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## APPENDIX A. STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009 – 2013 LOUISIANA SCORP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOP TEN PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>1) Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Professional Planning, Master Planning, Regional Needs Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) New Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Renovations and Updating of existing facilities and routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Education &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Better Wages and Salaries, Additional Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) Signage - Informational, Directional, Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Improve Accessibility - ADA &amp; elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) Promotion &amp; Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ADDITIONAL FUNDING PRIORITIES | Roadway Improvements, Provide Legislation necessary for general support, Infrastructure, Drainage, Erosion Control, Safety and Security provisions, New Equipment and Material Purchase, Employee Continuing Education & Training, Certification, Development of Web Site (outdoor recreation information) - networking for providers, contractors & users, Reevaluate Fee Schedule, Nontraditional Sports Facilities, Post Inspections, Recreation Guide overhaul, Investigate new sources of funding and ways to self-generate funds through taxes, grants |

<p>| ACQUISITION | 1) Significant &amp; Unique Areas &amp; High Quality Areas |
|            | 2) For Protection, Preservation &amp; Restoration - Coastlines &amp; oil production sites, Salt water intrusion prone areas, Erosion prone areas |
|            | 3) For Public Access to Lands for provision or extension of water resource |
|            | 4) Land for Special Use - ORV trails, Nature Walks |
|            | 5) Land for Natural Resource Based Recreation and Nature Centers near metro areas |
|            | 6) Creation of Buffer Zones adjacent to sensitive areas |
|            | 7) Transition Areas, River Diversion Lands |
|            | 8) Land for Non-Consumptive use |
|            | 9) Marsh &amp; Wetland areas |
|            | 10) Kisatchie Forest Land Consolidation (contiguous) by exchanging non-adjacent land for privately owned adjacent land |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOP TEN PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEVELOPMENT                    | 1) Sports and Athletic Facilities  
2) Regional & Cultural Learning Centers and attractions  
3) Trails & Trailheads (rural & metropolitan) – hiking, interpretive, sport (ATV, OHV, bike, BMX, motor cross, canoe, tubing, equestrian, etc), ‘Blue-Ways’, Transportation Links  
4) Access: Bank & coastline treatments (piers, boardwalks, boat ramps, etc)  
5) Universal Access – ADA & elderly  
6) Extension and expansion of existing facilities  
7) Statewide information database for providers and users  
8) Statewide collaboration, coordination & partnerships, (funding, promotion, development, maintenance & operations)  
9) Picnic areas  
10) Safe Urban Sanctuaries                                                                                                                                 |
| ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES | Underwater Recreation, Artificial Reefs, Support Facilities (restrooms, comfort stations, Educational experience facilities, Outdoor Event Areas, Playgrounds, Nontraditional Sports Facilities (skateboard parks, extreme sports, inline skating, interactive water-spray parks, disk golf, firearm shooting ranges, ropes & obstacle courses), Concession facilities, Safety & Emergency Plans, Sustainable Construction, Greenways and greenbelts |
| PROMOTION & MARKETING           | 1) Better Provision of Brochures, Maps & Information to providers, local merchants, community & Tourist Centers, Chamber of Commerce, local libraries  
2) Regional Attractions, Info Centers, Facilities, Programs  
3) Cross Reference Guides, agency collaborative & cooperative opportunities  
4) Promotion - Public Education of Health, Fitness, Stress Reduction, Crime Reduction benefits  
5) Trail Guide Production & Distribution – tie in all levels, community, state & federal  
6) Jobs, Career Opportunities  
7) Encourage more regional cooperation, cross promotion of events, tours  
8) Promote Educational Programs and class field trips and or school visits by park staff  
9) Showcase individual park’s strengths, resources, local amenities, unique ecosystems & weather  
10) Increase Efforts Local, Statewide and Nationwide in TV, Radio, ‘Web |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOP TEN PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL PROMOTION &amp; MARKETING PRIORITIES</td>
<td>Commercial Vendor opportunities, Offer Incentives to increase awareness of facilities, sites, events &amp; programs to locals for their benefit as well as word of mouth advertising locally and to tourists, Provide Education, Stewardship, and Opportunities &amp; Incentives for local facilities’ personnel to bring their families to nearby sites and facilities, Outreach to wider range of users, utilize chamber of commerce, Promote site history &amp; programs unique to site, Promote hunting lease sites, Promote Tour Vendors: bus, boat, RV Rallies, Promote Anti-Litter Programs through education, Fee Waiver Promotions, awareness of ‘no fee’ sites, Increase Awareness of accessible sites, Increase Awareness of sites catered to non-traditional recreation, Promotion of Citizen Involvement in planning for new facilities, Consider Private Partnerships on state lands, Re-evaluate ‘LaTravel.com’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION                 | 1) Master Planning, Strategic Planning, Long Range Planning  
2) ‘Regional Needs’ Planning  
3) Conservation & Preservation, Resource Protection from development & industry  
4) Wildlife Management  
5) Maintenance & Operations funding/budget  
7) Naturalization & Re-naturalization of existing sites  
8) Sustainable Construction  
9) Standardization Development/Certification Qualifications/Quality Control for events, programs, tours, facilities  
10) Requirement of Environmental Impact Statement Feasibility Study prior to design development                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
<p>| ADDITIONAL PLANNING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES | Statewide Zoning, Mitigation Assessment &amp; Planning, Utilization of professional consultants, Coordinate with local universities for complimentary design services, Coordinate Shared Use Facilities for shared maintenance and operations costs, Involve public in planning process, Control Burning, Optimum use and flexibility of facilities - concept of maximizing use variety, Design for safe, user friendly and aesthetically pleasing site entrances &amp; facilities, Conduct and utilize user and provider surveys  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOP TEN PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>1) Standardization or certification – quality control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Continuing education or training, certification for program developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Social, Educational, Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) After school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Promote partnerships with volunteer agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Provide more program facilities in suburban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Outreach Programs to educate &amp; draw urban population out to rural &amp; natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) Address single family needs, minority recreation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Target specific activities for special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) Educational programs – story telling, automated, sports education for participants &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11) Spectators – qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITIES</td>
<td>Hands-on workshops as educational &amp; recreational programs, More interpretive programs, Fishing camps, underwater adventure programs – vendor provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER ACCESS</td>
<td>1) Create connectors to existing trails (especially non-rural), provide rest nodes and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities for trail users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Signage: directional, educational, interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Meet ADA standards where reasonable &amp; feasible, address elderly &amp; special population needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regarding access to natural resources &amp; outdoor recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Develop More Access to and in Water &amp; Waterways (in balance with non-developed areas) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>canoe launches and trails, bank &amp; shoreline treatments, roads &amp; parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Bring users safely &amp; legally through private property adjacent to water resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) To Trails, urban &amp; rural trails, paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Link trails for interpretive-education use, recreation, exercise &amp; alternate transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) Improve roads, trails, walks &amp; paths to sites and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>TOP TEN PRIORITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1) Develop maintenance guidelines, comprehensive plan and replacement schedule (site, facility, equipment, etc.) and require employee conformance, install accountability measures 2) Maintain and utilize providers data base 3) Educate and train (formally and informally) the leaders, decision makers, public agencies, industry, private land owners, employees, volunteers and facility users about the importance of recreation, physical fitness, resource stewardship, awareness and encourage appreciation of our facilities and resources. 4) Schedule routine facility inspections (safety, maintenance, accessibility) and follow up procedures 5) Coordinate with local schools and universities for boost to labor force (volunteer assistant positions, administrative, programs development &amp; implementation, maintenance and operations, infrastructure repair &amp; installation, landscape maintenance, repair &amp; installations.) 6) Coordinate with local schools and universities for sharing use programs 7) Address Insurance and liability issues 8) Utilize, coordinate with and promote on-site amenities, area attractions, activities, infrastructure, physical &amp; thematic linkages to other destinations, community resources 9) Collaborate with statewide trail use and development 10) Address and maintain security, liability and safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES</td>
<td>Protection, enhancement and better utilization of existing sites and facilities, wildlife stock, barrier islands, wetlands, etc., Utilize and make available for public use all forms of available travel – physical, economic, experiential (bus, bike, trike, wheelchair, power wheelchair, tram, boat, seaplane, marsh buggy, airboat), Promote habitat conservation, Increase enjoyment level for users and staff, Educate staff on conservation and preservation issues, Utilize volunteer workforce, inmate labor, civic group membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B.  SCORP TASK FORCE COMMITTEE NOTES

Louisiana Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)
Task Force Committee
Findings & Visioning Meeting Notes, 2.26.14, 1-430 pm

Attending:
Birgitta Baker
Whitney Cooper
Ted Jack
Randy Albarez
Doug Bourgeois
Cleve Hardman
Suzette Simms
Cindy Heath
Kristin Caborn
Tommy Davidson
Kurt Johnson*

GreenPlay Follow Up
1. Contact Birgitta and Stephanie – would LSU conduct an economic impact study of outdoor recreation
   – could this be included in the recommendations?

Client Follow Up
1. Track down examples of economic impact studies pertaining to outdoor recreation
   (Statewide Chamber of Commerce, Office of Tourism)
2. Provide examples of facilities, activities for other communities to model (see below)

What are your reactions to the findings?
1. Trails a High Priority – consider recommendations on how to address connectivity, senior
citizen access, perception of safety, paved & natural surface trails
2. Water Access – possible recommendation to break out activities according willingness to
   drive – fishing, swimming, boating :: encourage future info gathering on types of water
   access vs need, ie. Motor boat launch, kayak & canoe launch, bank fishing, pier fishing,
   trail or boardwalk along water’s edge, outdoor classroom in wetlands, overlook, ADA
   access, etc.
3. Water Quality – include as an issue, information available from DEQ :: another source of
   coastal studies from DNR, LSU, LWLF? This might be a good spot for the Wetlands
   Component which should include a summary & references to studies done by these
   other agencies. Do you recall the links I sent previously?
4. **Multi-Sport/Regional Complexes** – cite Hammond example as an economic development strategy :: *more info from Randy Albarez*

5. **Youth Swimming Lessons** – decline in lesson opportunities due to pool closings, :: *Brec’s studies cited there was still a great need*

6. **Hunting** – not likely to be an unmet need in urban areas; above 50% in northern regions :: *I would trust LWLF stats more than our survey*

7. **Youth Sports** – surprised by youth sports participation responses, reduction in local youth sports organizations; increased emphasis on travel teams, playing on college fields; local communities can’t compete with specialized facilities; this is why Monroe would like a regional sports complex :: *local recreation providers are lacking funds for maintenance & upgrades, many local ball park facilities are in disrepair, some even abandoned*

8. **Playgrounds** – ranked in the top five for activities; high quality in BREC (Perkins Road Community Park [http://www.brec.org/index.cfm/park/detail/139](http://www.brec.org/index.cfm/park/detail/139)); need to educate communities on maintenance standards for playgrounds

9. **Reason for BREC’s success** – separate taxing district

10. **Open space and forest lands** – undeveloped forests being clear cut and developed; cite as an issue related to survey results identifying natural resource preservation/protection as a priority :: *also, perception of “forests” being developed may in fact be private land whose boundaries were poorly posted giving public the perception of being public land.*

**POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Statewide playground assessment as a liability mitigation ??
- Drill down trail use types in the next survey – statewide trails/connectivity master plan?
- User generated data collection using ESRI, Google Maps, Story Board
- Combine funding opportunities between RTP/trail grants and funds for active transportation
- Awareness campaign for ‘Staycations’ – promote tourism in your own backyard
- Step up tourism promotion of bike/ped trails for health benefits (more TA for local jurisdictions)
- Collect email addresses on the survey to support promotional efforts and show their voice was heard; also builds data base of advocates
- Sales tax on sporting goods, fishing licenses, etc. to support outdoor recreation development
- Balance SCORP allocations for developed recreation with natural areas
- Community Foundation of Acadiana may expand to create a fund for parks, historic sites; donate a dollar to state parks on tax return; - Bass Pro, Cabella’s, Civil War Trust are potential funders
- Study state models for land acquisition funds - Texas, Maryland, Colorado, Illinois, New York
- Change happens through non-profit initiatives (BREC, state foundations); government too political

**2008-2013 Strategy Discussion**

- Include matrix of previous recommendations status
• Possible SCORP vision? Louisiana communities provide well maintained, professionally run recreational facilities, natural areas, and trail systems to promote healthy, active lifestyle choices for all Louisiana citizens and visitors.

SUCCESS STORIES (to include in SCORP to promote positive impact of recreation on economy, public health, environmental sustainability, and survey activity priorities - fishing, picnicking, walking/trail access/signage, swimming, playgrounds, visiting natural areas)

Economic Development – Chappapeela Sports Complex (Hammond), Monroe, Lake Charles all have sports marketing focus in tourism agencies

Walking/Trail Access/Signage – Tammany Trace

Water Access – world class sport fishing, 27,000 miles of coastline, largest freshwater swamp in U.S.::Bayou Teche Paddle Trail

Promotion – BR Downtown Development District (8,000 emails):: what is this?

Friend’s Group – Palmetto Island

ATV – Muddy Bottoms ATV & Recreation Park in Minden (private) has 22,000 FB likes

GiS Data Collection – BREC for East Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, New Orleans

Cultural/Historic Tourism - Louisiana National Geographic promotes cultural & historic assets
APPENDIX C. REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NOTES

Louisiana Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORM)
Regional Stakeholder Meetings
November 12-14, 2013

Agenda

I. Welcome and Introductions
II. Project Overview
III. Discussion / Input on Outdoor Recreation Issues
IV. Summary & Next Steps

Regional Stakeholder Meeting Schedule November 2013

- JENNINGS: Jennings Park & Recreation Department, 1206 E. Academy Avenue
- BATON ROUGE: Capitol Park Welcome Center, 702 N. River Road
- HARAHAN: Jefferson Parish, East Bank Council Chambers, 1221 Elmwood Park Blvd #607
- January 21-23 Shreveport, Monroe, Pineville

Project Tasks & Schedule – 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks in Months</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Stakeholder Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings &amp; Visioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft/Final Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisiana Office of State Parks
Cleve Hardman and Suzette Simms, Division of Outdoor Recreation, office of State Parks
http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/ioutdoorrec.aspx
playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com

GreenPlay, LLC Contacts:
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
kristinc@greenplayllc.com
Cindy Heath, cindyh@greenplayllc.com

Additional Team Members:
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

Individual Questions (choose three to answer individually)

1. How can our outdoor recreation areas become the best places for everyone to experience the natural beauty of Louisiana?

2. How can different uses of outdoor recreation areas be managed to assure equal access and enjoyment (e.g., hiking or hunting, bird watching or off-road vehicle use?)

3. How can people who don’t often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?
   - Hosting special events
   - Corridor access to other areas of interest
   - Getting the word out to churches, community centers, organizations
   - Understand where outdoor rec areas are, and what amenities there are at the locations
   - Utilize tv, internet, other media to promote locations
   - Outreach to school programming to encourage youth, which encourages family members

4. What groups of people seem to you to be least likely to use outdoor recreation areas? Why?

5. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?
   - Fountainbleu State Park – beach, lake, board walks, nature trails, history, nature center, camping, Tammany Trace Trail
   - A variety of activities to participate in (active & passive) in surrounding communities – bicycling, walking, hiking, kayaking/canoeing, picnicking; opportunities for social interaction– both social activity opportunities & opportunities for solitude
   - Cooks Lake Lodge (Arkansas): humming bird days (interactive); outdoor recreation activities taught; interpretive displays; youth education opportunities about specific activities
   - Mountainview Arkansas (Folk Music Center); outdoor recreation activities merged with music, local artisans, cultural history within the state park
   - Larger state parks (Fountainbleu, Tammany Trace) offer a feeling of safety and security as opposed to smaller properties (lack of rangers, local security staff)
   - BREC park system offers a sense of getting away from ‘hustle, bustle, stress’ aspects of the community; allows visitors to decompress and transition from urban environment to natural environment
   - City Park (Baton Rouge) has a variety of activities (dog park), playground, scale and location is similar to Central Park in NYC, not so big that you lose the urban aspects
   - Pathways around LSU lakes are used for transportation, and blends in with City Park to create interconnected trail system and smooth transition between lands
   - BREC’s Greenwood Park is incredible – an undiscovered jewel with active spaces, interpretive nature trail, kayak/canoe, fish, golf, picnicking, splash pad, playground, amphitheater, dog park, disc golf (LSU students like disc golf), historic interpretive trail, tennis center
   - Baton Rouge skate park is an example of how exploring one park leads to enjoying other parks
Appendices

- BREC website is a model for communication with users, master planning, website/promotion
- Well maintained parks promote feelings of safety and security, but is often the first component to be cut

6. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve/restore?
   - Protecting the essential resource of the individual park; ex: skate park, boardwalk, trail, lake; whatever the resource is that is important to the park
   - Pool closure are viewed as an obstacle to youth learning how to swim, (lack of lifeguards as well)

7. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?
   - Multi-purpose uses, synergy in design to pool various use to inspire different types of users; people coming together encourages feelings of safety and security
   - Pay attention to aesthetics, view shed (Gumbo analogy!)
   - Transportation access (public); are parks sited near bus stops, convenient and safe routes to parks inspire access
   - Better bicycle infrastructure (LA is not strong in this area)
   - BREC model ‘BREC On The Go’
   - Design nature trails for senior populations – include seating, benches with views of playgrounds
   - Share uses with school facilities (playgrounds)
   - For youth, outdoor activities must be fun; youth doesn’t understand the benefits of outdoor recreation participation; partner with schools and youth serving agencies to increase youth exposure to the outdoors
   - New playgrounds need to be bigger
   - Engaging youth in community activities (ex: BR Library demo project)

8. How should we encourage Louisiana’s youth to explore the outdoors?

9. What kinds of services or facilities would you be willing to pay (more) for, and what would you not pay (more) for?

10. What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands (e.g., hiking or hunting, bird watching or off-road vehicle use)? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?
    - Manage time conflicts, appropriate seasonal use
    - Need signage to educate users
    - Lands that suffer from degradation were designed poorly
    - ATV trails are often located in areas that are not compatible with ATV use; most users are responsible; ATV use not compatible with equestrian uses
    - Evaluate demographics and design land use around local preferences
    - Hunting, fishing are priorities because of funding allocation (state F & G)
    - RTP program is funded by motorized trail users, although funding is not generally targeted for motorized uses
    - Ballfield and playground layouts can have safety concerns if sited too close together
Key Issues Identification

1. What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?
   - Hunting, fishing is a common denominator, and sports in general
   - Birding is a large draw due to migratory patterns (Mississippi Flyway); world wide attraction
   - Abundance of outdoor resources; state culture supports participation in outdoor activities, and is tolerant of a variety of activities, where other states may not be
   - Little competition for activities because of land mass
   - Topography varies throughout the state (north LA has hills, little known); regional differences are unique
   - Three season recreation (summer is hot)

2. What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?
   - Opportunities for outdoor recreation exists, but people don’t know about the opportunities; emphasis should be on building awareness of opportunities
   - Improvements not necessarily needed except for maintenance
   - Improve partnerships with public transportation, schools, community centers
   - Inspiring new users can influence funding of local, parish, and state budgets
   - Schools are operating independently; schools restrict use to school hours because of liability concerns – gates, fences inhibit after school use
   - Many schools are not implementing state level joint use agreements because of threat of vandalism, maintenance
   - In communities where there is limited park access, rec departments can partner with schools to make facilities accessible community wide
   - Increase interagency cooperation
   - Increase programming of outdoor recreation spaces
   - Individual communities should have their unique features highlighted (perhaps led by state agencies)
   - State government is reactive not proactive; needs to stay ahead of the curve and offer
   - Non-traditional activities (rock climbing, slack lining)
   - Youth may choose to participate in non-traditional activities, but may do so unsafely
In Depth Focus on Key Issues

PARTNERSHIPS

PROMOTION

OUTDOOR RECREATION TRENDS

1. Define the problem.

2. Identify barriers to resolution.

3. Recommend 2-4 feasible actions.

PARTNERSHIPS

Problem

• Silos (individual agencies working independently) resulting from egos or competition from limited funding; lack of time to establish partnerships
• Unequal partnerships where partners don’t understand the value of each partner
• Priorities, missions, timelines don’t align
• More partnerships that make sense than resources to manage
• Beauracracy (need for sound policies and contracts)

Barriers to Resolution (above)

Feasible Actions

• Promote successes and identify great models of partnerships (makes it easier to engage in partnerships, examples of contracts
• Ex: Shaw Center/Hughes Dog Park
• Invest strategically in partnership, focusing on those identified in strategic plans
• Make the effort to promote interagency team building
• Have sound contracts, clear expectations in place
• EX of a successful strategic partnerships: University partnerships in Hammond

PROMOTION

Problem

• Lack of promotion

Barriers to Resolution

• Funding
• Departmental silos
• Implementation & maintenance
Feasible Actions
- Utilize various types of promo – social media, special events, camp outs, incentives, hands on training, connect outdoor recreation with health & fitness, connect holistic health groups with resources
- Departmental web linking with all state entities
- Metric measurements reported to legislature to highlight measureable outcomes

OUTDOOR RECREATION TRENDS

Problem
- Louisiana is usually behind on trends; especially fashion!

Barriers to Resolution
- Once a trend is determined and implemented, it's over; people lose interest, and target demographics are missed (millennials)
- Resistance to change
- Adults tend not to listen to youth; need to learn what they are spending their time on; experience their activities (video games example)
- Youth that are not exposed to the outdoors don’t know what they’re missing; busy pace of family life necessitates youth recreating independently (EX: LSU Coastal Routes program exposing youth to their environment)
- Disconnect between community garden culture (healthy) and school event concession menus (unhealthy – burgers, fries, hot dogs; limits experience for those who want healthy food choices)
- Attempts to transition to healthy food options met with resistance

Feasible Actions
- Hiring staff with a background and specialty in trends (like yogalates)
- Outreach to schools, ex: middle school students (more apt to communicate with family members, while youth have lower attention span, teens interests already determined) to understand trends
- Understand connection to healthy access to food through community gardens, farm to school
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Louisiana Office of State Parks
Cleve Hardman and Suzette Simms, Division of Outdoor Recreation, office of State Parks
http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/outdoorrec.aspx
playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com

GreenPlay, LLC Contacts:
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
kristinc@greenplayllc.com
Cindy Heath, cindyh@greenplayllc.com

Additional Team Members:
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

Individual Questions (choose three to answer individually)

1. How can our outdoor recreation areas become the best places for everyone to experience the natural beauty of Louisiana?
   - Known as “Sportsmen’s Paradise” – fishing, boating, water recreation
   - Experience nature, nature interpretation
   - Need to know what Louisiana offers
   - Boys introduced to hunting; girls introduced to dance, tumbling, karate
   - Help raise families through recreation, take the pressure off parents by offering multiple options through regular recreation & outdoor recreation

2. How can different uses of outdoor recreation areas be managed to assure equal access and enjoyment (e.g., hiking or hunting, bird watching or off-road vehicle use?)
   - Some areas could be staffed by f/t, p/t, volunteers, civic organizations
   - Supervision for youth in schools that have community service hours
   - Sororities and fraternities can provide supervision for youth (by forming partnerships, this takes the pressure off the budget)
   - Watching recreational activities is enjoyable for spectators
   - Management of overuse of public beaches; officials want to restrict access; local communities must persuade local officials to keep beaches open (closures motivated by illegal activities); need for protection of public waterways
   - Jennings Tourism is exploring bike trail access on Hwy 90, connected water and natural surface trails between Jennings and Lake Arthur, corridor management plan in progress (bicycling, off road, water, hiking) to insure access to the public
   - Partnerships with youth organizations to insure access to the by-way/tri-way system
   - Promotion of access to outdoor recreation areas with existing campaigns (NRPA, LRPA)
   - Be more connected to customer service rather than profit oriented activities

3. How can people who don’t often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?
   - Peterson Street Park needs more attention; uptown parks are peaceful and clean; needs to be a balance between maintenance at both parks; would like to see patrols to support elderly uses;
   - Keep parks clean; community doesn’t want to turn in those who are dumping trash in parks

4. What groups of people seem to you to be least likely to use outdoor recreation areas? Why?
   - Those who don’t have transportation to get to outlying areas
   - Children with parents not willing to get them involved
   - Elderly fear getting out for safety
   - 4H groups heavily promoted previously, but no longer ‘cool’ from the youth perspective; still has value for educational life skills, recreational skills
   - People go to play where they feel comfortable – ex: low income youth cannot swim; if children are comfortable, parents feels comfortable
   - Financial means separates youth; youth need to encounter success
   - Make all recreational resources handicap, youth, senior-friendly
• Youth ‘stuck in the house’; lack funds to participate in activities
• Need more alumni giving back to the community; exploring Boys & Girls Clubs

5. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?
• In Merryville, develop public springs modeled after Balboria, TX (concrete pool, spring fed) for economic development and recreational use; Beauregard Tourist Commission has 8 acre natural area donated by former Gov. Sam Jones; contains Civil War graves, nature walk; needs funding to reclaim original trail
• Preservation of cultural history aspects

6. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve?
• The natural ecosystem needs to be protected for wildlife and birdwatching and other natural resource activities
• Encourage recycling, discourage littering

7. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?
• Make facilities handicap accessible; outdoor recreation facilities are generally accessible
• In the planning process, insure that people with disabilities have a voice
• Tuten Park (recreation area designated for people with disabilities, permanently protected for recreational use
• Opportunities need to be age appropriate to youth participations
• Transportation needs to be provided for low income participants

8. How should we encourage Louisiana’s youth to explore the outdoors?
• White Lake used for hunting, fishing; science curriculum exists
• Explore campus labs; Skype with rangers into science classrooms
• Educate users about recreational uses beyond traditionally developed parks (natural resources)
• Exposing youth to sports to encourage physical activity is working; expand opportunities for access to natural resource areas like Lake Arthur

9. What kinds of services or facilities would you be willing to pay (more) for, and what would you not pay (more) for?
• With the depletion of grants, public needs to be involved in supporting funding for recreation facilities
• Public beach with a police presence and security
• Multi-purpose facility that serves multiple uses – both brick & mortar, offering community wide quality of life services
• Extra taxes for area to jog, athletic facilities
• Attempt to pass a recreational tax failed; tax to restore court house passed because specifically dedicated use of funds was identified

10. What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?
Key Issues Identification

1. What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?
   - Bayous, waterways
   - “Sportsman’s Paradise”
   - Hunting
   - Fishing
   - LA has opportunities that aren’t available other places in country
   - Outdoor fitness “par course” provided in local parks
   - Dog parks benefits to dogs and the person
   - Outdoor pools
   - BMX tracks
   - Gulf seafood, fishing, boating opportunities
   - Preservation of outdoor areas, a lot of public support for open spaces, hunting, fishing areas, keeping public spaces open
   - Economic benefit of water resources
   - Make living off of land
   - Agri-tourism is a resource that can grow
   - Myths and Legends Byway: rural activities along the way- u-pick-em berries, corn maze, highlight local agricultural system

2. What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?
   - Better promotion of industries such as agri-tourism
   - Are we promoting the appropriate way to both the providers (crawfish farmer) and the potential user?
   - Aggressive approach to be heard, everyone listens to radio including commercials. Statewide radio campaign
   - Make it free, accessible
   - Boardwalks, access for people with disabilities

In Depth Focus on Key Issues

1. Define the problem.
2. Identify barriers to resolution.
3. Recommend 2-4 feasible actions.

AGRITOURISM

Problem:
   - People don’t know where their food comes from
   - Percentage of farmers is lower

Barriers
   - Communication, promotion
   - Finding funding; getting local parks on board
Feasible Actions:
- Starter grants with 50% match by farmers/producers, public meetings
- Hydroponics, alligator, rice fields, crawfish farms align with tourism byway project
- Find out what rural providers are doing and communicate it
- Community gardens in schools (not sustained by users at the community level)
- Partnerships with schools/rotary clubs for agricultural education and distribution of harvest to those in need

ACCESS FOR YOUTH
Problem
- Lack of access

Barriers
- Activities not close to neighborhoods

Actions
- ‘Take a kid fishing’
- ‘Take a kid hiking’
- Educational programs to expand exposure to activities beyond their neighborhood

MARKETING/PROMOTION
Problem

Barriers

Actions
- Use of radio (25K for radio v. 2500 for TV); partnerships
- Flyers in public places
- Make activities free
- Sponsor activities with Mayor’s office
- Advertise through LRPA, NRPA
- Partnerships with libraries, joint service agreements
- Give back to the community for volunteer services
- Summer job training
- Use data similar to state prison capacity evaluation by looking at 4th grade fail rates
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Louisiana Office of State Parks
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playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com

Project Contacts:
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
kristin.caborn@atkinsglobal.com
Cindy Heath, cindyh@greenplayllc.com

Additional Team Members:
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

Attendance: 5 public, 2 staff

Individual Questions (choose 2-3 to answer individually)

1. How can people who don't often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?
   - Education; reach out to various and diverse groups (socio-economic)
   - Marketing plan to target segments of the population
   - Offering different programs to appeal to multi-generational (orienteering, disc golf examples)
   - Geocaching, and other family friendly activities (70,000 registered geocaching enthusiasts in Louisiana)

2. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?
   - LMU sports complexes have enhanced the community
   - Not many safe places around Monroe to run, walk, recreate (levy, Forsythe Park considered unsafe); State Parks is working on a lighting plan
   - Wildlife Management Areas, duck hunters and other hunters have a lack of areas to use
   - A lot of lake facilities (cabins, waterfronts) could be beautified to be made more attracted
   - Vidalia Park, tournament complexes would support the local economy; suggest to develop trails
   - High demand for baseball and softball fields in Monroe; desire to develop a multi-use recreation complex to attract tournaments combined with trails; could draw from Dallas to Jackson
   - Locals travel to Baton Rouge for athletic tournaments
   - Pelican Park in Mandeville

3. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve?
   - Preserve state parks with cabins; synonymous with Louisiana; must book 11 months ahead
   - Hunting areas are overused; capacity of wildlife areas has been reached
   - Access to water is diminishing
   - State lands being transitioned from state ownership to private ownership

4. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?
   - Wheelchair access
   - Youth swingsets, jungle gyms
   - Seniors – alternate routes, shorter routes
   - Paved walking pathways for enhanced accessibility and safety for seniors
   - Collaboration between schools and state land owners for field trips and exposing youth to the outdoors
- **Transportation from low income and seniors neighborhoods to parks;** possible collaboration with churches, schools, university
- Midnight basketball was popular in the 90’s, and could be revived to give kids something to do
- Recreates an activity to give youth a positive image of recreation
- Potential for partnerships between private and public providers

5. **What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?**

- Consider using facilities for activities in the off season; Ex: birding outside of hunting season
- Creative uses of traditional facilities; EX: baseball fields for movies, tennis courts for roller skating, volleyball
- Tennis players go to Forsythe Park, 12 courts, good condition
- **Tennis courts around the state have not been maintained; could be repurposed**
- Few American role models today for youth to emulate

**Key Issues Identification**

1. **What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?**

   - State Parks cabins; weekdays are open; use is trending downward due to cost $60-$150; public cannot afford to stay one night; cut backs in state personnel have reduced customer service experience; keep the air conditioning, remove other amenities
   - Louisiana has great resources, but they are not accessible and not available; need more public information on accessing public lands
   - Public perception about wildlife (alligators) may be a deterrent

2. **What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?**

   - Consider multi-purpose facilities; active soccer group at Chenault Park – could expand their facilities
   - South Louisiana has 3-4 high quality baseball parks that could be duplicated
   - Flood more land with pumps to support duck hunting; work with Wildlife Fisheries and Ducks Unlimited; flyways have changed; done in most wildlife management areas
   - Use of improved campsites to serve as a gateway activity for new outdoor enthusiasts
   - Increase awareness of improved campsites to attract women who prefer developed facilities
   - Large mosquitoes are a deterrent; spraying and fogger trucks in use, West Nile virus a concern
   - Community golf courses are not well maintained; golfers prefer private courses
   - Swimming pools have been closed
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**Louisiana Office of State Parks**
Cleve Hardman and Suzette Simms, Division of Outdoor Recreation, office of State Parks
[http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/ioutdoorrec.aspx](http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/ioutdoorrec.aspx)
[playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com](http://playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com)

**Project Contacts:**
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
[kristin.caborn@atkinsglobal.com](mailto:kristin.caborn@atkinsglobal.com)
Cindy Heath, [cindyh@greenplayllc.com](mailto:cindyh@greenplayllc.com)

**Additional Team Members:**
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

Attendance: 2 public, 0 staff

Individual Questions (choose 2-3 to answer individually)

1. How can people who don’t often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?
   - Geocaching, food, music, events (First Tee Golf example)
   - Promote for youth, and parents will attend
   - Photo contests
   - Partner with organizations – 4H, High School Enviro Clubs, Service Clubs
   - Senior Citizen programs (partner with organizations serving seniors)
   - Veterans groups
   - Health CLAHEC.org, LA College, LSUA
   - Free entrance for youth to cultural/historic sites, parks
   - Think Alex – Jonathan Bolen – see City website for public input

2. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?
   - Grand Canyon
   - Kincaid Lake, Kisatchie National Forest
   - Red Dirt area (Shreveport, Manny)-for mountain biking, elevation changes
   - Locks and Dams of the Red River – return river to natural state? Commerce hasn’t materialized
   - Alexandria Zoo
   - Forts Randolph & Buhlow SHS
   - Kent House
   - Buhlow Recreation Area (Red River Waterway Commission)
   - Red River – water recreation; Dragon Boat race, kayaking, canoeing
   - Southern Forest Heritage Museum
   - Swamp Boat tours, Riverboats (revive the Red River Tour)
   - Lafreniere Park in New Orleans (Metairie)
   - Timber Trails Golf (encourages walking on course, coordinate First Tee golf)

3. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve?
   - Restrict 4 wheel access to public lands (lack of patrols an issue)
   - Wilderness areas – need some designated areas without public use
   - Separate motorized uses from quiet recreation uses
   - Native flora, fauna, horticultural assets
   - Education, environmental interpretation resources
   - Waterways, bayous within the Kisatchie NF
   - Agricultural lands – subdivision developments are encroaching, spraying of cotton fields can be a health hazard
4. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?

- **Green areas close to home**
  - Create a culture of safety (current perception that trails are unsafe; homeless population inhibits recreational use)
  - No fee days at recreational facilities (zoo, free park days)
  - Ramps, safe walkways to promote senior health and safe access
  - Rapides Foundation (funding source for health/wellness/recreation/education)
  - 1,200 non-profits in central Louisiana causes competition for grant dollars
  - Roy O. Martin (timber company philanthropist, supports the zoo, public radio)
  - Efforts to persuade Crest Industries to become more philanthropic
  - Adventure activities (zip lines, climbing walls, etc) in the NF to attract youth

5. What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?

- Historic sites should stay true to their intended purpose
- Marksville Historic site (historically used for recreation, but restored to historic purpose)
- Develop events that are aligned with the purpose of the site
- Bank fishing compatible with activities at Forts Randolph & Buhlow SHS
- Boating access on state lands – liability concerns – floating dock in planning
- Hunting and running trails are incompatible
- Duck blinds on Kincaid Lake should be separated from residential areas

**Key Issues Identification**

1. What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?
   - Great trail system through KNF
   - Ready access to Kisatchie NF
   - Cotile, bayous
   - Little River, Catahoula Lake (Jonesville) has ducks, waterfowl
   - Public access to waterways
   - Positive outreach by NF PR staff – March outdoor festival in collaboration with local convention/visitor’s bureau to raise awareness of Central Louisiana’s assets
   - AZA accredited zoo (Alexandria Zoo) has reciprocal entry membership program

2. What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?
   - Dock on Pineville side of the river near bridge (handicapped access)
Appendices
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft/Final Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisiana Office of State Parks
Cleve Hardman and Suzette Simms, Division of Outdoor Recreation, office of State Parks
http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/ioutdoorrec.aspx
playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com

Project Contacts:
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
kristin.caborn@atkinsglobal.com
Cindy Heath, cindyh@greenplayllc.com

Additional Team Members:
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

**Individual Questions** (choose 2-3 to answer individually)

1. How can people who don’t often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?

   For better health
   Walking and fitness trails in parks
   Exercise/parcourse facilities (Venice Beach, Little Rock examples – health messages along course)
   **Bicycle trails connecting adjacent parks**
   Appalachian Trail style connected trail system (similar to Red River Trail, Rails to Trails)
   Multi use parks with community center facilities – uses during inclement weather
   Pavilion style facilities with BBQ pits, picnic facilities; drop in/free
   Hours of operation – flexible enough to allow camping
   Good diversity in Shreveport, but could be more diverse
   **Beautify, modernize parks to make them more attractive to users**
   Community service projects, trade school projects to improve parks
   Photo project on Greenway example (Cleve)
   Social experience, community days, cookouts, music festivals
   Wifi and peace & quiet opportunities

2. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?

   Ford Park train set; airplanes; hands on experiences; interpretive experiences
   Water playground/splash pad (enlarge)
   Basketball courts, baseball parks for pick-up games
   Disc golf

3. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve?

   Scenery
   Historic/cultural sites (ex: Mansfield Battleground)
   Habitat, native species
   **Public and community leader education** about valuable natural and cultural resources
   (Portland, OR example of signage in open space within neighborhoods – natural resource info)

4. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?

   **Users must feel safe;** can’t staff with public safety because of competing demands on resources
   Crime does exist – kids more likely to misbehave in parks than at home; wireless cameras in use in communities creates perception of safety
   Diverse uses in parks attract diverse users - minimizes criminal activity
   Accessible facilities for people with disabilities
   Amphitheaters for concerts, plays, cultural events
   Airport Park attracts senior citizens who play dominoes & checkers; community center
   “Green Revolution” – incorporate community gardens
Better access to bank fishing (ponds, lakes, rivers)

5. What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?

Red River Trail – asphalt walking trail
Better designation between uses – mountain bicycling, hiking (Stoner Park)
ATV trails are underdeveloped across the state; no user group represented
Red River drownings – lack of awareness of drop offs; swimming lessons taught in pools but inadequate training for river swimming

Key Issues Identification

1. What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?

2. What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?

In Depth Focus on Key Issues

1. Define the problem.
   Beautification as it connects to perception of safety, need for education

2. Identify barriers to resolution.

3. Recommend 2-4 feasible actions.
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Project Tasks & Schedule – 2013-14
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<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings &amp; Visioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft/Final Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisiana Office of State Parks
Cleve Hardman and Suzette Simms, Division of Outdoor Recreation, office of State Parks
http://www.crt.state.la.us/parks/ioutdoorrec.aspx
playoutdoorsla.mindmixer.com

GreenPlay, LLC Contacts:
Kristin Caborn, Project Manager
kristinc@greenplayllc.com
Cindy Heath, cindyh@greenplayllc.com

Additional Team Members:
Atkins, NTB Associates, RRC Associates
INPUT QUESTIONS

Individual Questions (choose three to answer individually)

1. How can our outdoor recreation areas become the best places for everyone to experience the natural beauty of Louisiana?

2. How can different uses of outdoor recreation areas be managed to assure equal access and enjoyment (e.g., hiking or hunting, bird watching or off-road vehicle use?)

3. How can people who don’t often use our outdoor recreation areas be encouraged to take advantage of them?

4. What groups of people seem to you to be least likely to use outdoor recreation areas? Why?

5. Think of a park or recreation area that you have especially enjoyed. What was it about that place that should be copied in other parks and outdoor recreation areas?
   - Rivertown: on Williams in Kenner. Could be a more pet friendly area, shops, already an art gallery, museums, farmer’s market (1st and 3rd Saturday of the month), music and movies in the park (free), grass, small pond, surrounded by replica buildings of original city of Kenner building. “French Quarter” of Kenner, but more family friendly. Potentially get an old Navy ship. Also has festivals (Octoberfest, Italian Festival). “Green Belt Area” centrally located for produce in the US. Original jail and town hall. Public art statue of two boxers, first heavy weight boxing match in the county was in Kenner. LaSalle’s Landing where explorer LaSalle landed. “burned cane” translation was original name of Kenner. Laketown has concerts, car show. Want to bring Rivertown up to caliber of Laketown.
   - Veteran’s Park in Kenner has old military equipment

6. What do you think are the most important parts of outdoor recreation areas to preserve/restore?

7. How can outdoor recreation areas be designed to serve specific groups such as people with disabilities, youth, seniors, and low-income families?

8. How should we encourage Louisiana’s youth to explore the outdoors?

9. What kinds of services or facilities would you be willing to pay (more) for, and what would you not pay (more) for?

10. What are your thoughts about compatible outdoor recreation on state public lands (e.g., hiking or hunting, bird watching or off-road vehicle use)? Are there any outdoor recreation uses that are not compatible with other uses? Why?

Key Issues Identification

1. What are the strengths of Louisiana’s outdoor recreation resources? What works?
   - Wetlands that people can tour (swamp tour)
   - Liked cabins for family events in State Parks
2. What improvements could be made to enhance outdoor recreation experiences? For youth? Underserved? Special populations?
   - Bayou Segnett cabins gone (termites discovered after Hurricane Katrina).Possibly have “floating” cabins
   - Bike/walking trails have lights (especially during off day light savings time) so can be used at night
   - Laketown area add a yacht club/marina
   - Jet ski rentals, restaurants to activate area

In Depth Focus on Key Issues

1. Define the problem.

2. Identify barriers to resolution.

3. Recommend 2-4 feasible actions.
Access for youth

1. Define the target: lack of resources and access.

2. Identify barriers: lack of finances, parental involvement (lack of)
   activities near outside of the neighborhood.

3. Recommendations:
   - Provide programs that give children access to activities they
     wouldn't normally have.
   - Provide educational programs that expose children to outdoor
     activities that are outside their neighborhoods.

Marketing / Better Promotion

* State doing a National Geopolitical Study.
* A Wealth of Information under the Direction of Office of Tourism
* Use of Radio to reach more people. Larger Target Population
  250,000 vs. 2,000.

Agri-Tourism

Defining: "Kids don't play " outdoors.
* Lack of awareness
  - Lack of education
  - Low visibility of farms and farms.

Identify barriers to resolution:
* Communication / Awareness
  - Available funding (farmer grants)

2.4: Possible actions
   1. Matching grants
   2. Starter grants
   3. Public meetings
Activities free
Sponsored by your City or Mayor’s Office
Use the Sportsman’s Paradise
with its recreational facilities.
Spearfisher/ApacheChiefs
City of Lake Charles
Recreation & Parks

Advertisement
LRPA, NRPA
& other
Partnership
Collaborations
Joint Service Agreements
Convenional Commission or
Board/City
Should be
Known by the recreation
Depts (strengths & what
can you offer my child)

Advertisement for
Services rendered
Experience needed
(“Giving Back to Community”)
Volunteer services
Empowering a person
to share and know their
Self worth
Summer Job Training

Committee
Helen Lewis city
Amanda Johnson
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A.35

- Conceptualize into context in schools
  - pygame (game)
  - Spring beauty
    - Students having fun
    - Local events
    - Leadership

1. Problem
   - Need to expand

2. Resources
   - Not getting kids involved

3. Expectations
   - Need funding

Partnerships

1. Problems
   - Few partnerships exist
   - Need to talk to others
   - More partnerships
   - More people involved
   - More resources

2. Funding
   - Improved funding
   - Improved participation

3. Expectations
   - Need funding
   - More partnerships
   - More involvement
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INTRODUCTION / METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to gather public feedback on the outdoor recreation demands in the State of Louisiana. This feedback and subsequent analysis was designed to assist the Louisiana Office of State Parks in the creation of its 2014-2019 Outdoor Recreation Plan.

The survey was conducted using two methods: 1) a random telephone survey and 2) an online open link survey for members of the public who did not receive a randomly selected telephone survey. Unless stated otherwise, the analysis herein focuses primarily on the surveys conducted via the random telephone survey.

A total of 700 Louisiana residents were surveyed in the random telephone survey throughout the state. To better reflect the population of Louisiana, the sample for the telephone survey was distributed across the state based on parish population and a near 50/50 quota of males and females was also attained. The data from this survey was then weighted for age and race/ethnicity based on US Census data, and weighted for the statewide planning regions (a map showing Louisiana’s Planning Regions by Parish is provided on the following page).

As responses to the open link version of the survey are “self-selected” and not a part of the randomly selected sample of residents, results from the open link questionnaire are kept separate from the phone version of the survey for the overall analysis. The majority of the discussion that follows focuses primarily on results from the randomly selected sample of residents; however, the final section of the report exclusively evaluates the results of the open link survey and includes graphs comparing the phone and open link survey results.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In general, responses as to the benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation are extremely positive. Satisfaction ratings are strong and residents recognize and value the importance of having parks, trails, and outdoor recreation opportunities available to them. Although some variation exists, most all of the findings discussed below are consistent across all eight planning regions within the state. Specific key findings from the random telephone survey include the following:

- **Outdoor Recreation Participation:** The majority of respondents indicate that a member of their household participates in outdoor recreation activities (76 percent). The most popular frequently cited outdoor recreation activities are fishing (62 percent), walking (61 percent), picnicking (55 percent), swimming outdoors (52 percent), and visiting playgrounds (51 percent).

- **Recreation Locations:** More than 70 percent of respondents participate in outdoor recreation activities at City or Parish parks, while state parks, historic sites, and private lands and facilities are used by about half of overall respondents. National parks and federal lands are used by more than one-third of respondents.

- **Frequency of Participation:** While more than half of respondents visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway only 5 times or less in the past year, 20 percent visited more than 8 times. Almost two-thirds of respondents indicate that their visitation to parks, historic sites, forests, or natural waterways over the past year has either remained the same or increased in frequency compared to visit over the past five years (48 percent had the same frequency and 18 percent increased their frequency).

- **Day vs. Overnight Trips:** The majority of trips taken by respondents over the past year to parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways were day trips (74 percent were day trips, compared to 26 percent overnight trips).

- **Satisfaction:** Satisfaction with aspects of outdoor recreation in Louisiana is good overall, but varies slightly by Region. Respondents are most satisfied with the “active outdoor recreation opportunities provided” (62 percent satisfied), followed by the efforts to preserve land (57 percent). On the lower end of the scale, respondents were less satisfied with the state’s ability to provide adequate educational opportunities (48 percent).

- **Importance of Outdoor Recreation Opportunities:** Almost half of respondents indicate that the availability of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation facilities is extremely important to their household, with 70 percent overall indicating some level of importance.

- **Meeting Needs:** At the same time, only one-quarter of the respondents indicate that the parks, trails, outdoor recreation facilities, and outdoor recreation programs are “completely” meeting the needs of their household, suggesting room for further improvement exists.
• **Benefits of Land Conservation and Outdoor Recreation**: The majority of respondents (over 87 percent) rated the following benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation as having the most importance: “improving quality of life,” “promoting healthy active lifestyles,” “protecting the environment,” and “preserving cultural and historic resources.” The attribute of “providing an economic benefit to the State” is viewed as being the “least” important of the benefits; however, it still is rated as important by 72 percent of the respondents.

• **Priorities for Future Investment**: Respondents indicate that future investment is important for most recreation area types (all area types received ratings of 69 percent or higher), but that “forests and/or lakes/rivers with established trails, dispersed camping, boating, and fishing opportunities” was the most important, with 83 percent of respondents indicating it is important.

• **Preservation vs. Recreation**: The largest proportion of respondents (60 percent) feel that Louisiana should pursue an equal balance between natural resource preservation/protection and providing outdoor recreation in natural settings (as opposed to one or the other directions solely).

• **Prioritization of Activities on Public Lands**: Long-term planning and management, operation and maintenance of existing infrastructure and facilities, and educational programs and visitor experiences on public lands are the most important to respondents for the state to prioritize (at least 78 percent indicating high importance).

• **Public Funds to Acquire Land**: The majority of respondents feel it is important for the state to spend public funds to acquire land to prevent the loss of exceptional natural areas to development (53 percent extremely important plus 20 percent very important).
RESPONDENT PROFILE

Respondent Characteristics

- The average age of respondents was 46.2 years.
- More than 63 percent of respondents were white or Caucasian, 32 percent black or African American, and 4 percent Hispanic.

**Figure 1**

*Respondent Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or older</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian Indian, or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Characteristics

- Almost half of the responding random sample households had children living at home (47 percent), while another 28 percent were empty nesters (children grown and no longer at home). Fifteen percent of respondents were single with no children and 11 percent were couples with no children.
- The average household size in the random sample was 3.0 persons, with 57 percent of the sample households having three or more people.
- Household income was relatively evenly distributed with 33 percent of respondents earning less than $50,000 per year, 34 percent between $50,000 and $99,999 per year, and 19 percent with $100,000 or more annually.
Fourteen percent of households reported having a need for ADA facilities or services for a household member.

On average, respondents have resided at their current residence for 15.9 years. While 31 percent of respondents have been in their homes for five years or less, 28 percent have resided at their current residence for more than 20 years.

**Figure 2**

*Respondent Household Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, no children</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple, no children</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with children at home</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with children no longer at home</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to under $50,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to under $75,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to under $100,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to under $150,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in household</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself only</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more people</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in household under 18 years</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in household over 55 years</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for ADA facilities or services by any household member</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time living in current residence</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own a second home in Louisiana</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Household Size: 3.0 people
Median Household Size: 3.0 people

Average Length of Time: 15.9 years
Median Length of Time: 12.0 years
Location of Residence

- As described in the introduction, random sample survey results were weighted by planning region population to match the current statewide distribution of population. The following chart shows this weighted geographic breakdown, with almost half of the respondents residing in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge areas (Regions 1 and 2 comprise 45 percent of the random sample).

**Figure 3  
Respondent Location of Residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1 (Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, etc.)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2 (Ascension, E. Baton Rouge, E. Feliciana, etc.)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3 (Assumption, Lafourche, St. Charles, etc.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4 (Acadia, Evangeline, Iberia, Lafayette, etc.)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5 (Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, etc.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 (Avoyelles, Catahoula, Concordia, Grant, etc.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7 (Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, etc.)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8 (Caldwell, E. Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, etc.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

Outdoor Recreation Participation

The majority of respondents indicated that they or someone in their household participates in outdoor recreation activities. Overall, 76 percent of responding households have at least one participant, a proportion that was higher in Regions 3, 5, and 8, each with participation rates of 83 percent or higher. Regions 1 and 7 had the lowest participation rates of 71 percent and 73 percent, respectively.

Figure 4
Households with at Least One Member Who Participates in Outdoor Recreation Activities – By Region

Outdoor Recreation Activities

Respondents participated in a variety of outdoor recreation activities, but the most frequently cited were:

- Fishing (62 percent of overall respondents participate),
- Walking (61 percent),
- Picnicking (55 percent),
- Swimming outdoors (52 percent), and
- Visiting playgrounds (51 percent).

A second tier of activity participation includes:

- Spectator activities (44 percent),
- Visiting natural areas (44 percent),
- Hunting (42 percent),
- Playing outdoor athletic team sports (40 percent), and
- Non-team outdoor sports (basketball, tennis, etc.) (37 percent).
Figure 5
Outdoor Recreation Activities Participation – Total Random Sample

- Fishing: 62%
- Walking: 55%
- Picnicking: 52%
- Swimming outdoors: 51%
- Visiting playgrounds: 44%
- Spectator activities: 44%
- Visiting natural areas: 42%
- Hunting: 40%
- Playing outdoor athletic team sports (soccer, volleyball): 37%
- Non team outdoor sports (basketball, tennis, other): 35%
- Running/jogging: 32%
- Biking (road) - on a road bike only: 32%
- Bird watching / wildlife viewing: 31%
- Shooting sports (target shooting, archery): 30%
- Nature programs / Self guided tours: 29%
- Botanic gardens: 28%
- Motor boating: 27%
- Camping cabins: 27%
- Crabbing: 27%
- Art/Painting/ Drawing: 25%
- Nature photography: 24%
- Tent camping (primitive camping - no utilities): 24%
- Off-road vehicle use: 23%
- Hiking/backpacking: 23%
- RV/trailer camping (with electric/water hookups): 22%
- Golf, driving range or putting: 22%
- Paddling (canoeing/kayaking/rafting/paddleboarding): 18%
- Nature play spaces: 16%
- Jet skiing (personal watercraft): 16%
- Water skiing/wakeboarding/etc.: 16%
- Horseback riding: 16%
- Group Camp or Rally camping: 13%
- Boat or Bike Camping: 10%
- Mountain biking: 9%
- Skateboarding: 9%
- Rock Wall climbing: 8%
- Zip line / ropes course: 8%
- Sailing: 6%
- Other: 4%
- Geocaching: 4%
- Gravity sports: 2%
- Slacklining: 2%
The top ten outdoor activities among overall respondents were relatively consistent with the top ten activities among most of the individual Region respondents, although with slight differences reflecting each of the regions’ unique characteristics.

- Fishing was the top activity for Regions 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8, particularly Region 3 on the Gulf of Mexico. Fishing was slightly popular in Regions 1, 2, and 6.

- Activities like walking, picnicking, visiting playgrounds, spectator activities, visiting natural areas, and non-team outdoor sports were more popular among Region 1 respondents (New Orleans), but activities like fishing and hunting had lower participation.
Figure 6
Outdoor Recreation Activities – Top Ten Activities Overall – By Region
Barriers to Participation

A lack of time, personal issues, and physical limitations are the greatest barriers to overall respondents participating more frequently in outdoor activities, as well as the top barrier within each region. Forty-four percent of overall respondents indicated this was a barrier to more frequent participation, and Regions 1, 4, and 5 each had even higher percentages, especially Region 5 where 63 percent mentioned it as a barrier.

Some of the “other” barriers mentioned by respondents (15 percent of respondents) included:

- Climate of area, including heat and humidity
- Distance and travel time
- Don’t own or have access to a boat in order to utilize waterways as much as they would like

![Figure 7: Greatest Barriers to Participating More Frequently in Outdoor Activities](image)

Other issues mentioned, although to a much lesser extent, include safety and security, transportation/access issues, and lack of program/facility awareness (each mentioned by 11 percent of overall respondents).

- Safety and security was mentioned by a larger proportion of respondents in Regions 1, 5, and 8 than other regions.
- Transportation/access issues were mentioned by a larger proportion of respondents in Regions 7 and 8 than other regions.
- A lack of program/facility awareness was mentioned by a similar proportion of respondents from most regions, except Region 4 where only 4 percent mentioned it.
Figure 8
Greatest Barriers to Participating More Frequently in Outdoor Activities – By Region

- No time/other personal issues/physical limitations
- None
- Other
- Safety and security
- Transportation/access issues
- Not aware of program/facilities offered
- Condition of parks
- Price/user fees
- Lack of facilities/programs
- Hours of operation
- Size of facilities/amount of space available
- Prefer other recreation providers
VISITATION

Outdoor Recreation Location and Frequency of Participation

In the past year, the majority of respondents participated in outdoor recreation activities at their local City or Parish parks (71 percent). State parks and historic sites were the second most frequented location (55 percent), followed by private lands and facilities (52 percent). National Forest, National Parks, and Federal Lands, and trails outside of parks, forests, and Federal Lands were used the least by all regions (used by 36 percent and 22 percent of overall respondents, respectively).

Of those respondents who visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway in the past 12 months, 54 percent visited 5 times or fewer and 20 percent visited more than 8 times.

Almost half of overall respondents indicated that they visited parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways with the same frequency as the past five years (48 percent of respondents). However, while 18 percent of overall respondents indicated they visited parks more frequently than in the past, 34 percent indicated that they visited parks less frequently in the past 12 months compared to the past five years.

Figure 9
Type of Facility Participation Location / Frequency / Change in Frequency

Participated in outdoor recreation activities at:
- City or Parish park: 71%
- State park or State historic site: 55%
- Private lands or private facility: 52%
- National Forest, National Parks or Federal Lands: 36%
- Trails other than those found in a park, forest or Federal land: 22%
- Other: 8%

Number of times visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway in last 12 months:
- 1-2 times: 28%
- 3-5 times: 26%
- 6-8 times: 9%
- More than 8 times: 20%
- None: 17%

Change in visitation over the past 12 months compared to the past five years:
- More frequently: 18%
- Less frequently: 34%
- With the same frequency: 48%
While the majority of overall respondents participated in outdoor recreation activities at their local City or Parish parks (71 percent), this percentage was even higher among Region 1 respondents (88 percent). National Forest, National Parks, and Federal Lands, and trails outside of parks, forests, and Federal Lands were used the least by all regions, but respondents in Regions 6 and 7 were noticeably more likely to have visited National Forests, National Parks, and Federal Lands than respondents in the other regions.

**Figure 10**

*Incidence of Visiting Park, Historic Site, Forest, or Natural Waterway – By Region*
Respondents from Region 2 were among the most frequent visitors of parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways, with 26 percent of respondents visiting more than 8 times in the past 12 months (compared to 20 percent of overall respondents). Respondents from Regions 1 and 3 also had frequent participation, but not quite to the level of Region 2.

Figure 11
Frequency of Visiting Park, Historic Site, Forest, or Natural Waterway in past 12 months – By Region

Almost half of overall respondents indicated that they visited parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways with the same frequency as the past five years. Respondents from Regions 1, 2, and 8 were more likely than other regions to have not changed the frequency of their visitation, while Region 7 respondents were the most likely to have visited parks less frequently in the past 12 months.
Type of Visits

Respondents were asked to estimate, what proportion of their trips over the past year to parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways were overnight versus day trips. Of the trips taken by overall respondents, an average of 74 percent were day trips, compared to 26 percent overnight trips. The proportion of overnight trips was slightly higher among Region 4 and 5 respondents (33 percent of trips from each region were overnight), as well as Regions 2 and 8 (with at least 29 percent of trips from each region being overnight).
Regions Visited and Travel Time

Half of all respondents indicated that they have visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway in Region 1, followed by 47 percent visiting a park in Region 2, and 37 percent visiting Region 4. As would be expected, respondents tend to visit parks, historic sites, forests, and natural waterways in their home regions at a higher rate than parks and facilities in other regions. As shown in Figure 15, respondents living in each region were the most likely to visit a park or facility in that same region, but Regions 1, 2, and 4 had the strongest visitation from outside the Region, and Region 8 had the lowest level of visitation from respondents outside its own region.

On average, more than half of respondents travel between 30 minutes and 2 hours from their home to visit a park or recreation area (56 percent of respondents). Only 23 percent of respondents travel an average of less than 30 minutes, and 21 percent travel more than 2 hours.

When visiting parks and facilities outside their own region, respondents were most likely to visit neighboring regions. Other than visiting parks and facilities in the same region they live, respondents from:

- Region 1 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 2
- Region 2 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 1
- Region 3 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 1
- Region 4 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 2
• Region 5 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 4
• Region 6 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Regions 7 or 4
• Region 7 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 2 (although had the least amount of outside region visitation)
• Region 8 were most likely to have visited a park or facility in Region 7

![Figure 15: Regions Visited Park, Historic Site, Forest, or Natural Waterway – By Region](image-url)
Respondents from Regions 1 and 8 were the most likely to spend less than 30 minutes traveling to a park or recreation area from their home, while Regions 3, 4, 5, and 6 were the most likely to spend between 1 and 2 hours.

Figure 16
Average Travel Time to Parks or Recreation Areas – By Region
SATISFACTION

Satisfaction with Outdoor Recreation in Louisiana

Satisfaction with aspects of outdoor recreation in Louisiana is good overall, but varies slightly by Region. Overall, respondents are most satisfied with the “active outdoor recreation opportunities provided” (62 percent indicated a rating of 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5), followed by the efforts to preserve land (57 percent). On the lower end of the scale, respondents are less satisfied with the state’s ability to provide adequate educational opportunities (48 percent satisfied and 21 percent dissatisfied).

Respondents from:

- Regions 4 and 8 were more satisfied with the efforts to preserve the land than in other regions.
- Regions 4 and 6 were more satisfied with the active outdoor recreation opportunities provided than in other regions.
- Regions 3 and 4 were slightly more satisfied with the educational opportunities provided than in other regions.
- Regions 1 and 6 were slightly more satisfied with the stewardship of the State’s land and water resources than in other regions.

![Figure 17: Level of Satisfaction with Outdoor Recreation Areas in Louisiana](image_url)
Respondents were relatively satisfied with the amount of public access to natural bodies of water near their home. Overall, 43 percent of respondents indicated a rating of 5 “extremely satisfied” with the amount of access and 24 percent indicated a rating of 4 (on a 5-point scale). A total of 67 percent of overall respondents were satisfied, a percentage that was higher among respondents in Regions 1 and 7.

Figure 18
Satisfaction with the Amount of Public Access to Natural Bodies of Water near your Home – By Region
IMPORTANCE AND FULFILLMENT OF NEEDS

Importance of Availability of Outdoor Recreation Opportunities

Almost half of all respondents indicated that the availability of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation facilities was “extremely important” to their household (48 percent rated it a 5 on a scale from 1 to 5). Another 21 percent gave a rating of “4,” for a total of 70 percent of respondents rating the availability “important,” either a 4 or 5. While respondents from most Regions indicated similar levels of importance, the availability of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation facilities was more important to respondents in Region 1 with 76 percent indicating a rating of 4 or 5. Respondents in Regions 5, 6, and 7 placed less importance on the availability of parks and recreation facilities, especially Regions 6 and 7 where between 18 percent and 20 percent of respondents indicated a rating of 1 or 2.

Figure 19
Importance of Availability of Parks, Trails, and Outdoor Recreation Facilities – By Region
Degree to Which Needs Are Being Met by Current Outdoor Recreation Amenities

One-fourth of respondents (25 percent) indicated that the parks, trails, outdoor recreation facilities, and outdoor education programs are “completely” meeting their or their household’s needs (rating of 5 on a scale from 1 to 5). Another 27 percent gave a rating of “4” on the 5-point scale, totaling 52 percent of respondents indicating either a 4 or 5 that the parks and facilities were meeting their needs). In contrast, 18 percent of overall respondents reported that their or their households’ needs are not being met.

Regions 1, 2, and 8 had the highest proportion of respondents indicate that the parks, trails, outdoor recreation facilities, and outdoor education programs in their area currently were meeting their needs. Most regions had similar proportions of respondents who indicated a rating of 4 and a rating of 5, with the exception of Regions 7 and 8 where there was a noticeably larger proportion who indicated a rating of 5, rather than 4. In contrast, Regions 3 and 4 had significantly fewer respondents that indicated a rating of 5, compared to ratings of 4.

Figure 20
Parks, Trails, and Outdoor Recreation Facilities Currently Meeting Household’s Needs – By Region
Importance of Access to Connecting Trails

Respondents were asked to rate how important access to trails connecting outdoor recreation opportunities were to them and their households. Overall, 60 percent indicate that connecting trails is very important, 36 percent which indicated it was “extremely important,” giving a rating of 5. The importance of trails connecting outdoor recreation opportunities was especially important to respondents in Regions 1, 5, and 8. For almost all regions, the proportion of 5 ratings exceeded the proportion of 4 ratings. This was most evident in Region 8 where 56 percent of respondents indicated a rating of 5 and 23 percent gave a rating of 4.

Figure 21
Importance of Access to Trails Connecting to Outdoor Recreation Opportunities – By Region
Benefits of Land Conservation and Outdoor Recreation

The survey asked respondents to rate the importance of specific benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation. The majority of respondents rated each of the benefits as being “extremely important.” Each benefit, with the exception of “connecting people with nature” and “providing an economic benefit,” was rated a 5 “extremely important” by at least 70 percent of all respondents. The attribute of “connecting people with nature” was rated as “extremely important” by 61 percent of the respondents and “providing an economic benefit” by 53 percent.

![Figure 22: Importance of Land Conservation and Outdoor Recreation Benefits](image)

The average ratings for the attributes of the benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation did not vary much when broken out by region. Respondents from Regions 1 and 2 placed a slightly higher importance on each of the attributes, while respondents from Region 5 placed a slightly lower importance on most attributes.

Respondents were also asked in an open-ended question if they felt there were any other benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation. A wide variety of comments were provided, which can be found in the appendix section of this report, but several key themes were mentioned more than others, including:

- Coastal restoration,
- Education opportunities,
- Social aspects and family bonding,
- Wildlife preservation, and
- Land preservation, specifically for future generations.
FUTURE PRIORITIES

Prioritization of Recreation Types for Future Investment in Louisiana

In order to prioritize future investments in the state, respondents were asked to rate how important certain recreation areas should be for future investment in Louisiana. Most options were relatively important to respondents, but the top priority was “forests and/or lakes/rivers with established trails, dispersed camping, boating, and fishing opportunities.” At the other end of the scale were “wilderness areas or open lands with little to no development and opportunity for solitude.” More than 60 percent of respondents indicated that the forests/lakes/river option was “extremely important” (rating of 5), while 22 percent rated it as a 4, for a total of 83 percent. Similarly, most attributes received more 5 ratings than 4.
What should Louisiana pursue

The largest proportion of respondents (60 percent) feel that Louisiana should pursue an equal balance between natural resource preservation/protection and providing outdoor recreation in natural settings. The remaining respondents were almost equally split between the two sides (21 percent emphasis on natural resource preservation/protection and 19 percent on providing outdoor recreation in natural settings). Respondents in most regions prefer a balanced approach, but Regions 7 and 8 tended to have a slightly more clear opinion one way or another (both with slightly higher percentages of respondents preferring an emphasis on natural resource preservation/protection). There was also a higher proportion of Region 1 respondents that placed a slightly greater emphasis on natural resource preservation/protection, while Region 5, 6, and 8 respondents placed a slightly greater emphasis on providing outdoor recreation in natural settings.

**Figure 24**
*Emphasis Outdoor Recreation Providers in Louisiana Should Pursue – By Region*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Emphasis on natural resource preservation/protection</th>
<th>Equal balance between preservation/protection and outdoor recreation</th>
<th>Emphasis on providing outdoor recreation in natural settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding
Prioritization of Activities on Public Lands

To help outdoor recreation providers prioritize their efforts, respondents were asked to rate the importance of various priorities on public lands in Louisiana. Overall, long-term planning and management, operation and maintenance of existing infrastructure and facilities, and educational programs and visitor experiences on public lands were the most important. For each of these three priorities, 55 percent or more of overall respondents indicated a rating of 5 “extremely important” on a 5-point scale, and as shown in the following figure, when combined with 4 ratings, each of the top three had at least 78 percent of respondents indicating high importance. Acquisition of new parks and open space was the “least” important priority to respondents, although still with 40 percent of respondents giving a rating of 5 and 23 percent of respondents indicating a rating of 4.

Figure 25
How Recreation Providers Should Prioritize Activities on Public Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term planning and management</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of existing</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure and facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing educational programs and visitor</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new facilities at existing</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local, regional, and statewide trails</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of new parks and open space</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Public Funds to Acquire Land

Respondents were asked to rate the importance that the State of Louisiana spend public funds to acquire land to prevent the loss of exceptional natural areas to development. Overall, 53 percent of respondents indicated this was “extremely important” to them (rating of 5 on a 5-point scale), and 20 percent indicated a rating of 4 (total of 72 percent indicating importance). This proportion was highest in Regions 1, 3, and 8, especially Region 1 where 66 percent of respondents gave a rating of 5.

Figure 26
Importance for the State to Spend Public Funds to Acquire Land – By Region
GENERAL OPEN ENDED COMMENTS

Respondents were asked if they had any additional comments or suggestions that they would like to offer regarding land preservation and recreational opportunities provided in Louisiana. Of those respondents that provided comments, no single dominant theme was apparent, but several key issues were mentioned more than others, including:

- Preservation and restoration of coastlands and wetlands
  - I LIKE TO SEE OUR COASTAL RESTORATION AND DON’T HAVE ENOUGH FUNDING AND DON’T HAVE ENOUGH TO FUND COASTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.
  - I THINK WE NEED TO PAY ATTENTION TO EROSION OF OUR COAST LINE. IT’S A REAL PROBLEM.
  - I WOULD LIKE TO SEE OUR COASTLINE PRESERVED BETTER BECAUSE WE ARE LOSING, AND HARD TO REESTABLISH.
  - JUST THAT THE PUBLIC BE MORE AWARE OF HOW TO PREVENT COASTAL EROSION
  - WE SHOULD PRESERVE OUR WETLANDS AND NATURAL AREAS, WE NEED TO DO MORE FOR OUR CHILDREN, MAKE THEM A PRIORITY.

- Providing educational opportunities, especially for young people
  - I THINK SOME PEOPLE NEED TO BE EDUCATED ON HOW TO CONSERVE AND APPRECIATE AND RESPECT THE LAND AND TEACH THE YOUNG PEOPLE IN SCHOOLS. THAT SHOULD DEFINITELY BE TAUGHT.
  - THE KIDS ARE INTO IT, BUT THEY DON’T SEEM TO CONNECT TO ADULTS. EDUCATION AND INVOLVEMENT, PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES.
  - PUT MORE FACILITIES TO TEACH THE PUBLIC LAND PRESERVATION AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION.

- The use of state funds and taxpayer money for land preservation and acquisition, parks, open space, trails, and activities
  - IF THERE’S LIMITED DOLLARS IT’S MOST IMPORTANT TO ACQUIRE NEW LAND THAN TO FOCUS ON FACILITIES ALREADY IN PLACE.
  - LAND MUST BE ACQUIRED AND APPROPRIATED FOR THE GROWTH OF THE STATE WHILE KEEPING THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE STATE PRESERVED AND MAINTAINED.
  - SEND MORE MONEY TO DO THE UPKEEP ON THE ONES THAT THEY ALREADY HAVE.
  - DO NOT USE TAX PAYER DOLLARS ON THAT SORT OF THING, LET IT ALL BE PRIVATE, DONE BY THE PRIVATE SECTOR.
  - I DON’T WANT TO PAY MORE TAXES TO PAY FOR ALL OF THAT, TO WHATEVER THEY WANT TO DO IN ADDITION TO THAT.
• Communication
  o **THE ONLY THING I WOULD SAY IS TO DO A BETTER JOB TO LET THE PUBLIC KNOW WHAT'S AVAILABLE FOR HIKING ETC. THERE'S PROBABLY SOME THINGS I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY ARE BECAUSE I DON'T HEAR ABOUT THEM.**
  o **ADVERTISEMENT IS SOMETHING THEY NEED TO WORK ON.**

The full set of comments, which can be found in the appendix, should be viewed in order to understand the extent of issues covered and the specific topics and location of these issues.
ONLINE OPEN LINK SURVEY ANALYSIS

As mentioned in the introduction, the responses to the online open link version of the survey are “self-selected” and thus not included in the above analysis. The survey received 568 responses. The highlights of this research are provided below.

Open link respondents were nearly equally split between male (52 percent) and female (48 percent). The average age of open link respondents is 50.6 (with a median of 48.0), skewing just slightly older than the random sample (46.2 average age). Most open link respondents are families with children at home (37 percent), followed by empty-nesters (24 percent), couples without children (20 percent), and singles without children (19 percent). As such, open link respondents were proportionately more likely to be singles or couples without children than random sample respondents. Many of these respondents live in the Baton Rouge area (28 percent).

Activity Participation

Overall, the open link survey respondents are avid outdoor recreational enthusiasts. As such, they are prevalent users of the state parks, forests, and wildlife areas managed by the Louisiana Office of State Parks. As seen in Figure 27, nearly all of the respondents to the open link survey indicate that a member of their household participates in outdoor recreation (98 percent), as compared to 76 percent of random sample respondents. Random sample and open link respondents differ somewhat in their activity profiles. Open link respondents are especially likely to participate in walking (80 percent), visiting natural areas (71 percent), fishing (61 percent), and picnicking (61 percent). Among random sample respondents, fishing (62 percent), walking (61 percent), and picnicking (55 percent) are also top activities, however, random sample respondents participate to a lesser extent than do open link respondents.

As compared to random sample respondents, open link respondents also participate in the following activities with notably greater frequency: hiking/backpacking (53 percent of open link respondents vs. 23 percent of random sample respondents), nature programs/self-guided tours (52 percent vs. 30 percent), paddling sports (48 percent vs. 18 percent), botanic gardens (47 percent vs. 29 percent), bird/watching/wildlife viewing (44 percent vs. 32 percent), camping cabins (44 percent vs. 27 percent), nature photography (44 percent vs. 25 percent), and mountain biking (24 percent vs. 9 percent).
Figure 27
Outdoor Recreation Activity Participation – Random Sample vs. Open Link

Do you or members of your household participate in outdoor recreation activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming outdoors</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting playgrounds</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator activities</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting natural areas</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing outdoor athletic team sports (soccer, volleyball)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non team outdoor sports (basketball, tennis, other)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/jogging</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (road) - on a road bike only</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird watching / wildlife viewing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting sports (target shooting, archery)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature programs / Self guided tours</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanic gardens</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor boating</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping cabins</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabbing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Painting/Drawing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature photography</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent camping (primitive camping - no utilities)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road vehicle use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/backpacking</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV/trailer camping (with electric/water hookups)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf, driving range or putting</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling (canoeing/kayaking/rafting/paddleboarding)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature play spaces</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet skiing (personal watercraft)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water skiing/wakeboarding/etc.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Camp or Rally camping</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat or Bike Camping</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Wall climbing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip line / ropes course</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geocaching</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity sports</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slacklining</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sorted in descending order by Random Sample (Phone)
Outdoor Recreation Facilities to be Added, Expanded, or Improved

In a question unique to the open link survey, respondents were asked to indicate the five most important outdoor facilities in Louisiana to be added, expanded, or improved. The most cited facilities included: paved trails (60 percent), unpaved trails (55 percent), and camping areas (49 percent). Paved trails seem to be a particularly important priority, as this option had the highest share of open link respondents identifying paved trails as “most important” (29 percent).

Figure 28
Five Most Important Outdoor Rec. Facilities to be Added, Expanded, or Improved
– Open Link Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Second Most Important</th>
<th>Third Most Important</th>
<th>Fourth Most Important</th>
<th>Fifth Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved trails (for bikers, hikers)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved trails (for bikers, hikers, horseback riding)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping areas</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical sites</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental cabins</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming beaches</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing areas</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking areas</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating facilities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting ranges</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic fields</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road vehicle trails</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery ranges</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding
Location and Frequency of Participation

Most open link respondents participate in outdoor recreation activities at state parks or state historic sites (81 percent) or city or parish parks (78 percent). These sites are also most identified among random sample participants. Open link respondents have used outdoor recreation sites more than random sample respondents, with over half of all open link respondents indicating they have visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway more than eight times in the past year (54 percent). While open link respondents have either mostly maintained (42 percent) or increased (41 percent) their frequency of use, random sample respondents have a greater share of respondents reporting reduced frequency of use (34 percent).

Figure 29
Type of Facility Participation Location / Frequency of Participation / Change in Frequency – Random Sample vs. Open Link

Participated in outdoor recreation activities at:
- City or Parish park
- State park or State historic site
- Private lands or private facility
- National Forest, National Parks or Federal Lands
- Trails other than those found in a park, forest or Federal land
- Other

Number of times visited a park, historic site, forest, or natural waterway in last 12 months

- 1-2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-8 times
- More than 8 times
- None

Change in visitation over the past 12 months compared to the past five years

- More frequently
- Less frequently
- With the same frequency
Barriers to Participation

The survey also documented what factors serve as obstacles to more frequent participation in outdoor activity. Open link and random sample respondents differed considerably in their responses. While random sample respondents most often cited “no time/other personal issues/physical limitations” (44 percent), open link respondents were most likely to report they were not aware of programs or facilities (44 percent) or because of the condition of parks (36 percent). Overall, it seems as though open link respondents are more motivated to participate in outdoor activities, but would like to see improvements in communications and facilities in order to increase their use.

Figure 30
Barriers to Participating in Outdoor Activities More Frequently
– Random Sample vs. Open Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No time/other personal issues/physical limitations</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/access issues</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of program/facilities offered</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of parks</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/user fees</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities/programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of facilities/amount of space available</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer other recreation providers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sorted in descending order by Random Sample (Phone)
Importance and Level of Needs Being Met

Open link respondents place greater emphasis on the importance of the availability of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation facilities than do random sample respondents. Approximately 69 percent of open link respondents rated this availability a ‘5’, “extremely important”, as compared to 48 percent of random sample respondents, and gave an average rating of 4.6 (vs. 4.0 among random sample respondents). However, random sample respondents were more likely to report that parks, trails, outdoor recreation facilities, and education programs are meeting their needs compared to open link participants. Twenty-five percent of random sample respondents reported these facilities and programs were completely meeting their needs, as compared to 4 percent of open link respondents. Random sample respondents gave an average rating of 3.5, while open link respondents provided a rating of 3.1. It is worth noting that there is a notable gap between level of importance and needs being met among open link respondents.

Figure 31

Importance and Level of Needs Being Met for Parks, Trails, Outdoor Recreation Facilities, and Education Programs – Random Sample vs. Open Link

How important to you and your household is the availability of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all important</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Extremely Important</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well do you think the parks, trail, outdoor recreation facilities and outdoor education programs in your area are currently meeting your/your household’s needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Level</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all meeting the needs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Completely meeting the needs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average

- Random Sample: 4.0
- Open Link: 4.6

- Random Sample: 3.5
- Open Link: 3.1
Benefits of Land Conservation and Outdoor Recreation

Open link and random sample respondents have relatively similar views regarding the importance of benefits of land conservation and recreation. These two segments both gave the highest average importance rating for promoting healthy active lifestyles. However, open link respondents are more likely to place greater importance on the benefit of connecting people with nature (4.6) than random sample respondents (4.3). Open link respondents additionally weighed in on a few other potential benefits, including improving physical health and improving emotional well-being, both of which received relatively high average scores of 4.5. “Meeting new people/social interaction” was deemed to be a relatively less important benefit than the others listed.

*Sorted in descending order by Random Sample (Phone)
The open link respondents feel that the top three most important benefits of land conservation and outdoor recreation are: connecting people with nature (58 percent), providing places for healthy active lifestyles (57 percent), and protecting the environment (43 percent). Open link respondents considered providing an economic benefit (10 percent) and meeting new people/social interaction (5 percent) to be relatively less important.

Figure 33

*Three Most Important Benefits of Land Conservation and Outdoor Recreation – Open Link Survey*
Importance of Recreation Areas for Future Investment

Respondents were asked the following: “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means ‘Not at all important’ and 5 means ‘Extremely important’, how much of a priority do you feel each of the following types of recreation areas should be for future investment in Louisiana?” Both random sample and open link respondents gave the highest average rating for “forest and/or lakes/rivers with established trails, dispersed camping, boating, and fishing opportunities” (4.4 average score, respectively). Open link respondents also prioritized community parks within walking or biking distance of neighborhoods (4.2).

Figure 34
Importance of Recreation Areas for Future Investment – Average Rating
– Random Sample vs. Open Link

*Sorted in descending order by Random Sample (Phone)
Satisfaction with Outdoor Recreation

Consistent with responses regarding the extent to which outdoor recreation facilities and programs are meeting household needs, random sample respondents were also more likely than open link respondents to report higher average satisfaction with various aspects of outdoor recreation in Louisiana. While random sample respondents gave average ratings within the 3.4 to 3.8 range, open link respondents’ average ratings landed in the 3.0 to 3.3 range.

Figure 35
Level of Satisfaction with the Following Areas of Outdoor Recreation in Louisiana– Average Rating– Random Sample vs. Open Link

*Sorted in descending order by Random Sample (Phone)
Emphasis on Preservation/Protection vs. Outdoor Recreation

Similar to the random sample, the majority of open link respondents (66 percent) feel that Louisiana outdoor recreation providers should pursue an equal balance between natural resource preservation/protection and providing outdoor recreation in natural settings. The remaining open link respondents are also generally split between the two directions, with a slightly higher share of respondents preferring an emphasis on providing outdoor recreation (21 percent) and a smaller share favoring natural resource preservation/protection (13 percent). As more frequent recreationists, open link participants seem to be more in favor of outdoor recreation providers supporting these interests.

Figure 36
Emphasis Respondents Would Like to See Outdoor Recreation Providers in Louisiana Pursue – Random Sample vs. Open Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on natural resource preservation/protection</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal balance between preservation/protection and outdoor rec.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on providing outdoor recreation in natural settings</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding
Areas in Need of Improvement

According to open link respondents, the most important area for improvement is access to trails connecting to outdoor recreational opportunities (84 percent). Nearly half of all respondents (46 percent) cited this as the number one most important area for improvement. However, road signage identifying park locations/trails/bike routes (76 percent) and improved water-based recreation (65 percent) are also considered important among open link respondents.

**Figure 37**

*Three Most Important Aspects of Outdoor Recreation that are in Most Need of Improvement – Open Link*

- Access to trails connecting to outdoor rec. opportunities: 84%
- Road signage identifying park locations/trails/bike routes: 76%
- Improved water-based recreation: 65%
- WiFi availability at your local and state parks: 32%
- Barrier-free or ADA-friendly parks and recreation sites: 32%
Importance of Public Funds in Acquiring Land

Respondents were asked, “How important is it to you that the State of Louisiana spend public funds to acquire land to prevent the loss of exceptional natural areas to development?” As shown in Figure 38, open link respondents felt this to be of somewhat greater importance than random sample respondents, giving an average rating of 4.4 (vs. 4.1).

Figure 38
Importance of Public Funds in Acquiring Land to Prevent the Loss of Natural Areas to Development – Average Rating – Random Sample vs. Open Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Random Sample (Phone)</th>
<th>Open Link (Web)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all important</td>
<td>0% 8%</td>
<td>0% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4% 4%</td>
<td>11% 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20% 26%</td>
<td>53% 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20% 26%</td>
<td>53% 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Extremely Important</td>
<td>0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70%</td>
<td>0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average
Random Sample | 4.1
Open Link     | 4.4