



2011 – 2016 Wisconsin SCORP: Goals, Recommendations, and Actions

Amy Klusmeier
Reese Railling
Colleen Hoesly
Daniel Payette

URPL Fall Workshop

December 15, 2010

Background

Problem Defined/Our Challenge:

- Creating a product that could be used to refine/create the 2011-2016 SCORP **goals**, **actions**, and **recommendations**



Methods

2005-2010 SCORP and Literature Review:

- *2005-2010 SCORP*: Review of relevant sections
- *Literature Review*: Academic, special interest, and government literature

Why We Did It:

- To determine status of original initiatives
- To examine relevance for 2011-2016 SCORP
- To find out how practices line up with other comprehensive planning documents and best practices

Methods (cont'd.)

Public Input:

- *Survey*: Solicited input from 80 expert stakeholders
 1. Rate the importance of the 2005-2010 SCORP goals.
 2. Identify barriers and opportunities for outdoor recreation.
 3. How strongly is your work connected to the health and wellness of Wisconsin residents
- *Focus Groups*: Issues with 8 emerging trends discussed
- *Interview*: Issues concerning partnerships and community-based planning and implementation

Why We Did It:

To obtain information from experts about issues (i.e. emerging trends)

Methods (cont'd.)

Stakeholder Identification and Analysis:

- *Stakeholder analysis:* Identified 11 individuals/groups that could impact or be impacted by SCORP

Why We Did It:

- Implications for policy and implementation
- Means of identifying experts

Stakeholder Identification and Analysis

Criteria for Inclusion:

1. Stakeholder possesses special or extensive knowledge of one or more issues
2. Capable of facilitating or disrupting implementation
3. Impacted by or target of SCORP

Once included, assessed by:

- Influence = impact on SCORP creation
- Importance = impact on SCORP implementation

- 1 Landowners
- 2 Industry and industry advocates
- 3 Non-motorized users
- 4 Motorized users
- 5 Special needs and urban users
- 6 Conservation and preservation
- 7 Public health
- 8 Public safety and law enforcement
- 9 Academia
- 10 Economic development and planning
- 11 Government

		Stakeholder Importance			
		Unknown	Minimal	Moderate	Significant
Stakeholder Influence	Significant		7 9	6	11
	Moderate			2	3 4 10
	Minimal			1	5 8
	Unknown				

Status of Initiatives

3 Recommendations Accomplished

- Renew the Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson Stewardship Program
 - Develop a “Get Fit with Wisconsin” campaign – “Get Outdoors” and “Governor’s Wisconsin Challenge” programs
 - Develop a statewide interactive mapping system that shows public lands and access points statewide – DNR Webview
- Many ongoing or status unknown
 - Keep goals from previous SCORP
 - Modify actions and recommendations



Select Research Findings

1. Protect, Restore, and Enhance Wisconsin's Natural Resources for Outdoor Recreation

Why Important:

- 93% of survey respondents believe this goal is important or very important

Recommendations:

- *Funding*: Increase funding (Survey)
- *Land acquisition*: acquire land for outdoor recreation/conservation (Survey)

Select Research Findings (cont'd.)

5. Continue to Provide and Enhance Public Access to Wisconsin Outdoor Recreational Lands and Waters

Why Important:

- 87% of survey respondents believe this goal is important or very important
- 42% of survey respondents listed Inadequate access to facilities as barrier to outdoor recreation (second highest in survey)

Recommendations:

- *Trail Access:* Plans should be created for entire corridors. (URPL)
- *Facility Access:* Government entities should try to partner with private sports facility providers (URPL)
- *Water Access:* The DNR should fund and support improved access to lakes, streams, and other bodies of water, as well as facilities that cater to these activities (URPL)

Select Research Findings (cont'd.)

8. Maintain and Enhance Funding Opportunities for Wisconsin Outdoor Recreation

Why Important:

- 87% of survey respondents believe this goal is important or very important

Recommendations:

- *Public/public partnerships:* Municipalities and neighborhoods or informal/formal organizations share maintenance and management responsibilities
- *Public/private partnerships:* Partnerships with businesses to promote economic development

Select Research Findings (cont'd.)

Other Survey Items:

- **Connection to Public Health:**

- 61% of respondents said the connection is “very strong”
- 26% said “strong”

Select Innovative Ideas Emerging from Research:

- **Measurement/Definition:** Develop metrics for economic impact analysis
- **Information Gathering/Solicitation:** Develop a stakeholder/database network
- **Connections/Collaboration Ideas:** Increase between local/regional/state lands
- **Big Ideas:** Develop flexible land use and park master plans to accommodate emerging activities and changes in users

Conclusions and Limitations

Conclusions:

- Relevancy of previous SCORP
- Public health should be broadly construed
- Additional focus groups
- Need metrics and marketing

Limitations:

- Unknown status of actions and recommendations
- Progress not easily measurable because goals are broad
- Must include other sources of information, including local plans and incorporate into 2011-2016 SCORP

