# Health Benefits and Funding for Close-to-Home Recreational Trails







2019 International Trails Symposium April 29, 2019

# Recent Statewide Planning efforts have identified a need for additional non-motorized trail funding in Oregon.



**Oregon Trails 2016:** A Vision for the Future



2016-2025 on Statewide Recreation Trails Plan Oregon Parks and Recreation Department



#### Oregon Outdoor Recreation Initiative

Phase One Summary Report September 2017



## **Planning Recommendations**

- 1. Connecting trails into larger trail systems
- 2. Need for improved trail maintenance & major rehab
- 3. Recognize and strengthen park and recreation's role in increasing physical activity in Oregon
- 4. Support the development and ongoing maintenance of priority Signature Trail systems



## **Signature Trails**

Goal: To develop world-class trails to increase access to treasured landscapes for Oregonians and to support Oregon's growing population and growing outdoor recreation economy.

Example: Joseph Branch Rail Trail. A 63mile shortline railroad connecting Elgin to Joseph, OR.







# 2019-2023 SCORP Planning Components

# **An Oregon resident outdoor recreation survey**: (Conducted by OPRD with technical assistance from Kreg Lindberg - OSU)

- Oregonians of Spanish/ Hispanic/ Latino descent
- Oregonians of Asian descent (including South Asian and East/ Southeast Asian)
- Oregon's families with children
- Aging Young (ages 60-74)
- Aging Middle (ages 75-84)
- Low-income Oregonians (annual household income <\$25k)
- Oregon's urban, suburban, and rural populations.





# Top ten activities for Oregon residents, 2017, user occasions



 The top outdoor recreation activities based on total user occasions for Oregonians in 2017 were dominated by a number of linear activities.



# Non-motorized trail participation by activity, 2015, frequency by activity



 Trails plan survey breakdown of relative non-motorized trail participation by activity type.

OREGO// STATE PARKS \*\*

In Your Community Actions, How Would Actions Effect Physical Activity, Oregon General Population, Mean for 3-Point Likert (1=no effect, 2=lead to small increase, 3=lead to large increase), Oregon Demographic Group

	Demographic Group											
Actions	General Population	Latino	Asian	Families with Children	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low Income	Young Old	Middle Old	Male	Female
Walking trails or paths	2.21	2.36	2.30	2.30	2.23	2.25	2.10	2.21	2.09	1.76	2.14	2.29
More parks closer to where I live	1.96	2.25	2.14	2.13	2.01	1.99	1.82	2.03	1.76	1.50	1.91	2.01
Improved walking routes to parks	1.93	2.20	2.07	2.05	1.94	1.98	1.77	1.95	1.77	1.49	1.87	1.99
Bicycle trails or paths	1.90	2.00	1.92	2.07	1.95	1.94	1.73	1.87	1.65	1.29	1.93	1.87
Fitness classes (e.g., yoga, tai chi, pilates, zumba, cross-fit, water exercise)	1.72	1.99	1.78	1.78	1.76	1.74	1.63	1.77	1.62	1.37	1.55	1.89
Outdoor exercise equipment (e.g., elliptical trainer, stationary bike, rower)	1.60	1.97	1.81	1.76	1.62	1.64	1.48	1.68	1.39	1.21	1.53	1.66
Functional strength training (training the body for the activities performed in daily life)	1.56	1.90	1.69	1.59	1.58	1.58	1.47	1.69	1.50	1.39	1.52	1.60
Community gardens (where you can grow vegetables)	1.53	1.86	1.66	1.61	1.60	1.53	1.43	1.81	1.35	1.24	1.45	1.60
Adult sports leagues	1.49	1.75	1.58	1.66	1.50	1.51	1.43	1.52	1.24	1.12	1.49	1.48
Organized walks	1.48	1.80	1.64	1.53	1.48	1.49	1.46	1.65	1.42	1.34	1.37	1.59
Classes tailored to specific health concerns (e.g., heart disease, arthritis, diabetes or falls)	1.46	1.71	1.60	1.43	1.47	1.46	1.45	1.73	1.56	1.56	1.39	1.53
Adult dance classes	1.45	1.75	1.59	1.49	1.50	1.45	1.40	1.60	1.35	1.22	1.33	1.57
Provide accessibility for people with disabilities	1.40	1.71	1.50	1.39	1.43	1.38	1.43	1.85	1.44	1.48	1.37	1.44
Separate areas in parks for older adults to be with others their age	1.36	1.58	1.50	1.31	1.36	1.35	1.37	1.57	1.45	1.40	1.32	1.39
Senior activity centers	1.35	1.51	1.48	1.27	1.34	1.34	1.36	1.61	1.52	1.59	1.32	1.37
Provide seniors-only park areas	1.27	1.46	1.46	1.22	1.29	1.27	1.25	1.52	1.39	1.38	1.25	1.29

## **Statewide SCORP Priorities**

### **Resident Outdoor Recreation Survey Results:**

Close-To-Home Priorities	Dispersed-Area Priorities
Dirt/ other soft surface walking trails & paths	Dirt/ other soft surface walking trails & paths
More restrooms	Nature & wildlife viewing areas
Children's playgrounds & play areas made of natural materials (logs, water, sand, boulders, hills, trees)	More restrooms
Nature & wildlife viewing areas	Public access sites to waterways
Public access sites to waterways	More places & benches to observe nature & others



## **Statewide SCORP Priorities**

### **Recreation Provider Survey Results:**

Close-To-Home Priorities	Dispersed-Area Priorities
Community trail systems	Restrooms
Restrooms	RV/ trailer campgrounds & facilities
Children's playgrounds & play areas built with manufactured structures	Day-use hiking trails
Picnic areas & shelters for small visitor groups	Connecting trails into larger trail systems
Trails connected to public lands	Interpretive displays
Picnicking/ day-use facilities	



# Oregon Historic and Projected Population Change (1950-2030)



Trail funding need is compounded by continuing population growth.



### USFS recreational trail maintenance by Fiscal Year, 2011-2016, Oregon

Fiscal Year	Total Trail Miles	Trail Miles Maintained	% of Total Trail Miles Maintained	Trail Miles Improved	% of Total Trail Miles Improved	Total Trail Miles Meeting Standard	% Trail Miles Meeting Standard
2011	10,896	4,057	37.2%	55.4	0.5%	1,928	17.7%
2012	11,395	4,398	38.6%	123.6	1.1%	1,593	14.0%
2014	11,089	4,323	39.0%	21.0	0.2%	1,891	17.1%
2015	10,334	4,919	47.6%	31.1	0.3%	1,836	17.8%
2016	11,320	5,301	46.8%	82.9	0.7%	2,789	24.6%

- In FY 2016 the USFS provides about 11,300 miles of recreational trails in Oregon.
- In FY 2016 approximately a quarter of these trail miles met current agency maintenance standards.

# USFS recreational trails budget by Fiscal Year, 2011-2016, Oregon



• The FY 2016 annual trails budget of \$2.6 million was less than the \$3.1 million budget peak in FY 2011.

## Estimated USFS recreational trail maintenance needs Fiscal Year 2016, Oregon

Funding Category		Amount
Deferred Maintenance		\$19,377,580
Annual Maintenance		\$4,150,456
Capital Improvements		\$12,618,432
Operations		\$1,475,220
Το	tal	\$37,621,688

 Since the majority of USFS recreational trails in Oregon do not meet current maintenance standards, annual maintenance budgets fail to cover annual maintenance expenses, and deferred maintenance costs are approximately 7 ½ times the annual trail maintenance budget, the long-term sustainability of the Oregon USFS recreational trail system is on questionable footing.

# SCORP Advisory Subcommittee Recommendations:

- **1.** Funding need for non-motorized trail development and major rehabilitation within Urban Growth Boundaries.
- 2. Funding need for non-motorized trail ongoing maintenance and major rehabilitation in dispersed settings.
- 3. Funding need for Signature Trail development and maintenance.



# Nine Chapter Components:

- 1. Identifying the primary benefits of a new nonmotorized trails fund for the state.
- 2. Identifying the existing sources of funding for nonmotorized trails.
- 3. Identifying a total annual dollar estimate for the current level of need.
- 4. Recommending a total annual dollar amount needed for a proposed dedicated non-motorized trails fund.



# Nine Chapter Components:

- 5. Describing the objectives of a non-motorized trails fund.
- 6. Identifying the types of non-motorized projects to be funded and specific organizations/ agencies that would qualify for funding.
- 7. Identifying example funding sources.
- 8. Describing options for administering a new non-motorized trails fund.
- 9. Identifying implementation actions for moving forward with establishing a dedicated non-motorized trails fund for Oregon.



Oregon Outdoor Recreation Metrics: Health, Physical Activity, and Value

### Part A

### Health Benefits Estimates for Oregonians from Their Outdoor Recreation Participation in Oregon

Oregon Outdoor Recreation Metrics: Health, Physical Activity, and Value

2019-2023 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan Supporting Documentation

Randall S. Rosenberger & Tara Dunn

# SCORP Activities Included

CDC recommended physical activity levels for health benefits:

- MET (metabolic equivalent task) = energy expended relative to a resting metabolic rate (MET = 1)
- 150 weekly minutes of moderately-intense activity (3.0-5.9 METs); or / or a mix of
- 75 weekly minutes of vigorously-intense activity (≥ 6.0 METS); or
- MET < 1.5 considered 'sedentary'</p>
- **30 SCORP activities** with MET  $\ge$  3.0



# **Energy Expenditures**

### 503 billion kcal / year

= 144 million pounds of body fat = 29.5 Olympic swimming pools)

Top three activities:

Walking on local streets / sidewalks = 118 billion kcal Walking on local trails / paths = 57 billion kcal Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks = 42 billion kcal

Total kcal = MET \* Annual Median Hours \* Mean Body Weight (kg) \* Annual User Occasions

 Data sources: Ainsworth Compendium; 2017 SCORP Statewide Survey

# **Health Benefits Estimation**



#### ITHIM: Integrated Transport & Health Impact Modeling



Oregon HIA Program June 2015 www.healthoregon.org/hia Neil Maizlish, PhD, MPH, Epidemiologist Berkeley, California (neil3971@comcast.net)

A Tool for Estimating the Health Benefits from Outdoor Recreation in Oregon

by Tara Dunn

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

Honors College

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Honors Baccalaureate of Science in Natural Resources (Honors Associate)

> Presented May 21, 2018 Commencement June 2018

### **ITHIM Health Pathways, Diseases, and Injuries**

- Physical Activity
  - Ischemic Heart Disease
  - Hypertensive Heart Disease
  - Stroke
  - Diabetes
  - Dementia (Alzheimer's Disease)
  - Depression
  - Colon Cancer
  - Breast cancer

Women younger than 50, who get 2.5 hours of recreational physical activity a week may have a 25 percent lower risk of heart disease.



# Health Benefits

## \$1.42 billion year in Cost of Illness Savings

Top three activities: Walking on local streets / sidewalks = \$630 million Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks = \$146 million Walking on local trails / paths = \$126 million

17% of the estimated \$8.1 billion spent on chronic illnesses, or 4% of total health care expenditures in Oregon

# **Conceptual Model**









"What fits your busy schedule better, exercising one hour a day or being dead 24 hours a day?"





 Increased walking / biking on trails

#### Exposure

• Reduces relative risks of diseases









RR

# **ITHIM Health Measures**

- Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs)
  - ✓ Years Living with Disability + Years of Life Lost
  - Expresses deaths and illness for different diseases/injuries on a common scale
- Costs

### DALY





### **Physical Activity: Simplified Example of How ITHIM Works**



- Burden of Disease reduced (-19,332 DALYs)
- In practice, RRs come from a meta-analysis of the scientific literature



# **Recreation Calibration Worksheet**

	coposara	-	1 Mills				againerie				1.0		ngino -	
	A1	<b>-</b>	∫x ₩	/eekly min	utes spent	participati	ing in each	activity (N	ledian Par	ticipant)				
	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I.	J	K	L	М	N
	Weekly minute	es spent												
	participating i	n each												
	activity (Me	dian												
1	Participar	nt)	Į											
		,	-	day hiking	Long-	Jogging or						All-terrain		Riding
		Walking	Walking	on non-	distance	running	Jogging or		Bicycling		Bicycling	vehicle	Class III –	UTVs or
		on local	on local	local	hiking	on streets	running		on	Bicycling	on roads,	riding (3 &	Off-road	side-by-
		streets or	trails or	trails or	(back	or	on trails	Horseback	unpaved	on paved	streets or	4 wheel	motorcycli	side ATVs
2		sidewalks	paths	path	packing)	sidewalks	or paths	riding	trails	trails	sidewalks	ATVs,	ng	(non-
4	METS	3.5	3.5	3.5	7.0	7	7	3.8	5.8	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.
		Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of	Minutes of
		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Vigorous	Vigorous	Vigorous	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
		Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/W	Activity/V
5		eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek	eek
6	Rural	100.6849	34.52055	27.61644	27.61644	46.0274	23.0137	46.0274	23.0137	23.0137	34.52055	25.31507	46.0274	48.3287
7	Urban	161.6712	35.67123	24.16438	24.16438	57.53425	28.76712	9.205479	23.0137	23.0137	43.15068	20.71233	43.72603	16.1095
8														
9														
	Lookup Matrix	x for %												
10	Participati	ing												
				Walking/	Long-	Jogging or						Class I –		Class IV -
		Walking	Walking	day hiking	distance	running	Jogging or		Bicycling		Bicycling	All-terrain	Class III –	Riding
		on local	on local	on non-	hiking	on streets	running		on	Bicycling	on roads,	vehicle	Off-road	UTVs or
		streets or	trails or	local	(back	or	on trails	Horseback	unpaved	on paved	streets or	riding (3 &	motorcycli	side-by-
11		sidewalks	paths	trails or	packing)	sidewalks	or paths	riding	trails	trails	sidewalks	4 wheel	ng	side ATVs
13	Rural	0.773	0.68	0.519	0.105	0.16	0.116	0.083	0.126	0.193	0.262	0.166	0.046	0.08
14	Urban	0.8495	0.7545	0.559	0.1435	0.3	0.242	0.0275	0.1565	0.3365	0.424	0.0615	0.03	0.026
14 4	Cover shee	t / Instru	ictions OR v	ersion	Recreation )	Worksheet	Outputs	Recrea	tion Calibra	ation Inn	uts TO	Health sum		unty Pong

# OR Estimator Inputs / Outputs

	А	В	C D	E	F	G			
				Annual	physical activity benefit				
1	l li	nputs		per 30920 participants					
	Instructions: Fill in yello cells will be a	weells on this worksheet (blue automatically filled)		More in depth outputs can be found on the Outputs page					
2									
3	County (select)	Small Rural		Deaths	-2.838346183				
4	County Type	Rural		YLL	-18.17				
5	Current % of Total Population Participating	77%		YLD	-16.38				
6	County Population	40,000.00		DALYs	-34.55				
7	Current # Users	30,920.00		Value	-\$1,555,341.28				
8	Activity (select)	Walking on local streets or sidewalks							
9	MET Values For Activity	3.5							
10	Minutes of Moderate Activity/Week	100.6849315							
11	Desired Weekly Participation (weekly minutes per participant)	150							
12			1						

# **OR Estimator Outputs**

#### **Recreation Health Impact Estimator**

#### **Outputs Page**

Annual physical activity benefit per 30920 participants

			DALYs		
	YLL	YLD	(YLL+YLD)	Value	Deaths
Physical Activity	-18.17	-16.38	-34.55	-\$1,555,341.28	-2.8383

#### Health Outcomes by Disease

				DALYs		
9		YLL	YLD	(YLL+YLD)	Value	Deaths
10	Breast cancer	-0.36700	-0.13704	-0.50404	-\$64,948.74	0
11	Hypertensive H	D* -0.25359	-0.05753	-0.31112		0
12	Inflamatory HD	• 0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	4500 047 04	0
					-\$520,947.81	
13	Ischemic HD*	-7.99766	-1.87671	-9.87437		-1
14	Stroke*	-3.82166	-3.46318	-7.28484	-\$127,064.61	-1
15	Colon cancer	-0.13373	-0.02152	-0.15525	-\$18,552.85	0
16	Depression	-0.01318	-2.28350	-2.29667	-\$76,889.91	0
17	Dementia	-2.32781	-2.99158	-5.31939	-\$265,186.38	-1
18	Diabetes	-3.25357	-5.55067	-8.80424	-\$481,750.98	0
19	TOTAL	-18.16820	-16.38172	-34.54992	-\$1,555,341.28	-3
20	*Cardiovascular	r diseases				



#### 

Table 1. Energy Expenditures and Cost of Illness Savings from 2017 Outdoor Recreation Activity Participation in Oregon (2018 USD)

Activity	Total Participants (million)	% Population Participating	User Occasions, Total Annual (million)	Energy Expended, Total Annual kCal (billion)	Energy Expended, Annual / Participant, kCal	Energy Expended, Per User Occasion, kCal	COI Savings, Total Annual (\$million)	COI Savings, Annual / Participant	COI Savings, Per User Occasion
Non-motorized	Trail Activities	s					6		
Walking on local streets / sidewalks	2.716	83.2	312.726	117.893	43,406	377	\$385.405 - \$629.991	\$164.60 - \$231.95	\$1.43 - \$2.01
Walking on local trails / paths	2.416	74.0	113.083	57.497	23,801	508	\$71.602 - \$125.860	\$34.38 - \$52.10	\$0.73 - \$1.11
Walking / day hiking on non- local trails / paths	1.786	54.7	44.035	31.913	17,872	725	\$33.240 - \$45.556	\$21.59 - \$25.51	\$0.88 - \$1.03
Long-distance hiking (back packing)	0.431	13.2	4.915	15.992	37,111	3,254	\$5.670 - \$36.096	\$15.26 - \$83.77	\$1.34 - \$7.34
Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks	0.875	26.8	37.224	41.938	47,936	1,127	\$32.574 - \$145.605	\$43.19 - \$166.43	\$1.02 - \$3.91
Jogging / running on trails / paths	0.692	21.2	17.284	22.598	32,653	1,307	\$10.430 - \$64.721	\$17.48 - \$93.52	\$0.70 - \$3.74
Bicycling on unpaved trails	0.486	14.9	11.403	16.412	33,740	1,439	\$8.079 - \$26.983	\$19.27 - \$55.47	\$0.82 - \$2.37
Bicycling on paved trails	0.983	30.1	26.105	17.762	18,076	680	\$15.422 - \$15.840	\$15.69 - \$18.70	\$0.59 - \$0.70
Bicycling on roads, streets / sidewalks	1.254	38.4	51.251	32.086	25,596	626	\$47.311 - \$78.109	\$43.78 - \$62.31	\$1.07 - \$1.52
		TOTAL O kCAL (I	OREGON billion)	502.622	TOTAL OREGON COI SAVINGS (\$millions)		\$735.271 - \$1,415.872		

### Part B

### Total Net Economic Value from Residents' Outdoor Recreation Participation in Oregon

Oregon Outdoor Recreation Metrics: Health, Physical Activity, and Value

2019-2023 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan Supporting Documentation

Randall S. Rosenberger

# **Total Net Economic Value**

- Total value net of the costs of participation
  - Net Economic Value = Net Benefits = Net Willingness to Pay = Consumer Surplus



# Methods

Total Net Economic Value = \$/person/activity day \* #user occasions

- \$/person/activity day
  - Meta-regression analysis benefit transfer function
  - Developed using Recreation Use Values Database
  - Predicts \$/person/activity day for PNW region
- User occasions
  - 2017 SCORP Statewide Survey

# **Recreation Use Values Database**

- U.S. and Canada •
- 1958-2015 •
- 421 documents •

- 3,192 estimates of value
- 132 fields coded •
- 42 recreation activity categories

#### **Benefit Transfer of Outdoor Recreation Use Values**

RANDALL S. ROSENBERGER AND JOHN B. LOOMIS



United States Department of Agriculture

USD/

**Recreation Economic Values for Estimating Outdoor Recreation** Economic Benefits From the **National Forest System** 

Randall S. Rosenberger, Eric M. White, Jeffrey D. Kline, and Claire Cvitanovich



August



Pacific Northwe

esearch Static





Welcome to the 2016 updated Recreation Use Values Database (RUVD) for North America. What you will find here are links to the database, bibliography, and background information. If you have questions, comments and/or suggestions about the RUVD, would like assistance in using it for benefit transfer, or would like to submit documentation on North American studies not in it, please contact Dr. Randall Rosenberger (R.Rosenberger@oregonstate.edu).

We also are interested in how you apply benefit transfer for recreation valuation, so please submit documentation about your applications.



# Meta-Regression Models



# **Benefit Transfer Meta-Regression Models**



Predicted Welfare (Value) Estimate

SCORP Activity	RUVD Activity	2017 SCORP User Occasions (million)	Activity Days per User Occasion	2017 Activity Days (million)	MRA RUVD Value / Person / Activity Day (\$; 2018 USD)	Total Net Economic Value (\$million; 2018 USD)
Non-motorized Trail Activities					7	
Walking on local streets / sidewalks	Walking	312.726	0.993	310.586	\$14.47	\$4,493.226
Walking on local trails / paths	Walking	113.083	0.998	112.843	\$14.47	\$1,632.495
Walking / day hiking on non- local trails / paths	Hiking	44.035	1	44.035	\$87.66	\$3,860.354
Long-distance hiking (backpacking)	Backpacking	4.915	2.080	10.222	\$23.33	\$238.470
Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks	Jogging / running	37.224	1	37.224	\$69.29	\$2,579.240
Jogging / running on trails / paths	Jogging / running	17.284	1	17.284	\$69.29	\$1,197.586
Horseback riding	General other recreation	2.626	1	2.626	\$72.00	\$189.074
Bicycling on unpaved trails	Mountain biking	11.403	1	11.403	\$131.03	\$1,494.086
Bicycling on paved trails	Leisure biking	26.105	1	26.105	\$58.14	\$1,517.812
Bicycling on roads / streets / sidewalks	Leisure biking	51.251	0.996	51.061	\$58.14	\$2,968.863
Sub-total - Non-motorized Trail	Activities	620.651		623.390		\$20,171.206
Motorized Activities						
Class I – All-terrain vehicle riding (3 & 4 wheel ATVs, straddle seat and handle bars)	Off-road vehicle driving	5.746	1	5.746	\$50.38	\$289.475
Class II – Off-road 4-wheel driving (jeeps / pick-ups / dune buggies / SUVs)	Off-road vehicle driving	8.895	1	8.895	\$50.38	\$448.157
Class III – Off-road motorcycling	Off-road vehicle driving	2.038	1	2.038	\$50.38	\$102.672

Table 1. User occasions, activity days, and total net economic value.

# **Total Net Economic Value**

SCOPP Activity	Total Net
SCORI ACIVILY	Economic Value
Non-motorized Trail Activities	\$20.2 billion
Outdoor Leisure / Sporting Activities	\$11.8 billion
Nature Study Activities	\$10.8 billion
Non-motorized Water-based and Beach Activities	\$3.8 billion
Hunting and Fishing Activities	\$3.5 billion
Vehicle-based Camping Activities	\$1.8 billion
Motorized Activities	\$1.4 billion
Non-motorized Snow Activities	\$0.9 billion



Figure 3. SCORP activity categories by total net economic value

Direct economic impacts from outdoor recreation spending in Oregon: \$12 billion - \$16 billion

SCOPP Activity	Total Net
SCORI Adivity	<b>Economic Value</b>
Walking on local streets / sidewalks	\$4.5 billion
Walking / day hiking on non-local trails / paths	\$3.9 billion
Other nature / wildlife / forest / wildflower observation	\$3.5 billion
Sightseeing / driving or motorcycling for pleasure	\$3.1 billion
Relaxing / hanging out / escaping heat / noise, etc.	\$3.0 billion
Bicycling on roads / streets / sidewalks	\$3.0 billion
Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks	\$2.6 billion
Bird watching	\$2.4 billion
Fishing	\$2.2 billion
Beach activities - ocean	\$2.0 billion

Figure 2. Top ten SCORP activities by total net economic value

### **Trails Funding Needs & Sources**

# Determining a total dollar estimate for the current level of need.

### Within UGB Data Collection:

- Planned need for non-motorized trails and trail facilities.
- Major rehabilitation of non-motorized trails and trail facilities.

### **Outside UGB Data Collection:**

- Maintenance backlog for non-motorized trails and trail facilities.
- Major rehabilitation of non-motorized trails and trail facilities.



# Need For Non-motorized Trail Funding

### Within UGB Data Collection:

- Of the 300 providers contacted, 110 completed and returned forms.
- The 110 completions include the majority of providers with recreation departments and staff across the state.



### **Close-to-home trail development need data collection**

Non-motorized Trail Corridor Facilities							
Asphalt Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet					
Concrete Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet					
Natural/ Native Surface Trail (dirt, gravel, or rock)	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet					
Non-motorized Trail Corridor Support Facilities							
Boardwalk- Wood	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet					
Boardwalk- Fiberglass	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet					
Boardwalk- Composite	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet					
Trail Bridge- Steel	Length in feet	Width in feet					
Trail Bridge- Wood	Length in feet	Width in feet					
Trail Bridge- Fiberglass	Length in feet	Width in feet					
Trail Bridge- Concrete	Length in feet	Width in feet					
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)	Length in feet	Diameter in inches					
Restroom building	Type -Vault	Number of stalls					
Restroom building	Type- Flush	Number of stalls					
Asphalt parking	Number of spaces						
Concrete parking	Number of spaces						
Gravel parking	Number of spaces						
Asphalt trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile						
Concrete trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile						
Gravel trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile						
Non-motorized Trail Corridor Land/ Easement Purchase							
Land purchase: Total land purchase need for all planned trail development projects in trail miles.							
Land purchase trail miles (rounded to nearest 1/10 mile)							
Easement purchase: Total easement purchase need for all plan	Easement purchase: Total easement purchase need for all planned trail development projects in trail miles.						
Easement purchase trail miles (rounded to nearest 1/10 mile)							
Estimate of land and easement purchase costs (at estimated current market value) for the land and easement purchase need reported above.							

### **Close-to-home trail major rehabilitation need data collection**

Non-motorized Trail Corridor Faciliti	es		
	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Trail width in	
Asphalt Irali	1/10th mile	feet	
Concrete Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Trail width in	
	1/10th mile	feet	
Natural/ Native Surface Trail (dirt,	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Trail width in	
gravel, or rock)	1/10th mile	feet	
Non-motorized Trail Corridor Support	rt Facilities		
Boardwalk, Wood	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Width in foot	
Boardwark- Wood	1/10th mile	Width in leet	
Poardwalk, Eiborglass	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Width in foot	
	1/10th mile	Widthin leet	
Boardwalk-Composite	Linear miles (rounded to nearest	Width in feet	
	1/10th mile		
Trail Bridge- Steel	Length in feet	Width in feet	
Trail Bridge- Wood	Length in feet	Width in feet	
Trail Bridge- Fiberglass	Length in feet	Width in feet	
Trail Bridge- Concrete	Length in feet	Width in feet	
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)	Length in feet	Diameter in	
		inches	
Restroom building		Number of	
		stalls	
Restroom building	Type- Flush	Number of	
		stalls	
Asphalt parking	Number of spaces		
Concrete parking	Number of spaces		
Gravel parking	Number of spaces		
Asphalt trailbead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest		
	1/10th mile		
Concrete trailbead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest		
	1/10th mile		
Gravel trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest		
	1/10th mile		

#### SCORP Non-Motorized Trail <u>Planned Need</u> Reporting Form

Contact Information	Provider Name: Bend Park and Recreation District
	Reporters name: Laura Underhill
	Phone: 541-706-6155
	Email:laurau@bendparksandrec.org

Non-	M	otor	zed	Τ	rai	С	orr	d	or]	fac	ility	

Facility Type	Length Measure (linear miles - round to nearest 1/10 mile)	Width Measure (actual trail width in feet)
Asphalt Trail	2.2	10'
Concrete Trail	1.32972	10'
Natural/Native Surface Trail	69.77	varies

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Support Facility							
Facility Type	Number (planned/ needed)	Length Measure (in miles - round to nearest 1/10 mile)	Width Measure (in feet)	Material Type			
Board Walk				Choose an item.			
Board Walk				Choose an item.			
Board Walk				Choose an item.			
Board Walk				Choose an item.			

+

Non-Motorized Tra	il Corridor Supp	port Facility		
Facility Type	Number (planned/ needed)	Length Measure (in feet)	Wid th Measure (in feet)	Material Type
Trail Bridge	1	300	12	Steel
Trail Bridge	1	85	10	Steel
Trail Bridge	1	150	10	Steel
Trail Bridge				Choose an item.

#### Non-Motorized Trail <u>Planned Need</u> Reporting Form (cont.)

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Support Facility						
Facility Type	Number (planned/ needed)	Length Measure (in feet)	Diameter Measure (in inches)			
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)	0					
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)						
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)						
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)						

#### Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Support Facility

Facility Type	Number (planned/ needed)
Gravel Parking (parking spaces) 6 planned - 20 spa	
Asphalt Parking (parking spaces)	1 planned - 20 spaces
Choose an item.	

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Facility							
Facility Type	Number of Buildings (planned/ needed)	Type	Number of Stalls				
Restroom Building	0	Choose an item.					
Restroom Building		Choose an item.					
Restroom Building		Choose an item.					
Restroom Building		Choose an item.					

#### Non-Motorized Trail <u>Planned Need</u> Reporting Form (cont.)

#### Non-motorized Trail Corridor Land/Easement Purchase Estimate current land acquisition/ easement cost (at current market value) for planned/ needed nonmotorized trail development. Miles (round to nearest 1/10 mile) Land Purchase - Report your agency's total land purchase need for all planned trail development in trail miles. Do not 7 include land you already own. Easement Purchase - Report your agency's total easement purchase need for all planned trail development projects in trail 70 miles. Do not include easements you already own. Estimated Cost - Estimate land and easement purchase costs (at estimated current market value) for the land and easement purchase need reported above. Total cost of all Land and Easement Purchase Needs: \$554,400 This total cost estimate is based on (place an X in the box next to <u>all</u> that apply) Recent trail corridor acquisition costs County assessor estimates Appraisal X Educated guess - based on trail price values and the fact we use extraction rather than purchase for development Finally, if additional grant funding was available for non-motorized trail development projects in Oregon, would your agency/ organization apply for such funding in the next 10 years (assuming no match required)? Please mark an X in either the yes or no box below. X Yes, our agency/ organization would apply for such grant funding. No, our agency/ organization would not apply for such grant funding

When competed, email this document to Terry Bergerson: terry.bergerson@oregon.gov

3

STATE

1

#### SCORP·Non-Motorized·Trail·<u>Major·Rehabilitation</u>¶ Reporting·Form¶

	Provider Name: Bend Park and Recreation District	×
Contact¶	Reporters Name: Jeff Amarala	a
Information¤	Phone: 541-706-6202∝	×
	Email: JeffA@bendparksandrec.org¤	×
	e	

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Facility a				
Facility Type=	Length Measure (linear miles needing major rehab - round to nearest 1/10 mile)¤	Width Measure¶ (actual trail width in feet)⊠	\$	
Asphalt Trail	.3¤	6¤	]	
Asphalt Trail¤	1.7×	15¤	1	
Natural/Native Surface Trail¤	.5¤	49	1	

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Support Facilitya						
Facility∙Type≈	Number¶ (needing- major-rehab)	Length Measure (in miles - round to nearest 1/10 mile) <sup>22</sup>	Width Measure¶ (in feet)¤	Material∙Type≃	1	
Board Walk¤	l¤	. <b>1</b> ¤	40	Wood¤	]	
Board Walk¤	×	8	2	Choose an item.	3	
Board Walk¤	×	8	2	Choose an item.	3	
Board Walk	×	B	8	Choose an item.¤	3	

			 -
1.2			
	-	-	

C.

Non-Motorized Trail Corridor Support Facilitya					
Facility Type≍	Number (needing- major-rehab)	Length Measure¶ (in feet)¤	Width •Measure¶ (in feet)¤	Material · Type≃	
Trail·Bridge¤	18	15¤	<b>4</b> ¤	Wood¤	
Trail·Bridge¤	18	20≃	<b>4</b> 12	Wood¤	
Trail·Bridge¤	×	8	8	Choose an item.¤	
Trail·Bridge≈	×	۵	8	Choose an item.¤	

1¶

1

q

#### SCORP·Non-Motorized·Trail·Major·Rehabilitation¶ Reporting·Form:(cont.)¶

Facility∙Type≍		Number¶ Leng (needing-major-rehab)¤			g <b>th ∙Measu</b> (in feet)¤	e¶	Diameter Measure (in-inches)¤	
Culvert (minimum 18"d	iameter)¤	×		×		×		
Culvert (minimum 18" d	iameter)∙¤	×			×		×	
Culvert (minimum 18" d	iameter)∙¤	×			×		×	
Culvert (minimum 18"d	iameter)¤	×			×		×	
Non-Motorized Tra	il-Corrid	or Support F	acility	y Cl				
Facility∙Type≍					Num	er (s	eeding-major-rehab)¤	
Asphalt Parking (parking	;∙spaces)¤						3¤	
Choose an item.¤							8	
Choose an item.¤							×	
Choose an item.¤						8		
Choose an item.¤						×		
Choose an item.¤							×	
Choose an item.¤							8	
Non Motorized Two		ovFasilitas						
Non-Motorized I ra	I-Corrio	огтасшіу⇔						
Facility Type¤	Number (needin	r•of•Buildings¶ g-major-rehab)¤		Тур	eo	N	umber of Stalls=	
Restroom Building¤	×		Choo	se∙an∙i	tem.¤	\$		
Restroom Building¤	x		Choo	se∙an∙i	item.¤ 🕴	1		
Restroom Building¤	×		Choo	se∙an∙i	tem.¤ 3			
Restroom Building¤	oom Buildings a Choose an item. s							
Finally, if additional gran in Oregon, would your a match required)? Please	it∙funding gency/∙org mark∙an•X	was available for anization apply f in either the yes	or such	iotoriz i fundi box bei	ed trail maj ng in the ne low.¤	or re st 1(	habilitation projects ) years (assuming no	

# Need For Non-motorized Trail Funding

### **Dispersed-Setting Data Collection:**

- Of the 44 providers contacted, 7 Counties, 3 Federal Agencies, and 2 State Agencies completed and returned forms.
- Trail systems reported by respondents include the majority of dispersed-setting non-motorized trails in the state.



# Dispersed-setting deferred maintenance and major rehabilitation need data collection

Non-motorized Trail Corridor Facil	Condition Assessment				
Asphalt/Concrete Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Compacted Gravel Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Native Soil Trail	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Trail width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Non-motorized Trail Corridor Supp	ort Facilities		С	ondition Assessm	ent
Boardwalk- Wood	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Boardwalk- Fiberglass	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Boardwalk- Composite	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Trail Bridge- Steel	Length in feet	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Trail Bridge- Wood	Length in feet	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Trail Bridge- Fiberglass	Length in feet	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Trail Bridge- Concrete	Length in feet	Width in feet	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Culvert (minimum 18" diameter)	Length in feet	Diameter in inches	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Restroom building	Type -Vault	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Restroom building	Type- Flush	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Asphalt parking	Number of spaces	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Concrete parking	Number of spaces	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Gravel parking	Number of spaces	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Asphalt trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Concrete trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab
Gravel trailhead access road	Linear miles (rounded to nearest 1/10th mile	Number of stalls	% well maintained	% not maintained	% in need of major rehab

### **Converting reported facilities to dollars**

STAT	SOM TELS							
TRAIL D FSTIMA	DEVELOPMENT COST GUIDE FOI ATE OF PROBABILE COST	R OREGON PARKS	SAND RECRE	EATION DEPARTM	IENTS SCORP PI	ROJE	CT	1st Edition (Q4 - 20 Cast possible the OCh Cast Magazeme
ltem		Length	Vidth	Direct Constructio n Cost	Constructio n Cost incl. Mark ups	Tot Per	al <del>v</del> . Design, mitting, Etc.	Notes
					40.0%		34.6%	
Trail Net	twork - New Construction	Length (Mile)	Width (LF)					
	1 Asphalt trail (mile)	1.00	5	145,884.44	204,238.22	\$	274,904.65	
	2 Concrete trail (mile)	1.00	5	277,884.44	389,038.22	\$	523,645.45	
	3 Gravel trail (mile)	1.00	5	74,311.11	104,035.56	\$	140,031.86	
	4 Native surface trail (mile)	1.00	5	34,320.00	48,048.00	\$	64,672.61	
				Subtot	al Trail system	\$	1,003,254.56	
Boardw	alk - New Construction	Length (LF)	Width (LF)	_				
	1 Concrete structure	1	5	444.98	622.97	\$	838.52	
	1 Metal structure	1	5	444.98	622.97	\$	838.52	
	2 Timber structure	1	5	239.98	335.97	\$	452.22	
	3 Synthetic structure	1	5	209.98	293.97	\$	395.69	
							4 0 0 0	
				SUDCO	ocal Boardwalk	¥	1,686	
Trail Brid	dae - New Construction	Length (LE)	Width (LE)					
TTGIL DIT	1 Concrete structure	1	12	2 573 96	3 603 54	t	4 850 36	
	1 Metal structure	1	12	2 433 96	3 407 54	±	4 586 55	
	2 Timber structure	1	12	1,931,96	2,704,74	÷	3,640,58	
	3 Fiberglass structure	1	12	1.789.96	2.505.94	ŝ	3.372.99	
				Subtol	al Trail Bridge	\$	11,600	
Culvert-	- New Construction	Length (LF)						
	1 Culvert - 18" dia. or less	1		56.94	79.72	\$	107.31	
	2 Culvert - 24" dia. or less	1		70.49	98.68	\$	132.83	
	3 Culvert - 36" dia. or less	1		109.52	153.33	\$	206.38	
	4 Culvert - 48" dia. or less	1		151.15	211.61	\$	284.82	
				<b>•</b>	htotal Culuret	•	107	
				51	iococal Cuivert		107	
Parking	Lot - New Construction	Length (LE)	Width (LE)			_		
	1 Asphalt	9	18	1.640.04	2.296.06	\$	3.090.49	
	or # of stalls (9'x18')	1		1.640.04	2,296.06	\$	3.090.49	
	2 Concrete	9	18	2,992.74	4,189.84	ŝ	5,639,52	
	or # of stalls (9'x18')	1	10	2,992.74	4,189,84	±	5,639,52	
	3 Gravel	9	18	674.70	944 58	ŝ	1.271.40	
	or # of stalls (9'x18')	1	10	674 70	944 58	\$	1,271,40	
		· · · ·			0.1.00	<del></del>		
				Subtol	al Parking Lot	\$	18,731	
•••••	<u> </u>							

### Total non-motorized trail need estimates, 2018

Trail Need Category	Estimated Need	% of Total Need
Close-To-Home Trail Development	\$502,800,000	78%
Close-To-Home Trail Major Rehabilitation	\$60,900,000	10%
Dispersed-Setting Trail Major Rehabilitation	\$62,000,000	10%
Dispersed-Setting Trail Deferred Maintenance	\$14,700,000	2%
Total	\$640,400,000	



Development Category	Estimated Development Cost
Trail corridor	\$309,800,000
Land & easement acquisition	\$89,000,000
Bridges	\$42,800,000
Boardwalks	\$36,500,000
Access roads	\$8,800,000
Restrooms	\$8,600,000
Parking	\$6,400,000
Culverts	\$900,000
Total	\$502,800,000

<b>Rehabilitation</b> <b>Category</b>	Estimated Rehabilitation Cost
Trail corridor	\$46,100,000
Boardwalks	\$5,800,000
Bridges	\$3,500,000
Restrooms	\$2,500,000
Access roads	\$1,600,000
Parking	\$1,000,000
Culverts	\$400,000
Total	\$60,900,000



# Close-to-home non-motorized trail corridor need cost estimates by surface type, 2018

Trail Corridor Development- Surface Type	Estimated Miles	Estimated Development Cost	Trail Corridor Rehab- Surface Type	Estimated Miles	Estimated Rehab Cost
Asphalt	353	\$203,800,000	Asphalt	82	\$31,700,000
Concrete	79	\$87,200,000	Concrete	8	\$7,000,000
Natural/ Native Surface	260	\$18,800,000	Natural/ Native Surface	95	\$7,400,000
Total	692	\$309,800,000	Total	185	\$46,100,000



# Dispersed-setting non-motorized trail need cost estimates, 2018

Maintenance	Estimated Deferred
Category	Maintenance
	Cost
Trail corridor	\$8,300,000
Access roads	\$3,400,000
Parking	\$1,200,000
Restrooms	\$1,100,000
Bridges	\$400,000
Boardwalks	\$300,000
Culverts	\$30,000
Total	\$14,730,000

Rehabilitation Category	Estimated Rehabilitation Cost
Access roads	\$28,900,000
Trail corridor	\$18,600,000
Parking	\$6,300,000
Restrooms	\$5,800,000
Boardwalks	\$1,400,000
Bridges	\$900,000
Culverts	\$100,000
Total	\$62,000,000



# Recommend a total dollar amount needed for a proposed dedicated non-motorized trails fund.

### Funding need: \$640,400,000



- Close-to-home trail development
- Close-to-home trail major rehabilitation
- Dispersed-setting trail deferred maintenance
- Dispersed-setting trail major rehabilitation



# Annual non-motorized trail annual funding allocation for two planning scenarios, Oregon

Trail Need Category	Scenario #1 20 year timeframe	Scenario #2 30 year timeframe
	Annual fundi	ng allocation
Close-To-Home Trail Development	\$20.1 million	\$13.4 million
Close-To-Home Trail Major Rehabilitation	\$2.4 million	\$1.6 million
Dispersed-Setting Trail Deferred Maintenance	\$0.6 million	\$0.4 million
Dispersed-Setting Trail Major Rehabilitation	\$2.5 million	\$1.7 million
Signature Trail Development and Maintenance	\$9.4 million	\$7.9 million
Total Annual Allocation	\$35 million	\$25 million
Total Scenario Allocation	\$700 million	\$750 million

This analysis identifies a funding need of \$50 - \$70 million a biennium

# Describing the objectives of a non-motorized trails fund for the state.

- 1. Expand the state's outstanding non-motorized trail infrastructure to meet the needs of a growing population.
- 2. Provide high-quality non-motorized trail experiences that meet the demands of Oregonians.
- 3. Increase non-motorized trail connectivity to better use the state's existing non-motorized trail infrastructure and provide more trail opportunities.
- 4. Strengthen the individual health of Oregonians by enabling them to engage in daily physical activity on non-motorized trails.



- 5. Strengthen Oregon community health by enabling residents to engage in a range of highly valued non-motorized trail activities.
- 6. Strengthen the economic health of local economies by providing highquality non-motorized trail opportunities for non-local residents and outof-state tourists.
- 7 Support the development and maintenance of priority signature trail systems\* in the state.

\*Examples of signature trails include the Salmonberry Trail, Oregon Coast Trail, Joseph Branch Rail Trail, and trails with Scenic or Regional Trail designation.





## Identifying examples of funding sources.

- 1. State cell phone tax
- 2. E-cigarettes
- 3. State lodging tax
- 4. State rental car tax
- 5. Sugary drink excise tax
- 6. Employee payroll tax
- 7. Gas tax revenues for roads not maintained by ODOT
- 8. Lottery bond



### **State Cell Phone Tax**

OPRD estimates that a 75 cent per month increase in the month cell phone tax would generate an additional **\$42.3 to \$43.9 million in annual revenue** for non-motorized trails.

Monthly tax increase	New tax rate	Funding (\$)*
\$0.10	2.0%	\$5.8 to \$5.9 million
\$0.25	2.4%	\$14.5 to \$14.6 million
\$0.75	3.6%	\$42.3 to \$43.9 million
\$1.50	5.4%	\$81.3 to \$87.8 million
\$2.25	7.2%	\$116.9 to \$131.8 million

Based on average monthly bill of \$41.50.

\*Additional revenue is calculated by subracting revenue raised by the current \$0.75 tax from the toal tax revenue at the new tax rate.



### State Lodging Tax

OPRD estimates that a 1% - 2% increase in the tax rate would generate an additional **\$20.7 to \$42.4 million in annual revenue** for non-motorized trails.

Tax rate increase	New tax rate	Funding (\$)*
0.1%	1.9%	\$2.1 million
0.5%	2.3%	\$10.5 to \$10.6 million
1.0%	2.8%	\$20.7 to \$21.2 million
2.0%	3.8%	\$40.6 to \$42.4 million
3.0%	4.8%	\$59.6 to \$63.6 million
4.0%	5.8%	\$77.7 to \$84.7 million
* Additional revenue is calculation the total tax revenue at	ated by subtracting 1.8% of the new tax rate	the tax base (current tax rate)



OPRD estimates that a tax rate of \$0.01 per ounce of sugary drink could raise approximately **\$49.7 to \$124.3 million in annual revenue** for non-motorized trails.

Ta	x Rate	<b>Potential Revenue</b>
(	\$/oz)	(Annual)
\$	0.01	\$49.7 to \$124.3 million
\$	0.015	\$74.6 to \$186.4 million
Bas	sed on Oreg	on populaton of 4,142,776



### **Employee Payroll Tax**

OPRD estimates that a payroll tax could generate approximately **\$24.5 million in annual revenue** for nonmotorized trails (based on a .03% of employee payroll tax). This equates to less than 30 cents per week for the average Oregon worker.

	Fis	cal Year Fo	recasted Ta	ax Collectio	ons	
Payroll tax rate for						How much payroll is required to raise \$1
trails	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	in tax? (\$)
0.01%	8.2	9.5	10.3	10.8	11.3	10,000.00
0.015%	12.2	14.2	15.4	16.2	17.0	6,666.67
0.02%	16.3	19.0	20.6	21.6	22.7	5,000.00
0.025%	20.4	23.7	25.7	27.0	28.3	4,000.00
0.03%	24.5	28.5	30.9	32.4	34.0	3,333.33
0.035%	28.6	33.2	36.0	37.8	39.7	2,857.14
0.04%	32.7	38.0	41.2	43.2	45.3	2,500.00
0.045%	36.7	42.7	46.3	48.6	51.0	2,222.22
0.05%	40.8	47.5	51.4	54.0	56.7	2,000.00
Forecast values are sl	nown in \$r	millions				



## **Options For Administering A Fund**

- OPRD administration
- Create a semi-independent board or agency
- Establish an Oregon recreational trails investment trust fund
- Establish an independent nonprofit organization



Identifying implementation actions for moving forward with establishing a dedicated non-motorized trails fund for Oregon

- Identify other funding options
- Evaluate fiscal & economic implications
- Look at implementation requirements
- Examine social acceptability
- Examine the degree of association with intended use
- Compare benefits of each fund against implementation challenges
- Identify if a statute (proposed bill) or constitutional amendment (initiative) is the preferred method

## **Technical and Policy Review**

- Assemble a coordinating body with necessary skills & resources to complete the draft legislation.
- The Office of Outdoor Recreation is a likely candidate for spearheading such an effort.
- Create a coordination structure necessary for a successful advocacy effort.



# **Planning Cost & Timeline**

Product	Timeline	Cost
Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey	16 months	\$65 <i>,</i> 000
Technical support (\$10,000)		
Printing & mailing (\$45,000)		
Qualtrics (\$7,000)		
Data entry (3,000)		
Oregon Outdoor Recreation Metrics (OSU)	12 months	\$50 <i>,</i> 000
Trail funding need data collection	7 months	Staff
Trail development & maintenance cost estimator	4 months	\$5 <i>,</i> 000
Tax alternative revenue estimates	3 months	Staff
Total		\$120,000



# Why is SCORP a good plan for funding strategy?

March 29, 2019 March 29, 2019 Mrs Stanley J. Austin Regional Director, Pacific West Region National Park Service 333 Bush Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, CA 94104-2828 Dear Mr. Austin The state of Oregon is pleased to submit the 2019–2023 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to the National Park Service (NPS). The document constitutes Oregon's basic five- year policy plan for outdoor recreation. With the successful completion of this plan, the state of Oregon will maintain its eligibility to participate in the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The plan was prepared to be in compliance with Chapter 2 of the Federal LWCF Grants Manual so there were many opportunities for public input during the planning effort. A substantial investment was made to conduct a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as well as their opinions about park and recreation management. A total of 3,550 randomly selected Oregonians conpleted a survey questionnaire. A 23-member SCORP Advisory Committee was established to asist the department with the planning process. Members of the group represented warious organizations that included additional input on the draft plan. This plan closely examines the effects of an aging population, an increasingly diverse population, lack of youth engagement in outdoor recreation, underserved low-income populations, and increasing levels of programs and recreation providers to better describe the benefits resulting from recreation planning process and recreation providers to better describe the benefits resulting from recreation planning programs aimed at developing and fostering broader constituencies and wider community support throughout the state. It will also assist communities and other jurisdictions in their local park and recreation planning programs aimed at developing and fostering broader constituencies and wider community support throughout the state. It will al	
Mr. Stanley J. Austin Regional Director, Pacific West Region National Park Service 333 Bush Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, CA 94104-2828 Dear Mr. Austin: The state of Oregon is pleased to submit the 2019–2023 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to the National Park Service (NPS). The document constitutes Oregon's basic five- year policy plan for outdoor recreation. With the successful completion of this plan, the state of Oregon will maintain its eligibility to participate in the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The plan was prepared to be in compliance with Chapter 2 of the Federal LWCF Grants Manual so there were many opportunities for public input during the planning effort. A substantial investment was made to conduct a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as well as their opinions about park and recreation management. A total of 3,550 ranked to assist the department with the planning process. Members of the group represented various organizations that included local, state, and federal recreation providers, recreational user groups, and universities. In addition, there was a month-long public review and comment period for recreation providers and the general public to provide additional input on the draft plan. This plan closely examines the effects of an aging population, an increasingly diverse population, lack of physical inactivity within these populations. A series of carefully-designed research projects provide outdoor recreation managers with usable information and recommendations to guide federal, state, and local units of grograms aimed at developing and fostering broader constituencies and wider community support throughout the state. It will also assist communities and other jurisdictions in their local park and recreation providers to the the describe the benefits resulting from recreation planning efforts.	
<text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text>	
The state of Oregon is pleased to submit the 2019-2023 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to the National Park Service (NPS). The document constitutes Oregon's basic five- year policy plan for outdoor recreation. With the successful completion of this plan, the state of Oregon will maintain its eligibility to participate in the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The plan was prepared to be in compliance with Chapter 2 of the Federal LWCF Grants Manual so there were many opportunities for public input during the planning effort. A substantial investment was made to conduct a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as well as their opinions about park and recreation management. A total of 3,550 randomly selected Oregonians completed a survey questionnaire. A 23-member SCORP Advisory Committee was established to assist the dpartment with the planning process. Members of the group represented various organizations that included local, state, and federal recreation providers, recreational user groups, and universities. In addition, there was a month-long public review and comment period for recreation providers, and the general public to provide additional input on the draft plan.	
The plan was prepared to be in compliance with Chapter 2 of the Federal LWCF Grants Manual so there were many opportunities for public input during the planning effort. A substantial investment was made to conduct a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as completed a survey questionnaire. A 23-member SCORP Advisory Committee was established to assist the department with the planning process. Members of the group represented various organizations that included load, state, and federal recreation providers, recreation providers and the general public to provide additional input on the draft plan.	
This plan closely examines the effects of an aging population, an increasingly diverse population, lack of youth engagement in outdoor recreation, underserved low-income populations, and increasing levels of physical inactivity within these populations. A series of carefully-designed research projects provide outdoor recreation managers with usable information and recommendations to guide federal, state, and local units of government, as well as the private sector in making policy decisions addressing these key changes. The plan will assist parks and recreation providers to better describe the benefits resulting from recreation projects and programs aimed at developing and fostering broader constituencies and wider community support throughout the state. It will also assist communities and other jurisdictions in their local park and recreation planning efforts. Finally, the state of Oregon would like to thank the NPS and the Pacific West Region Office for the financial and technical support provided during the SCORP planning process. We also look forward to the opportunity to work with NPS staff in the administration of the LWCF program in the state of Oregon in years to come. Sincerely,	
Finally, the state of Oregon would like to thank the NPS and the Pacific West Region Office for the financial and technical support provided during the SCORP planning process. We also look forward to the opportunity to work with NPS staff in the administration of the LWCF program in the state of Oregon in years to come. Sincerely,	
Sincerely,	
Kate Brown	
KB:jm,kl	
254 STATE CAPITOL, SALEM OR 97301-4047 (503) 378-3111 FAX (503) 378-8970	

Ð

# Health Benefits and Funding for Close-to-Home Recreational Trails







2019 International Trails Symposium April 29, 2019