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Executive Summary

“Connect People with the Outdoors for Health, Conservation, Maine’s Economy, and....Fun!”

Every five years, the State of Maine is required to produce a State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) in order to qualify for the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF).

As part of the SCORP report, a list of priorities forming the basis of an implementation strategy were defined (and are listed below).

Since 1965, the State of Maine has received just shy of $40 million in Land and Water Conservation Funds, which have been used in every county.

2009-2014 ME SCORP Implementation Strategies (Overview...For More Details, See Chapter V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connect Mainers of All Ages with Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Connect Lands and Communities to Nurture Quality of Place</th>
<th>Connect Outdoor Recreation Stakeholders to Improve Collaboration</th>
<th>Connect Trails to Establish or Improve Regional Trail Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strive to provide a broad range of outdoor recreation opportunities for diverse interests and abilities.</td>
<td>Improve infrastructure at and connectivity between our parks, lands, preserves, etc. Recognize and address maintenance challenges.</td>
<td>Acknowledge the importance of private landowners allowing public recreation. Nurture landowner relations.</td>
<td>Invest in sound planning. Involve user groups, landowners, and government agencies in a collaborative effort to develop a vision for extended trail systems across the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on ensuring youth are active in the outdoors and engaged with nature.</td>
<td>Improve planning and coordination efforts that empower communities to identify and protect places and projects of local value.</td>
<td>Bring together diverse elements within communities to better manage and promote outdoor recreation.</td>
<td>Support coordinated trail management including sharing GIS data, public information, and technical expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve appreciation for outdoor recreation’s benefits and awareness of existing opportunities.</td>
<td>Focus on access to open spaces, including bike and pedestrian access. Better link town centers and trails.</td>
<td>Look for opportunities to form or join larger projects (e.g., East Coast Greenway) to leverage support and tourism.</td>
<td>Find ways to further develop gateway communities as regional trail hubs, including tourism and economic development efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More About the SCORP Plan

The federal Land and Water Conservation Fund program (LWCF) provides matching funds to states for statewide outdoor recreation planning and for acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Since 1965, approximately $39.5 million of LWCF money has been used for projects in Maine. Administered at the federal level by the National Park Service and at the state level by the Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) in the Maine Department of Conservation, LWCF grants can provide up to 50% of the allowable costs for approved acquisition or development projects. Municipalities and tribal governments are eligible to apply for local LWCF grants through BPL.

State participation in LWCF requires preparation of a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), and approval of the plan by the National Park Service (NPS). Prior to 2001, Maine state law required BP&L to periodically report to the governor on the supply of and demand for outdoor recreation facilities and how these might be met (12 MRSA 1817). Submittal of the SCORP to the Governor accomplished this reporting requirement. In 2001, the Maine Legislature amended this law to require the BP&L director to submit a state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan to the joint standing committee of the Legislature having jurisdiction over state parks and public lands matters every 5 years.

The planning process for the 2009-2014 Maine SCORP was intended to use best available resources to shape a vision for outdoor recreation needs and opportunities in Maine for the next five years. Details on the planning process can be found in Appendix A of the report.

Who is eligible for LWCF funds?

✦ Municipal agencies (towns, school districts, & counties)
✦ Tribal governments
✦ State agencies

How else can this report support outdoor recreation in Maine?

✦ The ME SCORP serves as a guiding document for outdoor recreation in the state. It synthesizes data, public input, and principles from recreation planning. It can serve as a source document for recreation studies or plans, grant proposals, campaigns, and any other initiative to support or develop outdoor recreation projects.

Trends Affecting Outdoor Recreation in Maine

1. Maine has one of the oldest populations in the Nation.
   As a percentage of the population, Maine’s seniors are a growing demographic. As “Baby Boomers” drive the “graying” of Maine’s population, their outdoor recreation preferences need to be taken into consideration.

2. There is growing concern that youth are not forging relationships with the outdoors.
   It is feared that a new generation of youth may be coming of age without any connection to the outdoors. This phenomenon is linked to health problems (e.g., obesity) and, if unchecked, has ominous implications for future conservation.

3. Sprawl is a continuous threat to outdoor recreation, especially in more developed/developing regions of the state.
   The fragmenting of rural/natural areas reduces the availability of outdoor recreation opportunities, especially close to more populated areas. Additionally, increased posting of lands is another form of fragmentation limiting recreation opportunities.

4. Changes in Maine’s Large-Scale Forest Landscapes Continue to Evolve.
   Mainers and visitors alike rely heavily on public access to privately owned forest lands. The continuation of this tradition is of concern due to rapid changes in ownership and ownership types.

5. “Quality of Place” is an Economic Asset.
   Investment in natural, place-based assets is seen as part of enhancing the valuable Maine “brand” that makes the state a desirable place to visit or live in. Attractive outdoor recreation opportunities, a huge part of Maine’s quality of place, are therefore a vital asset.
Why does this plan matter beyond LWCF funding requirements?
✦ Quality of Place Outdoor recreation is an integral part of Maine life. Mainers participate in outdoor recreation activities above national and New England levels\(^1\). Furthermore, outdoor recreation is a key component of quality of place, which recognizes that special attributes, such as access to stunning woods and waters, make Maine an attractive place to live and visit. Access to quality outdoor recreation experiences is an extremely valuable asset as Maine competes to lure employers and employees.
✦ Tourism Tourism is Maine’s largest industry, producing $10.1 billion in goods and services, $425 million in tax revenue, and 140,000 jobs. Maine’s natural resources and recreation opportunities are central to Maine’s tourism industry. Outdoor recreation is listed as the primary purpose for between 18% and 23% (depending upon season) of all overnight leisure trips in Maine.
✦ Health When 25% of Maine high school students and 36% of Maine kindergartners have a body mass above the 85th percentile, there is reason to worry about the implications of a generation of less healthy Mainers. Outdoor recreation is one tool to combat obesity while also promoting mental wellness. Ensuring access to the outdoors and instilling a love of time spent outside is a public health strategy.
✦ Economic Impact Outdoor recreation is major driver of economic activity in Maine. The three examples listed above represent only a portion of Maine economic activity associated with outdoor recreation.
✦ Conservation If Maine is to have future stewards, conservation advocates, and citizens concerned with protecting nature, then those potential leaders need to have the opportunity to fall in love with the outdoors now.

According to the Maine Office of Tourism, two-thirds of the top 36 Maine information requests involve outdoor recreation opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total economic activity in Maine generated by visitors to BSP equalled $6.9 million.</td>
<td>Visitors to Maine State Parks spent $60.3 million on direct goods and services.</td>
<td>$156 million net spending went towards purchasing, registering, and operating ATVs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

\(^1\) Green, Gary T., Susan Parker, Carter J. Betz, and H. Ken Cordell (2009). *Maine and the Maine Market Region: A Report to the Maine Department of Conservation by the Pioneering Research Group, Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Athens, Georgia*
The Supply of Outdoor Recreation Resources

Outdoor recreation in Maine spans diverse activities and settings ranging from tennis in a highly developed park to backpacking through remote forests. Public conservation and recreation lands now total slightly over 17% of Maine’s land. Still more land is available for public recreation through open-door policies held by many private landowners. Public, private non-profit, private landowners, and commercial entities are all involved in providing outdoor recreation opportunities.

Since 2003, an additional 3,317 miles of ATV trails have been funded. Non-motorized trail systems are also increasing. Non-profit organizations such as Maine Huts and Trails and the Appalachian Mountain Club have each acquired lands and each are actively developing non-motorized trail systems in Maine. For a more detailed discussion, see chapter IV.

Outdoor Recreation is vital to Maine’s economy, health, and culture. Concerted, collaborative efforts are needed to guide recreation planning and developments during challenging fiscal times. This is especially true given that the Maine State Planning Office estimates over $300 million in total green infrastructure needs (State Parks & Historic Sites, nature tourism infrastructure, coastal beaches, fish hatcheries, trails, and the Land for Maine’s Future program).  

---

Maine is many things; the state encompasses bald, windswept peaks, almost endless stretches of sprawling forest lands, bucolic small towns, rolling fields, spruce-clad ocean shores, island-studded harbors, mill towns, working ports, and a whole host of other environments.

This physical beauty, rooted in the allure of deep woods, clean rivers, clear lakes, and crashing surf is intertwined with a sense of place - a tempo, a way of life. Outdoor recreation is central to this way of life. Outdoor recreation's contribution to Maine is more than a collection of swimming pools or soccer fields, though they too have their role. Outdoor recreation is a broad umbrella under which Saturday morning baseball games behind the local middle school and ten day canoe expeditions both belong - along with countless other activities. Maine life is richly imbued with opportunities to get outside and experience the benefits of nature, movement, and traditions.

Maintaining the special character of Maine's places helps protect economic, environmental, and community values. Thus, protecting "quality of place" is a major concern as Maine seeks to ensure that its woods and waters, along with its outdoor recreation infrastructure such as trails and parks, continue to recharge residents and inspire visitors.

It is intended and hoped that this plan helps identify the areas in which outdoor recreation efforts can be undertaken to best serve the people of Maine and the visitors who come here to experience the outdoors. It is also hoped that the information on trends, demand, supply, and issues will be of interest to and support the work of the many diverse people and organizations that play a role in providing outdoor recreation experiences in Maine.

-Maine SCORP Planning Team.
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**Land and Water Conservation Fund Program (LWCF) & Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)**

The federal Land and Water Conservation Fund program (LWCF) provides matching funds to states for statewide outdoor recreation planning and for acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Since 1965, approximately $39.5 million of LWCF money has been used for projects in Maine (Table 1). Administered at the federal level by the National Park Service and at the state level by the Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) in the Maine Department of Conservation, LWCF grants can provide up to 50% of the allowable costs for approved acquisition or development projects. Municipalities, schools, the State of Maine, and tribal governments are eligible to apply for local LWCF grants through BPL.

State participation in LWCF requires preparation of a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), and approval of the plan by the National Park Service (NPS).

**SCORP Planning Requirements**

**Federal Requirements**

The LWCF Act requires SCORP to include the following requirements of Chapter 630.1 of the National Park Service LWCF guidelines.

- evaluation of the demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the state;
- a program for implementation of the plan;
- certification by the Governor that ample opportunity for public participation has taken place in plan development; and

The minimum requirements of the plan are:

1. inclusion of a description of the process and methodology chosen by the state;
2. inclusion of ample opportunity for public participation in the planning process, involving all segments of the state’s population;
3. comprehensive coverage - it will be considered comprehensive if It:

A. identifies outdoor recreation issues of statewide importance based upon, but not limited to, input from the public participation program. The plan must also identify
those issues that the state will address through the LWCF, and those issues which may be addressed by other means;
B. evaluates demand or public outdoor recreation preferences, but not necessarily through quantitative statewide surveys or analyses; and
C. evaluates the supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities, but not necessarily through quantitative statewide inventories.

4. inclusion of an implementation program that identifies the state’s strategies, priorities and actions for the obligation of its LWCF apportionment. The implementation program must be of sufficient detail to demonstrate that projects submitted to the NPS for LWCF funding implement the plan; and

5. inclusion of a wetlands priority component consistent with Section 303 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986. At a minimum the wetlands priority component must:
   A. be consistent with the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan, prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
   B. provide evidence of consultation with the state agency responsible for fish and wildlife resources; and
   C. contain a listing of those wetland types which should receive priority for acquisition.

SCORP may consist of a single document or be comprised of multiple documents, as long as the LWCF planning guidelines in chapter 630.1 are met.

State Requirements

Prior to 2001, Maine state law required BP&L to periodically report to the governor on the supply of and demand for outdoor recreation facilities and how these might be met (12 MRSA 1817). Submittal of the SCORP to the Governor accomplished this reporting requirement. In 2001, the Maine Legislature amended this law to require the BP&L director to submit a state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan to the joint standing committee of the Legislature having jurisdiction over state parks and public lands matters every 5 years. The amendment specifies that a plan meeting the federal SCORP requirements will also satisfy legislative requirements, further formalizing the role of SCORP in state government.

Planning Process

The planning process for the 2009-2014 Maine SCORP included a robust public process to shape a vision for outdoor recreation needs and opportunities in Maine for the next five years. Details on the planning process can be found in Appendix A.

SCORP’s Relationship with Other Recreation and Conservation Funds

As stated previously, states are required to submit a SCORP for approval by the National Park Service in order to be eligible for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. However, the intended purpose of the SCORP goes beyond the LWCF program in that it
serves as an assessment of outdoor recreation issues and recommends priorities for a broad range of programs and actions related to outdoor recreation opportunities in Maine. The following describes a few programs of note that are not directly linked to a SCORP through legal mandate (as is the LWCF program), many of which assess potential potential projects in light of the SCORP. Table 2 (at the end of this section) includes additional details associated with these programs.

### Other Federal Grants and/or Programs of Note

#### Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy For Users (SAFETEA-LU) transfers a percentage of gasoline taxes paid on non-highway recreational use in off-highway vehicles from the Highway Trust Fund into the Recreational Trails Program for trail development, improvement and maintenance.

The Bureau of Parks and Lands has been designated as the state agency to administer the program in Maine. Within the Bureau, the Division of Grants and Community Recreation provides day-to-day supervision of RTP matters. The state uses these funds directly on trail projects on state lands and also provides funds received under this program as grants-in-aid to municipalities, other qualified subdivisions of state government and to qualified non-profit organizations under guidelines established by the Bureau of Parks and Lands in conjunction with the Maine Trails Advisory Committee.

#### Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program

The Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program is a federal/municipal match program (typically 80/20) offering a funding opportunity to help communities expand their transportation and livability choices. Maine's program principally supports enhancements in connection with Maine Department of Transportation's Explore Maine, pedestrian & bicycle, environmental mitigation, and downtown revitalization initiatives.

---

### Table 1: LWCF Funds by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>$ (Millions) LWCF Requests 1966-2009</th>
<th>$ Local Project Match (Millions) 1966-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (Planning)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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that create a more enhanced transportation system focused on the community. The bike/pedestrian category is particularly relevant, as it deals with pedestrian and bicycle facilities, pedestrian and bicycle safety and education activities, and conversion of abandoned railway corridors to trails.

**Forest Legacy Program**

The USDA Forest Service Forest Legacy program protects “working forests” that protect water quality, provide habitat, forest products, opportunities for recreation and other public benefits. The Maine Forest Legacy Program focuses on acquiring conservation easements or fee interest in lands in order to protect the traditional uses and public values of Maine’s forests. The Maine Forest Legacy Committee advises the Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands on program policy and recommends projects to be presented to Congress for funding through the national Forest Legacy program.

**State Grants and/or Programs of Note**

**Land for Maine’s Future Program (LMF)**

In 1987, the Maine Legislature created the LMF Program within the State Planning Office to secure “the traditional Maine heritage of public access to Maine's land and water resources or continued quality and availability of natural resources important to the interests and continued heritage of Maine people.” Since then, four bonds supporting the LMF Program with a total of $117 million have passed by overwhelming margins. The Program has assisted in the acquisition of more than 490,000 acres from willing sellers, including 247,000 acres protected through conservation easements. The lands protected through the LMF Program include more than 1,000 miles of shorefront and 158 miles of rail-trails as well as valuable wildlife habitat, entire islands, and working forests and farms.

**Maine Outdoor Heritage Fund**

The Maine Outdoor Heritage Fund conserves wildlife and open spaces through the sale of instant Lottery tickets. With proceeds from ticket sales, grants are awarded twice a year, totaling approximately $700,000 annually. The seven-member Maine Outdoor Heritage Fund Board chooses projects in four categories that promote recreation as well as conservation of Maine's special places, endangered species and important fish and wildlife habitat.

**Snowmobile Grants**

The Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands provides Municipal Grants to municipalities or counties for sharing the cost of the construction and maintenance of snowmobile trails. Snowmobile Club Grants are made available to all snowmobile clubs who are on file with the Snowmobile Program (BPL) and wish to participate. It is intended to help defray some of the expenses incurred in snowmobile trail preparation, including pre-season
work and winter grooming. This differs from the municipal grant in that it is made directly to a club and does not require municipal involvement. Capital Grants (for grooming equipment) are available to clubs or municipalities.

**ATV Grants**

As with snowmobile grants, ATV grants to clubs or municipalities are available through the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands. Additionally, the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife manages the ATV Enforcement Grant and Aid Program. Grants from this program are intended to maintain, improve, and expand ATV enforcement and training for state, county, and municipal enforcement officers. Grants are available for three different project types: General ATV Enforcement, Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement, and Training & Equipment.

**Boating Facilities Fund**

The Boating Facilities Fund funds development and acquisition projects providing access to the waters of Maine for public recreational boating. The Boating Facilities Fund Grant Program, administered by the Department's Bureau of Parks and Lands, assists towns, cities, districts and other public and private agencies in the acquisition, development, enhancement, or rehabilitation of boat launching facilities available to the general public. Sites on both tidal and non-tidal waters are eligible. Funding is available to assist in the development of hand-carry as well as trailered boat launching facilities. However, since the Fund derives its revenue from a portion of the gasoline taxes generated by recreational motor boaters, priority is given to funding launching facilities that can be used by both motor and non-motorized watercraft.

**SCORP’s Relation to Recreation and Conservation Efforts involving Private Philanthropy**

It is hoped that the SCORP plan may help inform the outdoor recreation planning efforts undertaken by a broad spectrum of planners, advocates, and fundraisers. One way in which a SCORP document can expand its value and impact is by serving as support for organizations seeking private funds for recreation and conservation projects. Therefore, fundraisers and grant writers are strongly encouraged to use the 2009-2014 Maine SCORP as they seek support for outdoor recreation projects.

**SCORP & the Federal Energy Regulation Commission’s (FERC)**

FERC licensing procedures require that recreation facilities and needs are evaluated as part of licensing process for hydroelectric facilities. Furthermore, 6 year recreation updates (Form 80) are also required. An approved SCORP is one source of insight as these plans and updates are produced between dam owners and stakeholder groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Fund</th>
<th>Administered By</th>
<th>Types of Projects</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boating Facilities Fund</td>
<td>Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands</td>
<td>Acquisition, development, enhancement, or rehabilitation of boat launching facilities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maine.gov/doc/parks/programs/boating/grants.html">www.maine.gov/doc/parks/programs/boating/grants.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancements Program</td>
<td>Maine Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, pedestrian and bicycle safety and education activities, and conversion of abandoned railway corridors to trails</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maine.gov/mdot/community-programs/enhancement-program.php">www.maine.gov/mdot/community-programs/enhancement-program.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV Enforcement Grant and Aid Program</td>
<td>Maine Dept. of Inland Fisheries &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Maintain, improve, and expand ATV enforcement and training for state, county, and municipal enforcement officers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maine.gov/ifw/grants/atv.htm">www.maine.gov/ifw/grants/atv.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Outdoor Heritage Fund</td>
<td>seven-member board</td>
<td>Projects that promote recreation, conservation of Maine’s special places, endangered species and important fish and wildlife habitat.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maine.gov/ifw/grants/outdoorheritagefund/index.htm">www.maine.gov/ifw/grants/outdoorheritagefund/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Highlights

The overall conservation and recreation lands protected in Maine rose to over 17% of the state's land base.

Programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Land for Maine’s Future, Forest Legacy, and the State Parks Bond have supported the improvement of facilities and conservation of lands.

Increased ATV riding opportunities, as well as a better understanding of ATV riders and economic impacts associated with ATV riding, have been gained in the last 5 years. Additionally, measures to deal with the inappropriate or illegal use of ATVs continue to be implemented.

Statewide planning efforts have sharpened the concept that large pieces of Maine’s economy and the overall quality of life associated with living in the state hinge upon access to a quality outdoor environment. Maine’s natural wonders, scenic charm, and outdoor recreation opportunities combine to act as a major economic driver.

Both public and private (non-profit) efforts to protect backcountry experiences have taken place over the duration of the past SCORP.
Introduction
In an effort to look back at the broad objectives of the previous Maine State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (2003-2008), a review of developments or accomplishments is shared below. The developments/accomplishments are organized around the 6 priorities listed in the 2003-2008 Maine SCORP and are shared not as a total listing of developments, but rather as a sample of some of the work put towards improving recreation opportunities in Maine.

“Funding for Acquisition”
- Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) from 2003-2009 were used on 9 acquisition projects involving over $1.5 million in LWCF funds.
- The 2003-2008 Maine SCORP lists Maine's total 2002 public conservation and recreation lands, including easements, at 6% of total acreage. At the end of 2008, Maine's percentage of public conservation and recreation land was just under 8% of the state's total area. This increase in recreation and conservation lands represents a 33% jump. State-owned recreation and conservation land/easements increased by over 350,000 acres from 2002 to 2008. When land trust fee lands and easements are added to the figures for public lands/easements, the total conserved area percentage is 17.8% (source: Maine State Planning Office, Land for Maine's Future program). This represents an approximate overall increase of 183% since 2002.
- The Land for Maine’s Future program operated by the Maine State Planning Office received a total of 27 million in funds for acquisition. This total represents two bonds – one in 2005 and the second in 2007. These funds are now essentially completely committed and unavailable for new projects.
- Since 2003, Acadia National Park has obtained 2 easements with recreational elements (total of 29 acres). The park has, again since 2003, acquired 13 parcels totaling 391 acres.
- Between 2002 and 2007, Maine received over $36 million in federal Forest Legacy Funds to acquire 615,498 acres (combined) fee and easement forestlands.

“The ATV Issue”
- The miles of funded ATV trails have risen 141% from 2,346 miles in 2003 to 5,663 miles in 2009.
- The Economic Contributions of ATV-Related Activities in Maine report was published in 2005 (see “Statewide Planning” accomplishments on below).
- The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) continues to enforce ATV and snowmobile laws and work with local landowners to provide and maintain access to private lands. Maine DIFW also provides ATV and Snowmobile Safety Courses. The Landowner Relations Program, shared between Maine DIFW and the Maine Department of Conservation (starting in 2007) also assists with managing ATV issues associated with private lands.
• Legislation passed in 2006 requires ATV riders to have (verbal) landowner permission where they ride, unless they ride on designated ATV trails. Riding on farm land requires written permission.

• The **Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL)**, through the efforts of its Off-Road Vehicle Program and state park managers and public lands managers, continues to maintain and develop ATV-riding opportunities. Most notably, the Sunrise Trail, a multi-use rail trail open to ATV use, is slated to fully open in 2010 and already has over 30 miles open for use. This 87-mile trail in eastern Maine is owned by the **Maine Department of Transportation** and is being managed by BPL. A smaller scale example of collaboration involves the Northern Lands Region establishing a multi-use trail spur on the Salmon Brook Lake Unit connecting the Bangor and Aroostook rail trail in Perham to Salmon Brook just below the outlet of the lake. This provides water access for hand carry watercraft, and serves walkers, bikes and ATV’s. Project partners included the Town of Perham community volunteers, the Off-Road Vehicle Division and Washburn Beavers ATV Club.

• **Private ATV Clubs** have shown strong growth in the last 5 years. ATV Maine ([www.atvmaine.org](http://www.atvmaine.org)) lists 104 registered ATV clubs in Maine as of September 2009. Through grants and volunteer labor, ATV clubs have helped fuel the increase in miles of official ATV trails listed above.

**“Maintenance of Facilities”**

• Facilities maintenance over the past 5 years has been tackled using a variety of funding sources. One notable development is that in 2007 voters approved a bond package including $7.5 million for **Maine State Parks and Historic Sites**.

• Between 2003 and 2008, the **Boating Facilities Division of the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands** assisted with or performed the acquisition of 30 new boating facilities spread around the State of Maine. These new acquisition projects were in support of town ownership or state control and included both fresh and saltwater projects. The acquisitions included both hand-carry and trailered ramp developments.

• **The Boating Facilities Division (BPL)** also performed or otherwise supported 40 facilities improvement projects during the 5-year 2003-2008 span. Sample improvements made include making facilities more welcoming to those with disabilities, improving parking, minimizing environmental impacts from run-off, improving access at sites previously limited by tidal fluctuations, improving access roads, and repairing ramps and piles damaged by environmental forces (e.g., ice, storms, etc.). The Boating Division also has continued to maintain navigational aids on 24 lakes while permitting towns and lake associations to maintain aids on another 19 lakes.

• Over the life-span of the past (2003-2008) Maine SCORP, numerous **Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands** site improvements were undertaken. *Comfort station/shower/restroom facilities were developed and/or upgraded at:*
✦ Sebago Lake State Park
✦ Peaks-Kenney State Park
✦ Two Lights State Park
✦ Damariscotta Lake State Park
✦ Rangeley Lake State Park
✦ Moose Point State Park
✦ Lake St. George State Park
✦ Bradbury Mountain State Park

The facility improvements listed above, when combined with two other sanitary system projects at Colonial Pemaquid State Historic Site and Mount Blue State Park, total over $4 million.

Playgrounds were upgraded (over $250,000 total) at the following state parks:
✦ Swan Lake
✦ Moose Point
✦ Lake St. George
✦ Two Lights
✦ Sebago Lake
✦ Bradbury

Other accomplishments include:
• Electrical and water hook-ups for RVs at Sebago and Camden Hills State Parks
• Hiking trail rehabilitation projects on Maine Parks and Lands’ land units took place at a number of notable destinations, such as the Mahoosuc Land Unit, Tumbledown Mt., the Little Moose Unit, and the Deboullie Land Unit. Trailhead access projects occurred at the Bigelow Preserve, Chain of Ponds, Deboullie Public Reserved Land Unit,
• Recreation facilities on the recently acquired Machias River Corridor property (BPL) were upgraded with vault toilets complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act. In addition, a major campsite at the confluence of the West Branch and the Machias River was improved with a new access road and designated campsites designed to protect the stream banks and water quality.
• Work was undertaken to improve shore-side facilities at various locations along the shoreline of Moosehead Lake. In a partnership between Florida Power and Light and BPL, major site renovations were completed to the Cowan’s Cove camping area on the Days Academy Unit, and campsites on Spencer Bay in Spencer Bay Twp.
• A new public use road and bridge over the Red River at the outlet of Pushineer Pond was constructed in the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands’ Deboullie Unit using the existing footprint of a dam. This new access to campsites and
the boat launch site on the north side of the river has eliminated the need for vehicles to ford the river. As part of this project, the Pushineer trailer accessible boat launch site was reconfigured and improved. Deboullie also saw the construction of two new campsites near the recently-repaired Perch Pond dam and a new table shelter at the Perch Pond group use area; improvements to campsites on Crater Outlet and the parking area at the Upper Pond campsite; and improvements to a wetland boardwalk also on Upper Pond.

- Through a BPL partnership with the Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, improvements to existing trails and parking areas were completed at the Kennebec Highlands Land Unit.
- BPL continued its partnership with the Maine Appalachian Trail Club to accomplish stewardship and trail maintenance along the AT corridor in the Mahoosuc, Four Ponds, Bald Mountain, and Nahmakanta Units, as well as the Bigelow Preserve. Additionally, an agreement has been in place with the Maine Appalachian Trail Club to ensure a summer staff presence at heavily used areas of the Appalachian Trail in the Bigelow Preserve.
- A partnership between BPL and the Mahoosuc Land Trust was put in place to assist in the maintenance of the Frenchman’s Hole day use area in the Mahoosuc Unit. Additionally, BPL and the Appalachian Mt. Club have collaborated to improve and develop trails in the Mahoosuc Public Land Unit.
- Acadia National Park repaved 28 miles of the Park Loop Road and rehabilitated bridges and drainage structures associated with the road networks within the park. The park also improved restroom/sewage facilities Seawall and Blackwoods Campgrounds, Echo Lake, Thompson Island, Schoodic Point, Fabbri Picnic Area, Sieur De Monts Nature Center, and the Jordan Pond House. Acadia NP continued to rehabilitate trails all across the park. Interpretive exhibits, entrance and ranger stations, shelters, and information centers were upgraded, constructed, or repaired as well.
- MDIFW Hatcheries Division continued to raise and stock 1.2 million fish per year into inland waters statewide to provide recreational fishing opportunities.
- MDIFW builds on a wildlife species planning effort ongoing in Maine since 1968; a landscape approach to habitat conservation, Beginning with Habitat, initiated in 2000; and a long history of public involvement and collaboration among conservation partners. All MDIFW planning efforts incorporate and emphasize providing public recreational opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife watching, nature appreciation, recreational boating, ATVs, and snowmobiles.

“Statewide Planning”
- In 2006, the Brookings Institution published Charting Maine’s Future: an Action Plan for Promoting Sustainable Prosperity and Quality Places. This major report highlighted, among other concepts, the economic importance of protecting the quality of Maine’s environment and outdoor spaces.
• Fermata Inc. completed the *Strategic Plan for Implementing the Maine Nature Tourism Initiative*, which assessed the status of and potential for nature-based tourism in three pilot regions of the state (Downeast, Highlands, and Western Mountains).

• The *Economic Contributions of Maine State Parks: A Survey of Visitor Characteristics, Perceptions and Spending* study was published by the Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center in 2006. The study examined the total contribution to Maine’s economy that results from the spending related to visitors to Maine state parks and historic sites as well as from the operation of those parks. It also gathered and synthesized information on visitor characteristics, behaviors, and perceptions.

• The Governor’s Task Force on the Management of Public Lands and Publicly-held Easements completed its work in 2007 with a Report issued in January of 2008. As a recommendation of the task force, a Recreation and Conservation Forum was established and led by non-governmental organizations involved in the task force.

• The Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands adopted a recreation management plan for the state-owned islands on the Maine Island Trail. This plan was prepared by the Maine Island Trails Association in cooperation with the Bureau.

• The Margaret Chase Smith Center Policy Center and the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands published the *Economic Contributions of ATV-Related Activities in Maine* report in 2005. This study sought to determine the total contribution to Maine’s economy that results from the spending related directly to the purchase and use of ATVs in Maine. It also examined environmental and economic damages caused by ATVs.

• The Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Program at the University of Maine conducted the *Allagash Wilderness Waterway Visitor Survey* explored visit characteristics, including trip variables (method of travel, length of stay, etc.), visitor attributes, as well as visitor experiences and preferences at the BPL administered waterway.

• As an outgrowth of the Recreation Plan for the Public Islands on the Maine Island Trail, the Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Program at the University of Maine, with production support from the Maine Agricultural & Forest Experiment Station at the University of Maine, conducted and produced the *Maine Coastal Island Visitor Survey 2006 – Deer Isle/Stonington Region*. This study looked at use volume of regional islands, visitor-use characteristics, visitor characteristics and experiences, Leave No Trace knowledge and behavior, and visitor preferences and satisfaction.

**“Wilderness Recreation Opportunities”**

• The Appalachian Mountain Club has become a major landowner in the 100-Mile Wilderness Region. AMC purchased the 37,000 acre Katahdin Iron Works tract in 2003 and is poised to purchase 28,000 more acres in the Roach Ponds.
region. AMC is working towards establishing an interconnected network of overnight accommodations and trails, all open to the public, which will provide a wide range of outdoor recreation experiences, including wilderness-type experiences.

- **Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands** (Lands Division) management plans (detailing the management of public lands units and public lots) completed within the last 5 years have allocated non-mechanized backcountry recreation areas at 5 Public Lands units. The non-mechanized backcountry recreation management category is intended to protect and sustain “superior scenic quality, remoteness, wild and pristine character, and capacity to impart a sense of solitude” (Integrated Resource Policy, 2000). For more on Lands Division management plans, see below, under “Other Notable Accomplishments”).

- A 4,119 acre Katahdin Lake Parcel was gifted to **Baxter State Park** in 2006. The gift was the result of complex negotiations, land swaps on the part of the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, and legislation that resulted in Baxter State Park receiving the lake parcel originally envisioned for inclusion in the wilderness park established by former Governor Percival Baxter. The 2.5 mile Martin Ponds Trail, providing a loop access to Katahdin Lake in combination with the Katahdin Lake Trail, was constructed. The construction of the day-use picnic shelter and toilet at Katahdin Lake was also completed.

- **BPL** has worked towards developing an expanded backcountry hiking opportunity on the Nahmakanta Public Reserved Land Unit. With the help of the Maine Conservation Corps, a new link option for extended hiking in the Nahmakanta Land Unit is slated for completion in 2009. This last mile of trail section will link the 8+ mile Turtle Ridge Trail loop with the 12+ mile Debsconeag Backcountry Trail loop.

- **Maine Conservation Corps (BPL)** crews created a new, 3-mile Black Mtn. loop, which enhances hiking opportunities at Deboullie Mt. in the 21,871 acre Deboullie Public Reserved Land Unit.

- **BPL** has been an active member of a coalition of non-profit organizations (such as the **Appalachian Mountain Club**) and private landowners who developed and now manage the 35-mile Grafton Loop backpacking trail in the Mahoosuc Mountains. The trail provides scenic backpacking along state park land, state public reserved lands, **National Park Service** property (**Appalachian Trail** corridor), and private lands.

- The Maine Island Trail, with recreation management by the **Maine Island Trail Association**, has grown to include 182 properties, of which 66 are publicly owned and open to all. The remaining sites are open to MITA members only. 46 islands were added to the Trail between 2005 and 2009. While not all sites along the trail
have wilderness characteristics, the emphasis on primitive camping, coupled with the isolated nature of many island sites, can be looked at as providing a coastal wilderness experience.

- **Elliotsville Plantation, Inc.** now holds and manages 84,000 acres of conserved wildlands, many of these acres, such as those in the East Branch [of the Penobscot] Sanctuary, are adjacent to other conservation lands.

**“Community Recreation and Smart Growth”**

- Between 2003 and 2008, over $2.25 million of **Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)** dollars were dispersed to municipalities in Maine for 59 outdoor recreation projects.
- In that same timeframe, over $3.25 million in **Recreational Trails Program** (administered by BPL) funds were dispersed to municipalities and/or non-profit groups working on recreational trail projects in Maine communities.
- In the last five years, 12 community playgrounds, 7 community parks, 3 general recreation/trails projects, 6 skateboard or outdoor sports facilities projects, 1 golf course, and 3 outdoor pool projects were funded through Maine’s local share of LWCF.
- Between 2003 and 2008, the **Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT)** has received over $20 million in federal dollars through the **Transportation Enhancement Program**. Maine's program principally supports enhancements in connection with MDOT's *Explore Maine*, pedestrian & bicycle, environmental mitigation, and downtown revitalization initiatives that create a more enhanced transportation system focused on the community.
- **MDOT** also continued to manage and grow its Safe Routes to School Program, through which training, outreach, promotions, research, and grant funding were conducted or dispersed. Over 90 schools and communities were supported as they worked to build their programs.
- **Acadia National Park**’s Village Connector Trails Program has supported efforts to better link the park with towns on Mount Desert Island. In 2009, the 2.5 mile Schooner Head Path will reestablish the historic trail route from Bar Harbor to Schooner Head Overlook, with connections to other park trails.
- The **Beginning with Habitat** landscape approach to habitat conservation was initially developed by the University of Maine's Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (CFWRU) under the direction of the **Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW)**. Since its inception in 2000, Beginning with Habitat, has met with and provided information to more than 140 cities and towns and 35 land trusts and regional planning commissions within the state. Many towns and land trusts have incorporated the information they have received from Beginning with Habitat into their comprehensive plans and strategic approaches to conservation. As such, Beginning with Habitat not only serves to help conserve natural areas and functions, but it also helps towns conserve
opportunities for nature-based recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, hiking, and wildlife-watching.

- The Brookings Institution produced Charting Maine’s Future: an Action Plan for Promoting Sustainable Prosperity and Quality Places (see Statewide Planning section above). This significant report spotlighted the threat posed by sprawl and the need to protect quality of place.
- Governor John Baldacci created the Maine Council on Quality of Place to guide and support a state quality of place investment strategy, and to coordinate investment strategies across state agencies and regional councils. The Maine State Planning Office provides staff support to the council.

“Other Notable Developments”

- Maine Huts & Trails is a non-profit organization that has been working to build and operate a 180-mile recreational corridor from the Mahoosucs to Moosehead Lake. The corridor is intended to include a network of huts, trails and waterway corridors and will preserve some of Western Maine's best backcountry for the purposes of conservation, environmentally sensitive economic development, and public access. To date, Maine Huts & Trails has opened two huts (lodges) and 36 miles of trail in western Maine.

- The Northern Forest Canoe Trail is now an established presence in Maine. Nearly half of the trail’s 740 miles lie in Maine. The full trail covers the Adirondacks of New York, and cuts through Quebec, Vermont, and New Hampshire. The Maine route extends from the New Hampshire border on the Rangeley Lakes through to Fort Kent, including significant stretches of BPL managed rivers including the West Branch of the Penobscot, the Moose River, and the Allagash. In addition to working closely with four of inland Maine’s regional tourism councils (Western Lakes & Mountains, Kennebec Valley, Maine Highlands and Aroostook), NFCT is a lead partner in the emerging Maine Woods Discovery initiative involving a focused collaboration among Maine anchor recreation entities.

- Regional 15 year management plans were completed for a number of Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands’ Lands Division properties. The Downeast Region Management Plan, covering the Donnell Pond, Rocky Lake, Cutler Coast, and Great Heath public land units (as well as 7 smaller lots), is the guiding document for the multi-use management of over 45,000 acres. The Flagstaff Region
Management Plan includes the Bigelow Preserve and Flagstaff Lake properties, Mt. Abraham, Chain of Ponds, and 8 smaller, miscellaneous public lots. In total, it covers more than 54,000 acres. The Northern Aroostook Region Management Plan encompasses over 55,000 acres of land managed by the Lands Division of Parks and Lands. Deboullie, Eagle Lake, and Salmon Brook Lake Bog units are part of the plan as are 12 public lots. The Seboomook Region Management Plan covers the management of some of the Bureau’s newest properties. In total, the plan applies to over 50,000 acres of lands just north of Moosehead Lake.

Properties in the the plan include the Seboomook Lake parcel (with 58 miles of water frontage), a shore-land strip along Canada Falls Lake and its outlet, the South Branch of the Penobscot River, 3,900 acres surrounding a series of small ponds at the top of the St. John River watershed, a shoreline buffer around Baker Lake, and nearby Big Spencer Mountain (4,242 acres).

- Motorized trail easements are increasingly being used to guarantee trail connectivity across private or non-profit lands. In 2007, BPL secured a snowmobile trail easement across land owned by Elliotsville Plantation, Inc., to help maintain trail connectivity between the Millinocket region and the Patten region. In 2009, the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) approved a land use plan for Plum Creek’s ownership near Moosehead Lake; although the Concept Plan has not taken effect pending appeals. The Concept Plan requires a network of deeded snowmobile easements held by BPL on all major snowmobile trails in the region, along with a very limited requirement for deeded ATV easements held by BPL. Elsewhere, motorized trail easements or express permissions are increasingly becoming a topic for landowner negotiation as a component of larger conservation easements, especially where regional trail connectivity is otherwise at risk.

- After 8 years of acquisition work in partnership with the Pownal Land Trust, BPL now has the legal right and approved permission to establish a multi-use trail connecting Bradbury Mt. State Park in Pownal with the Pineland Public Reserved Land Unit in Gray and North Yarmouth. Acquired public reserved lands will be managed by Bradbury Mt. State Park.

- In 2008, recreation management was transferred to the Penobscot River Corridor Parks staff for the campsites and facilities adjacent to the rivers and lakes on this unit, which extends the system of campsites along the upper Penobscot River. Riverside fishing/nature trails were established along the West Branch and South Branch. BPL also collaborated with Great Lakes Hydro in improving the portage trails at Canada Falls and Seboomook dams.

- New brochures and maps were developed by BPL for Cutler Coast, Rocky Lake, the Machias River Corridor, Quoddy Head State Park, Rogue Bluff State Park, Shackford Head State Park, and Cobscook Bay State Park.

- The Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands website was enhanced with new search features, expanded content, print-at-home maps and brochures. The Unit
brochures and corresponding web descriptions updated in 2008 showcase a new format with more complete descriptions and information.

- Web-based, interactive mapping of state-owned and state-assisted recreational boating facilities was developed for the Google Earth program. This was a joint effort between the Bureau of Parks and Lands and the Department of Environmental Protection, whose staff has already developed expertise in placing geographic information on Google Earth.
Key Understandings

Maine’s population is among the oldest in the nation. While Maine saw a brief rise in population in the early part of the decade, patterns of slow or negative growth continue in Maine’s most rural counties. Demographic patterns will continue to be a major force shaping recreation demand.

The loss of rural lands, open space, and overall quality of place is a threat to Maine’s economy and way of life. Recreational opportunities are threatened as sprawl and unplanned growth erodes the valuable character of Maine’s outdoor areas. Recreation planning and investments are a tool for protecting quality of place.

Maine needs to work to ensure youth actively connect with nature. Outdoor recreation is a health measure addressing youth wellness while also fostering the development of future land stewards.

Maine’s vast forests are not as stable as in past decades. Rapid changes in ownership of large-scale private forest lands give rise to concerns over recreation access and experiences. Maine must continue to work to ensure public access to private lands.
A. Trend: Evolving Demographic Patterns

Population

According to a July 2008 estimate by the US Census Bureau, Maine’s population stands at 1,316,456. This is up from 1,274,923 in 2000 and 1,227,928 in 1990. Maine’s population growth from 2000 to 2006 represents an increase of 3.3% (compared to the national rate of 6.4%). Future US Census Bureau projections predict Maine’s population increasing 10.7% between 2000 and 2030. This growth places Maine 32nd nationally, based on estimates (US Census Bureau, Population Division, Interim Population Projections, 2005).

Population growth in Maine is expected to be driven primarily by immigration from (predominantly) interstate migration, with limited international immigration. Natural increase is not seen as the major force behind Maine’s anticipated modest population growth. Maine’s birth rate has been declining since the mid-1900s and has, since at least as far back as 1990, been below the national rate. Maine’s rate of death per 1000 has been slightly above the national rate during that same time. Maine’s recorded and projected population is depicted in Figure 1.

Population in Maine has fluctuated with the ebb and flow of people moving in and out of the state. In the early years of this decade, net in-migration boosted the population. Since 2004, there has been a net out-migration dampening Maine’s population growth to a near stall. The Brookings Institution’s Charting Maine’s Future: an Action Plan for Promoting Sustainable Prosperity and Quality Places (2006) explored, among other things, demographic and geographic patterns affecting Maine. In their report, the Brookings Institution suggested that Maine had reversed course and was growing once again, as reflected by the following excerpts:

- “Following on the state’s average net loss of 440 people per year in the 1990s, Maine gained an average of 8,200 net new residents per year between 2000 and 2004—7.5 times more than its average annual natural increase of 1,100 and the largest in-flow in over 50 years”
- “In fact, every one of Maine’s 16 counties is now experiencing net gains of people from outside the state” (i.e., immigration exceeded emigration).
• Maine moved up 20 places in its population growth rank since 2000. This turnaround from 46th to 26th was the biggest jump in the nation.
• Only Nevada, Arizona, Florida, and Idaho saw more domestic in-migration (from other states) than did Maine.

The subsequent downturn in this growth was reported by economist Charles Lawton in the March 16, 2008 Portland Press Herald; “In 2005, according to census estimates, our net in-migration fell to 2,400; in 2006, it dropped to zero, and in 2007 the inward movement turned to an outward movement of 5,400 people. In four years, that’s a net swing of over 15,000 people – from a net gain of over 10,000 in 2003 to a net loss of more than 5,000 in 2007”.

Recent population projections issued by the U.S. Bureau of the Census show 10 of 16 counties lost population between 2007 and 2008, and 3 counties (Aroostook, Piscataquis, and Washington) have dropped in total population since 2000 (population estimates, U.S. Census Bureau March 19, 2008).

Age

According to a report issued by the Maine State Planning Office and authored by Dr. Henry Renski, “the aging of Maine’s population is the driving force behind demographic change in every county. Maine’s population is steadily aging” (Renski, 2008). In 2000, Maine was the 12th oldest state in the nation, based on percent of population at or over 65 years old. By 2010, Maine is expected to move to third oldest (with 15.6% of the population 65 or older). In 2030, only Florida is projected to have a higher percentage of senior citizens. In 2030, Maine is projected to have 26.5% of its population in the 65 or older category.

Not only is Maine’s percentage of older citizens expected to rise, its number of younger citizens is expected to dip. The U.S. Census Bureau population estimates for 2008 show that 397,911 boomers (composed of those aged 45 to 64) live and work in Maine, as opposed to 331,809 Gen Xers (aged 24 to 44). For additional perspective on youth and senior population trends in Maine, see Figure 2.

Despite views to the contrary, US census data shows quite similar percentages of young adults across Maine’s 16 counties. As noted, these percentages are on a decline, but the declines appear to be somewhat consistent across regions. In short, all across Maine, older residents are becoming a more and more significant group and younger generations are reducing in proportionate significance.
Income and Education

Income is not homogeneous across Maine’s 16 counties. The USDA Economic Research Service lists Cumberland County, with a median household income in 2007 of $54,992, as having a median income level 120% that of Maine’s rate ($45,832). Conversely, Washington County, at a median income level of $32,624, only represents 71.2% of median state household income (USDA, 2009). According to the Rural Policy Research Institute (2006), in 2004, only Cumberland County had a per capita income of $35,000 or more. Oxford, Franklin, Somerset, Piscataquis, and Washington Counties all had per capita incomes below $25,000.

Maine has a higher proportion of high school graduates and a somewhat lower proportion of college graduates compared to the US. Maine’s median household and family incomes and its per capita income are all below national levels. A greater proportion of Maine households have social security and retirement incomes, consistent with its older population. Maine has a smaller percentage of families and individuals below the poverty level.

As with income, educational attainment has geographic variation in Maine. The Brookings Institution (2006), reported that “25.6 percent of Maine’s population over age 25 possesses a Bachelor’s degree. This achievement now ranks the state 25th in the nation, up from 44th in 1970 and 27th as recently as 2000”. In fact, based upon the US Census Bureau’s 2005-2007 American Community Survey, which collected data for geographic regions with at least 20,000 inhabitants, 15 of the 16 counties in Maine saw an increase in the percentage of its population having a bachelors degree or higher (2005-2007 American Community Survey data was unavailable for Piscataquis County due to its low population) Table 1 lists bachelor’s degree or higher attainment for Maine counties.

The significance of educational attainment and income relate to recreation in that researchers have documented associations between outdoor recreation participation patterns and education and income. Lee, Scott, and Floyd (2001), for example, cite numerous studies where higher levels of education are correlated with increased park visitation, increased outdoor recreation participation, and increased use of outdoor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% 25 or older with B.S. Degree or higher (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>13.3% (2000 data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recreation areas. Other sources, such as the Outdoor Recreation in America Report (1996), identify income as a major factor influencing participation in outdoor recreation. Tables 2 and 3 show Maine resident participation in snow/ice activities broken down by education and by income. This information is presented to show that specific activities appear to appeal more or less to certain demographic groups. Furthermore, the information is shown to highlight that there is an ongoing need to understand the evolving attributes of Maine's population and the recreational experiences they seek.

Disability

According to US Census figures (American Community Survey), 19% of Maine’s 2007 population over the age of 5 has some type of disability. The proportion of people 65 and older with disabilities is significantly higher than other age groups. Over 40% of Maine residents 65 years and over have at least one disability as compared to 16.3% of the 16-64 cohort and 10.0% for 5-15 year-olds. This higher proportion of people with

**Table 2: Participation Distribution by Education for Snow/Ice-Based Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Less than high school %</th>
<th>High school graduate %</th>
<th>Some college%</th>
<th>College degree%</th>
<th>Post-graduate degree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snow/ice activities (any type)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Participation Distribution by Income for Snow/Ice-Based Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>&lt;$15,000 %</th>
<th>$15,000-$24,999%</th>
<th>$25,000-$49,999%</th>
<th>$50,000-$74,999%</th>
<th>$75,000-$99,999%</th>
<th>$100,000-$149,999%</th>
<th>$150,000+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snow/ice activities (any type)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disabilities among the older population will become increasingly important as the number and relative proportion of older people in Maine increases. Select, recreation-relevant types of disabilities and percentages of the Maine public with those disabilities are shown in Figure 3.

**Racial/Ethnic Diversity**

The US population is increasingly diverse. Black/African Americans and people of Hispanic/Latino origins together accounted for more than one quarter of the country’s 2005-2007 population. Native Americans, Asian Americans and “other” racial/ethnic groups comprise additional segments of the population. Maine, by comparison, is about 97% white. Maine racial/ethnic groups comprising 0.5% or more of the state’s 2005-2007 population include: people of 2 or more races (1.6%); people of Hispanic/Latino origins (1.1%); Asians (1.0%); Native Americans (0.5%); and Black/African Americans (1.1%).

**A Second Look at Racial/Ethnic Diversity**

Maine is predominantly a state marked by a relative lack of racial/ethnic diversity. However, that surface assessment may miss several important points. For one, Maine has several locations, notably Portland (Maine's largest city) and Lewiston (the second largest city), in which immigration from outside of the US has resulted in a more diverse population. In the case of both Portland and Lewiston, there are sizable Somali populations. Overall, according to the US Census Bureau, Maine's foreign born population is estimated at 3.2% of the total state population.

It is also important to note that the St. John Valley in northern Maine, as well as current or former mill towns such as Lewiston/Auburn, Biddeford, Augusta, Waterville/Winslow, Rumford, and Millinocket have a strong French-Canadian cultural aspect and language tradition (especially amongst older Franco-American residents). Additionally, Maine shares a border with Quebec, and therefore receives French-speaking tourists. The American Community Survey lists Spanish or Spanish Creole as being spoken by 1.1% of Maine residents while 5.5% speak another Ind-European language and 1% speak Asian/Pacific Island or other languages.

Maine's history and heritage has been and continues to be shaped by cultural groups. It is only wise to continually consider the cultural make-up of Maine residents and visitors as outdoor recreation resources are developed and managed. Not only do cultural characteristics such as language need to be considered for the recreating public, but there may also be opportunities to interpret and celebrate the heritage found in Maine.
Other Characteristics of the Maine Population

As noted above, by comparison with the United States, Maine has an older, more rural and less ethnically diverse population. Other notable departures from national characteristics include: somewhat smaller average household and family sizes (a function of an older population); and a higher percentage of veterans. Economically, Maine has a slightly higher proportion of people in the labor force; a higher proportion employed in education, health, and social services and retail trade; a lower proportion employed in professional, scientific, management administrative services; a lower percentage of private wage and salary workers and a higher percentage self-employed in their own businesses.

One of the most notable departures from national characteristics is Maine’s high proportion of housing units that are vacant and for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use – the highest rate in the country. Maine’s attractive landscapes and recreational amenities, along with its proximity to large population centers in the Northeast contribute to high percentages of seasonal homes. Of the 16 counties in Maine, York County has the largest number of vacation homes, but Piscataquis and Franklin Counties have the highest proportions of seasonal homes. Areas around Penobscot Bay and Mount Desert Island have some of the highest concentrations of seasonal homes. In some small coastal communities, vacation homes account for more than one-third of all the housing. On the other hand, Maine has a higher than average percentage of owner-occupied housing, reflecting a largely rural population.

Figure 4: 2005 Maine County Populations (Source: US Census Bureau)

B. Issue: Development Patterns and Sprawl
Geographic Distribution

Maine is largely a rural state, especially by national standards. In 2000, Maine’s overall persons per square mile equaled 41.3 versus the national average of 79.6.
Furthermore, just over 20% of Mainers live in a county with between 4 and 26 persons per square mile. County populations are shown in Figure 4 (pg. 6).

While Maine is a rural state, that is not to say that it is completely rural or that it is unchanging. Cumberland County has approximate 318 persons per square mile versus the US average of 79.6. Cumberland County and York County (188.4 persons/mile) are Maine’s southernmost counties and are home to over 35% of Maine’s population while only laying claim to 6% of Maine’s land area. Furthermore, trends show the most rural counties in Maine (Oxford, Franklin, Somerset, Piscataquis, Aroostook, Washington, Hancock, and Waldo) falling from a 35% share of Maine’s population in 1960 to 27% in 2005 (Brookings Institution, 2006). Additionally, even more populated counties tend to have population patterns in which a city or set of cities account for a large percentage of the population (e.g., Bangor/Brewer in Penobscot County or Lewiston/Auburn in Androscoggin County).

This pattern of greater growth in the southern counties is predicted to continue. Figure 5 displays predicted county populations. Estimates from the Maine State Planning Office (Renski, 2008) predict the sharpest growth in York County and losses in both Aroostook and Washington Counties. Table 4 uses US Census Bureau county population estimates to examine Maine county trends in population from 2000-2008. It shows that 2007 and 2008 saw population losses in a majority of counties. Washington, Aroostook, and to a Piscataquis Counties have experienced net population loss from 2000-2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine Total</td>
<td>1277179</td>
<td>1316456</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>7484</td>
<td>9004</td>
<td>9062</td>
<td>5175</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>103846</td>
<td>106877</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>-215</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>73863</td>
<td>71676</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-1011</td>
<td>-109</td>
<td>-161</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>-166</td>
<td>-269</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>266028</td>
<td>276047</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>29480</td>
<td>29857</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>51863</td>
<td>53137</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>117213</td>
<td>120959</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>39684</td>
<td>40686</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-157</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>33699</td>
<td>34628</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>54802</td>
<td>56741</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>144904</td>
<td>148651</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>-495</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>17244</td>
<td>16961</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>35226</td>
<td>36332</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>-94</td>
<td>-264</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>50893</td>
<td>51377</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-119</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>36468</td>
<td>38342</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>188074</td>
<td>201686</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>3836</td>
<td>3396</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Population Trends and Predictions (Source: Renski, 2008)
Figure 5 (Continued): Population Trends and Predictions
(Source: Renski, 2008)
Development

*Charting Maine’s Future: An Action Plan for Promoting Sustainable Prosperity and Quality Places* (Brookings Institution, 2006) discusses Maine’s patterns of population movement and development. The excerpts below are but a few points illustrating significant patterns related to development:

- In the period from 2000 to 2006, 77 percent of growth has taken place in surrounding towns, newer emerging towns, and rural areas distant from traditional centers. Sparsely populated rural towns are the most popular destinations.
- “Southern Maine saw home construction and other development change the character of 100,000 of its rural acres between 1980 and 2000—some 30 percent of its total. Cumberland County alone lost over 56,000 rural acres—a 39-percent reduction.”

In short, much of the development and population shifting that has taken place within the last 20+ years has been a migration out of relatively more concentrated villages and cities into rural areas (notably to rural areas in Maine’s more populace southern counties).

Sprawl

The conservation and recreation community in Maine is very cognizant that the loss of wildlife habitat, rural lands, and general open space is a vital issue requiring continual focus. As the Maine State Planning Office’s *Regional Landscape Conservation in Maine: Best Practices for Enhancing Quality of Place* (Richardson, 2008) starkly states, “Maine’s sprawling land use patterns threaten to transform many of the state’s rural areas into suburbs.” Figure 6 depicts the loses of rural lands in Maine by region.

According to the Brookings Institution (2006), only Virginia saw a greater loss of rural land than Maine in the 1990s. This pattern of converting rural land to suburban development (sprawl) is a major concern to anyone who values outdoor recreation in Maine’s natural environments.

In a recent *Maine Outreach Meeting* associated with the New England Governors Conference’s Commission on Land Conservation (CLC), “the fragmentation and degradation of natural features and assets that have historically defined Maine and New England in the public imagination.
and enhanced the lives and livelihoods of all” was listed as one of two big questions facing conservation in New England. This echoes the Brookings Institution’s (2006) comments that:

“the suburbanization of so much of Maine threatens to degrade the very qualities of the state’s countryside and settlement areas that make them so appealing. Strip development along once-scenic roads, development in Maine’s forests and agricultural lands, and the threat of residential conversion of working waterfronts all endanger the value of Maine’s distinct quality of place—a critical asset for future competitiveness.”

There are numerous distressing issues associated with sprawl (e.g., habitat fragmentation, loss of scenic character, etc.), and loss of open space with potential loss of access to quality outdoor experiences is certainly one. Unplanned development has shown the potential to reduce the availability of the outdoor spaces that support the activities Mainers have made cherished parts of their lives. Maine’s outdoor recreation opportunities are vital assets for both livability and tourism. Local snowmobile and ATV clubs, hunters, hikers, birdwatchers, anglers, mt. bikers, Nordic skiers, and a host of other recreationists look to Maine’s waters, woods, fields, and shorelines as a source of renewal, adventure, peace, and even employment.

In its recent meeting of Maine conservation leaders, the New England Governors’ Commission on Land Conservation listed “Sprawling development patterns at several scales across the landscape; slavery to the private automobile and lack of public transportation; fragmentation of forested lands and open space, physically and legally; loss of wildlife habitat, especially connectivity and corridors; diminished public access and increased “nature-deficit” disorder; and chronic underinvestment in green public infrastructure” in their list of major conservation challenges facing Maine (and New England). These challenges are potential obstacles not only to conservation in general but more specifically to the goal of ensuring sustainable outdoor recreation opportunities.
C. Issue: Quality of Place and Recreation

“Maine’s place-based assets, both natural and built, are diverse and plentiful, yet are today at risk from sprawling development and the lack of investment in downtowns and historic assets, the selling off of industrial forest ownership to new investor groups with diverse interests, and the loss of agricultural land and access to working waterfronts and outdoor recreational opportunities”.

-Source: An Order to Create a Maine Quality of Place Jobs and Investment Strategy. Signed by Governor John Baldacci on June 6, 2008

Maine Quality of Place is described by the Maine State Planning Office as Maine’s as:

“...our majestic mountains, unbroken forests, open fields, wild rivers, pristine lakes, widely-celebrated coast, picturesque downtowns, lively arts and culture, authentic historic buildings, and exceptional recreational opportunities.” (Maine State Planning Office, 2009).

It is a concept that touches upon many areas, from economics to history to ecology. In essence, it focuses on sustaining and even enhancing the unique attributes that make Maine attractive to live in and visit. The rising level of concern about maintaining quality of place reflects the changes associated with the loss of, among other things, outdoor areas with scenic and recreational value to Maine communities. In the 2007 report, Place and Prosperity, prepared by the Maine State Planning Office, Reilly and Renski write:

“Quality of Place initiatives embrace landscape protection, downtown revitalization, historic preservation, the creative economy, outdoor recreation, nature- and heritage-based tourism, and local and regional planning initiatives. By implication, it also touches upon affordable housing, transportation, education, and health care.”

Focus group input in the SCORP process lines up with much of the interest in quality of place. Suggestions, such as making urban trails and greenspaces more interconnected or working to continue traditional public access to large privately owned forestlands, reflect a desire to protect access to outdoor recreation and a way of life focused on the outdoors. Quality of place is seen as an issue that bridges outdoor recreation/conservation interests and community economic development goals.

D. Issue: Youth and the Outdoors

“One-third of the 74 million children under age 18 in the U.S. are either dangerously overweight or obese. This number represents a 300 percent increase in just the last 10 years. The Center for Disease Control says the current generation of youth may be the first to live shorter lives than their parents because of growing health issues with a sedentary lifestyle”

- Acadia N.P. Superintendent Sheridan Steele quoted by the Children & Nature Network

### Table 5: National Figures on Children & Electronic Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationally, kids aged 2-18 spend an average of over 4 hours/day viewing a screen (TV, computer, etc.)</td>
<td>1 in 5 kids watch more than 5 hours of TV per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Kaiser Family Foundation, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Among the many concerns associated with the fear that youth are not active in the outdoors is that a generation of American youth are not outdoors burning calories through active play. In a 2008 speech at The Governor’s Conference on Youth and the Natural World (sponsored by the Maine Department of Conservation), Larry Selzer, president and CEO of the Conservation Fund was quoted stating, “A healthy nation asks how it is that children now gain 3-5 times as much weight during the summer as they do during the school year.” Considering that, as reported by Maine Public Health Director Dr. Dora Anne Mills, 25% of Maine high school students are overweight and 36% of Maine kindergartners have a Body Mass Index at or above the 85th percentile, it is vital that youth are able to and encouraged to get outside, get active, and get healthy. Tables 5 and 6 show some of the statistics underlying concern over youth health and outdoor lifestyles.

What do young people do and what gets them into the outdoors?

Data provided in the Maine & the Maine Market Region report (2009), shows activities such as mountain biking, backpacking, kayaking, rafting, using a personal watercraft, snowmobiling, downhill skiing, sledding, snowboarding, and outdoor sports such as jogging, tennis, soccer, etc., as popular activities for 16-24 year-olds in Maine. As for who influences youth to be active in the outdoors, the Outdoor Industry Foundation’s Outdoor Recreation Participation Report (2008) cites parents and then friends as the top influences on youth starting to participate in outdoor activities. The same report lists “it’s fun” as the overwhelming reason kids enjoy outdoor activities (“discovery/exploration” trailed in second place).

Future stewards

There is growing concern that if youth are not engaged in the outdoors, they will grow up to be adults who are not inclined to spend time recreating outdoors. This has a number of potential impacts, such as a less active adult population that is more prone to obesity and obesity-related health problems. However, that is not the only impact if a generation loses its connection to nature and the outdoors. Parks, preserves, and other public, and for that matter, private lands need advocates and stewards. If fewer people are available to take the torch passed by older generations of land stewards and outdoor advocates,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Maine High School Students- Attributes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% do not have daily physical education classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% watch 3 or more hours of TV on an average school day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% used a video game or computer for at least 3 hours of leisure time per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Maine Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capacity to protect and support outdoor recreation and conservation areas will be diminished.

E. Senior Recreation Needs

Maine is rapidly becoming one of the oldest states in the nation (based on percent of senior citizens). There are significant considerations associated with serving this group of Mainers - a group that will be becoming even more significant with time. However, it may be a mistake to treat a new generation of seniors as previous generations have been treated.

In 2011, the first of America’s Baby Boomers (born between 1946 and 1964) will turn 65. Will meeting the needs of Boomers, as Cochran, et al. (2006) predict, “require a change in traditional attitudes about the needs and desires of older participants”? If so, (as is predicted by researchers (e.g, Ziegler, 2002), then Maine should be prepared to embrace a wave of seniors who intend to continue their active lifestyles into their later years.

The first ME 2009-2014 SCORP focus group included participants who held expertise in senior issues. Some of the ideas to come out of that session included having clear, easy to obtain information on outdoor recreation opportunities (including difficulty); having socially interactive recreation offerings available; including a mix of intellectual and physical opportunities; considering cost, transportation, and other barriers; as well as other considerations.

In addition to serving resident seniors, planning for senior outdoor recreation needs and interest has economic development implications. For instance, One-third of active travelers are over the age of 45. (Outdoor Industry Foundation, Outdoor Recreation Participation Report 2006). The more Maine can position itself to offer senior friendly opportunities, the more tourism can benefit. Also, attracting retirees can be an economic development strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Outdoor Recreation by Older Maine Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to data obtained from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment as part of the Maine &amp; the Maine Market Region report (2009), there is a noticeably decline in participation for most outdoor recreation activities when comparing the 45-54 and 55-64 age brackets. Similarly, participation rates are relatively low in the 65+ group as well. One grouping of outdoor recreation activities in which senior Mainers participate relatively more is the “viewing/learning activities” including activities such as viewing/photographing birds; sightseeing; gathering mushrooms, berries, etc.; and several other activities. For a detailed look at participation rates for older Maine residents, see Exhibit II-A at the end of this chapter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit II-A** lists participation rates for the 55-64 and 65+ age brackets as well as the 45-54 age bracket. The 45-54 bracket is included due to the fact that “Boomers” today are aged 45-63.
for communities, in that relocating retirees are often a net economic benefit to the communities they move to.

F. Issue: Changes in Maine’s Large-scale Forest Landscapes

As is frequently cited, Maine is the nation’s most forested state. All throughout its history, even well before statehood, Maine’s forests provided economic, cultural, and inspirational sustenance. Not surprisingly, then, Maine’s forest lands, including intermingled waters, wetlands, and mountains, have been the foundation of long-standing recreational activities.

Maine’s robust outdoor recreation traditions, most notably nature-based activities, rely on access to forests, coastlines, and the like. Many, perhaps the majority of, Maine’s publicly-owned lands, from federal to state to municipal levels, are intended, along with other goals, to provide access for outdoor recreation. However, these fee-owned lands make up under 6% of Maine’s land area (total conservation acres owned by public and private entities, including both fee and easement lands, covers over 17% of the state). Therefore, private lands, including private lands with public easements, have traditionally played a vital role in supplying Mainers and guests with places to recreate.

Maine citizens and visitors alike still have remarkable access to private lands (when viewed by national standards) due to the tradition of Maine’s large private landowners, historically large paper company interests, allowing public use of their lands. However, concern is steadily rising about the future of public recreational access to private lands. Several developments appear to be driving this concern.

Changing Ownership Patterns in the North Woods

In the Winter 2007 issue of the Maine Policy Review, LeVert, Colgan, and Lawton write that:

“Over the past two decades, this unique area [Maine’s north woods] has experienced greater change than it has seen in the previous century. The industrial structure of the

The Birding Bus

The Waldo County YMCA based out of Belfast, Maine has developed a popular senior recreation offering built around bird watching. Each trip aboard the “Birding Bus” brings together bird watchers and a trip leader. The groups travels together to Maine birding destinations where participants can hear and observe birds, learn from one another, and generally socialize.

Birding, like other viewing/learning activities is a popular senior activity. In Maine, people in the 65+ age bracket make up the largest portion (22.9%) of bird photographers/viewers. (Source: Maine & the Market Region report, 2009).
forestland has changed; the residential and conservation demand for this land has increased; and the price of land has risen to unprecedented levels”.

From the late 1800s until the late 1980s, the bulk of the private northwoods ownership resided in industrial forest product companies in which a land base was owned and managed to produce pulp or timber for mills owned by the same company. As this model began to become less prevalent, other types of ownership grew. For instance, Hagan, Irland, and Whitman (2005) report that:

“The shift from industrial forest ownership to various new owner types is nearly complete. In Maine in 1994, forest industry owned about 60% (4.6 million acres) of the large tracts (>5000 ac) of timberland and financial investors owned about 3%. By May, 2005, financial investors owned about one-third of the large forest tracts and industry owned only 15.5% (1.8 million acres, mostly in a single ownership)”.

Changing Forest Ownership in the Mahoosuc Region

The Mahoosuc Region on the edge of Maine and northern New Hampshire is but one of the areas in Maine where the historic pattern of land ownership is quickly changing. According to Weinberg and Larson (2008), 40,000 -150,000 acres in the region is estimated to sell within 5-10 years. Furthermore, the fragmentation of the forest ownership has reduced forest-related jobs, increased harvest rates, increased posted property, and encouraged development of previously undeveloped waterfront.

This change, in which historically stable industrial ownership quickly evolved into investment-oriented owner types, continues to cause anxiety regarding public access to private lands. This new set of owners with short-term profit oriented goals is more likely to sell land holdings after short-term goals are realized. However, for the present time, large landowners, including new landowners, appear to largely acknowledge that public access to private lands is a tradition worth maintaining and is important to local economies (Daigle, 2008).

While much apprehension comes from the fear of development and fragmentation in private landscape-scale contiguous forests, there is also concern over changes in public and/or private management priorities. For instance, some recreational constituencies fear conservation lands (including private conservation lands) will become off limits to one or more activities (e.g., hunting/trapping, ATV & snowmobile use, vehicle access, etc.). There are also broad fears that regions will lose their primitive character and their ability to provide backcountry experiences if motorized uses are allowed to proliferate without regard to these values. While there is debate over the correct balance of recreation opportunities in Maine’s large forest landscapes,
fragmentation and rapid changes in ownership are considered a serious issue by the majority of outdoor recreation interests.

**Abuse of Private Lands**

Focus group comments as well as ongoing research by Maine SCORP steering committee member and University of Maine professor Dr. John Daigle point to abuse of private lands by the recreating public as a significant issue leading to the closure or potential closure of previously openly accessible private lands. With so much of Maine’s supply of outdoor recreation areas being on private lands, this is an acutely important issue. Professor Daigle’s work with large private landowners in northern New England and New York lists “To prevent damage to my property” as the top-ranked reason for landowners posting their properties to public access (Daigle, 2008). Whether in large landowner regions or in regions defined more by smaller landowners, the abuse of private lands through rogue ATV or truck traffic, dumping, littering, vandalism, and/or overall careless/malicious actions threatens recreational access.

**Summary**

The quality of outdoor recreation opportunities has a significant bearing on Maine’s economic future, and the future of access to large landscapes is in question. Additionally, sprawl, especially in southern areas, continues to be an issue facing conservation/recreation planning. Maine’s unique “quality of place” is threatened by these potentially erosive factors. All the while, Maine’s population continues to become relatively older and somewhat geographically realigned. Plus, there is growing concern about youth being disconnected from the outdoors and all its benefits. Outdoor recreation planning in Maine will need to consider these factors as projects and efforts are undertaken over the course of the next five years.
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Chapter III: Outdoor Recreation
Demand in Maine.

Key Understandings

- Maine residents participate in outdoor recreation activities at an overall higher rate than both national and regional averages. Maine participation rates are especially high in nature-based activities.

- Trends in outdoor recreation, identified through surveys, licenses, entrance figures, and other means show fluctuations across time and trends varying by type of activity and individual resources. While some sites and activities show declines in demand, outdoor recreation appears to continue to be a highly sought out Maine experience/lifestyle.

- Participation in outdoor recreation activities (and demand for activities) is not one-size-fits-all. Age, place of residence, income, education, and a number of other factors influence participation in specific activities.

- Maine has a relatively high proportion of non-resident participation in outdoor recreation activities. Maine State Parks, for example, report approximately 40% non-resident camper registrations. This high level of non-resident outdoor recreation has important recreation planning and economic implications.
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Introduction

Participation in outdoor recreation, including both recent levels and trends across time, can be measured with a number of tools. In this report, participation is analyzed based on surveys, entrance figures, estimated visitor use data, registration figures (for power boats, snowmobiles, and ATVs), and license data. The combination of data is intended to provide a well-rounded view of outdoor recreation demand in Maine.

Furthermore, Maine is an outdoor recreation destination for the greater New England/Northeast region as well. Therefore, recreation trends across New England are very significant to understanding outdoor recreation demand in Maine. Given that campground reservations in Maine State Parks average around 40% non-resident campers and that other entities such as Baxter State Park (43% non-resident visitation in 20081) and North Maine Woods (30% non-resident use from 1993-20062) experience high levels of non-resident visitation, it is important that recreation planning reflect this reality.

Source Notes: One major source of outdoor recreation participation used in this report is the Maine and Maine Market Region report (2009). This report uses survey data obtained as part of the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, a national random telephone survey effort maintained by the US Forest Service. More detail on the survey can be found in Exhibit III C on page 23.

---

1 Baxter State Park Annual Report 2008
2 Governor’s Task Force Regarding the Management of Public Lands and Publicly -Held Easements, (2008)
A. National Patterns of Outdoor Recreation Participation

It is at the national level where there is the most disagreement about whether Americans are less or more active outdoors than in years past. On one hand, the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment data supports the argument that outdoor recreation is growing in the United States; the number of days of participation in outdoor recreation activities has risen 25% from 1999 to 2008 (Cordell, Betz, Green, and Mou, 2008). On the other hand, the Outdoor Industry Foundation (OIF) (2006) reports approximately a 2.5% drop in total U.S. outdoor recreation participation between 2001 and 2005 (a subsequent OIF report shows an uptick in participation in 2007). Additionally, researchers Pergams and Zaradic have asserted that per capita participation in outdoor recreation has been declining since 1987 (Pergams and Zaradic, 2008).

National data provides more than simply an overview of participation in general. Table 1 on the previous page, comprised of data from both the NSRE survey and the OIF Participation Study, shows the most popular and fastest growing activities in the United States. The popularity and growth of viewing activities is especially noteworthy (in the NSRE data). Dr. H. Ken Cordell, a Pioneering Scientist and Project Leader with the US Forest Service, leads the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, a national telephone survey effort aimed at monitoring outdoor recreation participation. In Forest History Today (Spring 2008), Dr. Cordell writes:

“The increase in the observation and study of nature is, in my view, a very healthy trend that apparently reflects rising and widespread interest in the future of natural resources, conservation, and public lands.” He goes on to add, "Of these top seventeen activities [out of 60 tracked], six involve viewing, photographing, identifying, visiting, or otherwise observing elements of nature—flowers, trees, natural scenery, birds, other wildlife, nature exhibits, and wilderness (wildlands generally). The growth in viewing and photographing plants and natural scenery has been most rapid, at about 78 and 60 percent, respectively” (Cordell, 2008).

The Outdoor Industry Foundation notes that that half

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% Change in # Participants</th>
<th>Increase in Participants (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>2,656.9%</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball/racquetball - outdoors</td>
<td>458.6%</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet skiing</td>
<td>174.0%</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>159.9%</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photo fish</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View wildlife (besides birds)</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSRE Maine State Report data (‘02-’09)
of participants only get out once every other week (Outdoor Industry Foundation, 2008). Furthermore, the OIF report cites the diminishing participation rates associated with age. The NSRE data mirrors this finding.

National hunting and fishing trends show marginal declines, with the number of sportspersons and amount of time spent fishing or hunting showing small declines starting in 2001 (USFWS, 2006). However, "big-game hunting", according to NSRE data, has seen a 21.2% increase of days nationally between 2000 and 2007.

B. New England Trends

**Participation Rates**

The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment State Report produced for the 2009-2014 Maine SCORP examined activity trends in New England between 1995 and 2009. Both percent participating and number of estimated participants were recorded. Activities were clustered into "Nature-Based Land", "Viewing/Learning", "Developed-Setting", "Water", "Snow/Ice", "Outdoor Sports".

New England trends generally show increases in both percent participation and, as would then be expected, an increase in number of participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants Gained (Millions)</th>
<th>Participants Lost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View wildlife (besides birds)</td>
<td>+2.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gatherings outdoors</td>
<td>+2.46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk for pleasure</td>
<td>+2.44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball/racquetball outdoors</td>
<td>+2.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>+1.97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yard games (e.g. croquet, etc.)</td>
<td>+1.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>+1.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph fish</td>
<td>+1.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph birds</td>
<td>+1.44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in lakes and streams</td>
<td>+1.39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball outdoors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadromous fishing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterskiing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSRE Maine State Report data (‘02-’09)

The ten fastest growing outdoor activities in New England are listed in Table 2. Table 3 shows the activities with either the most participants gained or the most participants lost in New England from 1996-2009.

C. Maine’s Non-resident Recreating Public

Tourism is Maine’s largest industry, producing $10.1 billion in goods and services, $425 million in tax revenue, and 140,000 jobs. Maine’s natural resources and recreation opportunities are central to Maine’s tourism industry.
Maine’s Office of Tourism, through its contract with Davidson Peterson Associates, provides travel and tourism reports for the state on an annual basis that reflect samples of day and overnight visitors to Maine from US households. In 2008, there were an estimated 15.4 million overnight visitors and 16.5 million day visitors in Maine. Nonresidents made up 53% of day visitors and over 90% of overnight visitors. Table 4 depicts the residency of overnight and day visitors in Maine. Massachusetts and New York residents make the most trips to visit Maine, though it should be noted that seasonal patterns such as relatively greater visitation from Pennsylvanians in summer and New Brunswick residents in winter do exist (Davidson Peterson Associates, 2009). Nonresident percentages for select destinations or activities (e.g., Maine State Parks, ATV registrations, etc.) are shown in Table 5 (pg. 5).

Maine is organized into 8 tourism regions. A strong majority of tourist activity (approximately 70%) occurs in Maine’s coastal regions. Still, tourism plays a major economic role across the state. Figure 1 shows the percentages of tourism activity in Maine’s tourism regions.

### Table 4: Residency of Maine Visitors (Includes In-state Trips)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State(s) / Province</th>
<th>% Day Visitors</th>
<th>% Overnight Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire &amp; Vermont</td>
<td>14% (Mostly NH)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick &amp; Nova Scotia</td>
<td>11.5% (Mostly NB)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island &amp; Connecticut</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York &amp; New Jersey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Delaware, DC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Percent of Leisure Travelers Visiting Specific Maine Regions (2008). Source:** Davidson Peterson Associates/Maine Office of Tourism
In 2008, first-time overnight leisure travelers to Maine, according to Davidson Peterson Associates, were more likely to cite the natural beauty of the state as the reason for their visit than were repeat visitors. Furthermore, again according to Davidson Peterson Associates (2009), prospective visitors who have already been to Maine, rate the state higher than those who have not visited before. Thus, it can be said that natural attractions are a significant calling card drawing visitors - visitors who after coming to Maine, value what they experience.
Outdoor recreation is listed as the primary purpose for between 18% and 23% (depending upon season) of all overnight leisure trips in Maine. Outdoor recreation is the primary purpose of between 9% (winter) and 24% (summer) of leisure day trips. It is noteworthy that Maine residents participating in an overnight leisure trip within Maine are more likely to primarily be traveling for outdoor recreation than their other New England and Canadian counterparts. It should also be noted that for overnight leisure trips, outdoor recreation is only second to "rest & relaxation" as the listed purpose of travel. "Rest & relaxation" (as well as the category of "cultural/heritage tourism, which was cited as a primary purpose at the 1%-3% level) certainly also has links to demand for facilities such as parks, open spaces, etc.

The Maine Office of Tourism also collects data in the form of information requests. Table 6 lists those requests (ranked) for 2008. Two-thirds of the top 36 information requests involve outdoor recreation opportunities. 56% of information requests are for summer, 31% for fall, 3% for winter, and 10% for spring. Coastal counties account for a majority (upwards of 70%) of tourism in Maine.

Visitor Attributes

Research conducted by Longwoods International (2007) showed overnight visitors average age to be 46 years old. A majority (60%) were married and a majority also had a household of no more than two members (59%). 67% had no children less than 18 years of age. 64% were employed full-time in manager/professional jobs or other white-collar positions and 60% had incomes of greater than $50,000. 59% were college graduates. 70% of the overnight marketable trips to Maine in 2001 were by people 35 years of age or older; more than 50% were by people 45 or older.

Note

It bears mentioning that the Maine Office of Tourism transitioned from reports produced by Longwoods International to reports produced by Davidson Peterson Associates. Thus, reports differ some in content from 2006 to 2008. Additionally, visitor data cited in the 2003-2008 Maine SCORP differs in methodology from this SCORP; this SCORP document uses total annual trip figures that DO NOT count in-state day trips by Maine residents.

(Right): Landing a Brook Trout on the Roach River.
D. Maine Outdoor Recreation Participation

Activities - 2009 Participation Data One take-home message from the 2009, NSRE-based Maine and the Maine Market Region report is that Maine residents participate in outdoor recreation at a level above the national and regional average. For instance, Maine has a higher percent participation rate than both the U.S. and New England rate in 61% of activities reported. Exhibit III 1, on pages 23 - 29 of this section, lists activity-specific participation nationally, in New England, and in Maine.

Activities in which Mainers participate at least 10 percentage points above both regional and national levels include:
- “primitive camping”
- “big-game hunting”
- “snow/ice activities (any type)”, “snowmobiling”
- “boating (any)”, “motorboating”, “canoeing”
- “Coldwater fishing”
- “View/photograph other wildlife (besides birds)”
- “Gather mushrooms, berries, etc.”

Most Participated in Activities - Maine Residents
NSRE data lists “walking for pleasure” as the outdoor recreation activity with the most Maine participants (942,000 Maine participants). “Walking for Pleasure” and all the other activities with over 50% participation by Maine residents are shown in Table 7 on page 8.

Outdoor Recreation in Maine and Age
Maine’s population is fast becoming one of the oldest in the nation. Furthermore, it is widely accepted that different age groups tend to engage in different activities at different levels of participation. Therefore, a look at recreation patterns associated with age is an important part of analyzing outdoor recreation in Maine.

Maine’s current activity participation data follows this trend of distinct patterns along an age continuum. Most generally, it can be said that Maine’s 55+ age population participates in outdoor recreation at lower levels than younger (under 55) Mainers. When looking at all activities measured in the Maine and the Maine Market Region report data, the 35-44 age group participates in the most activities.

As might be expected, age-based participation rates vary greatly from activity to activity. For example, Figure 2 on page 9 shows the participation patterns in the “kayaking” and “view/photograph birds” activities across the age range of age groups (16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 64+). It also shows the percentage of the overall population within each grouping (red line). Of particular note is that in the “kayaking” activity, the two youngest age groups have participation rates well above their percentage of the population while the two oldest age groups participate in “kayaking” well below their percentage of the overall population. Conversely, the “view/photograph birds” activity participation rate for younger groups is low (below the relative percent of population), while the 65+ age group participates in the activity at a level higher than their percent of the population. In short, kayaking participation appears to be tilted towards younger participants whereas viewing and photographing birds appears to be more closely...
associated with older participants. A discussion of NSRE data specific to youths/young adults and seniors is included in the “Issues” section.

A more comprehensive examination of age group and activity characteristics is provided in Figure 3 on page 9. This graph uses the activity clusters employed by NSRE researchers (“nature-based land”, “Water-Based”, etc.) to explore Maine participation rates by age. For a full listing of activities in each cluster, see Table 8 (pg. 10). For more details on Maine outdoor recreation participation in specific activities, see Exhibit III-A on page 23 of this chapter.
Figure 2: “Kayaking” and “View/Photograph Birds” Activity Participation Rates and Maine Population Per-
cents Across 6 Age Groups

Note: Population (red line) is a Census estimate based on 2007 and representing the portion (percent) of the
population falling into each age group.

Figure 3: Maine outdoor recreation participation organized by activity clusters and age
groupings. Note: population (red line) is a census estimate (2007) and represents the
percent of the population falling into each age group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature-Based Land Activities</th>
<th>Developed Land Setting Activities</th>
<th>Water-based Activities</th>
<th>Snow and Ice-based Activities</th>
<th>Viewing/Learning Activities</th>
<th>Outdoor Sports (Individual and Team)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit a wilderness or primitive area</td>
<td>Walk for pleasure</td>
<td>Swimming in lakes, streams, etc.</td>
<td>Snow/ice activities (any type)</td>
<td>View/photograph natural scenery</td>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>Family gathering</td>
<td>Boating (any type)</td>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>View/photograph other wildlife</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a farm or agricultural setting</td>
<td>Gardening or landscaping for pleasure</td>
<td>Visit a beach</td>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>View/nature centers, zoos, etc.</td>
<td>Inline skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed camping</td>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>Swimming in an outdoor pool</td>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>View/photograph wildflowers, trees, etc.</td>
<td>Handball or racquetball outdoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>Gather mushrooms, berries, etc.</td>
<td>Tennis outdoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>Yard games, e.g., horseshoes</td>
<td>Freshwater fishing</td>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>Visit historic sites</td>
<td>Attend outdoor sports events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive off-road</td>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>Visit other waterside (besides beach)</td>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>View/photograph birds</td>
<td>Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (any type)</td>
<td>Attend outdoor concerts, plays, etc.</td>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>View/photograph fish</td>
<td>Basketball outdoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>Horseback riding (any type)</td>
<td>Coldwater fishing</td>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>Boat tours or excursions</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big game hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warmwater fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit prehistoric archeological sites</td>
<td>Soccer outdoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain climbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caving</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Game hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saltwater fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volleyball outdoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding on trails</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory bird hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterskiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use personal watercraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anadromous fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scuba diving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windsurfing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Recreation Trends—Visitation, Registration, and License Data

It is important to recognize that a number of factors influence demand for outdoor recreation activities, both cumulatively and in patterns specific to individual activities. Weather, economic conditions, evolving patterns of work and life, as well as demographic changes all have the potential to influence outdoor recreation demand and participation. With this in mind, the following sets of data showing quantifiable recreation visits or license/registration data is intended to help inform an understanding of where recreation demand is trending.

**US National Park Service (NPS)** Visitation to parks and public lands is a useful gauge of demand for many types of outdoor recreation (notably nature-based recreation). It is possible to look at national level trends to get a “big picture” view of visitation trends. In this light, Figure 4 shows the trend in visitation to properties administered by the **U.S. National Park Service**. Over the last 15 years, there has been fluctuation in visitation across the National Parks. However, the last five years have been more constant, with total National Park Service recreation visits hovering around 275 million per year. National Park Service camping trends (Figure 5) show an overall reduction in stays for RV camping, tent camping (campgrounds) and backcountry camping. From the overall 15 year high experienced in 1994, 2008 levels have dropped approximately 24% for backcountry camping, 30% for tent (campground) camping, and 41% for RV camping. Recent data points towards growth in NPS visits coming from parks.
situated in urban, suburban, outlying and mixed population areas (versus more rural, remote sites) (Outdoor Industry Foundation, 2009).

**Acadia National Park**, Maine’s iconic National Park, has more recently experienced reduced visitation compared to the period of the mid and late 1990s. As Figure 6 shows, Acadia NP saw a significant drop in visitation starting in 1995 and bottoming out in 2005. Recent trends show an uptick in visitation, followed by a small dip in 2008 (a year with poor summer weather).

**Figure 6** shows camping trends at Acadia, which have for the most part mirrored overall park visitation patterns.

**State and Other Non-Federal Parks and Lands in Maine**

At the state level, there are several sources of visitor use figures. One major source of insight is visitor use at **Maine State Parks**. As with a variety of outdoor recreation managers, Maine’s State Parks saw a reduction in visitation between the early 2000s time frame and the mid 2000s. However, the dip in visitor days between the 2001/2002 peak and the 2005/2006 valley (approximately 17%) is not as pronounced as some other recreation agencies experienced.

**Figure 8** shows both camper nights (overnight use) and visitor days (day use) figures for Maine State Parks and Historic Sites from 1993-2008.
The Allagash Wilderness Waterway and the Penobscot River Corridor, both waterways managed by the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, show noticeable trends in remote river-based recreation. In both cases, the overall trend since the mid to late 1990s has been generally reduced visitation. Trends for both waterways can be seen in figures 9 & 10.
**Baxter State Park (BSP)**, a 204,733 acres wilderness park operated under the guidance of a Governing Authority (Maine Attorney General, Maine Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, and Director of the Maine Forest Service), is separate from Maine’s Bureau of Parks and Lands. BSP, given its predominantly gated access and camping reservation system, has accurate data for trend analysis.

As with Baxter State Park, **North Maine Woods Inc. (NMW)**, a group of corporations, individuals, families, public agencies, and non-profit landowners, also has an insightful collection of visitation records. The gated entry system to this 3.5 million plus-acre landbase...
enables NMW recreation managers to measure recreation use year to year. Figure 11 shows that visitation has diminished at both Baxter State Park and the North Maine Woods system.

The *Maine Island Trail Association (MITA)* is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization dedicated to sustaining volunteer stewardship and recreation management of coastal islands along a 350-mile waterway extending from Cape Porpoise Harbor, Kennebunkport, on the western Maine coast, to Washington County on the east. It was established 1993 and includes over 150 islands and mainland sites along the route, available for day visits or overnight, low-impact camping. MITA, in conjunction with the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, manages 47 coastal islands along the trail. MITA estimates visitation to MITA managed islands. Figure 12 shows trends in Maine Island Trail use.

*Commercial whitewater rafting* is regulated by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. Figure 13 shows recent use trends on Maine’s three primary rafting rivers. Like some of the visitation figures, whitewater rafting figures show a downturn from an approximate turn of the century peak.

![Figure 13: Commercial Whitewater Rafting Participants on Maine’s Three Primary Rafting Rivers, 1992-2008](image)

**Hunting & Fishing - License Trends**

Maine’s Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife regulates hunting, freshwater fishing, and trapping in Maine. The hunting and fishing data obtained through analysis of licenses serves as a source of data for understanding the participation in and demand for hunting and fishing in Maine. The *National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation*, published by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, is also a source of insight regarding hunting and fishing in Maine.

Trends over the last decade show Maine’s level of participation in hunting and fishing remaining fairly steady, though license sales (see Figure 14 and 15) do show undulations over...
recent years. Likewise, data from the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (2006) shows no appreciable change in the number of hunters or anglers in Maine (both resident and non-resident).

Table 9 uses National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation figures to summarize hunting and fishing activities for Maine in 2006. It is also perhaps relevant to note that the same report shows 25% of Maine residents participate in hunting and/or angling (vs. 15% US rate).

Figure 14 shows hunting license trends since the mid 1990s. Echoing the USFWS National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation report, Maine hunting license sales data doesn’t show dramatic change in hunting participation. Figure 15 reflects recent, modest growth in fishing licenses sold. Table 9 provides a snapshot of hunting and fishing in Maine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Selected Maine Attributes from the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (USFWS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146,000 resident hunters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 hunting days/hunter (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,000 nonresident hunters (10 days/hunter average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89% of resident hunters live in a rural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorized Recreation

Registrations for snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), and motor boats provide recreation planners with information pertaining to trends in the activities relying on those machines. There is an assumption that individuals registering snowmobiles, ATVs, or boats intend to use them and the registrations are an appropriate proxy for popularity (demand). All registration data within this report comes from the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, which collects registration data.

Motorized outdoor recreation in Maine, based on registrations, shows growth over the last 15 years. For instance, ATV registrations grew rapidly in the late 1990s through the 2003-2004 timeframe, when registrations started to plateau. Figure 16 (pg. 18) depicts the growth in Maine ATV registrations, and Table 10 (left) shows the same data in tabular form. Participation data from the Maine and the Maine Market Region report lists 26.8% of Maine residents as having driven off-road for pleasure. It should be noted that this includes not only ATVs but 4x4 Jeeps and trucks as well as dirt bikes.

The rapid growth of ATV sales and use preceding creation of the 2003-2008 Maine SCORP led to “The ATV Issue” being listed as an implementation priority. As the 2003 Maine SCORP states, “an issue of overwhelming statewide concern that was raised in several groups was the impact of the tremendous growth in ATV use in Maine. Illegal or inappropriate use of All Terrain Vehicles is resulting in user conflicts and social problems on certain trails, causing environmental damage, leading to the closure of private lands to public recreational use, and can impede the acquisition of certain high-priority open space and recreational lands by government agencies and nongovernmental organizations”. Additional study grew out of this issue, and the result was that in 2005, The University of Maine’s Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center published Economic Contributions of ATV-Related Activities in Maine (2005). This study estimated that $156.0 million was spent in the 2003/2004 season to purchase, register, and operate ATVs (spending for accessories, clothing, lodging, gas, etc. was included in analysis).
The report also included data reflecting rider and use characteristics. Select rider and use characteristics findings are summarized in Table 10.

Snowmobile registrations (Figure 17) have also increased over the last decade. In that same time, however, volatility in registrations have increased as well. In the 2003/2004 winter season, registrations fell 14%. The next season, registrations rose 11%. The following winter (2005/2006), registrations fell 27%. Registrations have shown an uptick in the last two seasons.

Motor boat registrations, including everything from small outboard motors for canoes to large pleasure craft, do not show any dramatic change over the past decade. As Figure 18 shows, registrations have held steady in recent years.

It should be noted that registrations are not the only source of data relating to motorboat use. For example, the Maine and the Maine Market Region lists 38% of Maine residents and 27% of New England residents participating in “motorboating”. Additionally, the Economic Contributions of Maine State Parks (2006) reports 3% of state park visitors bringing a power boat with them to a state park or historic site.

In Focus- Snowmobilers

Essentially all snowmobilers in Maine are white, and 62.5% are male. Overall, 28.7% of Mainers over the age of 15 participate in at least one snowmobile ride per year (many, of course, ride much more). 68.7% of all snowmobilers over the age of 15 are between 15 and 44 years old. Only 16.5% of snowmobilers are 55 years old or older.

The largest income segment that snowmobilers fall into is the $25,000 - $49,000 family income range (41.2% of Maine participants). In New England, the income profile for snowmobilers is slightly higher than in Maine.

In 2008, 26% of registrations belonged to non-resident snowmobilers. Snowmobile registrations, like many other outdoor recreation and tourism figures, are impacted by weather. For instance, the winter of 2006, a year marked by overall poor snow conditions, saw a 27% drop in nonresident registrations from 2005. However, the next season (2007) saw a 10% increase followed by a 37% increase for 2008. Most recently, in 2008, Maine saw 99,245 resident snowmobiles registered and 26,541 nonresident snowmobiles registered.
Figures 17-18 (above) depict registration trends for ATVs, snowmobiles, and motorboats in Maine from the early 1990s to 2006. It should be noted that in ‘03/’04, non-resident ATV riders were first required to register.
State and National Perspectives on Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Recreation

The Internet Research Information Series, a collaborative effort between the USDA Forest Service’s Southern Research Station and its Forestry Sciences Laboratory in Athens, Georgia; the University of Georgia in Athens; and the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, Tennessee, produced a 2008 report entitled, Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation in the United States and its Regions and States: An Update National Report from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE). Excerpted discussion points are provided below. Though speaking at a national level, the sentiments expressed reflect issues of importance here in Maine.

- “Despite a recent dip in OHV sales, most likely related to increasing gas prices and ownership saturation, OHV’s still remain very popular. In particular, ATV sales account for more than 70 percent of the OHV market. There are approximately 44 million people, aged 16 years or older, who presently participate in OHV recreation. One-in-five Americans participated one or more times in OHV recreation within the past year. This interest in OHV recreation, overall, represents about an 18 percent increase in the number of OHV participants between 1999 and 2007. Population growth will most likely result in more OHV users in the future”.

- “Increasing urban and ex-urban sprawl and loss of open private lands will be important in the future OHV participants seek to gain access to our public lands, such as national forests, for OHV recreation. Public land managers will not only be faced with increasing pressure from the numbers of OHV participants, but also additional demands for related services and facilities”.

### ATV Riding Characteristics Findings
(Source: 2005 Economic Contributions of ATV-Related Activities in Maine Study)

- Riders with higher yearly riding totals were more likely to be members of an ATV club and to have taken a safety course. 21% of riders have ever been members of an ATV club.
- Per capita ATV ownership was greatest in Franklin, Piscataquis, and Washington Counties. The Maine Highlands tourism region ranked as the largest riding location (35% of state riding).
- 1/3 of respondents have been riding for more than 15 years. 1/3 have been riding for less than 5 years.
- Summer and fall seasons account for over 75% of all riding.
- Over 65% of riding occurred on private land (including 31.9% on rider’s own land). 15.1% of riding occurred on land of unknown ownership (i.e., rider did not know ownership).
- 78.4% of respondents rode at least some on private lands. Respondents reported riding at least some on state lands (38.9%), some on national or local lands (20.6%), and on unknown ownership (49.3%).
- Respondents riding more miles/year reported riding more on marked ATV trails than did respondents riding less miles.
- Nearly 2/3 of respondents took at least one overnight trip.
- The top 5 factors influencing where to ride include, in order: courteous riders, scenery, interconnected trails, good signage, and a variety of terrain.
The Case for Trails

According to NSRE data:
✦ 87.6% of Mainers walk for pleasure
✦ 27.7% run or jog
✦ 41.3% hike
✦ 38.2% bike
✦ 14.4% cross-country ski
✦ 16.7% snowshoe
✦ 28.7% snowmobile
✦ 26.7% drive off road.

The same data shows day hiking, driving off-road, backpacking, horseback riding, snowmobiling, cross-country skiing, and walking for pleasure as significantly growing activities (1995 vs. 2009). Perhaps it should not be surprising, then, that trails are viewed as an economic asset. Trails are now viewed as the number one amenity influencing home-buyers over the age of 55 (Morton and Lindahl, 2008).

In Focus: Mountain Bikers

27% of the Maine NSRE sample responded that they participate in mountain biking, leading to an estimate of 298,000 mountain bikers. Maine mountain bikers are 55.7% male, are almost entirely white (caucasian), trend towards the middle of income scales, and are just as likely to live in metro (more urban) counties as non-metro (more rural) counties. Over 40% of participants are under the age of 34. Mountain bikers have a diversity of educational attainment. At the time of this report, Maine has 3 local chapters of the New England Mt. Bike Association (Mt. Agamenticus Chapter in southern Maine, Central Maine Chapter in the greater Augusta area, and the Midcoast Chapter in the Camden region).

[Right]: Mountain bikers peddle towards Sugarloaf Mt., Maine’s highest ski peak. (Photo Courtesy Ellen Wells).
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Maine has seen growth in public conservation and recreation lands. Conservation easements have been one major source fueling this growth. Nonetheless, Maine still relies heavily on private lands being publicly available for nature-based outdoor recreation.

The relative amount of publicly owned lands vary by county/region. There is a general pattern in which state and (to a lesser degree) federal interests are greater in the less populated regions while land trusts and municipalities play a larger conservation/recreation role in more populated regions.

There are a diverse group of entities providing access to outdoor recreation. At local levels, municipalities and local (vs. statewide) land trusts are significant owners/managers of lands and facilities supporting outdoor recreation. This report recognizes the significance of these resources but is unable to fully quantify them.

Maine’s supply of areas supporting outdoor recreation is not self-sustaining. Issues such as urban sprawl, changes in the forest products industry, abuse of private lands, and the demand for second homes continue to create challenges to keeping Maine lands open to the public.
Resources for Outdoor Recreation - Maine’s Supply

Land and Water Recreation Resources in Maine

Maine’s 20.4 million acres offer a diverse natural environment that supports a wide variety of outdoor recreation activities for residents and visitors. The state’s 5,000-mile coast includes miles of sandy beach and rocky headlands, as well as over 3000 islands. In northern and western Maine, the Longfellow Range of the Appalachian Mountains contains more than 100 mountains over 3000 feet, and all of the state’s “4000 footers.” Maine’s inland waters total nearly 1,450 square miles in area and include about 5,800 lakes and ponds and almost 32,000 miles of rivers and streams. Maine also has about 5 million acres of wetlands ranging from small vernal pools to extensive coastal salt marshes. About 90% of the state’s land area is forested.

A. Public Recreation & Conservation Lands

Summary

The 2003-2008 Maine SCORP lists Maine's total 2002 public conservation and recreation lands, including easements, at 6% of total acreage. At the end of 2008, Maine's percentage of public conservation and recreation land was just under 8% of the state's total area. This increase in recreation and conservation lands represents a 33% jump. State-owned recreation and conservation land/easements increased by over 350,000 acres from 2002 to 2008.

When land trust fee lands and easements are added to the figures for public lands/easements, the total conserved area percentage is 17.8% (source: Maine State Planning Office, Land for Maine's Future program). This represents a 183% overall increase from 2002.

Federal Lands in Maine Available for Recreation 199,421 acres total

Most federal recreation lands in Maine are administered by three agencies: the US Department of the Interior's National Park Service (NPS) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (F&WS); and the US Department of Agriculture’s National Forest Service (NFS). Federal military and veterans’ agencies also administer some lands available for public recreation. The principal federal recreation lands in Maine are Acadia National Park (35,332 acres owned by the National Park Service and 12,416 acres of privately owned lands under conservation easement); the Evans Notch District of the White Mountain National Forest (49,166 acres); and the National Wildlife Refuges (58,100 acres).

State Lands in Maine Available for Recreation 1,316,575 acres total

73% of the state-held conservation and recreation lands are administered by the Bureau of Parks and Lands as Public Reserved lands and nonreserved public lands; state parks and historic sites and other park lands; trust islands; the Allagash Wilderness Waterway and Penobscot River Corridor; public boating facilities; and multiple use rail trails. Baxter State Park, administered separately, is Maine’s largest park and alone accounts for 16% of the state conservation and recreation lands. The Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife administers wildlife management areas, fish hatcheries; and
boat access facilities and holds 8% of the state conservation and recreation lands.

As Figure 1 (pg. 3) shows, Piscataquis County has the largest proportion of Maine’s conservation and recreation acreage, with much of this located in Baxter State Park. State lands in Maine’s most rural counties - Piscataquis, Aroostook, Somerset, Oxford, Hancock, Franklin, and Washington- account for the vast majority of the state-held conservation and recreation lands (when examined by acreage).

Table 2 shows state conservation ownership & interests for all 16 Maine counties. Table 3 lists Bureau of Parks and Lands Facilities within a) 25 driving miles and b) 50 driving miles of Maine’s ten most populated cities. As this table includes only State Parks, Public Reserved Land Units, and State Historic Sites, it should be noted that other outdoor recreation resources are available within those same vicinities. Nonetheless, Table 3 does give a sense of the “closer to home”, state-managed opportunities available for some of Maine’s more populated places.
Figure 1: Combined State and Federal Conservation/Recreation Lands as of 2008 as well as Conservation Easements Held by the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands. [Inset Map: Maine Town Populations 2000 (Source: US Census/ ME Office of GIS)]

Note: interior lines represent county lines and major road networks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality or Cluster of Municipalities</th>
<th>2007 Population (US Census)</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>BPL Sites w/in 25 miles of one or more listed communities</th>
<th>Additional BPL sites within 25-50 miles of community or cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Portland South Portland                  | 62,249 23,324               | Cumberland | • Bradbury Mt. SP  
• Crescent Beach SP  
• Ferry Beach SP  
• Mackworth Island  
• Pinelands Land Unit  
• Two Lights SP  
• Wolfe’s Neck Woods SP  
• Crescent Beach SP  
• Scarborough Beach SP | • Range Ponds SP  
• Reid SP  
• Sebago Lake SP  
• Vaughan Woods SP  
• Fort McClary SHS  
• John Paul Jones SHS  
• Androscoggin Riverlands |
| Lewiston Auburn                          | 35,690 23,203               | Androscoggin | • Bradbury Mt. SP  
• Pinelands Land Unit  
• Range Ponds SP  
• Androscoggin Riverlands*  
*Park in planning phase, trail use & hunting/fishing available. | • Peacock Beach SP  
• Popham Beach SP  
• Reid SP  
• Scarborough Beach SP  
• Sebago Lake SP  
• Two Lights SP  
• Wolfe’s Neck Woods SP  
• Mackworth Island  
• Fort Popham SHS  
• Fort Edgecomb SHS  
• Kennebec Highlands |
| Bangor                                   | 31,853                       | Penobscot | • Bradley Land Unit**  
** The Bradley Land Unit does not serve a substantial recreational role, though a snowmobile route does pass over it. | • Peaks-Kenny SP  
• Lagrange - Medford Trail  
• Four Season Adventure Trail  
• Penobscot Narrows Observatory  
• Swan Lake State Park |
| Brunswick                               | 21,806                       | Cumberland | • Eagle Island SHS  
• Fort Baldwin SHS  
• Fort Edgecomb SHS  
• Fort Popham SHS  
• Peacock Beach SP  
• Popham Beach SP  
• Reid SP  
• Bradbury Mt. SP  
• Pinelands Land Unit | • Crescent Beach SP  
• Ferry Beach SP  
• Mackworth Island  
• Range Ponds SP  
• Scarborough Beach SP  
• Two Lights SP  
• Androscoggin Riverlands |
| Biddeford Saco Sanford                   | 21,594 16,822 21,252         | York     | • Crescent Beach SP  
• Ferry Beach SP  
• Mackworth Island  
• Two Lights SP  
• Scarborough Beach SP  
• Vaughan Woods SP | • Pinelands Land Unit  
• Fort McClary SHS  
• John Paul Jones SHS  
• Sebago Lake SP  
• Wolfe’s Neck Woods SP  
• Range Ponds SP  
• Vaughan Woods SP  
• Bradbury Mt. SP |
| Augusta                                  | 18,367                       | Kennebec | • Fort Halifax SHS  
• Damariscotta Lake SP  
• Colburn House SHS  
• Lake St. George SP  
• Peacock Beach SP | • Colonial Pemaquid SHS (Fort. William Henry)  
• Damariscotta Lake SP  
• Colburn House SHS  
• Dodge Point Land Unit  
• Whaleback Shell Midden |

SP = State Park, SHS = State Historic Site.  
SOURCE: www.maine.gov/doc/parks  “Find Parks & Lands” page
Municipal and School Recreation Lands.

Municipal and local school system property represented less than 5% of Maine’s conservation and recreation lands in 2008. State Planning Office figures list 2008 municipal parks, forests, and recreation lands greater than 10 acres to be 112,323 total acres. This does not include school-owned lands, which in 2002 equaled 7,883 acres. Although municipal/school lands represent a small portion of Maine's overall recreation lands (by acre), they serve a large role for recreation in that they are embedded within communities and are often located close to residential dwellings.

B. Private Lands Available to the Public

Private Non-Profit Lands

Conservation and recreation lands held by conservation organizations and land trusts totaled 2,001,158 acres in 2008, a 48% increase since 2002. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of this land is held as conservation easements. Statewide and nationally affiliated organizations hold 93% of the acreage, with the largest proportion consisting of working forest easements primarily in northern Maine held by groups including the New England Forestry Foundation and the Forest Society of Maine. The Nature Conservancy holds over 500,000 acres in fee and easements. Local land trusts hold approximately 136,500 acres around the state.

Table 4 shows the acres of private conservation organization and land trust ownership in Maine. Table 5 shows the number of local land trusts in each county.

Traditional forest recreation activities like hunting, fishing, boating, camping and hiking are allowed to continue on much of this land, although restrictions do occur from place to place, particularly for motor vehicle and off-road vehicle access.

Table 5 (right): Number of local land trusts working in Maine by county cluster. (Source: www.mlnt.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Clusters</th>
<th>Combined Size (Square Miles)</th>
<th>Combined Population (1000s)</th>
<th># of Local Land Trusts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York, Cumberland, Androscoggin,</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec, Lincoln, Knox, Waldo</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Franklin, Somerset</td>
<td>7445</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock, Washington</td>
<td>4050</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis, Penobscot</td>
<td>7028</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>6453</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Private Conservation Organization and Land Trust Lands in Maine 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Trust/Organization</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Easement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Organizations/Trusts</td>
<td>338,106</td>
<td>1,526,556</td>
<td>1,864,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Trusts</td>
<td>82,289</td>
<td>53,207</td>
<td>136,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>421,395</td>
<td>1,579,763</td>
<td>2,001,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Maine State Planning Office - Land for Maine's Future program
The Mahoosuc Region

In August of 2008, the Open Space Institute published a report on the Conservation issues in the Mahoosuc region, which encompasses 600,000 acres centered on the Mahoosuc Mountain Range and the upper Androscoggin River watershed in Maine and New Hampshire. The report, entitled, Forestland for Sale: Challenges and Opportunities for Conservation over the Next Ten Years, presents some startling analysis regarding the pressures on the region. For example:

✦ The shift from integrated, long-term forest management to frequently turned-over timber investment has "caused fragmentation of large parcels, reduced forest-related jobs, increased harvest rates, expanded posted areas for trespassing, and hastened development of lakefront and river-front properties."
✦ Forestland in the Northern Forest is selling for two to eight times its timber value, ranging from $500 to more than $1,000 per acre."
✦ 40,000 to 150,000 acres (up to 28% of the region's area) is estimated to sell within the next five to ten years.
✦ $30 - $120 million is needed for conservation in this region.

The Lower Kennebec & Lower Penobscot Watersheds

Southern Maine, compared to northern and "downeast" Maine, has seen higher rates of suburbanization and loss of rural, undeveloped land. The private forests southern Maine tend to be owned more by families and are typically smaller in size than private holdings in northern/eastern Maine. Additionally, forests in southern Maine are more likely to be closer to amenities, such as stores, restaurants, and services.

Maine has the highest rate of second home ownership in the nation, helping explain how between 1990 and 2000, housing units in Maine rose 11% while population only rose 4% (White & Mazza, 2008). It is not surprising, then, that the US Forest Service lists the Lower Kennebec and the Lower Penobscot watersheds as two of the fifteen US watersheds to see the greatest increase in housing density on private forests by 2030 (White & Mazza, 2008). The Forest Service report predicts approximately 980 square miles of forest lands in these watersheds will reach urban-ex-urban housing densities within 20 years (White & Mazza, 2008).

The interplay of attractive rural landscapes and reasonable access to amenities and services drives demand for second homes (while simultaneously threatening the natural and cultural character motivating second home ownership in the first place). Though second home development does have an economic influence meriting consideration, it should be recognized that increased home building does have a conservation and recreation cost, especially when allowed to occur without appropriate planning.
Recreation on Private Lands

Slightly under 8% of Maine’s lands are held in public ownership (fee), and even when conservation/access easements are included, the percentage of ownership remains under 18%. Given this reality, many of the outdoor recreation opportunities Maine citizens and visitors cherish rely on public access to private lands.

Outdoor recreation on private lands, most notably nature-based recreation, involves landowners of varying scale. While recreational use of and access to small parcels of private land in and around more developed areas can and does have relevance to outdoor recreation in Maine, private landowners of large forest properties are especially significant in their importance to outdoor recreation. For example, approximately 95% of Maine snowmobile trails are on private lands (Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands Off-Road Vehicle Division figures). The robust network of destination snowmobile trails in western, northern, and eastern Maine counties relies heavily on agreements with large landowners. Furthermore, as reported by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation, 2006), 90% of Maine resident and non-resident hunters hunt on private lands.

With private forest-lands playing a major role in Maine’s range of recreation opportunities, keen interest has been paid to the ownership of vast forest lands. Over recent decades, significant changes have fueled concern about future recreational access to private lands. This uncertainty is driven by changes in forest ownership patterns. As Hagan, Irland, and Whitman (2005) write,

“… in 1994, forest industry [timber companies] owned about 60% (4.6 million acres) of the large tracts (>5000 ac) of timberland and financial investors owned about 3%. By May, 2005, financial investors owned about one-third of the large forest tracts and industry owned only 15.5% (1.8 million acres, mostly in a single ownership).”

Although emerging research by John Daigle at the University of Maine indicates that a majority of large private landowners in Maine continue to allow public recreation on their private lands (Daigle, personal communication), fast-evolving changes in landownership (as opposed to the relative constancy of ownership patterns from decades past) merit ongoing attention relative to recreation access. While there appears to be a general appreciation on the part of large private landowners for allowing public access, trails, etc., it appears unwise to assume the supply of recreation opportunities on private lands will remain steady without monitoring, communication, collaboration, and effort. The Hagan, Irland, and Whitman Manomet study cited above summarizes this uncertainty by writing, “In essence, the recent turnover in land ownership has led to less predictability in the future of the forest”.

Two regional examples of forest change are briefly discussed in Exhibit A on page 6.
C. Maine’s Range of Outdoor Recreation Opportunities and Settings

Maine’s diversity of landscapes, settings, facilities, recreation providers, and land management approaches give residents and visitors the opportunity to engage in a variety of outdoor activities. One way to look at that diversity is to explore the spectrum of outdoor opportunities available in the state. Taking inspiration from the US Forest Service’s “Recreation Opportunity Spectrum” (ROS) concept, it is possible to discuss, in general terms, the range of outdoor recreation opportunities in Maine. For more information on the ROS concept, see Driver et al’s (1987), The ROS planning system: Evolution, basic concepts, and research needed.

Setting characteristics and associated desired experiences are key elements of the ROS (Hammitt and Cole, 1998). Maine, while generally rural overall, does have highly developed areas where people recreate. On the other end of the spectrum, Maine has significant undeveloped areas. This range of settings drives much of the state's outdoor recreation diversity.

Outdoor Recreation in Developed Settings

Overview

Recreation experienced in a “developed” setting includes activities within a larger developed landscape, such as cities and towns, as well as recreation in areas that are moderately to highly developed for more intensive recreation use, though they may be located in an otherwise undeveloped setting. This would include ski resorts, golf courses, and even managed swim beaches.

Maine’s larger cities, such as Portland, Lewiston, and Bangor, are home to certain recreation sites that differ markedly from more rural or backcountry destinations. Likewise, even mid-range and small Maine towns often have developed facilities, such as sports fields, playgrounds, manicured town parks, “pocket parks”, skate parks, paved city/town-center walking and bike paths, and other infrastructure-rich facilities to serve the needs of the public in Maine’s more developed centers. These close-to-residences facilities are vital to the health and leisure of Mainers and are an important part of Maine communities.

Municipalities tend to own and manage the majority of the relatively highly developed facilities in more urban/suburban/town-center settings. Municipalities and schools provide the vast majority of playing fields, basketball courts, track facilities, and tennis courts.

Skiing and golf are both significant “developed” outdoor recreation activities (2008 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment reported New England participation rates of 13.6% and 17.4% respectively). Maine downhill ski areas range
from a handful of surviving small community hills with rope tows or t-bars that operate occasionally to two of the region’s largest ski resorts, Sunday River and Sugarloaf USA, which were purchased by Boyne Resorts in 2007.

Maine has 18 operating downhill ski areas open to the public that can be characterized as small, medium, and large according to the number of trails and lifts. Sunday River and Sugarloaf USA each have over 130 trails and 15 or more lifts. Medium size areas include Mt Abram, Saddleback, and Shawnee Peak, which have 30-65 trails and 4-5 lifts each. The remaining ski areas have 1-3 lifts and 20 or fewer trails (source: Ski Maine Association). Most ski areas now have some level of snowmaking and designated snowboard areas. The Ski Maine Association reported that Maine's ski & snowboard industry set a new attendance record during the 2007/08 winter season with 1.42 million skier/snowboarder visits.

According to Maine Office of Tourism statistics on the visitmaine.com website, Maine has 147 golf courses (with 23 new courses in the last 5 years). The 2003 Maine SCORP asserted that 90% of golf courses were developed by the private sector. The Maine State Golf Association (www.mesga.org) lists 6 municipal golf courses (Bangor, Dexter, Frye Island, Riverside in Portland, South Portland, and Val Halla in Cumberland). It also lists 13 private clubs, 86 public courses, 7 resort courses, and 14 semi-private courses.

Walking Trails: In recent years there has been an increased interest in walking for health, and trails have been constructed in-town and near to populations, as well as in the outlying areas a short drive from population centers. Many are handicap-accessible. Healthy Maine Walks is an organization that promotes walking trails, and hosts a website where those interested can find walking trails near to them. Most are a mile to three miles in length. Table 7 documents walks listed on the Healthy Maine Walks website.

Swim Beaches: 15 Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands properties are within no more than 50 miles of one of Maine’s ten most populated cities and provide swimming opportunities. 8 of those parks serve multiple large communities in southern Maine. Of
the 15 swim parks within proximity to Maine’s largest cities, 6 have lifeguards (staffing cuts over past years have reduced lifeguard positions, notably at most freshwater swim facilities).

In addition to state parks, federal, municipal, and private landowners own swim beaches. In particular, municipalities are major providers of swimming opportunities. It is worth noting that the Maine Coastal Program of the State Planning Office lists Maine as having 46 public, coastal beach/recreation sites (of these 46, 37 participate in the Maine Healthy Beaches Program). This listing refers primarily to beaches and does not account per se to the full range of swimming opportunities along the coast.

The 2003 Maine SCORP lists a total of 216,524 feet of swim beaches on Maine’s ocean coastline. It also lists 256,500 feet of freshwater swim beaches available. These figures have not been updated, but should be considered a baseline for available swim areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th># Healthy Maine Walks Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature-based Recreation Opportunities in the Suburban - Rural Fringe
Overview

There are a multitude of outdoor recreation pursuits in Maine that utilize recreation lands and facilities existing in landscape mosaics made up of residential housing, agriculture, smaller-scale parks and conservation areas, road networks, small (largely non-industrial) woodlots, lightly-developed shorelines, and commercial enterprises. Often times, these landscapes transition from more developed town or city centers to more rural areas.

Unlike ballfields or other intensively developed facilities (which may also be located in essentially rural areas), nature-based recreation facilities (e.g., trails, campsites, boat launches, etc.) rely primarily on the character of a natural setting to afford recreationists a desired experience. To this end, lands open to the public are the foundation of nature-based activities, regardless of setting.

In Maine, settings ranging from suburban neighborhoods to lightly developed rural communities serve many purposes. Green spaces in these settings, in addition to serving as wildlife habitat and performing ecosystem functions, are recreation resources. It is within this range of settings that state parks and state wildlife management areas begin to take on a more prominent role (versus more urban, developed settings where they are less prominent). In some cases, municipal conservation lands (such as town forests or other conservation lands) are also noteworthy in this intermediate range of land use. Additionally, private conservation, in the form of land trusts, is very significant in the areas where human development and undeveloped natural areas begin to significantly interact (see Table 4 for land ownership figures for private conservation organizations in Maine).

These “intermediate” Maine landscapes where in-town development lessens and the setting transitions to a robust mix of developed and undeveloped lands provide a diversity of recreation experiences. Hunting, fishing and trapping; gathering wild berries or plants (e.g., picking fiddleheads); paddling; watching wildlife; swimming; and walking/hiking are classic activities undertaken in these settings. Furthermore, snowmobiling and ATV use; jogging; Nordic skiing; mountain biking; horseback riding; snowshoeing; and other outdoor pursuits occur in this setting range.

All of these opportunities rely on access to facilities (e.g., trails, boat launches) as well as natural areas/open space. To this end, lands open to the public are the foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th># Private Campgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Lakes &amp; Mountains</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec &amp; Moose River Valley</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcoast</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast &amp; Acadia</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise County</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katahdin &amp; Moosehead</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine Camp Owners Association
of nature-based activities, regardless of setting. State parks and state wildlife
management areas begin to take on a more prominent role in this suburban-rural fringe
setting between human development and undeveloped natural areas. A few examples of
Maine State Parks located in this suburban to semi-rural setting range include parks such
as Range Pond, Damariscotta Lake, Two Lights, Bradbury Mountain, and Swan Lake. In
some cases, municipal conservation lands (such as town forests or other conservation
lands) are also noteworthy in this interface area. Privately held conservation areas, in the
form of lands held by land trusts, can also be very significant in this area (see Table 5
for more on the geography and scope of land trusts in Maine). Lastly, private landowners that
voluntarily protect natural resources and allow public use of their lands have always been
an important component of the spectrum of opportunities near to but outside of developed
areas. Unfortunately, the posting of private land has seen an increase, as reflected by
information provided by a survey of Small Woodlot Association of Maine members, in
which it was found that between 1991 and 2005, the number of small woodlot owners
restricting public access went from 15% to 36% (Levert, 2008). To learn about three
recreational areas that exemplify the types of opportunities typically available in this
range, see page 13.

**Nordic Skiing in Maine**

Based on information from Ski Maine Association, Nordic ski facilities (19) in Maine
provide over 575 km of trails. Facilities range from “mom and pop” operations to
facilities provided by the Nordic Heritage Center (NHC) in Presque Isle. NHC is a
world-class venue for cross country skiing, biathlon and mountain biking and includes:

* 6500 square foot lodge
* 20 kilometers of ski trail
* 32 kilometers of marked mountain bike trails
* 30-point biathlon range
* Visitors center with ski rentals
* 2.5 kms of lighted trail
* 1-kilometer paved roller ski loop
* Terrain Park - cross country skiing and mountain biking
* Wax building with 26 separate wax rooms.

For a geographic listing of Nordic ski facilities, see Table 6 on pg. 9.

**Bicycle and Mountain Bike Trails**

Maine Department of Transportation analysis (2009) lists over 500 miles of biking trails
in Maine. Over half of those miles represent biking opportunities associated with multi-
use (ATV/equestrian/walk/bike), gravel surfaced rail trails. Designated singletrack mt.
bike trails are emerging on more lands as riders organize. Maine has chapters of the New
England Mt. Bike Association in the Mt. Agamenticus region (York County), central
Maine, and mid-coast regions. While to date there is not a full accounting of mt. bike
trails in the state, it is worth noting that resources exist or are in development in
association with private sites (e.g., Backcountry Excursions in Parsonsfield), municipal
Conservation Areas in the Suburban-Rural Fringe - Three Examples

Mt. Pisgah Conservation Area - Kennebec Land Trust
The Mt. Pisgah Conservation Area, a combination of fee ownership and easement owned and stewarded by the Kennebec Land Trust, was assembled through donations and purchases beginning in 1998. Located in Wayne and Winthrop (Kennebec County), it is a relatively large undeveloped area of forests and wetlands, streams and ponds, mountain tops and ridges. The trail to the fire tower is a popular local hiking destination and the 730 acres of conserved land at Mt. Pisgah provide space for watching wildlife, hunting, and other low-intensity activities.

Range Ponds State Park - Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands
A short drive from one of Maine's major urban areas, Lewiston and Auburn, Range Ponds State Park welcomes visitors who enjoy the wide sandy beach as they swim, picnic and play. Most activity centers on the waterfront, which is easily accessible because of the smooth, surfaced promenade that parallels the pond for 1000 feet immediately next to the beach. A public boat launch site is located at the end of the beach and is limited to 10 horsepower motors. There are two-miles of easy trails along with a new group shelter, and playground. Handicap accessible enhancements have been completed as well.

The Roland Perry City Forest - City of Bangor, Orono Land Trust, & UMaine
The 650 acre Bangor City Forest provides residents in the Bangor area with a trail destination accommodating a diversity of uses throughout Maine’s distinct seasons. A wheelchair-accessible bog boardwalk through a raised peatland, as well as walking, primitive hiking, and mt. Biking trails enable trail users to exercise and experience nature – right on the edge of Maine’s third largest city. The area was established through collaboration between the Orono Land Trust, the City of Bangor, and the University of Maine’s College of Natural Sciences.
lands (e.g., City of Augusta, Bangor City Forest, and Camden Snow Bowl), State Parks (e.g., Bradbury Mt. State Park), and organizations (e.g., Nordic Heritage Center in Presque Isle).

**Hiking/Snowshoeing Trails**

A complete inventory of hiking and snowshoeing trails across the state is not available at this time. An accounting of trails on Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) properties, based on 2006 data, is available. Table 9 on pg 15 provide this information for all counties. All told, there are over 443 miles of hiking trails/walking paths on BPL lands. It is important to note that lands trusts, Acadia National Park, the White Mountain National Forest, US Fish and Wildlife Refuges, municipalities, and other entities provide hiking opportunities across the state. The Appalachian Trail in Maine, for example, provides 281 miles of hiking, backpacking, and snowshoeing.

**Horseback Riding Trails**

Horseback riding is a designated use of shared-use roads on Maine public land units. Additionally, trails at Bradbury Mt., Mt. Blue, and Camden Hills State Parks as well as Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands rail trails are available for horseback riding. Certainly, other lands, both public and private, provide access for horseback riding, though a full accounting is unavailable at this time.

**Snowmobile and ATV Trails**

Snowmobile and ATV trails are important resources in Maine, both in more remote areas and in/between local communities. In the relatively more developed counties (Androscoggin, Cumberland, Hancock, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, and York, there are a combined 3,938 miles of funded snowmobile trails (2008 ME Off-Road Vehicle program data). ATV trails funded in those same counties totaled 895 miles. Figure 2 & Table 10 detail motorized trail expenditures.

**Boat Access Facilities**

Table 11 lists public boat launches by county as well as by owner. Additionally, it notes tidal vs. freshwater launch sites. It should be noted that the Boating Facilities Division of the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands is finalizing its “Strategic Plan for Providing Public Access to Maine Waters for Boating and Fishing”. This document, like its predecessor's will list priority water bodies in which greater public access is considered a need.
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities Associated with Large-Scale Contiguous Forest Lands

Over 90% of Maine is forested, yet that forest land is not uniform. There are ecologically diverse forest ecosystems across the state, and an array of forest management approaches. Vast stretches of Maine’s western mountains, northern regions, and eastern interior lands are owned and managed by a mix of public, private conservation, and commercial owners. All told, this combination of forest regions comprises over 10 million acres and serves as the largest contiguous undeveloped area in the Northeast. Residents and visitors alike place a premium on the unique natural values they find here.

While some areas within these large forest landscapes are managed specifically for remote, quiet, backcountry recreational experiences affording solitude and a sense of unmanaged naturalness, the predominant land management approach is one in which commercial timber management and recreational opportunities overlap. Such multiple-use areas occur on both public and private lands and enable a variety of recreational opportunities. As mentioned earlier, approximately 95% of Maine snowmobile trails are on private lands. Private landowners also provide ATV and hiking trails, campsites, access to hunting and fishing destinations, roads over which the public reaches recreation sites, access to undeveloped beaches and shorelines, and a number of other nature-based recreation opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Miles of Backpacking Trails</th>
<th>Miles of Day Hiking Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin/Somerset</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock/Washington</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox/Waldo</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot/Piscataquis**</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>283.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Appalachian Trail) - Includes National Park Service corridor on Nahmakanta Unit (Eastern Lands)

**Baxter State Park (not part of BPL) maintains approx. 200 miles of hiking trails.

### Table 10: Motorized Trails Funded by County (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Miles of Snowmobile Trail</th>
<th>Miles of ATV Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Maintained</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>5485</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ME BP&L Off Road Vehicle Program

### Table 11: Maine Public Boat Launch Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total # Public Boat Launches</th>
<th># Hand-carry Sites (vs. Trailerable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>459</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ME Dept. of Conservation owns 112 sites, ME Dept. Inland Fisheries & Wildlife owns 97, ME Dept. of Transportation owns 3, and 247 are owned at the local level. Of all sites, 17 are tidal sites. Source: BP&L Boating Facilities Division

### Figure 2: Supply of Motorized Trails Funded by Type 1995-2009

- **Miles of Trail Funded**
  - **Snowmobile**
  - **ATV**

Source: ME BP&L Off Road Vehicle Program
Downeast Sunrise Trail
A multi-use trail resource in eastern Maine where residents and visitors can gather to ride ATV’s, snowmobile, walk, bicycle, ski, ride horses, and participate in other recreational trail activities.

History

The Calais Branch railroad corridor is a 127 mile long rail corridor that connects Brewer to Calais in Downeast Maine. It was acquired by the Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) in 1987 from Maine Central Railroad and has not been used for commercial freight rail or for passenger rail since that time.

Becoming a Trail Asset

On July 15, 2005, Governor Baldacci charged MaineDOT with developing a trail Management and Maintenance Plan for a interim multi-use trail on 87 miles of the Calais Branch Rail Corridor between Ellsworth and Ayers Junction. By constructing and using the trail, the corridor will be repaired and continuously maintained so as to enable the corridor to be available in the future for possible rail return.

MaineDOT formed the Calais Branch Trail Management Committee including the Maine DOC, local trail groups, law enforcement units, National Park Service, municipalities, and regional planning and economic development agencies to develop a management and maintenance plan for rehabilitation of the corridor and construction of the trail.

The plan recommended that the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) be the long term manager of the trail and corridor due to its extensive experience in constructing and managing multi-use trails throughout Maine for over 20 years. MaineDOT and BPL entered into an agreement for BPL to oversee the corridor rehabilitation, trail construction and long term maintenance and in the Spring of 2008 BPL contracted to begin the project.

To date: A ribbon-cutting ceremony was held on October 28th, 2009 to acknowledge the opening of the eastern 30 miles of the 85-mile-long Down East Sunrise Trail. Trail work, such as removing old rail ties and grading the trail bed continue to move the project towards completion. Over the course of 2009 and 2010, more miles of trail are expected to open for diverse trail use.

Other Multi-Use Trail (Rail Trail) Resources Managed by Maine Parks and Lands (BPL)

✦ BPL’s Off-Road Vehicle Division oversees approximately 200 miles of multi-use trails in addition to the 85-mile Sunrise Trail. These trails run through diverse landscapes in 7 different counties.
Over the last 15 years, dramatic changes in land owner types have occurred in the northern forest region. Over 30% of Maine’s land ownership has changed hands and the recreation implications of these changes are significant. Informal agreements as well as use policies on private land can and do change with changes in ownership (for instance, according to the Off-Road Vehicle Program (ME BP&L) approximately 90% of motorized trails agreements on private land are one-year agreements). Thus, the available supply of recreation opportunities in Maine’s large forest landscapes could be argued to be of concern based on the potential for changes in landowner prerogatives that affect public recreation.

One rapidly expanding tool aimed at conserving multiple natural values in Maine (including public recreation) is the purchase of conservation easements. In 2002, for instance, the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) held 55,404 easement acres. As of December 2008, BPL held 302,421 easement acres. Of those acres, approximately 90% are located in Aroostook, Franklin, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, and Washington Counties (counties associated with significant commercial forestry areas). Public access is developed into these easements, though specific management details vary. In some cases, BPL obtains recreation management options or rights (along with the grantor). In other cases, the grantor alone retains recreation management rights. The bulk (by acreage) of BPL-held easements are “working forests easements” facilitating public recreational access and enabling landowners to continue to harvest timber.

Nonprofit organizations have also acquired conservation easements in Maine’s northern forest. One example is provided by the Forest Society of Maine (FSM). The Forest Society of Maine, established in 1984, has worked to develop landscape-scale forest land conservation through working forest conservation easements. FSM-led

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Maine Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational use of most forest areas is managed by individual owners; however, <strong>North Maine Woods, Inc. (NMW)</strong> oversees recreation on 3.5 million acres of land in northern Maine and on 175,000 acres in the KI Jo-Mary Multiple Use Forest on behalf of a consortium of large and small woodland owners, including the State. In 1996, 44,000 acres on the Nahmakanta Unit of Public Reserved lands were removed from the NMW area, and in 1999, 700,000 acres in the West Branch Penobscot area were added to the NMW management territory. In 2009, over 20,000 acres of the Seboomook Unit of Public Reserved Lands (located in the West Branch of the Penobscot River area) were removed from the NMW system. Access to these lands and facilities is controlled through a system of gates, and users observe fees and regulations. All-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and bicycles are not allowed on NMW and KI Jo-Mary lands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Maine Woods, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
projects have conserved more than 400,000 acres. **Figure 3** shows the growth of conservation lands (largely through easements) from 1997-2007.

**Figure 3**: Growth of conservation lands, both fee and easement in Maine. Note: Mapping does not reflect the efforts of local land trusts or municipalities. Source: Forest Society of Maine
Backcountry Recreation Opportunities on Conserved Lands

Overview: In Maine, only the White Mountain National Forest (14,000 Wilderness acres) and Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge (2 parcels, one with 4,680 acres and one with 2,712) have federally designated Wilderness falling under the guidance of the 1964 Wilderness Act. However, this does not represent the total availability of opportunities for those who seek the experiences and benefits associated with “wilderness”. Both state and certain private land managers have dedicated areas where management policies have been established to facilitate experience attributes such as self-reliance, closeness to nature, tranquility, self-reliance, and solitude.

The Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, through its 2000 Integrated Resource Policy (IRP), allocates management priorities on its public reserved and unreserved lands units. For example, there are 5 recreation-focused allocations (“backcountry non-mechanized” and “backcountry motorized”, “remote recreation”, and “developed recreation class I & developed recreation class II”). Backcountry non-mechanized (BCNM) allocations are intended to provide opportunity to experience superior scenic quality, wild and pristine character, and a sense of solitude. They typically are at least 1,000 contiguous acres in size. Roads, timber management, motorized or mechanized uses, developed (vs. primitive) campsites, trailerable boat ramps, and non-renewable resource extraction are incompatible with BCNM allocations. Five BPL lands units have had backcountry non-mechanized allocations within the time-span following the 2000 adoption of the Integrated Resource Policy.

More discussion of backcountry opportunities is provided in Exhibit D, starting on page 23 of this chapter.

In addition to BCNM allocation process, backcountry recreation opportunities on Maine Public Reserved Lands Units can occur as somewhat of a byproduct to the establishment of Ecological Reserves. Ecological Reserves are state-owned lands specifically set aside to protect and monitor the state's natural ecosystems. As of 2009, Maine has designated approximately 84,000 acres of Ecological Reserves on 16 public land units managed by the Maine Department of Conservation. The original designation was enabled by an act of the Maine Legislature in 2000. Ecological Reserves are a form of “special protection area” in the IRP and take precedence over other (secondary) allocations. Ecological Reserves have stipulations on roads and recreation developments. Timber management and non-renewable resource extraction are not allowed in Ecological Reserves. Although they were not designed to further recreation objectives, Ecological Reserves do have a bearing on the availability of backcountry recreation settings in which nature, not human activities, is intended to be the dominant force shaping the environment.

Another trend within the last decade has been the growth of large blocks of land in Maine held by conservation organizations. It is worth noting that the management approach taken on some of these conservation lands is conducive to remote, backcountry recreation.
Backcountry Recreation Opportunities in Maine

The resources or destinations listed and described below have management policies that support a primitive or backcountry recreation experience. These areas, recreation management policies provide experience attributes such as self-reliance, closeness to nature, tranquility, self-reliance, and solitude.

Maine Lakes & Mountains Region

Caribou-Speckled Mt. Federal Wilderness Area, US Forest Service, White Mountain National Forest:

- This Wilderness area is entirely within the state of Maine. Topography varies from lower hardwood slopes to exposed rocky peaks. The highest point is Speckled Mountain, at 2,906 feet, with Mt. Caribou coming in second at 2,840 feet. 25 miles of maintained hiking trails lie within the 14,000 acre Wilderness.

Grafton Notch State Park:

- Grafton Notch State Park is located on Route 26 between Newry and Upton, Maine, and offers opportunities for sightseeing, picnicking, and hiking on its 3,000 acres of beautiful natural terrain. While parts of the park are more developed than backcountry recreation discussions merit, it is noteworthy as a portal into adjoining areas such as the Mahoosuc Public Reserved Land Unit and the related Grafton Loop Trail.

The Grafton Loop Trail

- The Grafton Loop Trail, when hiked in conjunction with a section of the Appalachian Trail is a 38-mile hiking loop bisected by Rt. 26 (Grafton Notch Scenic Byway). There are 7 campsites along the trail.
- Construction of the trail has involved hundreds of volunteers and the dedication of the several organizations and individuals who comprise the Grafton Loop Trail Coalition. These include the Maine Appalachian Trail Club, the Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Conservation Corps, Outward Bound Wilderness, Maine BPL, Creative Conservation LLC, Caribou Recreation Development LLC, and some key landowners. The group’s mission is to develop multi-day hiking opportunities as alternatives to heavily used sections of the Appalachian Trail.
- It should be noted that the Grafton Loop Trail traverses both public and private land.

The Mahoosuc Public Reserved Land Unit

- The Mahoosuc Unit is located on the New Hampshire border in central Oxford County. Combined with Grafton Notch State Park, the area comprises more than 30,000 acres of rugged mountainous terrain. The Appalachian Trail (AT), the Grafton Loop Trail (which uses a section of the AT), and numerous side trails lead
into and through this predominantly backcountry hiking area. There is a 9,993 acres ecological reserve on the western half of the unit.

**Tumbledown Mt. Public Reserved Land Unit:**
- The Tumbledown Unit is a relatively new lands unit (with acquisitions occurring from 2002 to 2004) and is located north of Weld, in western Maine. It provides over 10 miles of hiking trails and a total acreage of 22,585 (combined fee and easement). Portions of the area, such as popular hiking trails, at times, have numbers of visitors trending somewhat high for wilderness-type experiences.

**Four Ponds Public Reserved Land Unit:**
- Four Ponds lies just east of Mooselookmeguntic Lake. The Appalachian Trail traverses the length of this 6,000-acre unit with a lean-to at Sabbath Day Pond and a campsite at Little Swift River Pond. Fishing and swimming are popular activities. Winter visitors pass through on snowmobiles on their way from Rangeley to Weld.

**Bigelow Preserve:**
- Located in western Maine, just east of the village of Stratton about 40 miles north of Farmington, the Bigelow Preserve includes over 36,000 acres of public land. The preserve encompasses the entire Bigelow Range, which includes seven summits. The highest of these at 4,150 feet is West Peak, one of only 10 Maine summits over 4,000 feet in elevation. Bounded on the north by 20,000-acre Flagstaff Lake, the preserve offers many opportunities for outdoor recreation.
- 9,780 acres are allocated as “Bigelow Backcountry Non-Mechanized Recreation” dominant (Flagstaff Region Management Plan, 2007) and 10,540 acres are designated as ecological reserve. 15,315 acres are allocated with Backcountry Non-mechanized as a secondary allocation. Another 11,110 acres (dominant) and 1,075 acres (secondary) are allocated as “Bigelow Backcountry” (which still provides backcountry values but does allow 17.6 miles of Appalachian Trail and 14.8 miles of AT side trails run through the preserve. There are 6 trailheads and 35 camp sites at 6 hike-to camping destinations.

**Kennebec and Moose River Valley**

**Holeb Public Reserved Land Unit**
- A portion of the popular, 34-mile Moose River Bow Trip runs through this 20,000 acre public reserved unit in northwestern Maine. Several class I and II rapids can be either run or portaged, and a spectacular waterfall highlights the trip in this remote area. Camping (32 campsites), fishing, wildlife watching, and hunting are all possible elements of trips to Holeb. Not unlike the Tumbledown Unit, peak recreational use periods can have an affect on the experience of some users or potential users.
Maine Highlands Region

**Baxter State Park**
- Baxter State Park, administered separately from the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (based upon the deeds of former Governor Percival Baxter), is a 209,501 acre wilderness park with approximately 200 miles of hiking trails. The park maintains 8 rustic, vehicle-access campgrounds, 2 hike-in campgrounds, and 6 primitive outlying sites (hike or paddle access only). It is home to Maine’s highest mountain, Mt. Katahdin, and in total has 18 peaks in excess of 3,000’. Additionally, numerous lakes, ponds, streams, and wetlands dot the landscape. Approximately 75% of the Park is off limits to hunting and trapping. 14% of the Park is within the Scientific Forest Management Area, an area managed as a showcase of sustainable forestry best practices.

**Penobscot River Corridor**
- Located in the heart of Maine's undeveloped forest land, the Penobscot River Corridor (PRC) provides outstanding opportunities for remote canoe trips, fishing excursions, and whitewater rafting (provided by commercial operators). Managed by the Bureau in cooperation with several landowners, the PRC provides water access recreation along more than 67 miles of river and 70 miles of lake frontage. Major access points in the area are gained from Millinocket or Greenville.
- While not all sections of the corridor would likely be considered as offering wilderness-type recreation opportunities, sections of the corridor do provide river-based recreation with the opportunity for solitude and self-reliance. Additionally, the PRC can be combined with the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, via a choice of two historic portages, to provide an even more extended remote paddling experience. There are numerous primitive campsites along the corridor.

**Little Moose Public Reserved Land Unit**
- Located just west of Greenville in Piscataquis County, the Little Moose Unit covers more than 15,000 acres in Moosehead Junction and Big Moose townships. The unit also includes most of the Little Moose Mountain Range with its steep slopes, rocky streams, and remote ponds. Visitors enjoy hiking, snowmobiling, fishing, hunting, and camping in this remote setting. There are over 10 miles of hiking trails and 7 primitive campsites on the unit.

**The Nahmakanta Public Reserved Land Unit**
- Nahmakanta encompasses more than 43,000 acres and is the largest unit in the public reserved lands system. The Appalachian Trail crosses the unit following the shore of Nahmakanta Lake. The roadless Debsconeag backcountry area offers the experienced hiker the opportunity to explore a spectacular complex of low mountains and remote ponds.
The hiking trail along Turtle Ridge crosses densely wooded terrain with panoramic views of surrounding lands including Mt. Katahdin from open ledges. Vehicle accessible campsites provide convenient access to scenic ponds and hiking trailheads. A popular snowmobile trail crosses the unit linking Millinocket and Greenville.

6 primitive, hike-in and/or paddle-to campsites are located on the unit. Over 20 miles of hiking trails, in addition to roughly 9 miles of the Appalachian Trail are found on the unit. There is also an 11,000 acre ecological reserve (BPL’s largest) within the Nahmakanta unit.

**Maine Woods Initiative**

- The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) has embarked on a major land conservation initiative in the 100-mile Wilderness region. This effort, dubbed the Maine Woods Initiative, has substantial recreation implications. Much of the recreation planning and development associated with AMC’s efforts surrounds trail opportunities linking a series of traditional sporting camps purchased by AMC. As it stands today, AMC owns and manages 37,000 acres of forestland known as the Katahdin Iron Works tract. As the Maine Woods Initiative moves forward, it will, as it does today, have relevance concerning the availability of backcountry recreation opportunities.

**Debsconeag Lakes Wilderness Area**

- The Nature Conservancy owns a 195,000-acre easement bordering Baxter State Park and as well as fee ownership of the 46,271-acre Debsconeag Lakes Wilderness Area. The large Debsconeag parcel is almost exclusively managed as an ecological reserve. Hunting and fishing are allowed. Vehicles are limited to designated roads and snowmobiles are restricted to designated trails. ATVs and bicycles are not allowed. The Appalachian Trail runs through the property and provides backpacking opportunity. Camping is restricted to designated campsites, which do not require a fee or registration.

**Downeast & Acadia Region**

**Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge, US Fish & Wildlife Service:**

- The two Wilderness Areas contain two lakes and numerous bogs, streams, and beaver flowages. Two small undisturbed islands in Whiting Bay, known as the Birch Islands, are part of the Edmunds Wilderness Area. There are two Wilderness trails for foot travel.

**The St. Croix International Waterway**

- The St. Croix International Waterway, an independent, international body established by the Maine and New Brunswick legislatures, is the planning entity
overseeing recreation along the St. Croix River along the Maine-New Brunswick border in far eastern Maine. As the International Management Plan (1993) states: “Good summer flows, safe paddling and a remote setting have led to the upper river’s recognition as one of the Northeast’s best back-country canoe excursions. A 5-month season for novice and intermediate canoeists and shoulder seasons for white water enthusiasts draw users from a wide area. The 33 mi/53 km Vanceboro-Grand Falls section is one of the most heavily used canoe runs in Maine and New Brunswick.”

**Donnell Pond Public Reserved Land Unit:**
- The Donnell Pond Unit includes more than 14,000 acres of remote forested land with crystal clear lakes, secluded ponds, and mountains with panoramic views. Located in Hancock County between Franklin and Cherryfield, this is where visitors can enjoy outdoor recreation in a scenic, remote setting. There are over 15 miles of hiking trails at the Donnell Unit, including 10 mile loop including remote Rainbow Pond and Caribou Mt. (both within an ecological reserve). There are semi-remote campsites on the shores of Tunk Lake, Donnell Pond, and Spring River Lake. Interested parties are currently discussing opportunities to expand backpacking opportunities at this unit.
- 257 acres are allocated as “Backcountry Non-Mechanized” (IRP) dominant along with over 2,000 acres allocated as Backcountry Non-Mechanized” (secondary allocation). 6,215 combined acres are within two ecological reserves on the unit (ecological reserve designation is a dominant allocation - to which backcountry recreation can be a secondary management scheme).

**Cutler Coast Public Reserved Land Unit**
- Those seeking a taste of backcountry along Maine's coast enjoy exploring the Cutler Coast Public Lands, a 12,234-acre expanse of blueberry barrens, woodlands and peatlands with 4.5 miles of headlands (interspersed by pocket coves and cobble beaches) overlooking the Bay of Fundy. Hikers can enjoy 10 miles of trails, three remote tent sites and spectacular views from the property's steep cliffs-part of the dramatic "Bold Coast" that extends from Cutler to Lubec.
- 5,216 acres of the Unit is designated as an ecological reserve. Nearly the entire coastal portion of the reserve (below Rt. 191, 2,095 acres) has “backcountry Non-Mechanized” allocation as a secondary use (secondary to the priorities set forth in designation as an ecological reserve).

**Aroostook County Region**

**Allagash Wilderness Waterway (AWW):**
- The AWW is the first state-administered component of the National Wild and Scenic River System. It is a 92-mile-long ribbon of lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams winding through the heart of northern Maine's vast commercial forests.
The state-owned “restricted zone” is managed for wilderness character. There are 80 authorized campsites along the waterway. In addition to portage trails, approximately 7-8 miles of hiking trails lead to backcountry destinations (note: portions of several of those trails include private property).

Deboullie Public Reserved Land Unit

• Deboullie's low, rugged mountains and scenic remote trout ponds are all available for visitors using the 22,000 acre unit's hiking trails and campsites. Snowmobilers frequently pass through the unit on their way from Eagle Lake to the Allagash.
• Maine BPL manages 29 campsites within the unit; four are backcountry sites accessed only by foot or water. There are slightly over 10 maintained miles of hiking trails, including the popular 3-mile hike to Deboullie Mountain’s summit. Recent trail development has added a loop to this hike, employing trail routing to Black Mountain.
• A 7,253 acre ecological reserve is in place in the Deboullie – Black Mt. area (this area has a secondary “backcountry non-mechanized” allocation).

Saint John River

• The Nature Conservancy owns 185,000 acres bordering 40 miles of the St. John River in the western corner of northern Maine. The river flows for 130 miles without passing a settlement and is considered one of if not the finest wilderness canoe trip in the eastern US. While many acres in the Nature Conservancy’s St. John ownership are managed for sustainable timber production, others are left as forever-wild lands.
• North Maine Woods Inc., a non-profit recreation management group organized to serve a diverse group of landowners in northern Maine, manages recreation along the Nature Conservancy’s St. John River property. All told, North Maine Woods provides 65 campsites along the river.

Statewide Resources of Note:

The Appalachian Trail (AT)

• The AT in Maine is a 281 mile footpath leading across some of Maine’s highest, wildest peaks, through vast forests, and along pristine rivers, streams, and wetlands. It is managed largely by the Maine Appalachian Trail Club, but collaboration between the National Park Service, Maine BPL, the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, the Nature Conservancy, Baxter State Park, and the Appalachian Mountain Club is vital to continued success.

The Maine Island Trail

• The Maine Island Trail is a 350-mile waterway extending along the Maine coast. The Maine Island Trail Association is a non-profit organization with a mission
geared towards managing sustainable recreation on Maine coastal islands. The organization focuses on volunteer effort and collaboration with public and private partners to facilitate the stewardship of islands making up the trail.

- The Maine Island Trail is a collection of public and private islands available for day and, in many cases, overnight use. The predominant use of these islands could be labeled as low-impact. Overnight camping is primitive, with strong promotion of Leave No Trace principles. In 2009, there are 182 properties on the trail. 66 are publicly owned and open to all. The remaining sites are open to MITA members only. 46 islands were added to the Trail between 2005 and 2009.

**Northern Forest Canoe Trail**

- The Northern Forest Canoe Trail is a 740 mile route across parts of New York State, Vermont, Quebec, New Hampshire, and Maine. There are 347 miles of water trail in Maine. Some portions of the Canoe Trail are managed for wilderness values (e.g., Allagash Wilderness Waterway). However, again, wilderness-type recreation experiences may be found at other places along the route (even in places not specifically managed for such).

**A Note About Ecological Reserves:**

The Maine Natural Areas Program provides the following overview of ecological reserves:

Ecological Reserves are state-owned lands specifically set aside to protect and monitor the state's natural ecosystems. As of 2009, Maine has designated approximately 84,000 acres of Ecological Reserves on 16 public land units managed by the [Maine Department of Conservation](https://maine.gov). The original designation was enabled by an act of the Maine Legislature in 2000. As specified in the legislation, the purposes of the Reserves are:

- "to maintain one or more natural community types or native ecosystem types in a natural condition and range of variation and contribute to the protection of Maine's biological diversity."
- "as a benchmark against which biological and environmental change may be measured, as a site for ongoing scientific research, long-term environmental monitoring and education," and...
- "to protect sufficient habitat for those species whose habitat needs are unlikely to be met on lands managed for other purposes" ([Chapter 592, MSRA Section 13076](https://maine.gov/parks/natural_are/reserves/)).

As is seen above, ecological reserves were not specifically established to provide recreational experiences. However, their management does have an impact on what recreational activities are allowed to occur in those reserves. The Maine Bureau or Parks and Lands' Integrated Resource Policy dictates management policies of ecological reserves on Bureau lands, in coordination with and deference to statute. All recreation
facilities and uses are secondary in priority to the natural resource within ecological reserves. Existing public access roads and new trails for motorized recreation must lack any other reasonable alternative, have only a minimal resource impact, and must provide a crucial link in a significant trail system. Primitive non-motorized trails must not conflict with natural resource values. Forest management (harvesting, etc.) is not allowed.

D. Summary

The supply of outdoor recreation opportunities in Maine is based largely on the state’s diverse natural landscapes. Public and private facilities expand outdoor recreation possibilities. Federal, state, municipal, private conservation, and private landowners all provide recreational access to land. Mainers have access to more large, undeveloped landscapes than do most residents in the eastern United States. However, it should be noted that the state’s percent age of public land ownership is relatively low. Private lands of varying sizes and purposes play a large role in outdoor recreation in Maine.

While Maine is known for nature-based outdoor recreation activities and resources, its communities and agencies continue to also provide developed recreation facilities. Ball fields, pools, playgrounds, etc., are elements of an important recreation infrastructure in communities across the state.
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Chapter V: Implementation Strategy

Connectivity- the Primary Theme of the 2009-2014 Maine State Comprehensive Plan.

In a narrow sense, connectivity is recognized as a key element for trail-based recreation, especially longer networks. Likewise, connectivity of habitats enables the wildlife species that so many recreational experiences rely on to thrive. In a broader sense, connectivity relates to how Maine citizens and visitors alike interact with and understand outdoor recreation opportunities. Connectivity also has a social and community element reflecting Maine’s strong sense of place and outdoor traditions.

2009-2014 ME SCORP Priorities

Connect More Mainers of All Ages with the Benefits of Outdoor Recreation - pg. 1

Connect Lands and Communities to Nurture Quality of Place - pg. 3

Connect Outdoor Recreation Stakeholders to Improve Collaboration - pg. 4

Connect trails to establish regional trail systems supporting tourism and recreation opportunities in Maine’s less developed regions. - pg. 6

PRIORITIES FOR SPENDING LWCF FUNDS - pg. 11

Other

Associated Focus Group Comments: pg. 8

References Cited: pg. 12
**Priorities:**

**Connect More Mainers of All Ages with the Benefits of Outdoor Recreation**

Outdoor recreation provides multiple benefits to individuals and society. Time spent engaged in physical outdoor activities improves health and wellness. Even less physical activities in outdoor settings have emotional and psychological benefits. Experiences out in nature are positively correlated by researchers with childhood stress relief (Wells & Evans, 2003), coping with Attention-Deficit- Disorder (Taylor, Kuo, & Sullivan, 2001), Attention-Deficit/ Hyperactivity-Disorder, and obesity prevention (Council on Sports Medicine and Fitness and Council on School Health, 2006).

Given Maine’s highest-in – New England obesity rate, and given the positive impacts of outdoor recreation, it is essential that public and private entities strive to provide outdoor recreation opportunities where youth and adults can get out, get active, and experience the health benefits found in the outdoors.

**Implementation Strategies:**

A. Encourage increased participation in outdoor activities by raising awareness of outdoor recreation’s personal benefits.

- Encourage collaborative efforts between recreation and health groups in order to increase participation by appealing to a range of motivations. Collaboration and coordination between groups such as the Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Conservation, and Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife (and others) as well as collaborations amongst other recreation and health organizations should result in enhanced awareness of health benefits from being outside.

- Promote educational efforts to assuage fears and showcase benefits in order to help combat certain cultural trends that undercut outdoor recreation. Efforts to raise appreciation of outdoor recreation should recognize that there are fears and misconceptions that may keep some potential participants from enjoying outdoor recreation opportunities. Fears ranging from “stranger danger” (youth abductions) to insect bites need to be addressed via education.
B. Improve awareness of existing outdoor recreation opportunities.

- Provide readily available information on access to public lands and water. New media as well as traditional information dissemination routes are tools for getting information out to broad swaths of the public. If one goal is to reconnect more Mainers with the outdoors, it is logical to assume that some may need more of a guiding hand than existing activity enthusiasts, who largely know where to go.

- Improve signage, kiosks, and other on-site public information in order to increase public awareness and enhance visitor experiences. Many Maine sites need improvement in this area, including wayfinding signage, improved maps, interpretive messages, safety information, and use guidelines.

- Improve the quality and availability of GIS-based (Geographic Information System) data and maps. GIS systems serve as an underpinning of mapping efforts aimed at enhanced publicly available maps, brochures, websites, and global positioning systems data. Coordinating various public and private GIS-based mapping efforts would benefit public information efforts by supporting improved management efficiency.

C. Support programs that provide youth with experiences that connect them with nature.

- Continue youth outreach programs such as Take It Outside!, and Hooked on Fishing. These programmatic efforts build community support for outdoor recreation; celebrate life-long, healthy activities; develop skills and knowledge needed to enjoy the outdoors and link outdoor recreation activities with environmental stewardship.

- Look for new partnerships to reach more youth, perhaps with schools, youth groups, parent networks, etc. As one of the focus group participants suggested, “Don’t just target children: target the “informal support network.” Research by the Outdoor Industry Foundation (2008) finds that parents, friends, and relatives, are by far the strongest factors influencing youth to be active outdoors.

- Consider opportunities to use technology as a conduit to the outdoors. Despite the problems associated with too much time spent in front of electronic devices such as TVs, computers, and video game systems, there are opportunities to use technology as a tool for getting some youth outside more. Geocaching or Earthcacheing (both involving sleuthing using a GPS receiver), digital photography and video use, and even social networking on computers may have value in getting get kids outside.

D. Provide a broad range of outdoor opportunities to meet the interests of the public.

- Provide more opportunities suitable for Maine’s seniors. Programs, partnerships, and facilities well suited to specific senior interests should be developed and/or promoted. Recreation opportunities for Maine seniors should encompass mind and body and provide a range of settings and identified attributes. Maine is one of the oldest per capita states in the nation. NSRE data for Maine shows “viewing and learning activities” (including activities such as “view/photograph birds”) to
be the category in which seniors participate at the highest levels. However, shifting generational patterns may make traditional views of what seniors want to do for leisure outdated. More specifically, soon-retiring “baby boomers” are predicted to highly value maintaining an active lifestyle in retirement (Cochran, Stoll, and Kinzinger, 2006).

- Provide outdoor recreation opportunities of specific interest to working adults including young professionals and working parents. Working parents are a key piece of the youth issue. Additionally, recreation is a significant factor in quality of life, and research shows that businesses not tied to a specific resource (e.g., technology firms) value quality of life highly as they consider where to locate or relocate (Crompton, Love & More 1997). Therefore, providing desirable recreation opportunities for this demographic has benefits as a business attraction strategy.
- Support improvement of visitor use data and continued monitoring of outdoor recreation demand as tools for better understanding and meeting public demand as well as managing recreation in Maine.
- Maximize the range of opportunities for Maine citizens, recognizing that there are local, regional, and statewide levels of supply and demand to balance.
- Seriously consider developments that reflect growing interests and trends. Watchable wildlife facilities may serve as one example. Similarly, diversification of lodging opportunities (e.g., cabins, etc.) on parks and public lands may serve as another example.
- Recognize and address winter recreation demand, including the need for access (plowed parking, etc.).

Connect Lands and Communities to Nurture Quality of Place

Growth and development impact Maine in varying patterns across the state. What appears to be clear, though, is that Maine, especially in more southern regions, has lost swaths of open space and recreation access. As Maine moves forward, planning and action will need to continue to target conserving habitat and recreation access. Maine’s quality of place, a natural, cultural, and economic asset, is imperiled if the link between nature and communities is weakened.

A 2004 report produced by the Muskie School of Public Service and the Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy sums up the issue of losing connected open spaces by writing, “When a piece of land that forms part of an undeveloped corridor is lost, the value of the entire corridor, for both recreational use and wildlife habitat, may diminish. When public access to one segment of a trail is restricted, the value of the entire trail system may be threatened.” (Barringer et al., 2004). There is a strong need for and corresponding call for open space protection and stewardship.

There is also an increasing interest in and call for reducing the need to drive to designated recreation areas, including improving connectivity between outdoor recreation assets and neighborhoods within towns, as well as with other recreation, cultural and economic assets within those towns or in neighboring towns.
All in all, there is a growing chorus of researchers, officials, planners, advocates, and the public at large who are calling for action to ensure that Maine remains a place where high quality outdoor recreation experiences, a clean and healthy environment, and unique community identities define the sense of place.

Implementation Strategies:

A. Improve infrastructure and connectivity
- Support infrastructure development that links parks, natural areas, and open space within and between communities.
- Minimize barriers to connectivity and recreation arising from poor policies or design.
- Recognize that many small towns, lacking public works or parks departments, struggle with the maintenance of facilities and could use support to better maintain outdoor recreation infrastructure.

B. Support interconnected open spaces
- Support efforts to increase connectivity between natural areas that provide both recreation and wildlife habitat benefits. Low-amenity, nature-based recreation areas (such as preserves and trust lands) often exemplify this type of open space.
- Support planning and coordination efforts aimed at empowering local communities to identify important outdoor spaces, develop sustainable recreation access, and sustainably steward natural areas.
- Support the addition of a recreation element to the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife’s Beginning with Habitat program in order to help municipalities and land trusts integrate recreation and conservation planning at the local level.

C. Improve access to open space, recreation lands, parks, and preserves.
- Facilitate access to trails and open space; local access not requiring driving is especially of interest. However, parking is still a need in many destinations. Additionally, winter access (plowed parking) was mentioned in the public process as a barrier needing attention in many places.
- Barriers to access include those affecting bikers and pedestrians. Improved bike or pedestrian access to parks and outdoor recreation areas, especially in more
urban areas, would benefit health and quality of place objectives while potentially opening up more areas to those without motorized transportation.

**Connect Outdoor Recreation Stakeholders to Improve Collaboration**

Outdoor recreation in Maine involves a number of important stakeholders – including private landowners, land trusts, organized user groups or organizations, and state and federal agencies. Many recreation opportunities depend upon agreements by landowners to allow public recreation on and across private lands. Managing and coordinating the interests of multiple stakeholders is vital to maintaining a broad set of recreation opportunities in Maine.

Collaborations among stakeholders can provide, in addition to efficiencies, opportunities to foster partnerships in which individual assets are larger than the sum of the individual parts. For example, mergers and partnerships between land trusts are arising as a means to reduce costs while still addressing the goals of land conservation and stewardship.

**Implementation Strategies:**

**A. Continue to nurture landowner relations**

- Support the Landowner Relations position shared between the Maine Departments of Conservation and Inland Fisheries & Wildlife. Focus group participants emphasized that continual communication is needed to address landowner concerns, and supported the Landowner Relations efforts in DOC and IF&W.
- Support education and awareness efforts aimed at recreationists using private lands to help minimize negative recreation impacts on private lands.
- Encourage organized recreation groups and clubs to be proactive in landowner relations - these groups have an important role in educating users to help minimize and mitigate recreation impacts, and in communicating with landowners.
B. Focus on whole communities:
- Support efforts to bring together diverse elements within a community or region to better promote and manage recreation. Business interests, tourism stakeholders, landowners and managers, recreation groups, officials, and a host of other local players can produce richer projects with more potential for positive community impacts.

C. Look for opportunities that join communities in a larger, regional vision:
- Support larger visions or projects to which communities can attach as a means of addressing both regional and local recreation and tourism objectives. One example is provided by the Northern Forest Canoe Trail (NFCT), a non-profit organized to foster waterway stewardship, support rural economic development, and celebrate community recreation, arts, and heritage along traditional Native American canoe routes linking upstate New York across to Maine. NFCT actively works to link paddlers with guides, outfitters, lodging, and other business interests along the trail. Opportunities to integrate trails, whether motorized, non-motorized, multi-use, birding, etc., with local communities should be pursued as they become available.

Connect trails to establish regional trail systems supporting day-long and multi-day trails as part of a vision for expanded tourism and recreation opportunities in Maine’s less developed regions.¹

Maine is blessed with natural and cultural attractions around which trails of all types have been constructed. Iconic parks such as Baxter State Park and Acadia National Park have long-established human-powered trail systems. The Appalachian Trail climbs, drops, and twists just over 300 miles in Maine; this trail system, along with over 40 related side trails is a segment of a nationally significant hiking system. The state ITS snowmobile trail system provides thousands of miles of well-organized riding. In the last half-decade, ATV trails have become more statewide and organized in scope. The East Coast Greenway goes through 92 communities in Maine. On the water, both the Maine Island Trail Association (coastal waterway) and the Northern Forest Canoe Trail (freshwater lakes and rivers) systematically address stewardship, development, information, and outreach.

¹ Priority #2 addresses trail connectivity at the sub-regional, or community and multi-community scale.
Still, a great number of trails are disconnected from other regional trails, from potential users, and from a support network capable of realistically dealing with ongoing maintenance.

Coordinating existing trails and filling literal or experiential gaps could have the potential to realize improved opportunity awareness, enhanced tourism (and related economic benefits), heightened appreciation for the value of conserving landscapes, and additional volunteerism and trail stewardship. A more coordinated vision for regional trail systems across the state would be a step toward Maine realizing the full potential of its trail resources.

Implementation Strategies:

A. Provide direction with collaborative planning:

- Invest in sound planning that will enhance regional trails systems. Support trail system visioning and planning efforts that link tourism and recreation interests by region, and provide a comprehensive vision for trail systems across the state. Any effort to craft a Maine trails plan should include diverse interests and reflect the range of benefits trails provide along with the challenges in making trails environmentally and economically sustainable. Maine Office of Tourism regional marketing groups, landowners, and recreation groups all should be involved with trail planning efforts.

- Support a robust statewide dialogue on trails systems and related tourism efforts. A statewide trails conference could enable such a dialogue, and could be useful in identifying regions of the state that are logical components for a statewide plan.

- Support efforts to inventory the full suite of trails available, the condition of those trails, and the regional need (based on assets and demand) for specific trail types.

B. Encourage and support coordinated management of extended trail systems:

- Support the coordination of systems that collect and manage trail data (GIS and other trail related information). An important first step in developing trail systems is understanding what resources exist and what attributes they possess. This can serve as a basis for exploring potential collaborations and trail visions. Likewise, partnerships and alliances will facilitate coordinated or consolidated systems to collect trail information.

- Support efforts to coordinate expertise for trail construction, management, and maintenance. As more alliances/partnerships and systems are developed, availability of technical expertise should increase for more trail groups (especially volunteer groups).

- Support coordinated efforts to develop public information on trails through well-designed web and/or print products.
C. Encourage landowner collaborations:

- Create and maintain processes that facilitate trail projects across various ownerships, and that are consistent with a regional or statewide vision in order to minimize conflicts among user groups. Given that trails often are located on private lands (including private conservation organizations), and given that even different public land managers have diverse goals, there is a need to develop mechanisms for better coordination and collaboration in trails planning. User groups presently work with landowners on specific projects, and lacking a comprehensive regional or statewide vision for trails (including motorized, non-motorized, bicycle, horse, and even water trails), conflicts may be created that could otherwise be avoided.
- Support trail projects that break down barriers and effectively link resources under different ownership (e.g., trail partnerships between land trusts and municipalities etc.). Encourage these efforts by sharing examples of successes as examples for future efforts.

D. Foster and support mechanisms that enhance gateway communities as centers of information for regional recreation opportunities, including regional trails:

- Encourage initiatives through which communities improve their ability to serve as outdoor recreation information hubs. The development of regional visitor centers in key outdoor recreation areas of statewide significance is one potential action.
- Efforts to improve year-round access to outdoor recreation areas should be pursued and that access should be included in public information initiatives.
- Foster community/regional efforts to fully understand the economic impact of outdoor recreation and to integrate recreation into economic development planning.

Associated Comments/Recommendations from Focus Groups

A. Priority: Connect More Mainers of All Ages with the Benefits of Outdoor Recreation

- Consistent positive messages about the outdoors are needed; Reduce negative messaging around dangers: more communication of benefits
- Important to connect kids with the outdoors in an unstructured way.
- Combine technology with outdoors (geocaching example); attracts youth
- Don’t just target children: target the “informal support network”—family, friends and neighbors
- Schools: promote structured and unstructured time outdoors
- Support funds for grass root local/home grown projects (based on significant trends).
• Remove policy barriers
• Universal Design… People of all capacities can make use of program (disabilities, age, etc.)
• Integrate recreation planning and recreation offerings/awareness through community entities such as schools, workplaces, community centers, senior centers, etc. Consider coordination with:
  o Workplace wellness policies and programs
  o outdoor experiences through schools
  o environmental education programming
• Focus on effective communications to promote awareness for existing recreation opportunities and their associated benefits to users. Additionally, consider ways to help people get started in recreational activities.
• “Community Stewardship” – using stewardship activities such as community clean-up days or days of service to connect people with their community resources.

B. Priority: Connect Lands and Communities to Nurture Quality of Place
• Green policies… promote recreational planning based on smart/green concepts.
• A better understanding of economic impacts from outdoor recreation might drive up support for recreation projects. Furthermore, projects need to understand and account for the costs of implementation (volunteerism, stewardship etc.). Lastly, the role recreation on private lands plays in regional economic impact should be examined.
• Access for and support of hunting, in the context of community/local natural areas, needs to be considered.
• Planners and managers should strive to provide year-round uses of facilities and year-round access to outdoor areas. It was noted that funding is needed for additional plowed access in winter (parking and perhaps even some paved trails such as rail trails).
• “Better stewarding what we already have” was mentioned as a goal, including the fact that, for many areas, higher staffing levels are needed.
• Predictability (of access), fragmentation, changes to the character of lands, and the level of user-group stewardship were strong concerns [in the large-landscape focus group].
• Safe walking and/or biking routes to reach outdoor recreation destinations (such as local parks or open space areas) are needed.
• Interconnected trails can not only keep people in towns/cities, but they can also attract visitors.
• Developing more parks and ballparks, with connections to trails, would benefit communities by having open spaces linked to a bigger system that does not necessarily rely on driving.
• Routing public transportation (where existing) so people can get to the trailheads without driving was advocated.
• Providing more bike lanes to make city streets more bike friendly may be done at reasonable cost when repaving or redesigning streets.
• Land use and landowner impacts were mentioned as potential negative impacts of enhanced regional marketing, including the fear held by some participants that increased recreation visitors might lead to pressure to push lands more towards preservation (at the expense of certain recreation uses and land management activities). Conversely, there was sentiment expressed that overdevelopment could be an unwanted byproduct of aggressive marketing.

C. Priority: Connecting Outdoor Recreation Stakeholders to Improve Collaboration
• The often complex mosaic of varying landowners, fee-ownership, and easements can be a stumbling block for recreation management projects.
• Projects with multiple organizations involved and a central catalyst organizing efforts were mentioned [by the quality of place focus group] as ideal. It was also noted that partnering with large, established organizations, such as national or New England-wide associations can provide benefits (insurance, resources, education, etc.).
• “Case Studies” on implementing local outdoor recreation initiatives would be of assistance to communities starting out a project.
• It was suggested that efforts be made to balance advocacy and resources between motorized and non-motorized projects, and to build collaboration/alliances between motorized and non-motorized groups. Additionally, opportunities to link land and water resources should be explored.
• Inclusion of all voices/stakeholders should be a priority.
• Landowner relation position with DOC & IF&W should be supported.
• Education of users RE: private property & privilege of use should be a priority.
• Private/public partnerships for trails on private land remain important to nurture.

D. Priority: Connecting trails to establish more coordinated and greater appreciated systems
• More regional collaborations, in which trails and recreation areas are mapped and publicized, would be beneficial. An associated comment is that more recreation and conservation collaborations/partnerships between cities or towns are needed.
• Support was voiced for integrating established visions/resources (e.g., Maine Island Trail, Maine Birding Trail, East Coast Greenway, etc.) with local communities.
• There is a need to create more parking and to develop/enhance more trailheads.
• Appropriate, quality signage was mentioned as a need by more than one focus group.
• Providing adequate numbers of outhouses was noted as a need.
• Consider sharing GPS data for a growing population of recreationists who regularly use hand-held GPS units as part of their recreation experience.
• Consider promoting and developing a central resource for recreational information.
• Plan for recreationists who may not have high levels of outdoor skill or knowledge (i.e., craft information that welcomes and serves new participants).
• Look for the opportunity to better interpret diverse resources to attract and spread use.
• More regional hiking trails (such as Baxter State Park and the Bigelow Preserve) are needed (especially in the 3-5 day range). Additionally, loop trails and a statewide backpacking/backcountry hiking map are needed (as are carry trails on canoe routes).
• A high-level plan for regional trails, a funding mechanism for people powered trails, and aligning fishing goals with water trail goals are all planning-related suggestions made by at least one of the participating groups [in the large-landscape focus group].
• Trail heads, parking, and trail maps are needed for motorized trails.
• Long-term, stable funding; more trails closer to where people live; coordination and planning for long-distance non-motorized trails; identifying compatible & incompatible uses & designing trails; access to cross county skiing networks; and management of users across geographic areas (as numbers increase) were all mentioned as trail system needs.
• Consider developing visitor centers in key gateway trail towns.
• Improved public information (e.g., trip planning), perhaps based on user experience level, may be a way to increase connectivity between gateway communities and surrounding trail resources.
• Improved marketing [of trail resources] has the potential to diversify local economies and brand areas as significant outdoor recreation destinations.
• Maine Office of Tourism regional marketing groups, landowners, and recreation groups were all specifically mentioned as entities needing to be involved with trail planning efforts. Furthermore, trails specific planning, at a state-wide level, was brought up as a possible positive initiative. On a more regional note, the water trails-focused group advocated better tying water trails such as the Penobscot River Corridor with gateway towns (such as, in this case, Millinocket).
• There is a need for more sustainably managed (permanent adequate funding) non-motorized trails.
• Consider a comprehensive statewide trail plan to include balance of non-motorized and motorized, single use-multi-use, winter/summer, local (short) and multi-day, w/needed infrastructure.
• There is a need for designation – information – marketing of water – based trails & experience for daytrips & historic water trails & portages.
• Gateway communities need to be information providers, support services providers, while also providing information about outfitters & guides.
Priorities for use of Land Water Conservation (LWCF) Fund Expenditures

A. Strategically use LWCF funds for acquisition and appropriate management of natural/recreation areas that provide new or expanded outdoor recreation opportunities, with priority for opportunities:

• that serve youth, seniors or other demographic components that are underserved;
• that increase connectivity of recreation and natural areas, particularly in areas close to population centers;
• that provide multiple public benefits in addition to recreation benefits – ie, address public health issues (e.g., obesity), economic development (e.g., nature-based tourism, quality of place), and protection of ecological values; or
• that increase opportunities for multi-day trail recreation.

B. Recognize and support the need for maintenance and repair of the state’s outdoor recreation infrastructure.

• Outdoor recreation infrastructure maintenance and repair should be a high priority in the upcoming years. The 2006 white paper, Sustaining Maine’s Green Infrastructure, lists $40 million in need over 5 years and $10 million biennially (maintenance) for State Parks and Historic Sites (Harris, 2006). It also lists needs for $6 million for MDOT related nature tourism infrastructure (over 4 years), $143 million for coastal beaches (over 20 years), $2 million biennially for working waterfront access, $1.5 million biennially for small harbor improvement, $22.6 million for fish hatcheries (over 10 years), and over $100 million for the Land for Maine’s Future program (over 5 years). Plus, these figures do not represent the significant needs for repairs/maintenance at municipal sites. Therefore, rehabilitation and improved management of existing resources, especially resources related to Priority A (above), should continue to be a focus of LWCF funding.

C. Support efforts to augment staffing for outdoor recreation programs and facilities.

• It is worth noting that in correspondence and outreach with outdoor recreation providers in Maine, staffing is repeatedly raised as a top need. Too often, there is simply not enough staff to address the sustainable management of resources and appropriate visitor service needs, even when efforts are augmented by volunteers. Support use of internships through the AmeriCorps program or other similar program to augment staff.
• Opportunities to use LWCF funds to support efforts resulting in staffing improvements should be strongly considered, even if such opportunities are indirect or planning based.
• Develop volunteer capacity as one tool for addressing the challenge of maintaining sustainable trails.
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Chapter VI: WETLAND COMPONENT

Introduction

Maine has an abundance and diversity of wetlands unequalled in the Northeastern U.S. One quarter of the state’s land area is wetlands, four times the wetland area of the other five New England States combined. Over five million acres of Maine's wetlands are freshwater types (wooded swamps, shrub swamps, bogs, freshwater meadows, freshwater marshes and floodplains), while only 157,500 acres are tidal types (tidal flats, salt marsh, brackish marsh, aquatic beds, beach bars and reefs).

According to Dahl (1990) between 1780 and 1980, an estimated 20% of Maine’s wetlands were lost. Human endeavors like building and road development, dam and impoundment building, agriculture and timber harvesting, and other activities are prime contributors to these wetland losses.

Wetlands are valuable not only for their beauty and the recreation opportunities they support, but also for critically important functions they perform in our environment, including water storage, flood conveyance, groundwater recharge and discharge, shoreline erosion control and water quality improvement. They are the source of timber resources highly valuable to Maine's forest products industry, and perhaps most important, wetlands provide habitat vital to fish and wildlife, including many rare and endangered species.

The identification of important wetlands and their protection by regulation and acquisition has been ongoing for many years by government and private organizations. Since passage of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986, State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORPs) have been required to address the acquisition of wetlands with stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) dollars. Specifically, federal SCORP guidelines require the inclusion of a wetlands priority component consistent with Section 303 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986. At a minimum this component must:

- be consistent with the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP) prepared by the US Fish and Wildlife Service;
- provide evidence of consultation with the state agency responsible for fish and wildlife resources;
- and contain a listing of those wetland types that should receive priority for acquisition.
Wetland Conservation Planning

The Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986 affirmed that both federal-side and stateside LWCF money could be used to acquire wetlands. It required the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan that would specify the types of wetlands and interests in wetlands that should be given priority for acquisition with LWCF dollars so that efforts would focus on the country’s more important, scarce, and vulnerable wetlands. Federal agency wetland acquisitions with LWCF dollars (primarily by the US Fish and Wildlife Service) must be consistent with the plan, and wetland acquisitions by states with stateside LWCF dollars must be consistent with a SCORP that is consistent with the plan.

The NWPCP was prepared by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and published in 1989. To be eligible for purchase with LWCF dollars, a wetland must meet the following minimum criteria specified in the plan:

1. The wetland site must include predominantly (50% or more) wetland types that are rare or declining in an ecoregion.
2. The wetland must be threatened with loss or degradation. A site would be considered threatened if more than 10% of its values and functions are likely to be destroyed or adversely affected by direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts over the next 10 years considering the array of possible threats to the site and the level of threat afforded by existing regulations and owners’ intentions. Obvious threats include draining and filling, building development, mining, transportation projects, vegetation removal, etc.
3. The wetland site must offer documented public values in at least two of the following areas: wildlife, commercial and sport fisheries, surface and groundwater quality and quantity and flood control, outdoor recreation, and other values, such as rare/unusual species or features, educational/research value, or historical/archaeological features.

The Maine Wetlands Conservation Priority Plan: An Addendum to the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (1988) was a joint effort of the Maine Bureau of Parks and Recreation, the Maine State Planning Office, and the Wetlands Subcommittee of the Land and Water Resources Council, which coordinated natural resources policy among state agencies. The Addendum affirmed the three primary criteria of the national plan and identified the following Maine LWCF wetland acquisition priorities based on these:

1. rare or declining wetland types:
   • palustrine emergent (fresh marshes)
   • estuarine intertidal (coastal marshes and mudflats)
   • some palustrine forested wetland complexes in York County and southern coastal areas including Hemlock-Hardwood Pocket Swamps (Critically Imperiled) and Significant Vernal Pools as recently included in Significant Habitat designations.
• Wetlands supporting habitat for rare (S1-S3) natural community types (for details on S1-S3 natural community types, see table 1 on page 8).

2. wetlands threatened with loss or degradation:
• coastal marshes and undeveloped low-lying uplands in southern and mid-coast areas where population increases and second home construction is placing pressure on these areas and limited undeveloped lands remain for climate change induced inland migration of these wetland types;
• headwater streams, and seeps in the coastal plain;
• vernal pool complexes and small isolated habitat stepping stone wetlands in southern Maine that support rare herpetiles;
• large peatlands, if peat mining becomes prevalent in Maine;
• coastal intertidal areas in regions of high population growth;
• critical edge habitat in coastal and other wetlands; and

3. high value and/or function wetlands, determined by on-site analysis.
Under this criterion, the Addendum recommended particular attention to the following in Maine:
• high value and multi-value wetlands;
• habitats for rare and endangered plant and/or animal species;
• habitat for rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animals, and rare and exemplary natural communities in the state and for which there are inadequate representatives under protected status;
• exemplary occurrences of common wetland types that are not receiving adequate protection;
• habitats of state significance for fishery and wildlife resources, and that may satisfy the goals and guidelines of international treaties such as the North American Migratory Waterfowl Plan;
• wetlands with important hydrological functions of state or regional significance; and
• culturally significant wetlands, such as those with recreational or educational potential and those that can accommodate high visitor use.

The 1993 Maine SCORP recommended additional wetland acquisition criteria for stateside LWCF dollars that would target important wetlands not emphasized by other protection programs. These additional criteria required that a wetland proposed for acquisition:
• offer public access, including access to associated surface water;
• be located near population centers or in areas with high rates of growth;
• be wetland types that are not priorities for protection through other programs;
• contain public values and benefits that cannot be maintained except through acquisition, especially to gain access;
• be wetlands of local importance because they have been identified as a protection priority in local comprehensive, open space, or recreation plans; or because they provide public access to locally important outdoor recreation opportunities; or are key in protecting locally important habitat; and
• provide opportunities for nature education for a variety of age groups.

**Beginning with Habitat**

*Beginning with Habitat* is a habitat-based landscape approach to assessing wildlife and plant conservation needs and opportunities. The goal of the program is to maintain sufficient habitat to support all native plant and animal species currently breeding in Maine by providing each Maine town with a collection of maps and accompanying information depicting and describing various habitats of statewide and national significance found in the town. This data is coupled with suggestions for tools that can be implemented at the local level to advance local and regional conservation planning that better balances future growth with a functional network of habitat types capable of maintaining ecological services over the long term. The program is a cooperative effort of the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Maine Department of Conservation Natural Areas Program, Maine Audubon Society, Maine State Planning Office, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Maine Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission, and Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve.

After reviewing high value plant and animal habitats – of which wetlands are key components - and undeveloped habitat blocks, biologists from the Maine Department of Conservation Natural Areas Program and Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife identified landscape-scale areas meriting special conservation attention - including acquisition. These Focus Areas of Statewide Ecological Significance are built around the locations of rare plants, animals, and natural communities, high quality common natural communities, significant wildlife habitats, and their intersection with large blocks of undeveloped habitat, and are designed to bring attention to areas with concentrations plant and animal habitats values. The important habitat resources identified in a community are recommended as a foundation for resource protection and open space planning that may be part of town comprehensive planning and local land trust conservation efforts. *Beginning with Habitat* Focus Areas of Statewide Ecological Significance are recommended as targets for additional protection efforts by towns, local land trusts and other agencies and organizations.

*Beginning with Habitat* Focus Areas of Statewide Ecological Significance, including important wetlands, have been designated statewide. **Figure 1 (pg. 5)** and **Table 1 (pages 8)** show focus areas of statewide significance with rare or exemplary wetland natural community types. **Table 3 (page 10)** lists Beginning with Habitat Focus Areas of Statewide Ecological Significance by county.

**Current Wetland Acquisition in Maine**

Current wetland acquisition in Maine is driven largely by the program objectives of agencies and organizations concerned with fish, wildlife, and plant habitats rather than by a single overarching wetland protection strategy, and wetlands high in habitat values account for much of the wetland acreage that has been acquired for protection in Maine.
Figure 1: Beginning with Habitat Focus Areas with Rare or Exemplary Wetland Types
(Source: Maine Natural Areas Program, 2009)

Beginning with Habitat Focus Areas Containing Rare or Exemplary
Wetland Natural Community Types
The principal funding programs for acquisition of wetlands in Maine are listed in Table 2.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Gulf of Maine Program, the Maine Dept. of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, The Nature Conservancy--Maine Chapter, Maine Coast Heritage Trust, the Land for Maine's Future Program, Ducks Unlimited, The Trust for Public Land, local land trusts, and landowners come together periodically as the Maine Wetland Protection Coalition to identify protection priorities and coordinate large grant application efforts that result in important wetland acquisitions. The Maine Wetland Protection Coalition’s goal is to permanently protect high value wetland habitat in Maine. Winter and Fefer (2007) outline the coalition’s approach below:

- Prioritize statewide wetland protection projects based on habitat data, willing landowners, and grant requirements;
- Coordinate potential wetland protection projects with all conservation partners to avoid unproductive competition and maximize its use of staff time and funding sources;
- Identify projects where the expertise of Coalition members can support local partners in developing and implementing well-conceived and nationally competitive grants;
- Conduct outreach to ensure strong support for wetland conservation projects in Maine and nationally; and
- Ensure that projects are coordinated with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the lead Coalition agency, and other appropriate partners.

Recreation Considerations

Each State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan is required to consider outdoor recreation opportunities associated with its wetlands resources for meeting the State’s public outdoor recreation needs. In this regard, it is worth highlighting a few key services and opportunities provided by wetlands.

---

Table 2: Wetland Acquisition Funding Programs in Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Programs</th>
<th>Focus on Fish &amp; Wildlife Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Fish &amp; Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>North American Waterfowl Management Plan Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund (Federal-Side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service Challenge Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships for Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casco Bay Land Opportunity Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Mini-Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on Forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on Farmlands, Soil and Water Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Protection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQUIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land for Maine's Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Outdoor Heritage Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund (Stateside)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Wetlands play a key habitat role in relation to recreational hunting and fishing (according to the 2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation, produced by the United States Fish & Wildlife Service, there are a combined 366,000 resident hunters/anglers in Maine).

• Wetlands, as mentioned above, have vital wildlife habitat functions. As such, they are also natural sites for wildlife watching and photography. Developing additional wildlife watching facilities, including interpretive elements exploring the natural history of wetlands, should be considered a recreation goal associated with wetlands. This is especially noteworthy due to the strong growth in the participation levels for wildlife watching activities.

• Some wetlands, such as Maine’s peat bogs, are nationally unique environments and, when properly managed, can add to the overall diversity of landscapes residents and visitors alike can explore and enjoy.

**Recommendations**

There are a number of reports and planning efforts associated with wetlands, both nationally and in Maine. However, Beginning with Habitat (BwH) has become a leading force in the identification of focus areas for conservation, including wetlands, and may be best positioned to guide any potential wetland acquisitions associated with LWCF funds. Given BwH’s planning role regarding both wetlands of statewide significance and wetlands with more local (community) importance, it is recommended that BwH guidance, especially in the form of focus areas identified as having rare or exemplary wetland natural community types (see Figure 1), take priority for wetland acquisition.

**Qualification Note: NWPCP Standards**

As mentioned before, the following conditions (1-3) must be met to use the Land and Water Conservation Fund to purchase wetlands. Listed below each condition are details indicating wetland characteristics and/or locations meeting the condition.

1. **rare or declining wetland types:**
   • Wetlands supporting habitat for rare (S1-S3) natural community types

2. **wetlands threatened with loss or degradation:**
   • coastal marshes and undepveloped low-lying uplands in southern and mid-coast areas where population increases and second home construction is placing pressure on these areas and limited undeveloped lands remain for climate change induced inland migration of these wetland types;
   • headwater streams, and seeps in the coastal plain;
   • vernal pool complexes and small isolated habitat stepping stone wetlands in southern Maine that support rare herpetiles;
   • large peatlands, if peat mining becomes prevalent in Maine;
   • coastal intertidal areas in regions of high population growth;
   • critical edge habitat in coastal and other wetlands; and

2. **high value and/or function wetlands, determined by on-site analysis.**
particular attention should be given to the following in Maine:

- high value and multi-value wetlands;
- habitats for rare and endangered plant and/or animal species;
- habitat for rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animals, and rare and exemplary natural communities in the state and for which there are inadequate representatives under protected status;
- exemplary occurrences of common wetland types that are not receiving adequate protection;
- habitats of state significance for fishery and wildlife resources, and that may satisfy the goals and guidelines of international treaties such as the North American Migratory Waterfowl Plan;
- wetlands with important hydrological functions of state or regional significance; and
- Recreatively and/or culturally significant wetlands, such as those with educational potential, scenic attributes, hunting and fishing values, and those that can sustainably accommodate high visitor use.

Note: Wetland acquisitions should also include an adequate upland buffer to ensure off-site impacts to wetlands are minimized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Maine Natural Areas Program Rare and Exemplary Wetland Natural Community Types in Maine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• S1 Critically imperiled in Maine because of extreme rarity (five or fewer occurrences or very few remaining individuals or acres) or because some aspect of its biology makes it especially vulnerable to extirpation from the State of Maine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S2 Imperiled in Maine because of rarity (6-20 occurrences or few remaining individuals or acres) or because of other factors making it vulnerable to further decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S3 Rare in Maine (20-100 occurrences).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S4 Apparently secure in Maine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S5 Demonstrably secure in Maine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bog Moss Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulrush Bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar - Spruce Seepage Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Graminoid - Forb Saltmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Tall Sedge Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Holly - Alder Woodland Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern White Cedar Swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern White Cedar Woodland Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Maple - Sensitive Fern Swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Maple Wooded Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Laurel Dwarf Shrub Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce - Fir - Cinnamon Fern Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce - Larch Wooded Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Natural Community Types in Maine (Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetgale Mixed Shrub Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tussock Sedge Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder Shrub Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattail Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Graminoid - Shrub Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickerelweed - Macrophyte Aquatic Bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipewort - Water Lobelia Aquatic Bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-lily - Macrophyte Aquatic Bed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Works Cited**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
<td>Androscoggin Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Aroostook River - Washburn to Presque Isle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Big Machias Lake Peatland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Black Brook - Birch River Headwaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Burpee Brook Bog Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Caswell Fens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Chandler Deadwater and Malcolm Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Cross Lake Fens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Crystal Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Deboullie Ponds and Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Depot Stream Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Greater Mattawamkeag Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Macwahoc Stream Bog and Thompson Deadwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Mattawamkeag River Bogs and Fens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Portage Lake Wetland Mosaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Salmon Brook Lake and Perham Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Squa Pan Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>St. Francis Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>St. John River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>St. John River - Burntland Brook to Nine Mile Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>St. John River - Seven Islands and White Pond Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook</td>
<td>Wadleigh Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Holt Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Jugtown Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Kennebec Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Maquoit and Middle Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Otter Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Perley Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Scarborough Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Upper Saco River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Bigelow Mountain - Flagstaff Lake - North Branch Dead River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Kennebec Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Mount Abraham - Saddleback - Crocker Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Tumbledown Mountain to Mount Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Acadia East and West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Bagaduce River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Bald Bluff Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Fourth Machias Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Gouldsboro Grand Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Great Cranberry Island Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Nicatous Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Passadumkeag River - Thousand Acre Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Penobscot Bay and Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Schoodic Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Taunton Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Tunk Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Site Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Upper Union River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Androscoggin Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Belgrade Esker and Kettle Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Cobbossee - Annabessacook South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Great Sidney Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Kennebec Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Kennebec Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Kennebec River at Sidney-Vassalboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Messalonskee Lake Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Spectacle - Tolman Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Unity Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Appleton Bog - Pettingill Stream - Witcher Swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Camden Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Lower St. George River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Penobscot Bay and Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Ragged Mountain - Bald Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Rockland Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>St. George River and Associated Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Upper Sheepscot River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Weskeag Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Kennebec Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Lower Sheepscot River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Salt Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>St. Georges River and Associated Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Upper Sheepscot River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Ellis River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Jugtown Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Kezar Pond Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Mahoosucxs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Porter Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Twin Peaks Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Umbagog Wetlands to C Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Upper Saco River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>White Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Whitecap Mountain - Rumford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>Caribou Bog Wetland Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>Carlton Pond North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>Indian and Little Indian Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot</td>
<td>Sunkhaze Meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Baxter Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Big and Little Moose Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Big Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Borestone, Barren and Columbus Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Eagle Lake Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Ellis Bog - Carry Bog - Smith Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Millinocket Lake Wetlands and West Branch Flowage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>Nahmakanta Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>West Branch Penobscot Fens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>Kennebec Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Attean Pond - Moose River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Baker Branch - St. John River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Bald Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big and Little Moose Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Big Meadow Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Big Ten Peatlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Bigelow Mountain - Flagstaff Lake - North Branch Dead River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Carlton Pond North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Cold Stream - West Forks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Douglas Pond and Madawaska Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Great Moose Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Green Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Indian and Little Indian Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Kennebec Floodplain - Madison and Anson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>St. John River Southwest Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Upper Sebasticook River Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>West Branch Penobscot Fens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Appleton Bog - Pettingill Stream - Witcher Swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Big Meadow Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Camden Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Carlton Pond North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Unity Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Upper Sheepscot River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Baskahegan Stream Uplands and Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Bog Brook Flowage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Bold Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Cobscook Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Cutler Grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Englishman Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Fourth Machias Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Gouldsboro Grand Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Great Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Great Wass Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Jonesport Heaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Machias Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Maine River Wetland Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Meddybemps Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Nash Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Orange River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Petit Manan Point and Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Pleasant Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Roque Bluffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sawtelle Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Tunk Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Wahoa Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Bauneg Beg Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Beaver Dam Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Biddeford / Kennebunkport Vernal Pool Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Brave Boat Harbor and Gerrish Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Central Parsonsfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Folsom Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Kennebunk Plains and Wells Barrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Killick Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Massabesic Forest North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Massabesic Forest South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Mt. Agamenticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Saco Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Sanford Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Scarborough Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Shaker Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>South Acton Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Walnut Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Waterboro / Shapeleigh Barrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wells / Ogunquit Marshes Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>York River Headwaters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX I: PLAN PROCESS, INCLUDING PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITIES

Initial Background Research & Planning
The initial phases of plan creation involved staff review of the 2003-2008 Maine SCORP, review of state and national trends and issues identified in various reports and research, and a review of the issues affecting outdoor recreation and conservation in Maine. This initial process informed the overall thrust of research and discussions brought to the SCORP Advisory Committee for input.

Contracted Research
The Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands contracted with the USDA Forest Service to receive the Maine and the Maine Market Region report, which was based upon Maine and New England data pulled from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE). NSRE is a national random-digit telephone survey examining participation in outdoor recreation activities. This data, collected between 2002 and 2009, serves as a major element of Chapter III: Outdoor Recreation Demand in Maine. An executive summary for the Maine and the Maine Market Region report is provided in Appendix IV.

Focus Groups
Following Advisory Committee input, research continued as a series of focus groups were coordinated. Separate focus groups were arranged to discuss a) recreation issues and opportunities associated with demographic trends (notably youth and seniors), b) conservation and recreation connections (including connections to quality of place) in more developed regions of Maine, and c) landscape scale recreation needs and challenges in Maine’s largely undeveloped rural regions. The participants, processes, and outcomes for each of these three focus groups are shared in Appendix B.

Web Postings
Early in 2009, the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BPL) established two websites to share information and updates on the SCORP process. One site (http://www.maine.gov/doc/parks/programs/SCORP/index.html) was housed on BPL’s standard website, while the other was established as a blog site (http://maineparksandlands.wordpress.com/).

Group Outreach
One source of input came as a result of efforts to reach out to various groups or associations who were identified as strong potential sources of knowledge and feedback. Registered Maine Guides were reached out to through three organizations (the Maine Professional Guides Association, the Maine Wilderness Guides Organization, and the Maine Association of Sea Kayak Guides and Instructors). Outdoor recreation managers/providers were sought out via a number of channels, including the Maine Land Trust Network, the Maine Recreation and Parks Association, the Maine Association of Conservation Commissions, contact with federal recreation managers, and internal BPL land and park managers.
Listening Sessions

Public listening sessions were announced, promoted, and held in three locations in September of 2009. Sessions were held in Presque Isle, Brewer, and Scarborough. At each session, participants were given an overview of SCORP and the process of establishing priorities for the draft plan. Participants were encouraged to react to the draft priorities as well as to comment/elaborate on outdoor recreation issues they see as most important for Maine.

Advisory Committee

A SCORP Advisory Committee was established in the early phases of the SCORP process. The Committee served to advise on the overall direction of the process, general plan content, and implementation strategies/priorities. Committee members include: Will Harris (Chairperson) - Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands; John J. Daigle - UMaine Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Program; Elizabeth Hertz - Maine State Planning Office; Cindy Hazelton - Maine Recreation and Park Association; Regis Tremblay - Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife; Dan Stewart - Maine Department of Transportation; George LaPointe - Maine Department of Marine Resources; Phil Savignano - Maine Office of Tourism; Mick Rogers - Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands.

Report Drafting

Report drafting took place over the summer and early fall of 2009. Initial drafts of sections were posted online for review. Research and analysis, especially in the areas of supply and demand, occurred concurrent with drafting.

Draft Review

HAS NOT YET OCCURRED A draft final plan was posted online and all previous participants in the SCORP process, including all who provided comments and/or requested notification of a full draft, were made aware of its availability.

Submittal to National Park Service

At the time the full draft plan was made available to the public, a full draft version of the plan was sent to the National Park Service for initial review. Later, the final plan, including any revisions made as a result of the final review process, is to be submitted to the National Park Service for approval.
APPENDIX II: FOCUS GROUP OUTCOMES

As part of the 2009-2014 Maine State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan process, three focus groups were held in the spring and early summer of 2009. Each group had a different focus as well as different participants. The participants, general process, and outcomes are listed in the following pages.

Focus Group #1: “Connecting People with Outdoor Recreation Opportunities”
State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)
Augusta City Hall, 3/26/09 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Participants:
Rex Turner – Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands, Outdoor Recreation Planner
David Green /Facilitator/ – WardGreen Group. Also: Maine Guide, Scoutmaster
Dick Thomas – Chewonki - Chief of Staff & Alumni Relations, former director MaineYouth Camp Association
Michael Marion – Acadia National Park, Park Ranger/Trainer (Education District)
Leif Dahlin – City of Augusta, Director of Community Services
Lenard Kaye – University of Maine Center on Aging (Director), Professor in School of Social Work
Noelle Merrill – Eastern Maine Agency on Aging, Executive Director
Mick Rogers – Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, Grants and Community Recreation
Carol Leone – Teens to Trails (Founder)
Vicki Foster – Spectrum Generations, Healthy Aging Coordinator

Overview of SCORP process: led by Rex Turner
SCORP – Purpose is to look at outdoor recreation supply, demand, trends, and opportunities for your state and to craft a plan to address recreation needs.

- Public input required
- Final plan needs to be done by the end of the calendar year
- This is the beginning of the public part of the process; there will be more public input over the summer
- Why youth and seniors? Maine is a very gray state, currently 10th oldest; by 2030, recent census figures show that only Florida will be “older” than us, and not by much.
- New Take-It-Outside events in past year: First time campers program, Mount Blue State Park (500 people sledding, skating, etc.), Lake St. George St. Park (80+ kids in a snowstorm)
- There is a fear that many kids are not engaged in the outdoors. Results of a generation less connected to nature are troublesome (one analysis of 2,000 people: there is a link between experiences with the outdoors at age 11 or under and adult environmental decisions).
- Based on Outdoor Industry Foundation research, as a whole, the population is recreating more than the previous year or two, but youth participation did not increase, and girls were even less active outdoors than boys over the same period.

Exercise 1—Youth: brainstorming session led by David Green
How can we get more kids to make being in the outdoors an essential part of their life?
Procedure:
- Paired interviews
- Group reporting
- Suggested best practices

Results: “Best Practices” for getting youth involved in the outdoors

Highest ranked practices (in rank order):
- Outdoor engagement needs to be locally accessible: thoughtful planning is necessary (green growth, smart growth). Plus, accessible trails / facilities / natural areas are needed.
- Consistent positive messages about the outdoors are needed; Reduce negative messaging around dangers: more communication of benefits
- Important to connect kids with the outdoors in an unstructured way.
- Combine technology with outdoors (geocaching example); attracts youth

Next highest ranked practices (all similarly ranked):
- Parents need to get kids involved
- In schools there are different “tracks”; the “college” track and the “outdoor” track … combine technical / physical / intellectual
- Get kids to summer camps
- Don’t just target children: target the “informal support network”—family, friends and neighbors
- Parents need to be role models to model behavior

Other suggested practices/issues:
- Separate activities for girls
- Different approaches work for different ages
- Need to feel safe
- Balance structured with unstructured activities (planning can enable safe, unstructured play in the outdoors).

Recommendations to make these things happen in the community:
- Schools: promote structured and unstructured time outdoors
- High school outing clubs can serve as a vehicle to connect kids with the outdoors
- Locally accessible trails/facilities/natural areas are vital for youth participation in the outdoors.

Exercise 2 — Older demographic groups: brainstorming session led by David Green
Gallery writing (response) exploring the following questions:
I) What facilities are going to best serve older residents and tourists?

Highest ranked practices (in rank order):
- Degree of difficulty mixed and identified (top-ranked response)
- “Wayfinding” signage
- Parking easy to maneuver
- Inexpensive or free
- Bathrooms clean

Other suggested practices/issues:
- Low Impact
- Large lettering
• Easily accessible/safe
• Easy access/knowledge of the “Maine Recreational Icons”
• Well-lighted
• Seniors would like to be able to use the local schools for activities like walking
• Not congested

2) What programs are going to best serve older residents and tourists?

Highest ranked programs/activity traits (in rank order):
• Social interaction (top-ranked response)
• mix of physical and sedentary
• Fitness
• New knowledge

Other suggested programs/activity traits:
• Give them a “rush”/high (some risk)
• Programs available thru area agencies on aging and senior centers, senior housing, senior colleges
• Tourists: programs attached to resorts/hotels
• During daytime (in daylight)
• Intergenerational
• Fun activities
• Hunting
• Educational (i.e. elderhostel)
• Provide transportation during winter months

3) What activities will aging baby boomers most want to engage in?

Highest ranked programs/activity traits (in rank order):
• walking trails (top-ranked response)
• can do on their own—still independent
• “Water sports”

Other suggested programs/activity traits
• access to the coast/ocean
• Hunting
• Camping
• Less rigorous (kayaking vs. whitewater rafting)
• find some solitude
• more competitive opportunities like marathons, canoe races, triathlons
• Birdwatching
• Snowmobiling
• Nordic Skiing
• History
• Travel
• Walking/running the dog
• Sailing
• Fishing
• Bicycling
• Stargazing
• Geneology/cemeteries
• Nature podcasts

4) Are there demographic groups besides youth and elders that demand focus? If so...who are they? How can we best provide for their recreational needs?

**Highest ranked responses (in rank order)**

• Teens are a separate group from younger children and require separate focus—important to provide safe unstructured outdoor opportunities that they can do with friends (peers; high school outing clubs) (tied for top-ranked response)
• Parents (often financially responsible for kids and elders) shouldn’t be overlooked. (tied for top-ranked response)
• Extreme activities for those in late teens-30ish
• Working adults (middle ages)—work with employers to publicize outdoor opportunities
• Disabled persons

5) What are the strategies for attracting/retaining young professionals with recreational opportunities?

**Highest ranked responses (in rank order)**

• Build in opportunities for socializing and networking
• Exciting” … fast paces, energetic, fun, an element of technology
• Easy access—close-by
• Engage them in program design/decision-making
• Empower them – knock down barriers, build bridges

**Other suggested strategies:**

• Bike paths, running paths throughout Maine
• Continuing Education/College (college credit/certification courses)
• Professional association

**Conclusion:** Discussion and selection of previously discussed items to flag for potential focus in SCORP plan:

Guiding question: *What can the state of Maine do to effectively plan/provide outdoor recreation opportunities that appeal to different generations and that facilitate lifelong outdoor recreation?*

The following concepts were identified, based on the previous exercises and discussions:

• Funds for **grass root local/home grown projects** (based on significant trends).
• **Green policies**… promote recreational planning based on smart/green concepts.
• Remove **policy barriers**
• **Universal Design**… People of all capacities can make use of program (disabilities, age, etc.)
• Integrate recreation planning and recreation offerings/awareness through **community entities** such as schools, workplaces, community centers, senior centers, etc. Consider co-ordination with:
  • Workplace wellness policies and programs
  • outdoor experiences through schools
• environmental education programming

• Focus on **effective communications** to promote awareness for existing recreation opportunities and their associated benefits to users. Additionally, consider ways to help people get started in recreational activities.

• New **trail building**
  - Help communities build and connect trails
  - Accessible bathrooms
  - Continue Land for Maine’s Future program
  - Continue to seek conservation easements on private land
  - Incentives for developers to build trails

• **“Community Stewardship”** – using stewardship activities such as community clean-up days or days of service to connect people with their community resources.
2009 – 2014 Maine State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
Community Conservation, Recreation, and Quality of Life Focus Group
April 17, 2009 Sebago Lake State Park – Casco, Maine

Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Green</td>
<td>[Facilitator] – WardGreen Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Turner</td>
<td>Maine Bureau of Parks &amp; Lands, Outdoor Recreation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Eickenberg</td>
<td>Maine Bureau of Parks &amp; Lands, Chief of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mick Rodgers</td>
<td>Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, Grants and Community Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Brooke</td>
<td>Land for Maine’s Future Program, Maine State Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Vogt</td>
<td>Executive Director, Bicycle Coalition of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Mention</td>
<td>Trail Director, Maine Island Trail Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John J. Daigle</td>
<td>Program Leader, Parks Recreation &amp; Tourism. University of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barrett</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Smith</td>
<td>Stewardship Program Coordinator, Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shafto</td>
<td>Executive Director, Maine Association of Conservation Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe Tone</td>
<td>The Trust for Public Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Alexander</td>
<td>President, Central Maine Chapter of the New England Mountain Bike Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Springuel</td>
<td>Marine Extension Associate, Maine Sea Grant, College of the Atlantic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process:

- Rex Turner from Maine Parks and Lands overviewed the purpose and requirements of a state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan.
- Each group member then introduced themselves and shared their connections to Maine’s outdoors. Numerous participants shared their concern for a diminishment of quality of place due to rapid development. Another popular sentiment in introductions was an interest in more connectivity between conserved lands as well as between conserved lands and the built environment.
- Next, participants were broken into groups. Each group was tasked with listing best practices to encourage and promote projects supporting outdoor recreation specifically and protection of quality of place in general (environmental quality, open space, etc). Each group shared with the larger group as a whole.
- Participants then worked in their groups to explore specific actions or initiatives associated with (or stemming out of) their BMP listings. They tried to attribute general cost and impact estimates to each item. Again, groups reported out to the whole.
- The tail end of the meeting involved a group discussion of implementation issues and barriers and an assessment of the meeting (for future improvements).
A variety of topics, issues, opportunities, and challenges were identified during the focus group. The summary below takes items discussed during the focus group and groups them into associated clusters.

**Community level initiatives and successful collaborations**

A cluster of participant comments collected during the focus group centered on community-level initiatives, collaborations, and best practices for fostering processes that develop community vision and planning capacity. The comments included:

- Projects with multiple organizations involved and a central catalyst organizing efforts were mentioned as ideal. It was also noted that partnering with large, established organizations, such as national or New England-wide associations can provide benefits (insurance, resources, education, etc.).
- Support was voiced for integrating established visions/resources with local communities. Examples cited include the:
  - Maine Island Trail
  - Maine Birding Trail
  - East Coast Greenway
  - Appalachian Trail and International Appalachian Trail
  - Northern Forest Canoe Trail
  - ITS snowmobile trail system
- Ongoing stewardship needs to be considered, including fostering volunteerism from support groups.
- More regional collaborations, in which trails and recreation areas are mapped and publicized, would be beneficial. An associated comment is that more recreation and conservation collaborations/partnerships between cities or towns are needed.
- **“Case Studies”** on implementing local outdoor recreation initiatives would be of assistance to communities starting out a project. Studies could:
  - share steps for implementing a local trail system
  - be easily found and user-friendly (on web)
  - use social networking tools (e.g. Facebook) and other information sharing technologies to reach groups who are engaged in local initiatives
  - target municipalities / agencies / and Non-Governmental Organizations
  - Developing community vision and community carrying capacity would be beneficial. Projects would evaluate Social and cultural elements as well as tourism implications. The Trust for Public Land’s *Penobscot Valley Community Greenprint* project was mentioned as an exemplar.
- It was suggested that efforts be made to balance advocacy and resources between motorized and non-motorized projects, and to build collaboration / alliances between motorized
and non-motorized groups. Additionally, opportunities to link land and water resources should be explored.

- Collaborations / alliances with economic and business interests were also suggested as a best practice for outdoor recreation projects.
- Integrating hospitality and state recreation resources, as has been done with the Northern Forest Canoe Trail’s “guide finder” website feature, was promoted.
- Landowner relations and liability laws should continually be considered and improved (even though Maine is a leader in landowner liability protections).
- A better understanding of economic impacts from outdoor recreation might drive up support for recreation projects. Furthermore, projects need to understand and account for the costs of implementation (volunteerism, stewardship etc.). Lastly, the role recreation on private lands plays in regional economic impact should be examined.

Access

Access is a continual concern voiced in focus groups and listening sessions. The following thoughts were shared by participants in the second ME SCORP focus group:

- Access is a big issue to address in numerous settings for various activities.
- Access for and support of hunting, in the context of community/local natural areas, needs to be considered.
- Planners and managers should strive to provide year-round uses of facilities and year-round access to outdoor areas. It was noted that funding is needed for additional plowed access in winter (parking and perhaps even some paved trails such as rail trails).
- There is a need to create more parking and to develop/enhance more trailheads.

Management and Development Considerations

A number of comments can be grouped into the loose category of “management and development considerations” for outdoor recreation. Comments include:

- Successful recreation development projects fully balance recreation opportunities with landowner objectives, mandates, and constraints.
- Leave No Trace messaging has made a big difference (notably on coastal Maine islands) and is a valuable tool.
- The often complex mosaic of varying landowners, fee-ownership, and easements can be a stumbling block for recreation management projects.
- Appropriate, quality signage was mentioned as a need by more than one group.
- “Better stewarding what we already have” was mentioned as a goal, including the fact that, for many areas, higher staffing levels are needed.
- Providing adequate numbers of outhouses was noted as a need.

More specifically, several ideas or recommendations focused on connecting resources were shared.
• Safe walking and/or biking routes to reach outdoor recreation destinations (such as local parks or open space areas) are needed.
• Interconnected trails can not only keep people in towns/cities, but they can also attract visitors.
• Temporarily closing select streets (perhaps on Sundays) could be a way to increase human-powered recreation opportunities in the heart of some Maine communities.
• Developing more parks and ballparks, with connections to trails, would benefit communities by having open spaces linked to a bigger system that does not necessarily rely on driving.
• Routing public transportation (where existing) so people can get to the trailheads without driving was advocated.
• Providing more bike lanes to make city streets more bike friendly may be done at reasonable cost when repaving or redesigning streets.

Public Information Improvements

Each group commented on the need for improved information about the availability and characteristics of existing outdoor recreation resources. Suggestions to explore included:
• Sharing GPS data for a growing population of recreationists who regularly use hand-held GPS units as part of their recreation experience.
  - Promoting and developing a central resource for recreational information. A top-notch website or sites was mentioned as one approach. The prevalent role of the internet was noted, as was its adaptability and connection to younger generations.
• Considering recreationists who may not have high levels of outdoor skill or knowledge (i.e., craft information that welcomes and serves new participants).
• Looking into the opportunity to better interpret diverse resources to attract and spread use. The example of hiking was shared, with the point being that by better sharing the attraction and opportunity associated with, for example, coastal, wetland, and unique forest hiking destinations, new regions could emerge as hiking destinations (in addition to popular mountain hikes).

Implementation Issues and Barriers

The group initiated a discussion of implementation issues and barriers. The first issue brought forth was funding. Throughout the entire focus group, the lack of funding or need for more funding was flagged as an issue, especially for infrastructure and access. Furthermore, the idea of creating consistent funding streams was put forth. In the issues/barriers discussion, points of emphasis revolved around the dissemination of funds to municipalities and non-profits. Several ideas are described below.
- The concept of concentrating resources on a year by year focus was shared. In this scenario, funds might target, for example, trailhead improvements one year, focused (themed) land acquisitions the next year, and so on.
- A goal of keeping application processes as simple as possible was put forward, with the rationale that many local-level applicants may be disadvantaged or intimidated if they lack grant writing and preparation skills. Clarity and flexibility were shared as ideal application traits.

Discussion around the management of Land and Water Fund monies included the following notes:
  o Maine Parks and Lands can change the existing scoring system to reflect updated SCORP priorities. This is one primary means for directing funding towards issues identified as needing addressing.
  o It is important to help educate potential applicants about what types of projects are well suited to LWCF dollars and which are not. There may be opportunities to funnel projects not well suited to LWCF towards other funding sources.

- One major organizational / policy barrier was discussed. The overlapping areas of responsibility and jurisdiction, as well as sometimes complex patterns of land ownership, between various state agencies can lead to confusion. The public does not always know or understand the full range of public lands and opportunities available in a region. Additionally, there can be confusion as to who is the responsible agency to contact with questions or concerns.
State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)

Focus Group 3: “Preserving, Developing, and Enhancing Recreational Connections Across Large Landscapes”
Penquis Higher Education Center, Dover-Foxcroft 06/08/09 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Participants:
- Rex Turner – Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands, Outdoor Recreation Planner
- David Green [Facilitator] – WardGreen Group
- Corky Potter [Co-Facilitator] - Raven Works Consulting
- Mick Rogers – Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, Grants and Community Recreation
- Alan Stearns - Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, Deputy Director
- Katherine Eickenberg - Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, Chief Planner
- Maurice Marden – Maine Snowmobile Association
- Bruce Kidman – The Nature Conservancy
- Karen Woodsum – Sierra Club
- Kris Hoffman – Forest Society of Maine
- Kevin Slater- Maine Wilderness Guides Organization
- Lester Kenway – Maine Appalachian Trail Club
- Bryan Wentzell – Appalachian Mountain Club
- Sally Stockwell – Maine Audubon Society
- Gene Conlogue – Town of Millinocket
- Dave Herring – Maine Huts & Trails
- Roger Merchant – U. Maine Cooperative Extension
- Eric Axelman – Forest Society of Maine
- Jim Lane – A.T.V. Maine
- Sarah Medina – Maine Forest Products Council & Seven Islands Land Company
- Al Cowperthwaite – North Maine Woods
- Cathy Johnson – Natural Resources Council of Maine
- Jensen Bissell – Baxter State Park
- Ken Woodbury – Piscataquis County Economic Development Council

Overview of SCORP process: led by Rex Turner

SCORP – Purpose is to look at outdoor recreation supply, demand, trends, and opportunities for your state and to craft a plan to address recreation needs.

- Public input required
- Final plan needs to be done by the end of the calendar year
- This is the middle of the public part of the process; there will be listening sessions in late summer or early fall.

Overview of LWCF and Recreational Trails Program funding: led by Mick Rogers

Focus group goals and participant introductions: led by David Green

Focus Group Process:

Three groups were asked to self-select, each with a specific perspective to work from. Group A examined issues from a motorized recreation perspective, group B focused on a non-motorized land trail perspective, and group C examined issues with water-trails in mind.
Each team started with a topic, answered the questions and (later) made recommendations. First teams on a topic answered the questions, while second and third teams, when addressing the same questions, focused on similarities and differences, rather than recreating the same material. All answers and thoughts were posted and eventually discussed by all participants.

Additionally, groups were asked to outline characteristics and needs of trails along a continuum from a few hours to multiple days. This trail systems aspect of the exercise is shown below:

**Trail Systems**

- Along the continuum from a few minutes to extended days / nights….  
  - Describe the goals of / expectations for the experience  
  - Describe infrastructure needs & desired setting attributes  
  - Describe views on supply

*For results of this part of the exercise, see Figures 1-3, at the end of this focus group review document.*

**Summary of Results:**

**Are there specific, significant needs or gaps in regional trail systems?**

Specific needs and geographic gaps mentioned by group participants covered a range of issues. Geographically, Guilford and Millinocket, as well as central/southern Maine in general were listed as having a need for better connected ATV trails. Downeast rivers and lakes were identified as not yet having marketed/managed water trails. Furthermore, the Kennebec was mentioned as needing more cohesive planning (for river-oriented recreation). Lastly, the group looking at trail opportunities with a land-based non-motorized trail perspective found that more regional hiking trails (such as Baxter State Park and the Bigelow Preserve) are needed (especially in the 3-5 day range). The non-motorized land trail group also shared that there are no trails in the northwestern part of Maine and that loop trails and a statewide backpacking/backcountry hiking map are needed. They also described a need for carry trails on canoe routes.

A high-level plan for regional trails, a funding mechanism for people powered trails, and aligning fishing goals with water trail goals are all planning-related suggestions made by at least one of the participating groups. It was noted by one group that there is a shortage of skilled trail builders.

On the motorized trail side, the motorized group noted that trail heads, parking, and trail maps are needed.

**How can we best avoid potential trail conflicts while supporting diverse, quality trail experiences?**

Respect and sharing were put forth as pillars of avoiding trail conflicts and supporting diverse trail experiences. Specifically, respect for landowners, respect among and between trail users, sharing law enforcement/rescue burdens, and shared maintenance responsibility were ad-
vocated by at least 2 of the 3 small groups participating. Segregating trail uses (in some places) and involving stakeholders in trail use planning were also supported by multiple groups.

SUSTAINING TRAILS (connectivity, maintenance, user education/ ethics, landowner issues)

1. Who is responsible for maintenance…? How is this done, and funded?

All small groups participating listed volunteers as a source of trail maintenance. Paid trail crews or contractors (including Conservation Corps teams) as well as State Parks and Lands staff were also mentioned as sources for trail maintenance work. Financial resources for trail maintenance listed include Federal Recreational Trails Program funds and dollars from registrations (motorized trails). The potential need for a funding mechanism for non-motorized trails was brought up, though uncertainty was shared on how to implement.

How does the public hear about the trails and learn about ethics…what are the strategies?

Focus group participants listed a variety of ways to communicate trail information and ethics. Groups organized around activities (e.g., the Maine Snowmobile Association etc.) were identified as a good communication channel. Additionally, the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands’ publications, published trail guides, chambers of commerce, trailhead kiosks, visitor centers, the Maine Office of Tourism, and guides/outfitters were all mentioned as avenues to spread information and awareness. Websites were continually mentioned;

2. Connectivity
What are the forces affecting or likely to affect public recreation on private lands?

Changes in land ownership and related changes in recreation management on private lands were a unanimous concern for the group. Additionally, predictability (of access), fragmentation, changes to the character of lands, and the level of user-group stewardship were strong concerns. Other forces listed as having influence on public recreation on private lands include harvesting, communications, road use issues, population demographics, climate change, the availability (and balance) of public lands, hydropower licensing, as well as potential concerns with “takings” associated with recreational features/sites on private land.

What are the best ways to sustain extended recreation opportunities, like those provided by trails, given that large portions of many of those trails rely heavily on public access on private land?

When looking at sustaining extended trail systems, the small working groups came to somewhat divergent visions. Namely, the motorized group was generally more focused on landowner relations whereas the water-based trails and land-based non-motorized trails groups were quicker to promote acquiring more public land and public easements. That being said, concepts associated with landowner relations (such as sustaining the landowner relations position shared between Parks and Lands and Inland Fisheries & Wildlife and quickly addressing abuses of private land) were supported by more than one group. Collaboration between user groups and strong volunteer networks were clearly put forth as elements of trail sustainability.
3. Landowner issues

Are there new trends/issues that need to be considered regarding recreation (especially trails) on private lands? What has worked, what needs improvements?

Trends, needs, and successes associated with recreation on private lands are many (based on participant viewpoints). One overriding trend identified is the changing nature of land ownership. Whether in the form of wind power development, subdivision, non-profit land conservation, or timberland investment, change in land ownership is a trend. Additionally, the growth of motorized recreation, including new technologies pushing the envelope of motorized recreation, is a trend. On the non-motorized side, private trail construction is mentioned as an emerging trend (e.g., Maine Huts and Trails). Growing numbers of conservation easements, continually developing technologies (e.g., cell phone use, GPS units, etc.), Cultural recognition of importance of trails, and demographics were mentioned as other trends.

Consulting with landowners (on published maps, etc.) and the landowner relations program were listed as efforts that produce positive results. Listed needs included: long-term, stable funding, more trails closer to where people live; coordination and planning for long-distance non-motorized trails; identifying compatible & incompatible uses & designing trails; access to cross county skiing networks; management of users across geographic areas (as numbers increase).

GATEWAY COMMUNITIES & TRAIL TOURISM (coordination, planning, issues, needs)

How can access from gateway communities to trail systems in surrounding areas be improved?

Overall, the 3 small groups all advocated tying gateway communities in to the surrounding trail system. As part of that concept, trail heads integrated into the community were viewed positively. Two of the groups brought up improved public information (e.g., trip planning), perhaps based on user experience level, as a way to increase connectivity between gateways communities and surrounding trail resources. Maps, including mapping showing public and (approved) private assets and lands, were mentioned as well. The notion of developing visitor centers in key gateway trail towns also emerged.

Web-based efforts were suggested too. The need for community-based web efforts providing trail updates, commercial services, and tourism information was expressed. Additional community-minded suggestions included working to increase length of stay (via more awareness of and opportunity to enjoy outdoor resources), added exposure for small service providers (perhaps though online resources), and positioning gateway communities as key “hubs” for trail experiences.

What are the benefits stemming from improved marketing of recreational opportunities in and around gateway communities?

Improved marketing, based on focus group responses, has the potential to diversify local economies and brand areas as significant outdoor recreation destinations. Improvements to marketing efforts also hold the potential to improve local trails and resources by increasing momentum of and exposure for recreational trails.

What are the fears about improved marketing of recreational opportunities?

Marketing of outdoor recreation resources has the potential to alter the status quo (which is, even if “left alone”, evolving). For that reason, there is some concern around the thought of enhanced marketing efforts.
First, participants shared the concern of too much use leading to impacted environments (social and physical). Land use and landowner impacts were mentioned by some as well, including the fear that increased recreation visitors might lead to pressure to push lands more towards preservation (at the expense of certain recreation uses and land management activities). Conversely, there was sentiment expressed that overdevelopment could be an unwanted byproduct of aggressive marketing.

**How can state and local players work together to create/enhance trail destinations (towns)?**

Good communication and getting diverse stakeholders together early in planning processes were both suggestions made by multiple groups in the focus group process. Along those lines, having state and regional collaboration was listed an important element for success. Maine Office of Tourism regional marketing groups, landowners, and recreation groups were all specifically mentioned as entities needing to be involved with planning efforts. Furthermore, trails specific planning, at a state-wide level, was brought up as a possible positive initiative. On a more regional note, the water trails-focused group advocated better tying water trails such as the Penobscot River Corridor with gateway towns (such as, in this case, Millinocket).

**Recommendations:**

Specific recommendations, organized into broader categories, were brought forward by the three groups. Each participant was then given a limited number of votes to cast for recommendations they found most important. The number to the left indicates the number of tallies.

*It is important to note that while the composition of participants was diverse in interests (as hoped and planned for), it cannot be said to be perfectly equal (i.e., it covered a range of interests but was not necessarily comprised of a perfectly balanced number of participant perspectives). Schedules etc. made arranging a perfectly balanced number of participants difficult. In short, it may be more instructive to evaluate the tallies of broad categories than tallies for individual recommendations.*

**Acquisitions/easements 28 total**

- 4 Inclusion of all voices/stakeholders
- 6 Permanence of trails
- 1 Flexible easements/row
- 2 Filling gaps!
- 15 (goal) more sustainably managed (permanent adequate funding) non-motorized trails

**EASEMENTS**

Easements - more easements for other (motorized, multi, “non-quiet” hiking…recreation that doesn’t require quite wilderness setting)

**Planning 33 total**

- 1 Trail inventory (filling gaps)
- 2 Bring gateways together
- 20* Comprehensive statewide trail plan to include balance of non-motorized and motorized, single use/multi-use, winter/summer, local (short) and multi-day, w/needed infrastructure
- 2 look at RTP trail mix 30 non/30 motor/40 multi and determine state’s priority
- 1 we need strategic planning around specific waterways – water trails: uses & access & camping & management
- 2 compatible use – trails
- 5 designation – information – marketing of water – based trails & experience for daytrips & historic water trails & portages
Whatever this becomes, it needs to be coordinated & connected with communities – regions – tourism – marketing – outdoor recreation

SCORP process needs to coordinate & communicate with LURC & the development of CLUP, IF&W

**Landowner – Programs  21 total**
- Improve landowner relations
- Landowner relation position with DOC & IF&W
- Education of users RE: private property & privilege of use
- Centers in gateway communities for info & education

**Infrastructure  39 Total**
- Study among user groups way to fund non-motorized recreation
- i.d. critical corridors connecting existing trail systems
- i.d critical existing sources of funding for trail development & maintenance
- Day use water trail infrastructure: parking, Shuttle – multiple launch site - rest room – kiosks – rentals, signage
- Opportunities for non – motorized water trails, multi-day trips, should be expanded
- Gateway communities need to be information providers, support services providers, provide information about outfitters & guides for water – trail experiences, stewardship
  …Becoming a water – trail “gateway”
- Include all users in responsibility – (need Mechanism) *(maintenance)*
  Continue & support existing volunteer base *(maintenance)*
- Broaden funding (not just registration fees) *(maintenance)*
- Trailheads
- Cell phone coverage
- Connectivity
- Access to services

**“OTHER” - Communication, Collaboration, & education  18 Total**
- private/public partnerships for trails on private land
- coordinate publication of maps and brochures
- more web info (state) with landowners
- DOC, IF&W,MOT, DOT
- communication/cooperation among users LWCF, RTP, Forest Legacy, LMF
- promote responsible use & user ethics
- support landowner relations program (DOC, IF&W) and like efforts

Communications
- On – line info, maps and brochures
- Bring all users to the table
- Trail mapping/Signage
- Real time
- State wide GPS Common and Consistent
Figure 1: Motorized Trails Working Group – Activity Spectrum

Experience expectations

- Access close to home
- "Get away"
- Wilderness experience

Infrastructure needs & desired attributes

- Trail Heads/Parking
- Maps (club level)
- Maps (statewide, w/rating)
- Cell phone coverage
- Loop Trails
- Signage
- Lodging-based trails & access
- Camping (ATV)

Views on supply

- Trail head/parking needed: Greenville, Brownville, Milo
- Service access needed: Millinocket
- Opportunities needed: southern/central area
- Trail permanence needed
Figure 2: Non-Motorized Land Trails Working Group – Activity Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience expectations</th>
<th>Full day</th>
<th>Overnight</th>
<th>Extended days/nights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access close to home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some level of physical challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some quiet &amp; solitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quiet, solitude, &amp; remoteness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery &amp; views</td>
<td></td>
<td>“destination” scenery</td>
<td>No forest harvesting or at least aesthetic forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geared towards beginners (family friendly, easy to get to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of overnight accommodations (shelters, sporting camps, primitive campsites, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Accessible Trails (ADA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to view wildlife</td>
<td>wilderness (or close approximation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Foot travel only trails)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible to a broad spectrum of users</td>
<td>Baxter, Bigelow type experiences - on large scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail heads/parking/privies/signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campsites in beautiful locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for user feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maps (&amp; access info)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. bike &amp; equestrian trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure needs &amp; desired attributes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding for non-motorized trails</td>
<td>Not enough 3-5 day extended backpacking opportunities (especially loops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more land trails in conjunction with water trails...e.g. day hikes off St. John</td>
<td>Backcountry (Nordic) ski opportunities lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more trails of this type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need health/fitness trails &amp; intro to more backcountry experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 3: Water Trails Working Group – Activity Spectrum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience expectations</th>
<th>Infrastructure needs &amp; desired attributes</th>
<th>View on supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few minutes - hours</td>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>Overnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon of fishing,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet, solitude,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing, etc. (local)</td>
<td></td>
<td>wildlife, fishing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality scenery,</td>
<td></td>
<td>scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mystique (tourists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding/training/coaching (tourists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring dead-waters,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy, well-defined access (launches)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campsites, privies, picnic tables, shelter (variations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road access (ungated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure planning/delivery based on specific needs, not a statewide plan: parking, shuttles, launches, private services/rentals, restrooms, kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Designation &amp; protection of historic water trails &amp; portages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access, hand-carry only, conserved lands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing &amp; branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage trails:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating water trails with land assets (trails, destinations, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintained &amp; designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample water resources,</td>
<td>Need research on market for huts, amenities, B&amp;Bs, village services</td>
<td>Very limited supply of non-motorized water trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Packaging” (itineraries) &amp; services needed</td>
<td>Need communication between SCORP, LURC &amp; CLUP*</td>
<td>Be clear about compatible/incompatible multiple use of water trails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Comments

Registered Maine Guides Comments

In an effort to solicit input from Registered Maine Guides for input on the 2009-2014 Maine SCORP, outreach efforts were undertaken to reach guides through three different guides groups. Questions were passed to guides through the Maine Professional Guides Association, the Maine Wilderness Guides Organization, and the Maine Association of Sea Kayak Guides and Instructors. Comments obtained through this process are shown below.

In total, 27 guides completed the questionnaire. Guides holding a specialized sea kayaking guide license made up by far the largest group of responders, with a total of 24. There were 3 responding guides with specialized hunting classification, 4 with specialized fishing classification, 13 with specialized recreational, 2 with specialized tide-water fishing, 0 with whitewater, and 7 with “master” classification (based on years licensed and experience obtained). Total classifications equaled more than the number of respondents due to the fact that guides may hold more than one classification. It should be noted that the proportion of guide types responding to this outreach effort do not necessarily match the proportion of guiding activity across the state (e.g., hunting may be underrepresented, etc.). Still, the input provided is valued, as it at least starts to pull in the perspective of guides who know Maine’s outdoors intimately and are working to make a living from Maine’s nature-based, outdoor recreation assets.

Suggestions for improvement of the State of Maine's management of recreation on state owned lands?

- Expand ranger staff & warden staff. Increase the number of state owned primitive campsites & provide additional staff to handle the maintenance schedule.
- On some of the land in our area the trails only use a small portion of the site, the signs say stay on trail. This makes us feel like a criminal if you explore something interesting you find using maps.
- Recycling, Better trash removal, Composting Toilets.
- Problems with trash/ recycling containers- need more or need to better educate population about use and cleaning up sites after oneself.
- I'd have to know more.
- There is not enough public access in Southern Maine. If this is a sign of the future for mid-coast and northern Maine usage of public access. Then we have something to worry about in the near future. Then trend in southern Maine is that there is public access available but there is not enough public parking and none for commercial outfitters. ie. Cape Porpoise area.
- Unfortunately the State needs to provide for all recreational interests and often times the non consumptive or Guides who provide human powered experiences have been the ones to loose out. Examples are the recent Seboomook planning process and Allagash. There are too few areas that are strictly human-powered access. That is, too many areas now allow drive-in access.
- Always room for improvement! I am well aware of the budgetary issues that constrain ideal management.

Are there any trends in demand (activities, lodging options, time, type of experience, etc.) you are hearing from clients or potential clients? If so, please consider sharing.
• human powered trail use/ need for non-motorized corridors
• Day trip destinations
• eco tours.
• Adventure race day trips
• Less time available but still want full experience
• more interest in camping
• We have just in the last 6 months seen an up turn in requests for extended canoe and sea kayaking trips
• shift from camping to residential (cabins, etc.)
• More families requesting guided trips

Are there developments or improvements (infrastructure, acquisitions, programs/initiatives, tourism-related efforts, etc.) that would benefit the guiding community? If so, please describe.

• Maine's Quality of Place and Mobilize Maine Initiative
• always more promoting of the state
• More education on leave no trace practices and sustainable use practices
• Trash/ Recycling programs, and the need to inform people that dilution is not the solution to pollution. Rivers and oceans should not be dumping grounds.
• more public access island and coastal properties
• Affordable worker's comp. ins. The status needs to change. More parking for commercial outfitters.
• Better coordination of advertising on a statewide and outside basis promoting guided trips and the use of individual guides that may/may not have a regular storefront business as an "outfitter". Tourists do not know about guides or the state's requirement to use them for "guided trips" nor the training that it takes to become one.
• More state sponsored marketing
• I wish the State Office of Tourism would recognize the unique opportunity that we have in the State to provide multi-day wilderness experiences.
• Acquisition of more island and coastal property

Given that financial and staff resources are limited, what would you list as the top two broad priorities for improving outdoor recreation opportunities in Maine?

Priority 1

• Acquisition & protection of public land
• more put in sites for coastal paddlers
• Parking, access points, and shoreline access for boating.
• advertising
• More attention paid to the need for areas/trails for non motorized travel
• Conserving lands for future generations
• Advertising
• More public access to coastal waters
• marketing
• more publicity about state parks
• more land acquisition for public lands
• boating access
• Affordable worker's comp. ins.
• Better ads stating the need/benefits for guides in state
• Improve advertising promoting guided trips through all media
• marketing low cost alternative vacations
• develop a comprehensive plan that sets goals for separating some human powered and
  motorized uses particularly for winter use.
• More BPL Managed Island property
• rails to trails increase
• more land
• More rivers with established campsites.
• Protect foot and non-motorized boat access.
• enhanced reservation systems (like NPS)

Priority 2
• Vastly improve the marketing of Maine's assets of our beautiful natural environment,
  spectacular coastline, majestic mountain ranges, pristine rivers, trackless wilderness and
  serene inland waters.
• encompassing leave no trace camping
• not sure
• better public access
• Appropriate use of resources
• Access
• more accessibility in state parks for guiding opportunities
• emphasis on low impact activities, i.e. human powered vs. motor powered
• More parking for commercial outfitters.
• Maine schools involvement with outdoor recreation and opportunities
• Create "trails" linking different outdoor activities by themes - "lighthouse trail", "Moose
  sighting trail", "Bird watching trail" and etc.
• Managing tick populations on islands - Casco Bay
• trail expansion across the State
• more access
• Protect wilderness quality in at least some public lands
Outdoor Recreation Providers’ Comments

In late spring 2009, an online questionnaire was sent out to organizations connected with managing land open to the public for recreation in Maine or providing outdoor recreation opportunities in Maine. This questionnaire was designed to solicit perspectives on the outdoor recreation needs in Maine as seen by outdoor recreation providers. The questionnaire was sent out via channels such as the Maine Parks and Recreation Association, the Maine Land Trust Network, the Maine Association of Conservation Commissions, Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands regional managers, and general correspondence with other known outdoor recreation managers. 25 providers responded, broken down into the following categories: municipality (9), Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands (6), Land Trust (7), Other Conservation Org. (not for profit) (1), Federal Agency (2).

Responses to open-ended questions:

Considering the outdoor recreation needs of the community or communities you serve, please list your top three facility, acquisition, management, and/or program needs.

#1 Priorities
- Need to determine priorities for conservation and recreation according to regional needs
- nature center/place for school field trips
- Operating and stewardship expenses
- Administrative staff person
- Conservation and management of 21,700 acre West Grand Lake Community Forest
- public water access
- feedback from visitors about harvesting
- More staff
- More campsites along trails
- Shoreline launch sites
- acquiring lands within the legislated park boundary
- River access
- more recreational staffing
- Funding
- more field staff
- deeded access/acquisition
- funding
- publicly accessible beach
- Funding for Land Conservation and Open Space
- Bike Trails
- Open space for land conservation
- Development of Athletic Field Complex
- Redevelopment of the Ragged Mountain Recreation Area (Camden Snow Bowl as year round facility)
- Non-Motorized/ Multi-use Trails
• Neighborhood play areas/playgrounds

**# 2 Priorities**

- Retain/protect large tracts of forest land for hunting, wildlife habitat, multi-use trails, sustainable forestry and water quality protection (both surface and groundwater)
- single track mountain bike trails
- Land acquisition
- funding
- Stewardship funding to support road maintenance, recreational facilities, and wildlife habitat management
- financial resources for trail maintenance
- $ for trail maintenance
- Greater number of volunteers
- Conversion of outhouses to pumpable tanks
- Islands / recreational access in Frenchmans Bay
- developing/promoting use of the Schoodic Education and Research Center
- trail development
- base funding that allows for more recreational management/improvements
- Land acquisition
- fewer administrators
- campsite improvements/upgrades
- staff
- cross-country skiing trails
- Hiking and Nature Trails
- Recreational trails
- Park site amenities development: basketball courts, picnic pavilions, tennis courts,
- Expansion of multi-season multi-use trail system
- Trails thru marsh area
- Riverfront stabilization and water quality

**# 3 Priorities**

- Funding, more capacity, more staff, of course!
- groomed xc ski trails
- Planning and community involvement
- public support
- Resources to support local outdoor recreation businesses
- public lands
- road name signs on units
- Cooperators in the form of teachers who want to help teach others about the value of recreation and conserving land for recreational pursuits
- Developing recreation on some timber lands
- Safe parking
- NPS overall mission: protecting resources and ensuring high quality visitor experiences
- Open space
• more recreational staffing
• timber management
• staffing
• mountain biking trails
• Public Picnic Areas
• Interconnected trail system
• Collaboration with other community organizations: land trusts, YMCA, mountain bike club, chamber of commerce, bed and breakfast assoc., WinterKids, Ski & Snowboard Club
• Promotion of recreation areas
• Acquisition and development in underserved areas.
Listening Sessions - Comments

Public listening sessions were announced, promoted, and held in three locations in September of 2009. Sessions were held in Presque Isle, Brewer, and Scarborough. At each session, participants were given an overview of SCORP and the process of establishing priorities for the draft plan. Participants were encouraged to react to the draft priorities as well as to comment/elaborate on outdoor recreation issues they see as most important for Maine. Sixteen people attended the evening listening sessions.

Comments received as part of the Maine SCORP Listening Sessions
(September 2009)

- The Maine Department of Conservation should routinely send a representative to the Sportsman’s Forest Landowner Alliance (as one way to address issues concerning public recreation non private lands).
- [Recreationists in Maine] still need access to private land.
- Money for (and costs associated with) search and rescue was brought up as an issue needing attention. There are groups that do not contribute to the services they receive or benefit from.
- The private/public partnership at Aroostook State Park (trails) is an example of developing/maintaining quality of place.
- Illegal dumping is an issue, including what do you do with trash after it has been collected? (transfer station fees). Welcome signs, including landowner information and land use information, are an example of a way to communicate with the public (educates, welcomes, and encourages good stewardship)
- Landowner appreciation days are a good way to sustain relationships with private landowners.
- Aroostook State Park is an example of a park having success by interacting with the community.
- Student outreach and collaboration is a great way to benefit parks and youth. One example is the interpretive signage done by UMaine Presque Isle students, who received a $8k grant for work in Aroostook NWR.
- Park events (to encourage use) are a great way to introduce people to parks.
- Good communication is always needed for events (Ex. Birding festival at Aroostook State Park)
- Focus on visitors not just tourism
- How to connect with untapped users?
- We need to recognize outdoor recreation’s health benefits.
- There is an economic benefit to attracting retirees.
- It can be hard to find senior-friendly trails.
- Seniors are attracted to walking amenities.
- Friends groups should be promoted/encouraged. They are ideal sources of volunteers and advocates.
- The plan should recognize the damage done by minimum lot size zoning, which has led to sprawl.
- Make sure economic development is in priorities.
• The Maine Office of Tourism should be more active in the Northern parts of the state.
• There is a need for more/better public information.
• Many locals don’t know what resources exist in their own area.
• It would be good if there were a list serve for outdoor recreation funding opportunities.
• In southern Maine, there is a loss of trails to development. Monetary incentives for keeping trail access might change that equation.
• The plan seems very broad.
• Local parks and recreation needs should be emphasized, as gas prices and the economy are big barriers to people travelling to regional destinations.
• Support for municipalities should not be just “bricks and mortar” but more “humanitarian”, people-focused as well.
• Avoid preaching to the choir.
• Low-to moderate income people are not well represented or reached. Reach them via schools, the YMCA, the WIC program, and general assistance programs.
• Weave recreation into daily life: bike paths, trails, alternative commuting options.
• Emphasize the perpetuity of LWCF projects.
• Even if general public access is part of an easement, that may have limited recreational value. Easements should have clear recreation objectives and rights.
Other Comments Received

November 16, 2009

Rex Turner
Outdoor Recreation Planner
Maine Department of Conservation
Bureau of Parks and Lands
22 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0022

Re: Public Comment on SCORP

Dear Rex,

Further to our phone conversation today, I wanted to share some perspectives on the sport of mountain biking as it pertains to the SCORP report and, more broadly, to the approach the state takes in planning for this sport as an outdoor recreation use in the years to come.

Like most sports, mountain biking can be enjoyed by a wide range of participants, from children and beginners who use their bikes to travel through the outdoors on easy trails and dirt roads to the most advanced riders who ride for hours on narrow, steep trails that travel far from trailheads.

As mountain biking becomes more common as a sport, the beginner end of the spectrum will often be accommodated by being included as one of many user types who travel on multi-use trails. For the state, this is a relatively easy situation, as users at this level travel at moderate speeds and enjoy wider trails with low to moderate grades.

But, I fear that recreation planners often see the inclusion of mountain biking as a permitted use on multi-use trails as a way satisfying the needs of all sides of the sport of mountain biking. To the contrary, this satisfies only the lowest tier of our sport, and the result is a substantial user community (with very substantial disposable income, by the way) that is underserved. A secondary outcome is a communications gap between the mountain biking community and land managers – where the former feels picked on, and the latter may not understand the needs of mountain bikers well enough to plan for their use.

Beyond the beginner/casual level of this sport, mountain bikers seek trail systems that allow them to:

• Ride for extended periods of time; mountain bikers can ride 5-15 miles in an hour
• Enjoy the challenges of “singletrack” trails, rather than wider multi-use trails or dirt roads
• Enjoy changes in elevation
• Enjoy “technical trail features” to include bridges, “skinnies”, jumps and other obstacles (often with optional routes that allow these features to be avoided)

With proper planning, trail systems with these characteristics can easily accommodate other user groups such as hikers, cross-country skiers and trail runners – and there are hundreds of examples of these types of collaborative systems all over the country. I highly recommend a publication by IMBA (International Mountain Biking Association) called “Managing Mountain Biking.” This book is a great resource, not only for this sport, but as a guide to modern trail planning.

I hope you find this input useful. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance to you.

Best regards,

Kent Simmons
Freeport, Maine
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input in this broad planning process regarding outdoor recreation in Maine. I am not able to attend any of the three public listening sessions, so I have opted to share my thoughts in writing.

My family and I enjoy canoeing and camping, mostly in eastern Maine. We have camped on Junior Lake (south east of Lincoln) for at least a week every summer for the past six years. We enjoy the St. Croix River trip (Vanceboro to Kellyland) and often take others with us to experience this peaceful and scenic area. We do not fish or hunt. We do not own a motor boat. As a result, we do not contribute financially to the preservation and maintenance of the campsites and ‘water trails’ that we use. We value the access and the amenities (picnic tables, latrines, fire pits) and we would like to contribute. We have noticed that the picnic tables at some sites have deteriorated. These are not being replaced; we assume this is because of a lack of funding. If folks like us had a means to contribute, more money would be available for this routine maintenance.

We would also be interested in volunteering while we paddle and camp, if there were things we could do to help support these outdoor recreation assets.

Please add me to the list that will receive an electronic copy of the draft SCORP document when it is available. I look forward to reading it and I will provide additional feedback at that time.

Thank you, again, for this opportunity.

Terry

Rep. Terry Hayes

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Rex,

I just checked the status of the SCORP work. I am a little concerned because the meetings and conversation are missing some key conversations:

(1) How do we manage rec in a way that supports appropriate economic development? Conversely many seem to assume that more and more trail will add to economic development without considering that burdens that trails can create economic (e.g., grooming time and costs for local snowmobile clubs which can be shifted to local communities [e.g., Greenville]), social (loss of local trails only known by local community members), and environmental (too many trails to adequately maintain). When are there too many trail miles and how to we avoid this potential problem?

(2) Rec trails (including non-motorized) in some instances may be having many negative impacts that are largely ignored. Some of these impacts have social impacts as well (low desirability trails, foster dumping or other destructive behavior). I don’t have a clear sense of how the SCORP will help support planning and development of trails to improve the management of extensive existing problems.

Please correct me if I have missing something in the scan of materials. However, I see the goals of the SCORP to improve rec opportunities, make rec more sustainable, and help rec make the rest of Maine more sustainable. These should be key themes in the development of the SCORP. The SCORP seems to be on a solid path to achieve the first goal (improve ops) but I don’t have a clear sense of how it is moving forward to achieve the other two goals. Thank you for your time.

Best Regards,

Andy
Andrew Whitman
Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences
14 Maine Street, Suite 305
Brunswick, ME 04011
Appendix IV  
**Maine and the Maine Market Region Report, US Forest Service, Summary and Results**

**Summary**
Between 2002 and 2009, the National Survey of Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) was accomplished by interviewing approximately 100,000 Americans aged 16 and over in random-digit-dialing telephone samplings. The primary purpose of the NSRE and was to learn about approximately 85 specific outdoor recreation activities of people aged 16 and over in the United States. Findings in this report are based upon approximately 900 total surveys for the State of Maine and approximately 6,400 for Maine’s market region, which includes the states of CT, MA, ME, NH, RI and VT.

**Nature Based Land Activities**
Visiting a wilderness is the most popular nature-based land activity (47.1%), followed by day hiking (41.3%), in the state of Maine. Visiting a farm or agriculture setting (35.2%) along with developed camping (34.5%) are also popular activities with just over a third of state residents indicating participation within the last year. Slightly over a quarter of the state residents also indicate an interest in mountain biking, primitive camping and driving off-road. The somewhat specialized, technical outdoor pursuits usually requiring special gear like rock climbing and migratory bird hunting are among the least popular nature-based land activities with three percent or less of people participating.

**Developed Setting Activities**
Developed setting outdoor recreation is by far the most popular form of recreation in Maine. More residents indicated participation in walking for pleasure (87.6%) and outdoor family gatherings (80.3%) than in any other overall activity. Other activities, such as gardening or landscaping (63.7%) or driving for pleasure (63.0%) are also favorites with Maine residents.

**Water Based Activities**
Over half of Maine residents have swam in a lake or stream, been boating or visited a beach in the least year. Almost 40% have also swam in an outdoor pool or gone motor-boating. In addition, 35.4% of residents have done some type of freshwater fishing in the last year. Between 20% to 30% of residents have also enjoyed canoeing or several types of fishing activities.

**Snow and Ice Based Activities**
Over 55% of Maine residents participate in some form of a snow or ice activity in the last year. The most popular of these actives is snowmobiling, with 28.7% of the state participating. Sled- ding also attracts about 26.9% of the population, while snowboarding has the lowest participation rate at 9.2%.

**Viewing / Learning Activities**
Statewide the largest percentage of residents participating in viewing/learning activities is viewing or photograph natural scenery (73.1%), followed by viewing/photographing other wildlife (62.1%) and sightseeing (60.3%). Visiting outdoor nature centers, zoos, etc is also popular with over half the state residents participating. Over half of the state’s residents have also viewed/photographed wildflowers or gathered mushrooms, berries, etc within the last year.
Individual Outdoor Sports Activities
Individual outdoor sports continue to be popular with over a quarter of Maine residents running/jog (27.7%). Golf (19.1%) and inline skating (18.4%) were also somewhat popular with Maine residents. It is worth noting that almost 10% residents also chose to play handball/racquetball or tennis outdoors.

Team Sports Activities
Less than 12% of Maine residents indicate participating in an outdoor team sports activity within the last year. However, while participation in team sports may be low, viewing or watching an outdoor sports event is popular with over 60% of residents indicating attendance at this type of event.

Mass Markets in Outdoor Recreation
In general, Maine residents are fairly active in the outdoor recreation as compared to the rest of the nation. Residents have fairly high participation rates in most outdoor recreation activities. This is due in part to a combination of abundant recreation resources and a seasonable climate which allows for wide ranging outdoor experiences.

Walking is the single most popular activity, with almost a million participants. The second most popular activity is outdoor family gatherings with over eight hundred thousand participants. Other activities with over half a million participants include gardening, driving for pleasure, picnicking, yard games, visiting a wilderness area, boating, visiting a beach, viewing or photographing natural scenery, wildlife, wildflowers or birds, sightseeing, visiting a nature center, etc, gathering mushrooms, berries, etc visiting historic sites, attending outdoor sports events, and swimming in lakes and streams.

Activities with between a quarter to half a million participants include driving off-road, day hiking, visiting a farm, developed or primitive camping, mountain biking or bicycling, attending outdoor concerts, swimming in a pool, motor-boating, freshwater fishing, visiting other watersides, canoeing, coldwater fishing, snowmobiling, sledding, viewing or photographing fish, and taking boat tours.

Most activities, in general, with under 100 thousand participants include horseback riding, rock climbing, caving, scuba diving, sailing, etc attract few participants, relatively speaking, but these are often niche activities with a small but loyal participant base.
Table Set A: Maine Resident Participation Distribution by Age for Outdoor Recreation Activities. Percentages shown sum across to 100%, though rounding may make the total value differ from 100% exactly.

**Participation Distribution By Age Developed-setting Land Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk for pleasure</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding (any type)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor concerts, plays, etc.</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation Distribution by Age for Viewing/Learning Based Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph natural scenery</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph other wildlife</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph wildflowers, trees, etc.</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit nature centers, etc.</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph birds</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather mushrooms, berries, etc.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit historic sites</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph fish</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit prehistoric/archeological sites</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat tours or excursions</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation Distribution by Age in Water-Based Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in lakes, streams, etc.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating (any type)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a beach</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishing</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit other waterside (besides beach)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwater fishing</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in an outdoor pool</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmwater fishing</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater fishing</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterskiing</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal watercraft</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadromous fishing</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation Distribution by Age for Outdoor Sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor sports events</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participation Distribution by Age for Nature-Based Land Activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit a wilderness or primitive area</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed camping</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a farm or agricultural setting</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive off-road</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (any type)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding on trails</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain climbing</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation Distribution by Age for Snow/Ice-Based Activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Age 16-24 %</th>
<th>Age 25-34 %</th>
<th>Age 35-44 %</th>
<th>Age 45-54 %</th>
<th>Age 55-64 %</th>
<th>Age 65+ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Set B: Maine and New England Outdoor Recreation Participation Figures Ordered by Participation Rates for Activity Types.

**Participation in Nature-based Land Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit a wilderness or primitive area</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a farm or agricultural setting</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed camping</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive off-road</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (any type)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big game hunting</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain climbing</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Game hunting</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding on trails</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory bird hunting</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a wilderness or primitive area</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a farm or agricultural setting</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed camping</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>2,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive off-road (any type)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain climbing</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (any type)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big game hunting</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding on trails</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Game hunting</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory bird hunting</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation in Developed-setting Land Activities

### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk for pleasure</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gathering</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening or landscaping for pleasure</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard games, e.g., horseshoes</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor concerts, plays, etc.</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding (any type)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk for pleasure</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>9,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gathering</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>8,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening or landscaping for pleasure</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>7,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>6,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>6,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard games, e.g., horseshoes</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>5,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor concerts, plays, etc.</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>4,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding (any type)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation in Water-based Activities.

### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in lakes, streams, etc</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating (any type)</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a beach</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in an outdoor pool</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishing</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit other waterside (besides beach)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwater fishing</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmwater fishing</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater fishing</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterskiing</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal watercraft</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadromous fishing</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba diving</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsurfing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in lakes, streams, etc</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>6,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a beach</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating (any type)</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>5,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in an outdoor pool</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit other waterside (besides beach)</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwater fishing</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmwater fishing</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater fishing</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal watercraft</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterskiing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadromous fishing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba diving</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsurfing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation in Snow and Ice-based Activities

#### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snow/ice activities (any type)</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snow/ice activities (any type)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhill skiing</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating outdoors</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiling</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross country skiing</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice fishing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation in Viewing/learning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph natural scenery</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph other wildlife</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit nature centers, zoos, etc.</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph wildflowers, trees, etc.</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather mushrooms, berries, etc.</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit historic sites</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph birds</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph fish</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat tours or excursions</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit prehistoric archeological sites</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caving</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph natural scenery</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>7,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit nature centers, zoos, etc.</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>6,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>6,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit historic sites</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>5,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph wildflowers, trees, etc.</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>5,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph other wildlife</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>5,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph birds</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>4,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather mushrooms, berries, etc.</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat tours or excursions</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View/photograph fish</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>3,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit prehistoric archeological sites</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caving</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation in Outdoor Sports (Individual and Team)

### Maine

#### Type of Sport=Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inline skating</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball or racquetball outdoors</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis outdoors</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Type of Sport=Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor sports events</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball outdoors</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer outdoors</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball outdoors</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New England

#### Type of Sport=Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inline skating</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis outdoors</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball or racquetball outdoors</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Type of Sport=Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
<th>Number of participants (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend outdoor sports events</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>5,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball outdoors</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball outdoors</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer outdoors</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>