

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback		After years of entering comments as a Goodyear citizen, I fail to see a plan for extending the Bike trail that runs from the border of Goodyear all the way to Scottsdale, making a safe space for biker's to go UNDER roadways and keep children safe!! We use to live in Peoria and had no idea that by choosing Goodyear we have to practically give up biking from our home due to the unsafe road conditions. There is an intersection accident weekly, or a biker getting hit on the Goodyear roads continuously, which could be avoided if Goodyear would step it up and match the other towns commitment to providing a safe trail. Why doesn't Goodyear pick up where it ends and extend it through Goodyear over to Buckeye and have them pick it up from there. Why is this never a priority for Goodyear? It's a disgrace to all Goodyear citizens and the children who grow up here. I never imagined I would prefer living in Peoria over Goodyear. Disappointing!					Thank you for reaching out about the bike trail expansion in Goodyear, AZ. Bike Trails are within City of Goodyear limits, it is out of Maricopa County Park System. We encourage you to reach out to City of Goodyear to discuss your ideas/concerns.
Public Feedback		While the new park at 56th St and Montgomery Rd is being developed please keep in mind the traffic flow. We live off Lone Mountain in Desert Wind subdivision and the speed is 45 mph much higher than any other streets north and south of us. People drive 50-55 mph and there have been too many accidents already due to the many access streets. If it can play into the Plans for traffic control for this park, it would be conscientious to have the speed limit changed to 35mph on Lone Mountain from Cave Creek road to 56th St. Thank you for your consideration.					Thank you for reaching out about traffic concerns during development near the Desert Wind subdivision. This area is within City limits, it is out of Maricopa County Park System. We encourage you to reach out to the City to discuss your ideas/concerns.
Public Feedback			Just overall feedback for the executive summary is that there is too much text. For public communication the information needs to be concise.				Thank you for your feedback about the length of text in the executive summary.
Public Feedback					pp 96-7: I love the idea for Nature Outreach, and would suggest trail work as an additional activity in this area. Trail work provides a unique lens to learn about nature, and through such programming we could teach newcomers the "why" and "how" of caring for our beloved trails -- establishing a sense of responsibility and highlighting the importance of a reciprocal relationship with the land + wildlife from the beginning of kids' time in the outdoors.		Thank you for your suggestion on the nature outreach. We have a goal to strengthen volunteer participation and training to offset operating costs and add value to the visitor experience.
Public Feedback				Clear descriptions of the background.			Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					The plan looks appropriate, protecting open areas, providing opportunities to access open and wild areas, and keeping wild areas wild is important to me.		Thank you for your feedback. We are continuing our development for a comprehensive land use, open space, trails, and wildlife corridor that provide opportunities and protect wildlife.
Public Feedback						Clear information. I focused on the area in which I live and recreate most often. I live in the Northeast section and I am pleased with the plan for my area.	Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback			Images were very fuzzy and docile to see the plans. Overall the graphics were nice with key themes easily understood.				Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback				Explosive growth still anticipated? Would like to hear more about innovative efforts that are being taken to conserve water. As seen in the data (example: lake pleasant most desired and pleasing experience) water features are a major feature / compelling driver for people to want to engage with these areas. It's only going to increase in demand with climate change and projected overall hotter / longer timespan of hotter days.			Thank you for your feedback on innovation efforts to meet population growth and water supply.
Public Feedback					I'm surprised more isn't being done to improve the experience at lake pleasant. The satisfaction rate has not gone up much compared to other key parks' satisfaction increases. Why is this? Also how is the chip plant going to impact this park? I would like to hear more about this. We know the have a pipeline directly to this lake and are planning to recycle a lot of water. How is this anticipated to impact the park? Overall I am surprised to not see more plans in the north area given the explosive growth that is already happening, and only anticipated to increase, due to the chip plant and other technology / commercial and residential growth anticipated for this area. It is also the corridor to the North. If you want to increase funds from tourism, consider prioritizing more attractions in the north area that are easier to access from northern AZ. Visitors from these areas don't want to spend an extra 1+ hrs commuting across Phoenix to get to a different park destination - especially with the increase in traffic congestion.		Thank you for your feedback. Additional experience improvements for Lake Pleasant Regional Park will be reviewed during the upcoming Park Master Plan update. Water supply for corporations is established with City officials. It is out of Maricopa county Park System scope.
Public Feedback			Overall plan looks good and seems to have solid priorities. I would ask that some budgeting dollars be set aside for enforcement of regulations so that residents can truly enjoy the Parks. For example, I frequent Lake Pleasant a lot and there are always people with blaring music, glass bottles (leaving lots of debris), unleashed animals and other antisocial behavior. It would be good if we could enforce existing regulations better and allow all residents to enjoy the beauty of our parks.				Thank you for your suggestion to enforce regulations within Maricopa County Park system. Our Park Master Plan studies park laws and rule enforcement models with the Sheriff office and a potential Law Enforcement Ambassador program to assist with rule and law education and enforcement.
Public Feedback			I'd like to provide feedback on the Park Vision plan with a specific emphasis on the critical importance of employee training and retention and competitive salaries. It appears that the plan lacks any mention of employee training and retention, both of which are crucial for enhancing the public's park experience. To ensure the long-term success of our parks and elevate the visitor experience, it is paramount to prioritize employee training and retention within the Park Vision plan. These strategies should be comprehensive and include: 1. Ongoing Training Programs: Develop and implement regular training programs to enhance the skills and knowledge of our employees. These programs should be tailored to address the evolving needs of our parks and visitor expectations. 2. Recognition and Incentives: Recognize and reward employees for their dedication, performance, and years of service. Implement incentive programs that motivate staff to stay engaged and contribute their best efforts. 3. Mentorship and Succession Planning: Establish mentorship programs to facilitate knowledge transfer from experienced employees to newer ones. Additionally, create succession plans to ensure a smooth transition of responsibilities as employees near retirement. 4. Positive Work Environment: Foster a positive and inclusive work environment that encourages teamwork, innovation, and employee satisfaction. Happy and motivated employees are more likely to stay and excel in their roles. 5. Professional Development: Offer opportunities for continuous learning and professional growth. This not only benefits employees but also enhances the overall quality of services provided to the public. 6. Competitive Salaries: Ensure that the salaries offered to our employees are competitive with those in similar roles within city parks or other relevant sectors. Competitive salaries are vital for attracting and retaining top talent. By emphasizing employee training and retention strategies in the Park Vision plan, we can not only address the current challenges but also pave the way for a brighter future for our parks, ensuring they continue to thrive and provide an exceptional experience for the public. Thank you for your consideration.				Thank you for addressing your concerns regarding employee retention. Our Park Master Plan studies a plan to ensure employees can improve/grow their skills for advancement1
Agency Feedback	Tempe Gov					I'm wondering if there is room for "regional opportunities" (highlighted in yellow) that should be identified by a red symbol at our northern borders, connections with Rio Salado multi-modal path, possible improvements along Mill Avenue and connections at Indian Bend Wash at Scottsdale/Tempe border.	Thank you for providing feedback and giving us an opportunity to update our records with a new graphic. We will request an updated map that identifies the red symbol at northern borders.
Public Feedback			I am a king-time patron (over 40 years, many as an annual pass holder). Please pay your rangers and supervisors a decent salary and restore the staffing to at least one full-time Ranger per park.				Thank you for your feedback. Our Park Master Plan shows County working with Innovation Studio to develop a staffing strategy, including support models and tools for forecasting staffing needs

Survey Responses Received							Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback					As a professional Software Developer and Big Data Systems student, I am curious about the nature of the use of artificial intelligence on page 120. In such preliminary stages, the nature of how new technologies will be implemented is often quite unclear. I admire the commitment to use the most powerful tools available to carry out a stated mission as effectively and efficiently as possible. Still, without details about what specific patterns and decisions are planned to be monitored and carried out by a machine learning model, the use of the term to represent the intention to use advanced software comes across as a desperate attempt to leverage the current zeitgeist by cramming in AI as a buzzword. To be clear, the nature of preserving land over generational time spans is complex and intricate. It would be best executed in a manner that leverages some form of neural network to gather and process large amounts of data on Maricopa County regional park lands over both immediate and indefinitely long time scales to recommend and, perhaps in the future, perform changes to policy and the execution thereof to improve outcomes of daily individual guest experiences and the long-term preservation of the lands under its stewardship. The issue is with the messaging surrounding its use, which, in a lengthy master plan document that is publicly available but sparsely viewed, needs to use language reflecting the entire detail of the intentions behind the goals it sets forth, especially when it comes to emergent and exponentially progressive new technologies that are fundamentally misunderstood by the general public, and which would require the oversight of an industry expert from a field that does not commonly overlap with that of those whose work is reflected in said document. Experts must be brought into the loop before the public so that they can adequately inform the people of the intended use of these technologies, and their advice needs to be as clearly laid out as the methodologies for public opinion sampling laid out earlier in the document so that the general public can as fully as possible understand the intent behind the implementation of these technologies, and the reasons behind the necessity of their implementation, along with reassurances that said implementation is being carried out by those who most fully understand those new technologies which the general public still lacks a sufficient understanding of.		Thank you for your feedback, Our Park Master Plan continues to expand future technology and artificial intelligence (AI) to provide direct services to visitors through online sales and automated entrance machines, including entrance passes, annual pass renewals, program notifications, parking availability, etc. Additional technology opportunities will be explored with our County Office of Information Technology.
Public Feedback			I am a volunteer and spend much time at Skyline. I would like to know the LT plans for the White Tanks. The Master Plan data was not helpful.				Thank you for your feedback. Our Park Master Plan will address the LT Plans for White Tank.
Agency Feedback	City of Scottsdale					Within Appendix C – Regional Plans (page 193-figure 15) identifies "Gap Analysis Opportunities" within Scottsdale. The base map used is the Bikeways & Crossings map (page 164) from the Scottsdale General Plan 2023, you might consider using the Trails & Trailheads map from the Scottsdale General Plan 2023 (page 139). The Gap Analysis Opportunities identified as #1 and #2 on the map may already be resolved in light of the Trails & Trailhead map or the narrative description of the gaps could be redrafted to read "Through public and private development, create and improve upon the planned trails that are identified within the Scottsdale General Plan 2023 Trails & Trailheads map". scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/General+Plan/2035/Ratified_AsAmended/2035+Full+Doc.pdf	Thank you for providing feedback and giving us an opportunity to update our records with a new graphic. We will use map from website noted in your response (scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/General+Plan/2035/Ratified_AsAmended/2035+Full+Doc.pdf) to update graphic.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Acknowledgements page - Replace "Maricopa County Flood Control District" with "Flood Control District of Maricopa County"					Thank you for your feedback. Our Maricopa County team will update Acknowledgement page with corrected naming of government entities.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page v - The Bureau of Reclamation uses "Reclamation" instead of "BOR." Consider replacing "BOR" with "Reclamation" throughout the document. Replace "MCFCD" with "FCDMC" (please do a search in the document)					Thank you for your feedback. Our Maricopa County team will update page v. with corrected naming of government entities.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 1, first paragraph, third line - The addition of Vulture Mountains added about 70,000 more acres. The total should be 190,000 instead of 120,000.					Thank you for your feedback. Maricopa County only acquired 1,000 acres through a lease. The overall management of the area is still being determined.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 25, first line - Try to eliminate the widowed line at the top. There is a huge amount of white space on page 24 below the org chart.					Thank you for your feedback. Our Maricopa County team will update white space on page 24.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 48, Climate Change - Suggest incorporating 2023 data for number of excessive heat days.					Thank you for your feedback. The data included is though 2022 which coincides with multiple timelines throughout the plan. If updated then all timelines will require adjustment.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 54, Park Inventory -The number of acres shone is before Vulture Mountain was added to the system.					Thank you for your feedback. Maricopa County only acquired 1,000 acres through a lease. The overall management of the area is still being determined.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 89, Most Important Challenges - Replace "%" with "percent" to be consistent with the other four bullets.					Thank you for your feedback. Our Maricopa County team will update the use of "%" to remain consistent.
Agency Feedback	MCDOT	Page 119, Goal 5.5 - The spacing for the first line is too close to the text above it. May have been a conversion issue to pdf. Consider a page break to put it with the objectives for the goal.					Thank you for your feedback. Our Maricopa County team will update narrow space on page 119.
Public Feedback			Please continue to preserve and expand our regional parks!				Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback		Thank you for planning long range for the Maricopa Park System. Gems, to be sure! I live near the San Tan Mountain Regional Park and have been an annual member since moving here in 2017.I am wondering about the increasing population that is expected because of the new homes being built just outside the south entrance. What improvements are being planned to accommodate the likely increasing participants.Will there be improvements to the Interpretive Trail? Perhaps a longer trail, signage, more benches, other? Thanks again for your work on this park system!					Thank you for your feedback. Our Park Master Plan will address improvement ideas at San Tan Mountain Regional Park.
Public Feedback					The reason I initially became involved in park development was to promote more dog parks in the greater Phoenix area, as well as in state parks. With the growing population of humans there comes a growing population of pets that come with them. At this time, dog parks in Phoenix are few and far between and require miles of driving for some of us to get to them. We love the outdoors and walk our dogs on many of the current trails, however, it is always nice to have a place for them to run free and socialize. Perhaps I missed it, but I didn't see any plans to develop more dog park areas. Please do give this some consideration. Thank you!		Thank you for your feedback, Dog Parks/Pet Friendly development could be addressed during future Park Master Planning
Public Feedback					My feedback concerns two sentences mentioned in the New River Mesa Area section. I believe this paragraph can be found on page 123 of the Draft Plan. It states: "The New River Mesa Area is a unique opportunity to provide a regional gateway park into one of the southmost boundaries of the Tonto Nat'l Forest"..... and continues with these two questionable sentences:"To the west, Daisy Mountain (ASLD) provides trails, and south of the property is the MT. Both provide connections between the New River and Desert Hills communities." 1) At this time there are NO sanctioned trails on Daisy Mountain. The county applied for a trail easement (several years ago). It was denied by ASLD. There are many social trails. An ASLD permit is required to hike on their property, as I understand. 2) Currently there are NO trails that connect the Maricopa Trail (MT) to Daisy Mountain and the New River community. The MT does have a connection to the Desert Hills community. I am a member of The Friends of Daisy Mountain Trails (FDMT) a 501c3 not for profit. We have worked to acquire a trail easement on Daisy Mountain with little success. Please consider reworking these two sentences to avoid misinformation. Better yet encourage ASLD to grant a Daisy Mountain trail easement to the County.		Thank you for your feedback. We will make corrections to page 108
Public Feedback					I'd like to see Maricopa county residents given priority over out of state residents when booking campsites. We love to camp at the regional parks on weekends but can rarely find a campsite available in the fall, winter, and spring due to the high number of out-of-state visitors. If we do find a site available it is usually 4+ weeks out. Not everyone can plan that far in advance because of work and kid's ever changing sport schedules.		Thank you for your feedback. This will be considered in our future fee analysis

Survey Responses Received							Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback	
Public Feedback			I find it interesting that in the Public Outreach Responses, the public felt that only \$14 of their \$100 should go to developing new regional parks, yet the plan appears to place a high priority on acquiring and managing new parklands and corridors. This seems like an inconsistency. Are we taking what the citizens want at face value or just acknowledging it and moving on with what MPRD WANTS to do?				Thank you for your feedback. The question contains multiple components. One, included \$14 developing new regional park and one included \$22 for acquiring/protecting new open space. The two combined equals \$36 for acquisition and development of new parks. White Tank Mountain Conservancy is referenced in 3.2.2 (page 110). Chapter 3 comments can be further evaluated in individual Park Master Plan updates. Objective 3.1.4 "the additional and priority of new sites will be determined and dependent of population growth and other factors."	
Public Feedback				Chapter 2, p.28 on Corridors and Connections- Given that some very specific work is being done on connectivity in parks, I would recommend that this be placed specifically into the Plan. I am of course referring to the Wildlife Linkage from the White Tank Mountains to the public lands to the west. In Chapter 2, p. 28 Community Enhancement is listed in two sections; first in Conservation, Community Enhancement, and Invasive Species, and then in Community Enhancement and Restorations. I believe the first sections should remain as Conservation and Community Enhancement and be rewritten to really address the ideas for Conservation and Community Enhancement. Invasive Species should be moved to the following section and that section should be called Invasive Species and Restorations and the discussion on invasives should be in this sections.				Thank you for your feedback. White Tank Mountain Conservancy is referenced in 3.2.2 (page 110). Language in Corridors and Connections, and Community Enhancement sections will be updated.
Public Feedback				Chapter 3. In the benchmarking sections there is a fair amount of information on trends for youth (6-24). This section highlights the importance of young people (18-24) and their recreational activities (pp. 41 & 43) hiking, running, biking. Given this information I hope that this informs where the CIP dollars for the next years will be spent. For 2017-2021 the focus was on Ramanda's, camp host sites, campground development, boat house and docks (lots of money spent on building structures. To support this group, more money should be spent on trails, water fountains, shade, parking lots and road improvements for cycling through the parks, in other words, less focus on structure development and more on park enhancements. A refocus on this would actually have the trends inform resource allocation in our parks. s and apply it to where resources spending can be focused. While I am aware that camp grounds and RVs/ramadas BRING revenues in, they also cost a lot more than trail improvements, water fountains and creating safe road cycling conditions in the parks. Additionally, your p. 66 and 72 on behavior and top priorities note that visitors want to hike, walk and have a passive recreation experience.				Thank you for your feedback. Chapter 3 comments can be further evaluated in individual Park Master Plan updates.
Public Feedback				Chapter 2, p.28 Community Enhancement is listed in two sections; first in Conservation, Community Enhancement, and Invasive Species, and then in Community Enhancement and Restorations. I believe the first sections should remain as Conservation and Community Enhancement and be rewritten to really address the ideas for Conservation and Community Enhancement. Invasive Species should be moved to the following section and that section should be called Invasive Species and Restorations and the discussion on invasives should be in this sections.				Thank you for your feedback. Language in Corridors and Connections, and Community Enhancement sections will be updated.
Public Feedback				Benchmarking our trail miles and parks acreage (Fig 48,49 & 50) to population and other communities is an old metric. The Trust for Public Lands has begun to look more at accessibility and distance to a park/trail. Just having miles or numbers spread out over a general population does not really speak to equitable access. Consider looking at newer standards for evaluating trails/ parks and equitable access. (you have this in one of the graphics p. 26). Given the types of parks the system has, this is more relevant metric. Additionally, the trails system we have (Maricopa and the internal trails) are very different from the other state/county parks/trails systems. Trust me I visited many you listed this year. They are all different and it is a slippery slope to just throw up numbers as a comparative.				Thank you for your feedback. The maps included coincides with multiple timelines throughout the plan. If updated then all timelines will require adjustment.
Public Feedback					I support priorities 1, 2, 4 & 5, but have a concern about the focus on Priority 3 that places emphasis on acquiring new parklands on the edges of the County, specifically on Big Horn, Verde River and Harquahala. I would suggest that the County really look at the population growth within the County in these areas to determine if spending funds for acquisition in this area improves access and recreational opportunities for a significant amount of Maricopa County residents. In other acquisition areas (Table Mesa) do we really want to try and acquire and manage areas such as this that do not align with the user experience our visitors say they want.			Thank you for your feedback on population and agree. Objective 3.1.4 states "the addition and priority of new sites will be determined and dependant on population growth and other factors."
Public Feedback	Archaeology Southwest					Page 186: GILA BEND The final sentence currently reads: Painted Rock State Park is located on the northwestern edge of the planning area and is administered by Arizona State Parks. The corrected sentence should read: Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground is located on the northwestern edge of the planning area and is administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Weblink for verification: https://www.blm.gov/visit/painted-rock-petroglyph-campground Accessed: 10/7/2023		Thank you for your feedback. The text will be updated.
Public Feedback	Archaeology Southwest					Page 186: OPPORTUNITIES The first sentence in the second bullet currently reads: The potential to expand incorporates approximately 84,000 acres of BLM land in the area if legislation (HR 1348) is approved by Congress in the future. Corrected sentence: The potential to expand incorporates nearly 377,000 acres of BLM land in the area if legislation (HR 8719) is approved by Congress in the future.		Thank you for your feedback. We will update Park Master Plan with updated HR8719.
Public Feedback		I'm not sure people had an adequate opportunity to review the draft. Early events Monday, November 8th, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. Wednesday, November 10th, 2021 at 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. Online form was available from November 8 – December 31, 2021 Since April 2022, there were emails and presentation recordings on the Maricopa County Parks Vision 2030 Stakeholder Meeting 7/28/2022 10:54 AM Email from the MC planner that included the statement "You can now expect to receive updates more regularly as we get closer to releasing the draft plan for public review later this fall." After that - I saw nothing until .. Tuesday, September 12, 2023 2:17 PMv - I think the last email on the vision.						Thank you for your feedback. Regular updates were provided at the Public Park Commission meetings.

Survey Responses Received							Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback		I like the focus. The PV 2030 focuses on looking outside existing park boundaries and expanding the lens to include park and open space opportunities across the County to serve best the needs of current and future generation					Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback				Page 14 CONNECTED LANDSCAPES AND TRAILS includes the phrase "significantly enhancing the open space system's ecological viability and connecting our communities." Comment: I believe this should include connection the New River community to the MC trail system using New River Kiwanis Community Park (which is a county park).			Thank you for your feedback. Landscapes and Trails will be addressed in the Maricopa Trails and Pathway 2.0.
Public Feedback				Page 20 – seems to show the population shrinking north of Anthem. With all the planned development, I think this is an error; please check or explain.			Thank you for your feedback. The maps projecting Anthem, AZ was provided by MAG.
Public Feedback				Page 108 –New River Mesa Area (USFS) section says: The New River Mesa Area is a unique opportunity to provide a regional gateway park into one of the southernmost boundaries of the Tonto National Forest. The USFS manages the area with limited use due to the few trail connections into the greater Tonto National Forest. Still, it features a pristine Sonoran Desert environment against a mountain backdrop. To the west, Daisy Mountain (ASLD) provides trails, and south of the property is the MT. Both provide connections between the New River and Desert Hills communities. Comment: New River Mesa appears closer to Spur Cross and seems north of the Cave Creek Regional Park. Both already have connections to USFS so I'm not clear on what this "regional gateway park" would improve. Noting that Daisy Mountain is to the west of NR Mesa may be true but there's no current way for a connection. In addition, Daisy Mountain does not provide trails. The trails that look like they exist are "social" illegal trails and therefore should not be promoted in this plan. At this time, there is only a potential trail that the county has lease application submitted with ASLD on file.			Thank you for your feedback. Maricopa Trails and Pathway 2.0 will review New River Mesa connections.
Public Feedback				Page 26 shows much of NR within 10 miles of Lake Pleasant, Cave Creek RP, and Spur Cross Comment: This may not be accurate for actually access distance. The Park may be within 10 on the north side but that is usually closed (and off a dirt road that goes through an active shooting area. – Likewise, Cave Creek Regional Park and Spur Cross are not within 10 miles via roads.			Thank you for your feedback. Landscapes and Trails will be addressed in the Maricopa Trails and Pathway 2.0.
Public Feedback				Page 83 says. There are also significant opportunities to connect communities with the Maricopa Trail to help improve regional connectivity Comment: Great idea but I don't see how the plan supports the 2019 Daisy Mountain – New River Plan that on pages 44 – 45 "Transportation Issue 3: Bike Facilities and Equestrian Trails" that includes a strategy to: • Identify a network of roadways and multi-use trails throughout the community that link people to a larger regional multi-use system (i.e. Maricopa Trail) and locally to community facilities such as Kiwanis Park and schools."			Thank you for your comments. Maricopa Trails and Pathway 2.0 will review New River Mesa connections.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES, Page 28 - Habitat blocks are mentioned for the first time in the second paragraph. The Department recommends adding, "areas of existing unfragmented habitat" after habitat blocks, and in the third paragraph, adding, "the lands surrounding parks and open space, may contain wildlife corridors that connect to these spaces". Please add that these corridors provide for wildlife movement, immigration, emigration, re-colonization, gene flow, seasonal migration, and population movements in response to environmental factors.			Thank you for your feedback. The text will be updated
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Corridors and Connections, Page 28 - Specifically, the Department recommends removing the following language "habitat blocks, allowing the flow of genetics, biodiversity, and wildlife between them.", and replacing the language with "habitat blocks, maintaining wildlife connectivity, genetic flow, and providing for biodiversity." Further in this Section., the Department Recommends incorporating language specific to identifying wildlife corridors and maintaining wildlife connectivity across the landscape during planning efforts for development and transportation corridors. The Department believes a balance can be achieved that maintains wildlife connectivity, while balancing the economic and public safety needs for future development and transportation needs, and Department staff remain available to assist in identifying opportunities to maintain wildlife connectivity during planning efforts.			Thank you for your feedback. The text will be updated
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Community enhancement and restoration, Page 29 - The Department recommends replacing "In addition, planting native plants with seeds will help the areas recover and provide soil stabilization.", with "In addition, revegetation with plants native to the area will help the area recover and provide soil stabilization."			Thank you for your feedback. The text will be updated
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Chapter 3 - Trends and Benchmarking: outdoor recreation, Page 36- The Department recommends incorporating Hunting and other outdoor recreation trend information into the planning document. Hunting, as an example is an important contribution to the local economy. A national survey of fishing, hunting, and wildlife-associated recreation has been conducted about every five years since 1955 to evaluate national trends. The survey provides information on the number of participants in fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching (observing, photographing, and feeding wildlife), and the amount of time and money spent on these activities. Further, in 2022, state resident and nonresidents spent \$9.8 billion on fishing, hunting, watchable wildlife and other outdoor related recreation in Arizona (USFWS 2022) supporting 18,220 jobs statewide. These economic benefits illustrate that conserving habitat and corridors for wildlife populations is also good for business in the County (excerpt AGFD 2011).			Thank you for your Feedback. Fishing and hunting is address in Chapters 3 and 4 of our Park Master Plan.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Objective 1.1.2 strategies, Page 95 - Please include coordination with the Arizona Game and Fish Department on outdoor recreation opportunities.			Thank you for your Feedback. AZ Game and Fish is a member of the North Valley Outdoor Network and will be invited in coordination efforts. AZ Game and Fish will be a stakeholder in any regional planning efforts.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Goal 2.3 Promote and expand the regional trails, Objective 2.3.1, Page 102 - The Department recommends including collaboration with the Department on priorities for wildlife connectivity, outdoor recreation, future planning efforts and potential funding sources.			Thank you for your Feedback. AZ Game and Fish is a member of the North Valley Outdoor Network and will be invited in coordination efforts. AZ Game and Fish will be a stakeholder in any regional planning efforts.

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Section 3. The Importance of acquiring and managing new parklands and corridors - Recommendations - Protect regional park buffers and establish wildlife corridors, Page 104-105 - The Department recommends incorporating language regarding wildlife corridors that includes discussion of identifying, conserving, and/or enhancing existing corridors through the establishment of buffers and increased open space to provide for movement and permeability of wildlife habitats into and through those areas. With varying land ownership in the County, a collaborative approach would be beneficial to ensure these connections. On page 105, in the bullet titled: Protect Regional Park Buffers and Establish Wildlife Corridors: the Department recommends using the words "identifying and maintaining" versus "establish" .			Thank you for your Feedback. The text will be updated. Your feedback is address in more details in our strategies. The lands identified on the map are BLM and USFS property.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Partner with federal and state agencies to manage increased recreation participation threatening natural and cultural resources, Page 104 - The Department recommends identifying opportunities and partnerships with land owners beyond the BLM, including state (ASLD, AZGFD) and other federal agencies (USFWS). Additionally, the Department recommends the County consider developing agreements or other instruments with identification of priorities and goals in areas of mutual interest.			Thank you for your Feedback. Partnership is addressed in 5.1.4.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Goal 3.1; objective 3.1.1: expand partnerships with BLM and USFS, Page 107 - In regards to expanding outdoor recreation opportunities, the Department recommends expanding the partnership to ASLD, USFWS, and AZGFD as well as BLM and USFS.			Thank you for your Feedback. Partnership is addressed in 5.1.4.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Objective 3.1.2: identify acquisition, Page 108 - As Maricopa County explores the acquisition of lands identified on page 108, the Department would appreciate early coordination on the management framework and development of any future plans that can impact outdoor recreational opportunities, including hunting opportunity, and wildlife management priorities.			Thank you for your Feedback. AZ Game and Fish will be a stakeholder in any regional planning efforts.
Agency Feedback	ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT			Goal 3.2: Refine and prioritize linear parks and connected landscapes - Objective 3.2.2. Page 110 - Regarding Objective 3.2.2: Participate in establishing wildlife corridors: The Department recommends removing the word "establishing" and replacing with "identifying and maintaining". Further the Department requests collaboration in identification of wildlife corridors, and coordination on priorities for management activities associated with maintaining connectivity. The Department has several planning tools available to assist and Department staff can provide special expertise and guidance on maintaining and conserving connectivity across the landscape.			Thank you for your feedback. The text will be updated. AZ Game and Fish is a member of the North Valley Outdoor Network and will be invited in coordination efforts. AZ Game and Fish will be a stakeholder in any regional planning efforts.
Public Feedback		Acknowledgements Page: Could you include the park planning intern names? They dedicated approximately 10 hours/week for at least 4 months each to research associated with benchmarking, trends, river corridors and more. There are parts of the report that were written by them. Names: Travis Lundell, Lucas Jensen, Ajdin Spahic, Cole Hunger					Thank you for your feedback. Names will be incorporated in document.
Public Feedback				Chapter 2 pg. 23 – Language – why was the total percentage of those who have Limited English Proficiency not listed? The percentage is approximately 6.26%. This is important for people to be aware of especially when utilizing federal funds that may require compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.			Thank you for your feedback. The PV 2030 reflects that 20.4 percent of the County's population speaks Spanish. Of those who speak Spanish, 32.8 percent speak English less than very well, with most being 65 or older. Thus, a deduction is made that 32.8 percent speak English less than very well, greater than or equaling "Limited English Proficiency."
Public Feedback				Chapter 3 - For the entry fee chart in the benchmarking chapter it lists parks departments but includes lakes and other facilities, but does not state if the other regional parks in the system are free to enter. Please include if other regional parks in these systems are no charge.			Thank you for your feedback. See Figure 56 on page 63 of Park Master Plan.
Public Feedback				Chapter 4 Outreach Pg 74. – Add Parks Vision 2030 in front of Public Outreach Feedback Form (important as this was the key survey conducted specific to public outreach for this plan).			Thank you for your feedback. The "Public Outreach Feedback Form Results" fall within the heading section "Parks Vision 2030 Planning Outreach" beginning on page 73.
Public Feedback				Chapter 4 Pg. 75 – In the Activities section where the question on the survey was regarding the "top activities, they would participate in at a Maricopa County Park," It should be noted that park concessionaire programs only came in at 5.1% and 18 activities had rated higher (the only activity that came in lower was a water park/slide at 4.1%). With trail hiking coming in at 62.2% and the next highest activity was mountain biking & walking at 22.3% and 21% respectively, it is clear that there are higher priorities for activities outside of concessionaires.			Thank you for your feedback. As our Department does not have enough financial or staffing resources, concessionaires are a creative way to supplement most of the 18 activities listed.
Public Feedback				Chapter 4 Pg 76 – why are the responses for the prioritizing improvements to trails, amenities, and actions not just showing up as priorities 1, 2, and 3. It's confusing that 5 is the best and doesn't accurately represent the results. I realize the way the question was written but I think it would help if it just identified the top results as 1,2,3. It does not make sense when there is no #1 or #2 like in the two tables on page 77.			Thank you for your feedback. Adjustments will be made to graphs and additional language added for clarity.
Public Feedback				Chapter 4 Pg 78- should add a bullet to give a summary on the income level of who completed the survey, similar to how it was explained for the other demographic questions. Ex: The majority of respondents who answered the income question made over \$100,000. Those who make under \$75,000 only represented X%. (There is an issue with the income ranges, they do not go in order and there is a "0" missing from between \$100,000-\$150,000).			Thank you for your feedback. Adjustments will be made to tables.
Public Feedback				Chapter 4 Pg. 82 – was it 200 stakeholders or 135? The paragraph has both listed.			Thank you for your feedback. Will correct to 135 stakeholders
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Request to increase font size of the goals so it's easier to see what objectives/strategies relate to each goal.		Thank you for your suggestion.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Add more goals relating to public safety and investing in technology and other means to increase safety for visitors in the parks, such as ensuring each park has a secondary means of access. Parks that are remote without cell access should include signage to let trail users know in advance regarding the potential to lose service.		Thank you for your feedback. Access issues will be addressed in individual Park Master Plan updates.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Include more goals & strategies to address accessibility in the parks as well as striving for compliance with ADA and the Architectural Barriers Act.		Thank you for your feedback. Our department aims to fund in Fiscal Year 2025 a systemwide ADA compliance analysis, including a recommended implementation plan.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Need more on environmental and cultural resource protections including coordination with Native American tribes.		Thank you for your feedback. We agree. Environmental and cultural protections will be addressed in individual Park Master Plan updates. Tribal consultation is also included in cultural resource surveys for development projects. Parks will continue to reach out to Tribal governments and communities.

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Need more goals on developing an online interactive mapping tools as the public expressed this as the #1 way the department could improve visitor experience. Use the online mapping tools as a way to educate the public about the parks and promote environmental stewardship.		Thank you for your feedback. Survey Monkey's survey asked, "rate the importance of each of the following when prioritizing actions to improve the visitor experience." However, the survey did not ask how MCRPD was performing the actions. Mapping is addressed in our Natural Resource Plan, and we plan to continue updating our GIS capabilities.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 92 -are there 14 or 12 regional parks?		Thank you for your question. There are 14 regional parks.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Vision Statement – add exceptional "parks, trails, and" open spaces for current and future generations.		Thank you for your feedback. The "Vision Statement" is the vision statement of the system plan, not the Department vision statement, which is what is referenced in the comment provided.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg. 93 – trends are discussed but there is no mention of disc golf. Parks Commissioner Stapley had requested the County review opportunities for disc golf as he had seen people "waiting in line" and playing disc golf in a retention basin in Mesa.		Thank you for your feedback. Chapter 3 addresses national trends. Trends will be taken into consideration with individual Park Master Plan updates.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 94. - Stakeholders had discussed creating a group to help establish funding for parks, trails, and open space. Instead, the strategy identified includes an annual meeting to set up a Recreation Industry partnership. Why is there such a big focus on the recreation industry and doesn't the AZ APRA annual conference cover this? I don't think the County should be spending government resources on expanding opportunities for industries, even if they are recreational in nature.		Thank you for your feedback. There is one objective to work with the recreation and tourism industry. The focus is to increase the opportunities through the industries, such as making them aware of the unique experiences in the County's backyard. It will bring revenue to the communities and enhance the communities' recreation offerings. AZ APRA does not do this. Goals and strategies under Priority 5 also address partnership opportunities for collaborative funding.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 No matter what, with an entry fee you are denying the ability of those who are less fortunate to be able to access the parks. With parks, recreation, trails, and open space being so critical, even identified as essential during the pandemic, shouldn't we be covering the operating cost of the parks from the county's general budget and not through entry fees which disproportionately adversely impact those with less income. a. In general, the operating budget is much lower than most other parks departments and even studies from the public have shown they favor more help from the county general funds. b. The Parks Department's 2017 fee study with 1,112 responses found that: • 89% disagreed that "park user fees should pay for all of the park's operation and maintenance costs with no funding coming from Maricopa County". Only 2.61% strongly agreed. • With the statement that "Maricopa County Regional Parks should be funded by Maricopa County" 83% agreed with only 2.26% strongly disagreeing. • 89% also agreed that "entrance fees should be kept at a minimum to encourage use of regional parks" and only 1.53% strongly disagreeing. c. I am concerned that the Parks Department has put such high importance on attaining 100% of the operating budget being covered by user fees, especially as it is not consistent with the findings above in the 2017 MCRPD Fee Study.		Thank you for your feedback. MCRPD's 2018-2019 Visitor Survey: A total of 1,427 of the 2,204 onsite visitors took an offsite survey. Of the 1,427, 119 visitors returned the mailbox questionnaire, and 365 visitors returned the email questionnaire. The offsite questionnaire is the survey that asked about the "Management and user fee issues in the Maricopa County Parks System." There is not a 2017 MCRPD Fee Study; however, in the document, there is a reference to using the MCRPD 2018-2019 Visitor study in particular: "A majority of respondents felt that the current entrance fee is a good value for the benefits. About 50 percent of respondents also felt that entrance fees could be increased occasionally to keep up with inflation but should still be kept to a minimum. Only 40 percent of respondents said they would support a dedicated property tax to support the park system." The recreation opportunities within Maricopa County are not completely the responsibility of Maricopa County. There is a vast shared network of city, state, and federal outdoor experiences, all within a short distance from where individuals live. The key to all of our successes is that we all offer something that park visitors are seeking and work on a regional platform.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg. 94 – branding and awareness campaign goal seems more focused on economic impacts than environmental or social health benefits – It mentions including chambers of commerce, the recreation industry, current and future park concessionaires, and resorts or lodging – it should be noted that the 1965 plan specifically mentioned that no hotels should be in the parks.		Thank you for your feedback. There is no mention of economic impacts in Objective 1.1.1.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 94 – why is objective 1.1.2 listed so early on, again the focus is on economic impacts with "enlist the recreation and tourism industry to strength opportunities". Why is the parks department focusing on them? If the recreation and tourism industry wants to strengthen opportunities they should take the initiative to work with the Parks Department. The focus of the Parks Department should be on researching the needs of the public and visitors and then working towards providing for those needs. An approach simply focusing on revenue generating activities to generate revenue without addressing the key thing park users want to see such as improved GIS maps, ADA accessibility, and helping low-income/underserved groups is a disservice to the public. a. Is it appropriate for the Parks Department to develop an Outdoor Recreation Industry Forum to as the report says, "explore opportunities to advance common goals" when the main goal of private businesses is revenue generation? i. Most of the park lands were acquired utilizing the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. Only non-profit organizations can currently conduct activities on most of the park lands, which is something that should stay the same. ii. What resources would the Parks Department need to establish this recreation industry forum and is that where the focus of the department should be?		Thank you for your feedback. There is no priority order to the goals or objectives. There is no mention of economic impacts in objective. Survey Monkey's survey asked, "rate the importance of each of the following when prioritizing actions to improve the visitor experience." However, the survey did not ask how MCRPD was performing the actions. Many of the actions listed are operational, not system plan actions. For more than 20 years, the Department has conducted regular Visitor surveys to research the needs of the public. A new Park Visitor Survey is scheduled to be completed in the next 18 months. a. Common goals could include things such as better promoting opportunities available in the parks to enhance community awareness. i. Thank you for your feedback ii. Still to be determined.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 96 – Under Objective 1.2.3. bringing underserved communities to nature add a goal of having MCRPD join the AZ Act One Culture Pass program where residents can check out a parks pass from their local library. There are limitations. A household can only get 2 culture passes checked out per month and they have to physically go to their library to get the pass. MCRPD was invited to join the program, which focuses on bringing the arts to everyone, due to the cultural resources that exist in the parks such as petroglyphs (which are prehistoric art).		Thank you for your feedback. This opportunity will be explored.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 97 – Bullet 3 – Regarding the youth pass for 4th grade students, is it necessary that park access includes a "stipulation of giving back to the land (volunteering)"? They are 9-10 years old, not sure if a good idea as most volunteering is labor related.		Thank you for your feedback. Our established MCRPD Junior Ranger program represents this concept and encourages developing a public land ethic versus providing labor.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 97- #2. Add deferred maintenance to first sentence (and take out last sentence of paragraph).		Thank you for your feedback. Addressing maintenance in a timely manner is more effective than addressing maintenance that has been deferred. The priority will be addressing maintenance on a life cycle basis.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 98 – As MCRPD relies on "fees for service" the report states the parks need "perceived value" from "quality facilities and new amenities". While I would argue that's true about quality facilities, I would not say its necessary for new amenities. For the most part people want parking, trails, and bathrooms and they want them maintained. New amenities may be a great added value, but the focus should not be on just adding amenities for revenue generation.		Thank you for your feedback. The entire section 2 speaks to reinvesting, protecting, and continuing to improve our existing park system.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 98 – "Develop standards and guidelines"-the last sentence says "PMP amendments are warranted for specific elements as new development occurs and trends emerge" but the Park Plan Amendment policy should be mentioned and it should be communicated how it works. It should say "proposed" not "occur" as there is a process.		Thank you for your feedback. We will update this sentence.

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 99 –What most people seem to want are trails, parking, and bathrooms. “As PMPs are updated, the planning process should capitalize on opportunities to expand the role of concessionaires in providing and maintaining facilities and opportunities” i. I don’t recall one member of the public commenting that they wanted to see more concessionaires in the parks. There needs to be a stronger focus on the activities that were given higher priorities in the public outreach results.		Thank you for your feedback. The entire Section 2 speaks to reinvesting, protecting, and continuing to improve our existing park system. Concessionaire opportunities are only a small part of the overall recommendation.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 100 –I would prefer to see park rangers in the parks. People should be paid for the work that they are doing in the parks if it is part of the agencies mission and essential services. Volunteers should not serve as substitutes for paid park employees.		Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 100 – I am confused about the need to update all the park plans in the next 2-3 years and wonder what concessionaire opportunities are being pushed through. I am concerned that there is a rush to update the plans simply to be able to include more revenue generating opportunities not because it necessarily needs to happen or that the public wants it.		Thank you for sharing your concern. Updating the Park Master Plans altogether allows for MCPRD to strategically stay more current with trends and development, thus creating efficiencies. Nothing in the plan states “concessionaires opportunities are being pushed through.”
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 100 - explain the access matrix		Access Matrix is an internal operations tool used to determine access from outside the park, entering the park. It evaluates a request through a measuring and evaluation process.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 102- 2nd bullet add “and bike paths” at end of sentence.		Thank you for your feedback. This term is not applied in the current Trails Manual. In addition, Maricopa County Department of Transportation funding cannot be used for separated bike paths.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 105 – “Provide a Future Parklands Acquisition and Development Priority Strategy” – why do new parklands need to generate revenue once development? Why can’t they just be protected to be protected and accessible to the public?		Thank you for your question. The County has determined the best and most sustainable way to ensure a regional system of parks, open spaces, and trails is through a diversified approach as outlined in Priority 5. In some instances, regional opportunities’ acquisition, development, and maintenance can best be sustained through regional partnerships, County funding, and reasonable service fees.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 105 –after WUI include “(where development and undeveloped areas meet)” for the general public to have a better understanding.		Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 104 – Paragraph 5 “Similarity...” add “The Maricopa Association of Governments developed a plan in 1970 Maricopa Open Space Plan that had a map where trails were planned along all the major river corridors”. And add picture of map (or could work on page 110 under Objective 3.2.1)		Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 110 –Objective 3.2.1. “Evaluate rivers, canals, utility and transportation corridors as open spaces and trail opportunities.” Added “transportation” as these are critical corridors for pathway opportunities and are consistent with earlier goals/objectives.		Thank you for your feedback. Multimodal transportation corridors are included in the last sentence of the Objective.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 114 - #5, There is nothing about how funding could help to increase equitable park access.		Thank you for your feedback. The first bullet on page 115 addresses the need to evaluate dedicated funding sources in addition to fees. We also added a strategy to 5.2.1 to develop alternative fee programs for underserved populations.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Page 114- Recommendations – enhance revenue through capacity building at existing parks and facilities – “The construction of significant new projects will help expand existing parks capacity and enhance revenue generating opportunities” What are the new projects?		Thank you for your feedback. To be determined during the development of Park Master Plans.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 114 – “Evaluate the County’s parkland inventory to realize the highest and best use” – this statement includes adding “lodging, cabins, RV and boat storage to the parks” but lodging and hotels were specifically mentioned in the 1965 plan that they should not be included in the parks.		Thank you for your feedback. With that said, a 58-year-old plan (1965) superseded by the 2009 Plan (again in 2014) can expect many updates based on public input, trends, management philosophies, and many other factors. As mentioned in the current system master plan, several statistically valid surveys, focus groups, and survey tools were used to glean the provided recommendations. Our goal is to be responsive to visitor needs while not jeopardizing our mission and vision.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 115- should add more on development impact fees, need to cover improvements to parks and recreation based on growing population especially as population growing in the unincorporated county and the population increases closer to the regional parks and because parks, trails, and open space are essential to people’s quality of life.		Thank you for your feedback. Impact fees will be considered as part of a diversified strategy.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 116 – on “Investments in technology” should add to utilize GIS capabilities, enhance online interactive web-based maps to this section.		Thank you for your recommendation. Your recommendations are operational and already in the works.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 116 – on “Monitor cost containment of overhead as visitation and programs grow” it says that, “Internal overhead should be measured and only grown proportionately to increase revenue and operational allocations”. You might as well add to the entire plan that the only way anything can be accomplished in the parks department is if it creates revenue. Are you operating a public park system or a parks business?		Thank you for your feedback. The objective of monitoring overhead is to ensure new future budget expenditures, regardless of the point of origin, are directed to visitor services and resource protection. Administrative costs should only be proportional with other expenses.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 116- on “attract and retain quality staff” should add training for staff especially in their job-specific roles. Also, MCPRD needs duplication of some roles to ensure quality staffing for members of the public and in order to provide staff members with support from other persons knowledgeable about their specialty. Parks Commissioner Mears had stated at a Commission meeting that he thought the parks department could use a Senior Planner.		Thank you for your feedback. Training will be reviewed as part of our staffing model.
Public Feedback					Add goal to re-establish the Parks Planning and Development (P&D) Division. A document from the 1960’s discussed that the parks department aimed to have 5 park planners on staff. Supposedly, planners were in high demand and hard to find, so they had to hire landscape architects instead.		Thank you for your feedback. We have elected to contract out our planning efforts.
Public Feedback					Add a goal to staff the Planning and Development Department to at least 1990 levels. There were over 10 positions in the Department that supported the Planning and Development in the 1990’s including: i. Assistant Director ii. Planning and Development Superintendent iii. 2 - Planning and Development Supervisors iv. 2 -Landscape Architect II v. 1- Landscape Design II vi. 2 – Landscape Architect I vii. 1- Engineering Tech II viii. 1 - Admin Secretary		Thank you for your feedback. Some thirty years later, we discovered our organization is much more efficient as structured. In addition, the positions during that time were needed as we were still designing facilities in-house, and the Department was successful in bond issuance, thus the need to manage multiple park improvements. Currently, it is much more proficient for us to work with contracts that have designers and engineers not limited to just civil and landscape.
Public Feedback					Chapter 4 The #1 opportunity identified in the Strength, Weaknesses, opportunities, and Threats analysis was more “Proactive planning for trails, maintenance, administration, and interpretive programs”. The department will have a better chance at success and being a leader for park planning and conservation efforts if planners work there.		Thank you for your feedback. We feel that we are making great strides in our efforts.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 117 – Please explain more about the “Federal Appropriations for Partnerships Projects from the Southern Nevada model)		Thank you for your feedback. We will clarify.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Page 118 – under “Objective 5.1.3: Manage and expand the regional trail system” a strategy includes “trail use fees or voluntary user donation through a friend’s group”. I do not believe there should be a fee associated with regional trails and pathways. People should be allowed to travel freely, it’s in the Constitution.		Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Page 119 – Can you explain more on tiered level of service opportunities?		Thank you for your question. Tiered services are offered at various levels of price, quality, or features based on the visitors’ needs.

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Page 120 – Objective 5.5.1 – why is the Department so focused on business opportunities and increasing visitor services? What types of services? – they haven't even been discussed, what types of concessionaries ideas are you talking about?		Thank you for your question. The root of the objective is for partners to help bring additional services for visitors that may not be offered by the Parks Department.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Goal 5.6 – Parks should be well staffed. I am concerned that a significant amount of funding that has been going into building host sites. When discussing volunteer hours and benefits, please be sure to include the cost associated with training and establishing campgrounds for the volunteers.		Thank you for your feedback.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 120 – interesting that the last objective 5.7.1 mentions "assertively pursuing active recreation partners", especially because the activities of the parks department have always been guided towards being more passive recreation.		Thank you for your feedback. Many other objectives are focused on traditional activities.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 120 – what types of convenience stores?		Thank you for your question. Type of convenience stores is to be determined.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 120 – why is the Parks Department focused on "for-profit active sports facilities"? Municipalities expressed need for county on providing access to natural areas and passive recreation.		Thank you for your feedback. This is one of approximately 162 strategies and will only be entertained if included as part of a park master plan.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Pg 120, "Evaluate the sale of excess land that is County owned suitable for development". Why would the Department sell park land for development? I am not in support of selling county park land and would request that any proposal do so include adequate public outreach.		Thank you for your feedback. There are lands owned by the County, respectfully, within the Parks portfolio that provide no recreational or conservation value. The realization of adequately managing said land with the necessary funding and staffing or to sustain our existing park proper and staffing may be needed.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Add a goal to increase areas where wheelchairs and other mobile-assisted devices can travel to help provide connections for everyone to nature.		Thank you for your feedback. This will be analyzed in future trail planning as part of ADA requirements, our Trails Management manual, and through Park Master Plans.
Public Feedback					Chapter 5 Add a goal to develop a website for locations for those with ADA accessibility can visit in the system best access and enjoy the parks. There were hundreds of comments asking for more ADA facilities, yet I do not see enough a strong enough focus in the goals around ensuring more places are accessible for everyone. Helping to improve ADA accessibility came in #2 in the public Parks Vision 2030 survey how on MCRPD could improve the visitor experience.		Thank you for your feedback. Our department aims to fund in Fiscal Year 2025 a system ADA compliance analysis including the recommended implementation plan.
Public Feedback		Regarding the importance of public input, I would like to request an accommodation that the public can submit public comments virtually at Maricopa County Park and Recreation Commission meetings. Comments are only a few minutes and being that we are one of the largest counties in the country, I would hope you all would not expect that someone should need to drive, waste gas, time and funds, to come in person to provide a short comment with feedback on their regional park system. This also has a disproportionate impact on those who not only financially may not be able to come in person but also physically may have challenges driving long distances and attending long meetings in person. Transparency and respect are important in building trust with the public. Public comments were accepted virtually at Park Commission meetings from 2020 to August 2023. It is disappointing to see the Parks Commission and County enact this change.					Thank you for your feedback. The 2020 to 2023 option to attend virtually was due to COVID. Here is the current process as stated on all web-posted agendas: The public may also join in view/listen-only mode to the meeting using the links below. However, this access is dependent on the availability of internet connectivity. • View/Listen by video feed: https://meet.goto.com/896096565 • Listen by telephone: +1 (872) 240-3412 Access Code: 896-096-565 Speaker forms are available at the meeting if you would like to address the Commission regarding any matter on the agenda. Call to the Public – Public comment on matters pertaining to Maricopa County Parks. Please limit comments to 2 to 3 minutes. (Note: Pursuant to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, Commission members may not discuss matters raised under this public comment portion of the meeting; however, an individual Commission member may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the Commission, ask staff to review an issue raised or may ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda. Public comment is at the discretion of the Chair). If you would like to send a written comment, please send an email to MaricopaCountyParks@Maricopa.Gov by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting. Written comments will be summarized at the meeting, noting the topic or topics. All written comments will be forwarded to each Commissioner for their review.
Public Feedback		There is a strong focus on revenue-generation throughout almost all aspects of the goals. I would suggest the entire plan takes a stronger focus on balancing the three E's (economy, environment, and equity or the social factor). The equity factor is the one that struggles the most throughout the plan as it's not touched on as frequently as environmental and economic initiatives.					Thank you for your feedback. We will work to provide this balance as we implement the plan.
Public Feedback		The former Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department Director, Ken Smithee, who served from 1957-1965 wrote an article titled "The Decline in County Park Funding" that was published in the McDowell Messenger in October 1997. In this, he wrote about how the visionary County Board of Supervisor and County Manager showed their high priority for the County Park System evidenced by their financial support. In this article he discusses how the situation in the late 1990's has since changed and the challenges the park staff had with trying to maintain the system with insufficient personal and equipment with a lack of funding for repairs of facilities. In 1997, he stated that the Department generated 70% of it's operating budget through fees and charges. In 2023, 92% of the revenue is generated this way. Director Smithee discusses how a, "lack of funding for day-to-day operations continues to plague the parks system". My concern is that in chapter 5 where any new venture in the parks department does will need to cover more overhead leads me to believe this will put continued undue stress on the existing parks department staff and lead to diminished visitor experiences in the parks. Former Director Smithee continue in his 1997 letter that, "According to the best available data for the past 30 years the County's population has tripled, assessed valuation has increased thirteen fold, park use has greatly increased, and 23,000 acres have been added to the system. But at the same time financial support from successive Board of Supervisors has been reduced in real purchasing power by almost 90%, from \$2.57 per capita in 1966 to 32 cents per capita in 1997." If support stayed at the 1960's level it would have been \$13.09 per capita in 1997 dollars. Today, the amount Maricopa County spends from the General Fund on the Parks Department is approximately 25 cents per capita – even less than in the 1990's, and considerably less than in the 1960's.					Thank you for your feedback.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	The draft Plan has great visuals, is well constructed with a good overview, history and analysis of existing and future conditions					Thank you for your feedback.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	Really like having list of acronyms					Thank you for your feedback.

Survey Responses Received						Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Responses	
1. Which category do you represent?	2. If an agency, please provide the agency name:	GENERAL STATEMENTS (Not Related to Specific Questions)	3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEEDBACK	4. BACKGROUND: CHAPTERS 1-4 PAGES 1-90	5. CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PAGES 91-121	6. APPENDIX A, B, C, AND D PAGES 124-149	Replies to Feedback
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	There is little-to-no mention throughout the Plan regarding the role of municipalities in helping Maricopa County achieve its goals (and vice-versa). Even under the "Partnership Recommendations / Goals, etc." on Pages 85-90, the wording could be strengthened. Cities and towns, especially those along the periphery of the developed areas, will play a huge role in the future protection of critical habitat, wildlife corridors and other areas, as well as the extension/completion of trails and paths					Thank you for your feedback. In chapter 4, cities were a part of determining the major themes to be addressed as part of the stakeholder focus group meetings (see page 82 through 85). Page 83 also identifies partnership opportunities for communities in future regional efforts. This is highlighted by the statement on page 83, "The groups also discussed trails and the various projects communities are working on. Communities may begin to collaborate with other each other on how projects might connect for increased cohesion of trail systems within the region." In addition, specific cities, including Peoria, were called out for partnership opportunities.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	There is little-to-no discussion of policies regarding coordination with cities/towns pertaining to paths, trails and corridor connections. Were cities / towns involved with the preparation of the Plan? There is little mention of that					Thank you for your feedback. There are no policies called out at any level in the plan, only goals and objectives. There are, however, goals and objectives that address wildlife corridors, and trails. Sixty-one organizations, including cities were involved, and partner plans were reviewed in Appendix C.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	Lake Pleasant has a prominent role in the existing and future parks vision for Maricopa County as noted in the Plan, even though the Lake is within the City's jurisdiction. However, there is little-to-no mention of partnering with the City of Peoria (which encircles the Lake) in accomplishing the County's goals, nor in facilitating Peoria's goals for the Lake and surrounding areas					Thank you for your feedback. This will be reviewed in Lake Pleasant Regional Park Master Plan.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	Doublecheck page numbering and figure numbering, including those of the Appendix					Thank you for your feedback. We will review formatting
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria	Font types and sizes vary in areas throughout the document					Thank you for your feedback. We will review formatting
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Page 85 (Partnership Recommendations): One of the very few mentions of "jurisdictions" yet really isn't very strong language regarding the significant role that cities and towns play in regional linkages and recreational opportunities. Define "Local Partners" and/or include cities and towns within this section			Thank you for your feedback. We will incorporate text to include "cities and town" on page 85.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Page 86 (Partnership Goals...): There is no mention of partnerships with cities and towns – were they not part of the meeting? Other than this type of review, what role did the cities/towns have in the creation of the draft document?			Thank you for your feedback. We will incorporate text to include "cities and town" on page 86. Cities and towns were included as stakeholders in the Plan Development.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Page 91 / Chapter 5 (Findings, Recommendations and Implementation (all goals (1-5) / entire Chapter): There is very little in regard to collaboration with cities and towns, and the critical role they can and should play in forwarding the County's priorities and goals.			Thank you for your feedback. A word search of the goals finds 14 different references to "cities" in each of the five priorities goals and objectives.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Chapter 5 (Findings, Recommendations,...) – Goal #3 (... Importance of Acquiring...) – Recommendations – Bullet #4 (Partner with federal and state agencies...) AND Bullet #5 (Identify, plan, and classify regional parks and connected landscapes): Include language regarding partnering and coordinating with municipalities, as many (especially Peoria) have large master-planned communities and other areas within the planning area that has substantial open space and corridor opportunities which MAY be able to provide linkage and conservation opportunities that align with those of Maricopa County. As noted above, there really isn't anything about the role of municipalities in helping Maricopa County achieve its goals (and vice-versa).			Thank you for your feedback. Cities and towns will be included in future open space, corridors, acquisitions, and opportunities. Regional opportunities and gaps within the City of Peoria is identified on page 162. Priority 3 is addressing the acquisition and partnership with federal agencies in the far east and far west portions of the county. Priority 2 addresses cities/towns connection to existing park.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Chapter 5 (Findings, Recommendations,...) – Goal #3.1 (Implementation / Protect critical open space...) – Objective 3.1.1 (Expand partnerships with the BLM and the USFS): As with the above, please include language regarding partnering and coordinating with municipalities			Thank you for your feedback. Cities and towns will be included in future open space, corridors, acquisitions, and opportunities. Regional opportunities and gaps within the City of Peoria is identified on page 162. Priority 3 is addressing the acquisition and partnership with federal agencies in the far east and far west portions of the county. Priority 2 addresses cities/towns connection to existing park.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Chapter 5 (Findings, Recommendations,...) – Goal #4 (Leadership...) – Recommendations – Bullet #5 (Strengthen partnerships...): Again, no real mention of the inclusion of cities and towns into the mix of "organizations" that should be included given their vital role in furthering the County's goals.			Thank you for your feedback. The text will be changed from "regional" to "local."
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Chapter 5 (Findings, Recommendations,...) – Goal #5 (Developing Sustainable...) – Recommendations – Bullet #7 (Promote (GA's...): The only real specific mention of cities and towns; we do support the recommendation but note that there are other non-IGA-related ways to accomplish the goals of the Plan.			Thank you for your feedback. The word, "Intergovernmental" will be removed and replaced with various types of agreements.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria			Page 122 (2030 Vision Map): Scale makes it difficult to ascertain city/town connections. Strengthen discussion within Plan regarding the coordination that must occur to provide path, trail and corridor connections with city/town and county. Provide this within separate Goals and Policies. Not listed in Figures (but is listed in Table of Contents, albeit with incorrect page number).			Thank you for your feedback. Mapping and greater coordination are addressed in Objective 4.2.2. Regional trail and corridor planning in conjunction with local stakeholders is called out in two goals of the plan. Figure numbers will be identified in chapter 5.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Page 131 (Appendix 'A' (Park Overviews)) – Lake Pleasant Regional Park: Would be good to note the role that the City of Peoria plays with Lake Pleasant (same comment for other Regional Facilities not influenced by Peoria but by other cities/towns).		Thank you for your feedback. The intent of Appendix A is to provide information on each of the county parks.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Page 149 (Appendix 'B' (Partners)) – Community and Park-Specific Partnerships: Additional mention of the critical roles that cities and towns have in the goals of this plan should be noted.		Thank you for your feedback. Community and Park-Specific Partnership will be addressed in future individual Park Master Plans and through future regional trail planning efforts.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Page 153 & 154 (Appendix 'B' (Partners)) – Community and Park-Specific Partnerships – #6 (Lake Pleasant Park): Support the statement regarding the City and others; could expand on outstanding relationship that now exists between Peoria and Maricopa County as well as the critical role that Peoria plays in the Lake's future. Also mention the role and interaction of the other agencies (Yavapai County, MWD, BoR, etc.) rather than just an assertion of rights and obligations. Also, last paragraph doesn't appear to relate to Lake Pleasant?		Thank you for your feedback. Community and Park-Specific Partnership will be addressed in future individual Park Master Plans and through future regional trail planning efforts. Last paragraph will be removed.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Page 162 (Appendix 'C' (Regional Plans)): Discussion notes the General Plan, but utilizes an exhibit from the CSMP (Level of Service) that is NOT part of the General Plan. Consider using a different base map (NOT a Level of Service exhibit), such as Figure 0.1 (Page 92) from PROST – even if outdated as it provides a more-thorough overview of the City's path and trail network.		Thank you for your feedback. We will remove text, "General Plan" and insert "Community Services Master Plan."
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Page 163 (Appendix 'C' (Regional Plans)) – Peoria – Regional Service Opportunities: Please add "New River" to the sentence "Protect Agua Fria Corridor to ensure wildlife/ecological connectivity".		Thank you for your feedback. We will add text, "New River Corridors."
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Appendix 'C' (overall): Exhibits include references to numbers which are missing in the text (text uses only bullets).		Thank you for your feedback. This is an oversight, the numbers were not meant to align with the bullets.
Agency Feedback	City of Peoria				Appendix 'C' (overall): Try to keep one City per page, with related exhibit(s), for ease of reference.		Thank you for your feedback. We will format maps to align with city information.