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Why is a SCORP required for LWCF grants?

• Federal grant programs sometimes require States to periodically submit an assessment of need that describes generally how grant funds may be applied to legitimate purposes / eligible projects and expenses over the ‘planning horizon’. Such reports assure Congress and the public that the funds will be spent appropriately to address the State’s valid and unique needs.

• Currently SCORPs have a 5 year ‘planning horizon’.
Goals & Objectives of the SCORP

The goals of the SCORP and its associated planning process are to direct each State's use of its LWCF apportionment. Objectives:

a. Fulfill the purposes of the LWCF Act;

b. Provide each State the maximum opportunity and flexibility to develop and implement its plan;

c. Describe the role of the LWCF in the State's provision of outdoor recreation resources and the State’s policies for use of its LWCF apportionment (via the Open Project Selection Process or OPSP in which LWCF grant applications compete for funding);

d. Provide a basis for determining each State's LWCF eligibility; and

e. Ensure relevant, influential and timely planning for the State's use of its LWCF apportionment.
Goals & Objectives of the SCORP

And yet … States are “encouraged to conduct outdoor recreation planning beyond the minimum required to maintain LWCF eligibility.” States can link the SCORP’s analysis and proposals to issues of statewide importance or emphasis (e.g. economic development, tourism, public health, ecological restoration or adaptation, etc.).

In addition, States are encouraged “to consider in their plans the needs and opportunities for establishing recreation and historic trails, and wild, scenic and recreational river areas.”
Minimum requirements

a. The name of the state agency that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the LWCF Act of 1965, as amended.

b. Evaluation of demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the state.

c. An program for implementation of the plan.

d. Certification by the Governor that ample opportunity for public participation has taken place in plan development.

e. Other necessary information, as may be determined by the Secretary.

The SCORP shall take into account relevant federal resources and programs and shall be correlated so far as practicable with other state, regional and local plans.
a. The **name of the state agency** that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the LWCF Act of 1965, as amended

---

**Introduction**

Every five years, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Missouri State Parks produces a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) as a framework for planning, development, management and protection of the state’s outdoor recreation resources.

The SCORP also meets the requirements of the federal Land and Water Conservation (LWCF) grant program, ensuring that Missouri remains eligible to receive federal LWCF funds for future outdoor recreation projects. (Missouri State Parks staffs the State Inter-Agency Council for Outdoor Recreation (SIACOR), which administers the LWCF program for the state of Missouri.)
b. Evaluation of demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the state

*Can be done in different ways (quantitative vs qualitative methods)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Need</th>
<th>Public Recreation Provider Survey</th>
<th>Oregon Resident Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close-to-Home Priorities</strong></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Dispersed-Area Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community trail systems</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Group campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playgrounds</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>RV / trailer campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of trail corridors &amp; ROWs</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Public restroom facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails connected to public lands</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Tent campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public restroom facilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Group day-use &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking / day-use facilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Acquisition of trail corridors &amp; ROWs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From OR SCORP 2013-2017*
c. A program for implementation of the plan.

Can include proposals broad in nature and description. However, at least some should be written in sufficient detail to update OPSP scoring criteria so that new LWCF grant-funded projects will incrementally implement at least some of the SCORP.

The SCORP is not required to identify specific timelines or funding sources for the implementation plan. Including an updated OPSP is not required, but it is a good idea.
c. A **program for implementation** of the plan.

### Recommendations and Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations and Action Steps</th>
<th>Implementing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Continue to strengthen connections between outdoor recreation and health in communities for people of all ages and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Fund and support pilot programs with innovative partnerships that build a health and wellness connection with outdoor recreation programming, emphasizing active recreation, diverse populations and volunteer recruitment and training.</td>
<td>DOH, DCNR, PPFF, DOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Link state grant program criteria to community projects designed to strengthen the health and outdoor recreation connection.</td>
<td>DCNR, DOH, PennDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Develop educational materials and best practices to highlight and encourage local successes in linking outdoor recreation and health for planning, recreation, community and health care leaders.</td>
<td>DCNR, DOH, PRO Wellness, PRPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identify and work with five pilot communities, representing specific population groups, to develop and distribute materials that highlight available outdoor amenities and correlating fitness benefits.</td>
<td>DCNR, DOA, DOH, PDC, LVGIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All implementation steps do not need to have a direct link to the OPSP, but at least some should. Often the OPSP criteria used to rank LWCF grant applications for funding is the single aspect of the required ‘Implementation Plan’ controlled by the SLO staff overseeing the LWCF grant program.
d. Certification by the Governor that ample opportunity for public participation has taken place in plan development.

I have determined that the public outreach effort undertaken during the planning process gave Idahoans ample opportunity for participation in its development. Elected officials and outdoor recreation opinion leaders statewide took part in focused sessions designed to stimulate discussion on issues and opportunities.

Citizens were encouraged to use an interactive, Web-based tool where they were asked to share their opinions and put forth new ideas. A randomly selected sample of state residents participated in a survey about recreation issues and opportunities. Finally, the draft SCORTP document itself was available for review electronically for 60 days.
Tip: Build in your public comment period at the end.

*If a SCORP is due by the end of December, the ‘best case scenario’ timeline could go something like this…*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>NPS reviews draft and provides comments <em>prior to</em> public comment period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late September - Early October</td>
<td>State makes final edits to draft based on NPS comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-October - Early November</td>
<td>State puts draft SCORP out for public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-November - Early December</td>
<td>State edits draft based on public comments received. The State Parks Board/Steering Committee (or other entity appropriate to the state) reviews and approves the final version. SLO staff initiate Governor’s letter request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early December</td>
<td>NPS receives the final draft including Governor’s letter / certification about ample opportunity for public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late December</td>
<td>NPS accepts the new SCORP update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This is the best case scenario that assumes the State's Parks Board / SCORP steering committee and the Governor's office can turn around their final approvals / letter quickly, which is not always the case.*

*For example, the State Parks Board may have a quarterly schedule and meet the first week of November which would push this hypothetical schedule up by a month. **It is best to map this timing out with the SCORP writing team at least a year in advance.***
Minimum requirements

e. **Other necessary information**, as may be determined by the Secretary

While always possible, it’s not a frequent requirement. There are no specific new requests for information in SCORPs from NPS at this time.

**Plus:**

- The SCORP shall **take into account relevant federal resources and programs** and shall be **correlated** so far as practicable with **other state, regional and local plans**.

- The SCORP update must contain a **reference** to wetlands component pursuant to Section 303 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986. A **new and original wetlands report or assessment is not required** to be included in the SCORP.
Minimum requirements

- Describe the process and methodologies to meet the guidelines in this section.
- The plan may consist of a single document or may be comprised of multiple documents. However, the arrangement must be sensible. A reasonably informed member of the public should be able to find all the components of the SCORP, understand how the sections relate, and that together they comprise the SCORP for the intended purposes.
- Remember you must print 3 hard copies for NPS submission.
Keep the audience(s) in mind

The SCORP should be useful to:

• Decision makers in state and local government deciding which capital projects to approve or fund through grants;

• Private sector recreation providers (and allied industries) deciding what facilities to invest in;

• State policy makers working on issues affected by public recreation facilities and programming, such as: economic development, tourism, public health, infrastructure resilience during extreme weather events, etc.;

• The public interested in / advocating for outdoor recreation in their communities;

• Federal agencies evaluating facility build-out plans and policies; and

• Academic researchers.
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Basic SCORP Elements

SCORP common weaknesses

• Overly dependent on data collection without linking it to reasonable conclusions

• Narrowly focused on one segment of the outdoor recreation in the state, such as only Federal or State-administered resources or one recreation facility type promoted by a vocal advocacy group

• Insufficient public involvement, such as surveying a small number of people relative to the overall population as the only public outreach, or no public comment period at all

• Failing to make an assessment of supply and demand

• Focus on only one aspect of the SCORP (an impressive new GIS database or great public process) while not fulfilling other SCORP requirements

• Lack of implementation plan

• Not allowing sufficient time for a thorough process
Thank you!
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