

For example, jurisdictional collaboration on a statewide recreation pass would alleviate agency confusion and misinterpretation of required recreation passes. Additionally, cooperative management agreements between agencies, lacking adequate resources for maintenance, and local governments or friend’s groups to develop and manage trail systems would protect the resource as well as enhance the recreational user experience. Furthermore, recreation providers should not only strive to grow collaborative connectivity between institutions but also strive to make physical linkages between trails, recreation areas, and conservation strategies.

**Types of project that could be funded under this category**

1. Projects that involve collaboration and/or sharing of information, data, best practices among land management agencies/ recreation agencies, universities, communities and volunteers.

2. Projects that involve collaboration between stakeholder groups throughout the duration of the project including planning, development, and long-term stewardship.

3. Project that facilitate connectivity to recreational opportunities either physically, economically, or through collaboration in research, marketing, outreach, education, and communication efforts.

*Recreation providers should not only strive to create connectivity between institutions but also in physical attributes such as trails, recreation areas, and conservation strategies.*
5.6 MARKETING, COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

Today’s youth are spending less and less time outdoors in part due to technology and dependence on electronics. Although this lack of early exposure to nature can lead to reduced environmental ethics and outdoor recreation experience, technology is here to stay and opportunities to engage youth in outdoor activities need to integrate these two areas in order to grow the next generation of outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

Environmental education programs in the classroom as well as in the parks are necessary tools to teach the benefits of outdoor recreation, conservation, and safety. Many agencies and recreation providers do readily provide educational opportunities; however, our research shows that a gap exists in the dissemination of information between providers and the public. Providing easily accessible information and awareness about recreation areas, access points, and opportunities is important. The information disseminated is useless unless it is digested and retained by the public.

With print material being replaced by online digital media, tools like social media and websites are relatively easy and effective means of providing information to those whom are already associated with the organization(s). Despite this online presence, the millennial participants in the focus group reported that they receive information about outdoor recreation opportunities from their own social networks as opposed to agency social media channels. This emphasizes the need for agencies to assess their marketing, education, and communication efforts to ensure that they are reaching their intended audience.

Types of project that could be funded under this category

4. Shared marketing, outreach, and/or education campaigns and projects which reach out to underrepresented populations.

5. Developing, promoting, and consolidating mobile applications and other technologies which promote outdoor recreation and increase user accessibility.

6. Projects which consolidate recreational opportunity information related to trails whether it be via social media, print or other forms of distributing this information that aim to increase the user experience.

7. Funding outreach and educational projects/events that teach the importance of conservation, preservation, and sustainability such as Leave No Trace.

EXAMPLES: Website upgrades related to outdoor facilities, promotion of mobile maps or applications which engage the user during the outdoor recreation experience (iBird, Strava, TrailFork, etc.), provide wifi at campgrounds.

Technology is here to stay and opportunities to engage youth in outdoor activities need to integrate these two areas in order to grow the next generation of outdoor recreation enthusiasts.
5.7 FUNDING

Securing sustainable funding for the long-term stewardship of our state’s recreation areas is an ongoing issue. In an age of user-generated funding, budget cuts and short-term grant funding cycles, organizations and agencies are routinely required seek out creative ways to do more with less and use existing resources efficiently. Seeking innovative collaborations, private/public partnerships, and grant opportunities is required to keep up with ongoing maintenance of facilities and existing infrastructure. In addition, the State of Arizona is focusing on enhancing agency efficiency through problem identification and data analysis, the implementation of solutions, and consistent monitoring to identify if solutions are effective. Recreation providers should be seeking innovative means of optimizing long term sustainability and vitality to adapt to changing economic times, not just seeking to maintain systems and operations.

Recreation providers should be seeking innovative means of optimizing long term sustainability and vitality to adapt to changing economic times, not just seeking to maintain systems and operations.

Types of project that could be funded under this category:

1. Projects which work in conjunction with local communities to stimulate economic benefits of outdoor recreation opportunities provided.

2. Projects which are funded through multiple stakeholder contribution to match, provide overmatch, and/or in-kind match.

3. Projects which demonstrate a maintenance plan and budget for the duration of the project.
Chapter 6 OPEN PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS (OPSP)

6.1 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

6.1.1 Process

The open project selection process is used to make funding decisions for the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grant programs administered by Arizona State Parks and Trails (ASPT). The guidelines for the LWCF programs are based on the results of the SCORP planning process and public input. Traditionally, a portion of the LWCF allocation has been made available for competitive grants and a portion has been utilized for outdoor recreation projects at Arizona State Parks and Trails (1994 Memorandum of Agreement between AORCC and the ASPTB).

Project Solicitation

Eligible applicants include:

Incorporated municipalities, counties, state and tribal governments.

When a funding cycle is announced:

1. A grant manual is posted with instructions on how to apply, and
2. A grant workshop is provided giving eligible applicants an opportunity to review the program requirements and ask questions.

The workshops are designed to ensure that applicants understand the guidelines and rating criteria used in the LWCF program, and assist them in developing quality projects and applications.

Project Selection

Once LWCF Grant applications are received:

Each application is reviewed by ASPT staff to make sure it meets the minimum guidelines and legal requirements.

These projects are then reviewed by a team made up of ASPT staff and outdoor recreation professionals.

The grants are scored using rating criteria developed through the SCORP planning process.

Grant funding recommendations are then presented to AORCC for their review and recommendation.

AORCC then forwards their recommendations to the ASPTB for final action.

Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission
AORCC is an advisory body to the ASPTB with many responsibilities, including review of statewide outdoor recreation plans and oversight of the LWCF grant process. Made up of mostly parks and recreation professionals appointed by the Governor, AORCC is responsible for making statewide planning and funding recommendations to the ASPTB.

Public Participation
Public participation is the basis of the Arizona SCORP and the LWCF grant program in Arizona. Public participation is integral to the LWCF grant program for the development of guidelines and rating criteria and in project solicitation and selection. This participation is achieved through numerous opportunities for public comment including during the planning process, and at AORCC and ASPTB meetings during the SCORP and grant selection process.

Program Review and Updating
Further, in an effort to obtain pertinent input from the applicants, AORCC may occasionally established a task force comprised of recreation professionals representing various geographical locales and jurisdictional affiliations. This group meets to discuss and evaluate the current rating criteria and guidelines that are being used. Ultimately, the group may recommend changes to the process for future use. As a result, the rating criteria and weightings change periodically to reflect the needs and demands of recreation providers and the public. Current guidelines and the rating criteria can be found in the LWCF grant application manual, which is revised and printed each cycle.
6.1.2 LWCF Grant Program Details

The following is a brief summary of the LWCF grant program. This information is available to the general public as well as any group or organization upon request from Arizona State Parks and Trails.

Authorization and Purpose
The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965 (Public Law 88-578) became effective January 1, 1965 and has since been authorized to continue through 2018. The Act provides financial assistance to states, their political subdivisions and Indian tribal governments for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

Eligible Applicants
Eligible applicants under these programs include incorporated municipalities, counties, state agencies, and Indian tribal governments. In accordance with a 1994 Memorandum of Agreement between AORCC and the ASPTB, a portion of the LWCF allocation may be made available for competitive grants and a portion may be used for outdoor recreation projects at Arizona State Parks and Trails.

Eligible Activities
Eligible activities for the LWCF program include, but are not limited to: park development (e.g., playground equipment, lighting, picnic facilities, ballfields, ramadas, sports facilities, restrooms and other facilities deemed appropriate or eligible by federal and state guidelines) and land acquisition to serve future outdoor recreation and/or open space, or protect wetlands. Projects related to statewide outdoor recreation planning are also eligible activities.

Matching Requirement
LWCF grants are awarded on a 50/50 match where the participant provides at least 50% of the project cost and the grant provides the other 50%.

State Contact
Contact Arizona State Parks and Trails Grants and Trails Section at (602) 542-6942 for further information.

The Arizona State Parks and Trails Board adopted a new vision for the agency in 2009 emphasizing that part of the agency’s mission to not only manage the state’s recreational, natural and cultural resources but also to educate stakeholders, the public, the media and decision-makers about the importance of the system, the benefits of preservation for individuals, families, economies, communities and the environment. The ASPTB directed staff to implement this vision throughout its parks and programs, including the numerous grant programs administered by the agency.

Vision: Arizona State Parks and Trails is indispensable to the economies, communities, and environments of Arizona.
6.2 FY 2018 LWCF RATING CRITERIA

The rating criteria are based on the priority issues identified through the SCORP process and were developed by the SCORP Work Group and Arizona State Parks and Trails and Trails Grants staff.

Table 13. FY 2018 LWCF Rating Criteria Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LWCF History/Compliance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaboration</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engagement and Communication</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accessibility and Inclusion</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conservation of Resources</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Secured Matching Funds</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 LWCF History/Compliance

Table 14. LWCF History/Compliance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LWCF History/Compliance Criteria</th>
<th>10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are your current LWCF and recreational facilities maintained and free of any major issues?</td>
<td>7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes,</strong> do you have a current LWCF facility that will need to be converted? If conversion has not been addressed, they will not be eligible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do all of your LWCF facilities have the required LWCF signage?</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2 Collaboration

ASPT is encouraging applicants to identify and work with partners to protect the special places in their communities and across the state. Collaboration includes the sharing of resources among different groups. Partnerships may be with other agencies and/or organizations with similar or compatible missions, Friends Groups, volunteers or other stakeholders. Recreation providers should not only strive to create connectivity between institutions and people, but also in physical attributes such as trails, recreation areas and conservation protection strategies.

Projects that collaborate with more than one other organization, group or individual will receive more points. Also, those projects that serve to connect public recreation opportunities will also receive more points.

Points will be awarded on a sliding scale if at least 10% of your agency's match comes from collaboration with other entities.
Table 15. Collaboration Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If collaborating with another agency/organization, please indicate the collaboration</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort with a letter from that other agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much ($) of your match will come from other entities? (This match must be</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documented from the donating agency/organization.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If project is providing connectivity with another agency, please provide a map</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showing this connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If collaborating with volunteer or Friends group, please provide a letter from that</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group explaining this effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Engagement and Communication

**Project Need (Project Specific Planning/Public Involvement)**

This proposed project should be designed to meet the priority needs expressed by local, regional or statewide recreation users and to link recreation opportunities. This criterion refers to **project specific planning**.

Table 16. Engagement and Communications Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement and Communication Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain and document what circumstances brought this project (the one this application is for)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the forefront and why this project is a priority. Include the demographics of your service area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Explain and document your public outreach efforts, what you did to solicit public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement (for example, held public hearings or meetings, conducted surveys, put notices in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio or newspapers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Explain and document how the public was involved in determining the need or how they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responded to your public outreach efforts for the project you are applying for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Document how the public demonstrated support and affirmation for the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would include any innovative means of engagement for members of project</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, particularly youth, in the planning process. Recreation development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential learning opportunities. Participation in these processes will foster a sense of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownership and stewardship for the recreation resources. (More points are given for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovative methods of engagement.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your proposed project serve and engage youth to grow the next generation of outdoor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation enthusiasts? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your project include any education opportunities or materials? If so, focused on what</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user group(s)? (Projects that provide educational opportunities or materials for youth will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score higher.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.4 Accessibility and Inclusion

Table 17. Accessibility and Inclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility and Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will your project provide facilities or opportunities for underserved populations? Teenagers, children, low income &amp; ethnically diverse groups</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will this project fill a gap in recreation demand in your service area?</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your project provide activities or opportunities for multiple user groups (age groups, ethnic groups, activity user groups, etc.)?</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your facility or part of your facility ADA compliant? (3 point full ADA, 1.5 points partial, 0 points none)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your proposed project serve local, regional or statewide users? (3 points Statewide, 2 Regional, 1 local)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.5 Conservation of Resources

The public, the media, and decision-makers are starting to become more aware of what parks and open space contribute to the quality of life of Arizonans, both now and in the future. Protection of Arizona’s natural and cultural resources, public lands, recreation areas, and scenic landscapes are increasingly necessary. Human activities, including population growth, and naturally occurring events, such as wildfire, flooding, erosion, and the spread of invasive species, increase the need for long term stewardship of resources. Furthermore, conservation strategies and partnerships should be formed to address issues related to conservation across jurisdictions, using the best practices and current information to effectively address these issues.

Applicants are encouraged to conserve resources by: 1) maintaining existing facilities and public recreation sites; 2) incorporating innovative and effective technologies and green building practices into their renovation and development projects; and/or 3) protecting natural and cultural resources and open space.

Table 18. Conservation of Resources Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation of Resources Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovation</strong>—Renovation of a public outdoor recreation facility that is at least 20 years old. (Use of green technologies in renovation activities scores more points.)</td>
<td>11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovation and Development</strong>—Renovation of an outdoor recreation facility that is at least 20 years old and development/construction of a new outdoor recreation facility. (Use of green technologies in renovation and development activities scores more points)</td>
<td>8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition and Development</strong>—Acquiring permanent rights in property and developing a new outdoor recreation facility on that property. (Use of green technologies in development activities scores more points.)</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong>—Acquiring permanent rights in property for public outdoor recreation purposes. (Acquisition of unique, natural areas or wetlands scores highest.)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong>—Explain how this project will incorporate design elements, sustainable products or habitat enhancement in the most effective manner to conserve water or energy, or enhance natural resources. (Conservation examples could include use of &quot;green&quot; practices (products or technology), smaller footprint (less concrete or asphalt), energy efficiency or conservation use of timers or sensors, solar energy.)</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explain how this project will protect existing natural and cultural resources within the project boundaries; include size of area to be protected and uses to be allowed. (Examples of existing natural and cultural resources include riparian areas, washes, wetlands, other native plant communities, or wildlife habitats.) 5 pts

Explain how this project will protect existing natural and cultural resources within the project boundaries; include size of area to be protected and uses to be allowed. (Examples of existing natural and cultural resources include riparian areas, washes, wetlands, other native plant communities, or wildlife habitats.) 5 pts

6.2.6 Secured Matching Funds

**Matching Funds**

LWCF funding will not exceed 50% of a project’s total project cost. All applicants must provide a minimum of 50% of the total project cost. This match may include cash, materials, equipment, donated labor or other State and/or local grants. Please provide the source of the match for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19. Matching Fund Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Fund Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secured Match</strong>: % of match that is secured. This match must be documented with a verified letter that indicates the value of the match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Match</strong>: (%) Please explain your plan for the balance of the required match that has not yet been documented for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Sustainability**

The ability of the applicant to operate, maintain, or manage the facilities constructed or land acquired with grant funds throughout the required term of use is an essential factor of the LWCF grant programs. These grant programs mandate that any facilities or land, including natural areas or open space, purchased with grant funds be available for public use in perpetuity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20. Sustainability Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sustainability</strong>: Explain and document how your agency intends to operate, maintain or manage this project once it is completed. (If they are not maintaining their current sites, they will not get any points.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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