

SCORP University 2017 ~ NPS & SORP

Flip Chart Notes from the 3 Discussion Groups

May 1, 2017, 8 am – noon, The Lantana Room, Saguaro Hotel
SORP Conference, Scottsdale, AZ

Group 1 Public Outreach

Outreach Challenges

- Conducting outreach with limited staffing/budget resources
- Reaching a wide variety of people (diverse groups)
- Getting people to come to meetings (or participate in surveys)
- Conducting outreach across the state
- Summarizing all the data collected

Solutions

- Varied outreach tools/methods
- Different notification/contact strategies
- Focused, invitation-based stakeholder meetings
- Data management strategies

Varied Outreach Methods and Tools

- **Different types of methods/tools**
 - Statistically-representative survey (mail/phone)
 - Online questionnaire (emailed/posted link)
 - On-site intercept surveys
 - Visitor use survey
 - Community/public meetings
 - Advisory group meetings
 - Focus group meetings
 - Stakeholder/partner interviews
- **Online Questionnaires**
 - Mix of open-ended and directed questions
 - Subscription to Survey Monkey
 - Avoid long mail surveys
 - Partner with others on questions (SCORP, tourism, wildlife)
 - Easier to make bilingual/multi-lingual
 - Can be completed on computer, laptop, cellphone / smartphone
 - Can target specific groups (e.g., tourist survey, recreation provider survey)

- **Intercept / Visitor Use Survey**
 - On site interviews and counts
 - Need people on ground with surveyor training
 - Must be done across state in different regions
 - Send people home with online survey link or QR code to get more feedback
 - Hold in conjunction with park event (or peak use times) to get more responses

Comparison of statistically-valid and online surveys

Statistically Valid Survey	Online Questionnaire or Survey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows randomly selected individuals to respond 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives everyone a voice in the planning process (allows anyone who wants to participate to do so)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher cost • Done by survey firm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower cost • Done by firm or in-house (e.g., Google, Survey Monkey, Lime Survey, etc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically representative of entire state • Only representative of regions or counties if expand sample size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not statistically representative • Can obtain feedback from across state or more localized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes users and non-users (people not using parks or participating in recreation) • Typically targets residents only • Data sample can be selected to focus on voters, homeowners, or phone users (cell and landlines) • Obtains response from pre-determined number of people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongest response from park users, stakeholders, recreation interest groups • Can reach both residents and visitors (recreation tourists) • Involves people most likely affected by plan • Level of response depends on efforts to make the questionnaire available

- **Community Meeting (in person)**
 - Low attendance, small number of participants
 - Often attended by older, retired people
 - Is staff/resource intensive to hold meetings across state (high cost)
 - Online outreach (questionnaire) or online meetings can be more effective

- **Focus Groups /Listening Sessions**
 - Invite selected providers, partners stakeholders
 - Typically well attended
 - Involve people who represent different interests and trends
 - Get more specific feedback about certain topics
 - Most effective for underrepresented groups

- **Meeting Toolkit / Meeting in a Box**
 - Can be used by existing groups and clubs
 - Allows others (non-staff, friends groups) to lead and host meetings
 - Materials & supplies (pencils/pens, comment cards, etc.)
 - Talking points/presentation
 - Questions / comment sheets
 - Data collection form / online data input tool
 - Link to any available online survey

Notification and Techniques to Expand Outreach

- **Target different demographics**
 - Young families
 - Millennials
 - Seniors / retirees
 - Ethnic /cultural groups
 - Income groups
- **Expand advertising / notification**
 - Email announcements
 - Social media (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)
 - Traditional media (newspapers, radio, TV, billboard)
 - Existing networks (group newsletters, word of mouth)
 - Tagline / logo for project/plan to make it easily recognizable
 - Flyers/posters in parks and nearby locations
 - Business cards (with QR code/questionnaire link) to distribute by park host, park rangers, at gate, at park events, etc.
- **Broaden data sources/contact lists for meeting notices and questionnaire announcements**
 - Purchased email data for regions
 - Mailing lists (existing city / county lists)
 - Concessionaires
 - Service providers
 - Schools / universities
 - Federal, state, county, and city organizations
 - Churches
 - Youth Groups
 - HOA's
 - Insert in utility bills
 - Neighbors around State Parks
 - Campground and facility reservation lists (email contacts)
 - Fishing/hunting licenses
 - Annual pass programs
 - Day-use pass purchases
 - Environmentalists / conservation stewards
 - Health and wellness organizations
 - Connect to local providers via state's Park and Rec Association

- **Offer incentives for participation**
 - Drawing (entered for prize if complete survey or submit comment card)
 - Offer FREE day pass to outreach participants
 - Food/childcare at meetings

- **Use multiple formats to collect Draft Plan comments**
 - Host a summit (meeting of advisory group, partners and key stakeholders)
 - Send comment card to local park and rec agencies
 - Hold public open houses
 - Provide online forum to collect comments

Data Collection and Interpretation

- Use outreach feedback collected in park-specific master plans
- Incorporate data already collected / other surveys and studies
- Consider social equity
- Collect demographic info to know who is responding
 - Demographics
 - Language
 - Income / ethnicity / age
 - Weighted results
- Present/process data efficiently
 - Identify themes
 - Use 'Word Clouds' to emphasize more frequently repeated words (free program = <http://www.wordle.net/>)
 - Use bar charts and graphics
 - Scan all comments received (put in appendix; include response log)

Group 2 Partnerships & Collaboration

- State Parks & Rec. Associations
- O.R. Trails Advisory Board
 - Representing different sectors (motorized, non-motorized)
- Campground Owners Association
 - Newsletters
- Tourism Board
- Hospitals (providing match for LWCF grants)
- Health conglomerates
 - Prescription Trail
- County Health Department (Health Awareness)
- 501(c)(3) for State Park system to fundraise
- Created quasi-SCORP plan (strategic plan regional plans)
- Elementary and secondary educators mailing list
- Municipal League mailing lists
- Mega-church youth groups at county level
- “Friends of” groups (represents diverse group of supporters)
- Include tribes
- Internal partners (inside diverse agencies there is a lot of expertise)
- Use other agencies data before developing your own SCORP survey
- AARP – enormous amount of data; they have \$
- Church youth camps – ministry
- “Recreationist” email list
 - Compiled from numerous databases (fishing license, P&R Association)
- Universities
 - Focus on land management issues, social science
- Employers
 - Quality of Life tie to economic development
- Hydropower Utility Company
 - Relicensing studies
 - Require addressing recreation
- Volunteer Groups
- Mega-resort Companies (e.g. Delaware North Concessionaires)
- Private Interest Groups (ski, Maine Assoc., Vermont)
- Easement – land conservation connection to recreation (e.g. private landowners inviting public in for duck hunting)
- Ducks Unlimited (Hook & Bullet Clubs)

Group 3 Evaluating Supply & Demand

Evaluation of the demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the State is complex. How to begin? Two approaches:

1. *The Quantitative Approach to understanding Supply & Demand:* Statistically valid surveys of recreation providers (about quantities of current recreation facilities, future needs, and visitor counts) and resident and tourists/visitors (about current and future recreation activities and desires). See also the discussion on surveys in Group 1.
 - **Pros:** *Not required, but a wonderful study and base data for a SCORP and other statewide recreation planning initiatives as well as providing a resource for local government and non-profit decisionmakers.*
 - **Cons:** *Difficult to achieve on a budget; generally relies on partnering with universities or consulting firms which adds to the cost and management burdens; methodologies must be well-planned out; requires quality data analysis skills on the SCORP writing team in addition to data collection skills. For all these reasons this is not the most common approach for recent SCORP updates.*
 - **Example:** See Oregon's 2013-2017 SCORP
2. *The Qualitative Approach:* Ascertain public outdoor recreation trends and needs based on input from recently adopted planning reports, knowledgeable advisors, the public, and demographic trends.
 - **Literature Review** ~ Gather current 'Comprehensive Plans' (aka 'Parks, Recreation, and Open Space' plans) and recent park-specific development plans from several public recreation providers across the state. Strive for a range of sources and locations to get a balanced picture of what public recreation providers and the public have been discussing since the last SCORP was created. Read the plans' conclusions and recommendations. Can you discern trends associated with communities to be served and/or types of recreational facilities in either increasing or decreasing demand? Does it vary by geographic region, age group, race, or recreational facility type? Is there a nexus with other statewide priorities (e.g. public health initiatives, tourism, economic development, climate change, a change in land use regulations, etc.)? Summarize what the literature review suggests about current recreational deficits / needs as part of the SCORP's 'Supply and Demand' section.
 - **Advisory Committee** ~ Recruit and convene a committee of manageable size for broad guidance and buy-in at a high level (senior SCORP-writing department leaders, elected officials or their representatives, state and federal government agency representatives, economic development and tourism leaders, university researchers, etc.).
 - **Steering Committee** ~ Recruit and convene a smaller committee of SCORP-writing departmental leaders, recreation professionals, and advocates for more detailed guidance and reaction during SCORP development. Consider a standing committee that meets semi-annually to keep momentum and institutional memory going. Considering including current and recent members of the LWCF Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) grant application scoring panel as they are very knowledgeable about what local governments are trying to build in response to recent public demand.
 - **Focus groups** ~ Convene invitation-only small group discussions in various parts of the state with recreation providers, organized advocacy groups, and community members with expertise on issues the SCORP might address.
 - **Surveys** ~ In-person at parks, online, by invitation, by phone

- **Public Meetings** ~ Note: Sometimes the public participates more after a draft plan is available because is it something to react / respond to (e.g. during the public comment period *after* a DRAFT SCORP is released). Incorporate public comments into the FINAL SCORP submitted to NPS by making changes to the text where deemed appropriate; include raw comments and agency responses in an appendix.
- **Pros:** *Less cost and complexity. This is the most common approach perhaps because of the reduced cost and management burden to the SCORP writing team. If done thoroughly, the SCORP can provide a credible guide to future need.*
- **Cons:** *Trends and conclusions about current supply, demand, and therefore the need for future public outdoor recreation facilities must be synthesized from multiple sources. It is more “fuzzy” on data points and relies instead on the SCORP writing team to have a wide range of published and interpersonal sources in order to make accurate conclusions about current supply / demand and future need over the 5 year planning horizon.*

Existing Data Sources

- Recent comprehensive plans, park system or individual park master plans, and other studies indicating trends and public demand for recreation services
- NRSE (costs \$)
- Outdoor Industry Association (OIA)
- State sources of survey data on special topics (could be separate chapters of SCORP update)
- FERC
- USFS National Recreation Survey
- USFS National Visitor Use Monitoring Survey
- CommunityCommons.org for health data

Collaborate with recreation, public health, and other recreation provider leaders/contributors

- Sometimes government agencies or programs will help develop or write the chapters (public health programs or advocates, National Forests)

National Database Sources

- USGS Protected Areas Database (PAD-US) – in development for locally owned lands
- NRPA PRORAGIS
- GreenInfo.org
- California Park Factor
- Test mapping of LWCF sites in 10 states
- Many States have GIS databases
- Listen to what local parks and recreation projects are telling us
- SORP Newsletter
- AARP