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Executive Summary

The purpose of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Annual Report is to provide information about the program and the projects funded in Federal fiscal year (FY) 2013. This report serves as a useful guide to the RTP for trail managers and the public. It highlights program funding and administration, the RTP Database, and how States use funds for trail projects. It illustrates eligible project types along with award-winning examples from across the country. It documents the many benefits of the program and national trends and issues affecting trails.

Access the RTP Database at:
http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org

Program Summary

The RTP provides funds to the States to support a wide variety of trail activities and related facilities, as well as environmental education and safety programs. Since 1993, the RTP has apportioned over $1 billion in Federal funding to the States for local project funding. The RTP has been responsible for creating and improving over 19,400 trail-related projects nationwide, including urban greenways, nature centers, and horse, hiking, mountain bike, and motorized trails, as well as snow and water routes.

The US Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is leading the United States in developing a surface transportation system to move people and goods in a safe, accountable, flexible, efficient, and environmentally responsible manner. FHWA’s partnerships and programs benefit communities, enhance the quality of life for Americans, and assure access for all to the Nation’s transportation network and to recreational opportunities.

The RTP is a Federal-aid assistance program.
of the FHWA to help the States provide and maintain recreational trails for both motorized and nonmotorized trail use. Annual funding is up to $84 million.

The RTP applies the “user-pay/user-benefit” philosophy of the Federal Highway Trust Fund. Trail users pay the Federal motor fuel excise tax for fuel used for nonhighway recreational trail use, and receive the benefit of the RTP through funds provided to the States for trail projects. This program implementation is consistent in practice with other expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund. Although the gas tax supporting the RTP is paid primarily by motorized recreational vehicle use, resources are shared among all users of recreational trails to develop a balanced system.

Over 20 years, RTP funding has grown to represent a more equitable portion of the total fuel taxes paid by nonhighway recreationists, although that portion is still less than 42 percent of the total taxes paid annually by nonhighway recreationists.

Each State administers its own grant program for RTP funds and develops its own procedures to solicit and select projects for funding. Each State has a State Recreational Trail Advisory Committee representing both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trails users to advise on program eligibility, selection criteria, and other trail-related issues. An ongoing goal of State administration is efficient use of RTP funds. This includes streamlining required reviews, clarifying financial accountability, improving project selection, and reducing project implementation costs for sponsors.

### Program Benefits

The RTP provides many benefits beyond providing funds for trails, including benefits for the economy, youth employment, accessibility, safe and livable communities, health and fitness, habitat conservation, and transportation. A review of the RTP Database clearly shows the diversity of local impacts of RTP funding. Like other Highway Trust Fund programs, the RTP provides benefits to virtually every county in the United States. While the variety of projects is highly diverse, there are some key topics that illustrate important benefits of RTP project development in every State:

#### Economic stimulus

Many studies show that trails and greenways promote economic activity through direct spending as well as employment.

#### Youth employment

Youth and conservation corps members engaged in trail work receive training and mentoring, while making a salary and gaining valuable experience.
Accessibility improvements

RTP funding has been used in every State to make accessibility improvements and to teach problem-solving for improving trail access.

Safe and livable communities

Trails and greenways make our communities healthier, link our neighborhoods, contribute to tourism and civic improvement, and provide alternatives to driving.

Health and fitness

Public health researchers find that access to trails connecting to parks or other recreational facilities increases the level of physical activity in a community.

Habitat conservation

Trails can be the catalyst for preserving open space, as well as improving habitat, reducing impacts of outdoor recreation, and fostering environmental education.

Active transportation

RTP funding is helping build transportation networks designed for bicycling and walking. Trails can be both efficient modes of transportation as well as linear parks and habitat corridors.

National Trends and Issues

The flexibility of RTP funds enables States to direct grants to projects which respond to changing public needs. Local project sponsors and public land managers have used RTP funding for trail projects that address current issues of health, livability, climate change, and safety. This section identifies some of these key nationwide trends along with issues of national significance affecting trail use, public lands, and community improvement.

Youth Service and Conservation Corps

In many States, local Corps organizations have helped build many miles of trails while providing an important step into the labor market for young Americans.

Accessibility

Besides improving trails for persons with disabilities, we need to understand the needs of older people, families with children, and those who are new to trail activities.

Sustainability

To trail managers, sustainability means reducing expenditures on maintenance by better design of trails, and the use of appropriate materials and structures.

Repair and Rehabilitation

Extreme weather events in recent years have provided evidence of the vulnerability of our trails and parks, making it essential to make them more resilient and less costly to maintain.

Climate Change

Events related to climate change will affect trails, but trails can also encourage more walking and bicycling and contribute to efforts in reducing greenhouse gases.

Promoting physical activity

Trails can positively influence physical activity for both recreational and transportation purposes.

Safety and Environmental Education

RTP funding has been used in every State for educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection.

RTP Legislative History

1991: The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) created the National Recreational Trails Funding Program.


2005: The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) revised the program, providing the current legislative text.

2012: The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) reauthorized funding for the RTP as a set-aside of Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds (extended through May 2015), but did not change the program.
Annual Achievement Awards

The Coalition for Recreational Trails (CRT), a federation of national and regional trail-related organizations, hosts the Annual Achievement Awards program to recognize outstanding trail projects funded by the RTP. Nine projects were recognized in the 2013 awards program. In addition, two State programs were recognized for their effective use of RTP funds.

The awards are good examples of the diversity of projects funded by the RTP. Awards were presented to project sponsors in these categories:

Maintenance and Rehabilitation
Northern Erie Sno-Seekers Trail Grooming Equipment (New York) - Northern Erie Sno-Seekers, Inc.

Construction and Design
East and West Twin Creek Bridges (Michigan) - Cycle Conservation Club of Michigan

Education and Communication
School Messaging Project (Minnesota) - Coalition for Recreational Trail Users; National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council

Multiple-Use Management and Corridor Sharing
Longleaf Trace Equestrian Trail Improvements and Extension (Mississippi) - Pearl & Leaf Rivers Rails-to-Trails Recreational District

Environment and Wildlife Compatibility
Seneca Bluffs Trail and Trailhead Facility (Maryland) - Friends of Seneca Creek State Park

Accessibility Enhancement
Beaman Park Accessible and Interpretive Trail (Tennessee) - Friends of Beaman Park

Use of Youth Conservation/Service Corps
Leicester Hollow Loop Trail (Vermont) - Green Mountain National Forest; Vermont Department of Forests, Parks & Recreation; Vermont Youth Conservation Corps; Vermont Mountain Bike Association; Moosalamoo Association

State Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Award
Wisconsin

Outstanding State Trail Program
West Virginia

RTP Database

The goal of the RTP Database project is to provide a central repository for RTP project data that is usable by the FHWA, Congress, the States, policy makers, RTP administrators, project managers, and the general public. The Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org) includes over 19,400 projects that have received over $951 million in funding. These projects have been matched with over $710 million.

As of 2013, the Database has been developed so that data can be searched by State, County, Congressional District, Trail Name, Project Name, Permissible Use Category, and Year Awarded. Reports can be printed from the results pulled. In addition to the fields that can be searched, users can view a record of the project for more information.
Funding & Administration

The RTP is a Federal-aid assistance program of the FHWA with funds provided to each State to provide and maintain recreational trails and related facilities and activities.

Each State:
• Receives funds apportioned by statutory formula.
• Administers its own program, usually through a State resource or park agency.

• Develops its own procedures to solicit and select projects for funding.
• Establishes a State Recreational Trail Advisory Committee (representing both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail users) to assist with the program.

States are required to use 40 percent of their RTP funds for diverse recreational trail use, 30 percent for motorized recreation, and 30 percent for nonmotorized recreation. (The 40-30-30 calculation takes place after accounting for State administrative costs. A small State exclusion exempts Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and Rhode Island from 30 percent motorized and nonmotorized requirements.)

The specifics of how to apply this formula to project selection is up to the States, and varies considerably around the country. States with large Federal land ownership sometimes fund backcountry projects with both motorized and nonmotorized use to achieve diversity. Others may fund projects with adjacent paved and unpaved trail surfaces for diverse nonmotorized activities, or trails with winter snowmobiling and summer all-terrain vehicle (ATV) use.
RTP funding is highly leveraged by community and State funds and contributions from organizations and businesses. Of the over 19,400 projects between 1993 and 2013, total RTP funding was over $951 million with additional funding of over $710 million, showing that RTP funds were matched by nearly 75 percent.

The Federal funds generally will provide up to 80 percent of the project cost (with a higher sliding scale in most western States) and require project sponsors to provide the remaining amount in matching resources (generally at least 20 percent). In many cases, the actual match from the project partners is 50 percent or more. For instance:

- The Burrillville Rail Trail in Rhode Island received a $100,000 RTP grant which has been leveraged with State funds including $100,000 from the Historic and Passive Park Restoration Grant program, $150,000 from Open Space and Recreation bonds, and $34,000 from an Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant, plus additional Town funds and a donation of 13 acres of land abutting the Rail Trail.

- Of Georgia’s 18 RTP grants for 2013, eight provided more than a 25 percent match.

- Of Colorado’s 15 RTP grants for 2013, nine provided at least a 50 percent match.

An ongoing goal of State administration is efficient use of RTP funds. This includes streamlining required reviews, clarifying financial accountability, improving project selection, and reducing project implementation costs for sponsors.

States are encouraged to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with qualified youth conservation or service corps. These partnerships with various types of service corps have proven very popular in most States. There are many examples of projects completed by youth conservation or service corps working in cooperation with private contractors, agency or community staff, and volunteers.

**Effective use of funds**

North Dakota conducted a field test of snow trail maintenance equipment, which is a vital component of the State’s RTP benefits. The goal was to evaluate snow grooming machines and advise trail managers on purchasing the best type of equipment for snowmobile trails. Evaluations were conducted by six experienced operators, who operated each piece of equipment in all condition types. The field test was conducted by the nonprofit Snowmobile North Dakota in cooperation with equipment manufacturers.

The goal of the Rivanna Trail in Charlottesville, VA is to be accessible to as many users as possible.
This table shows RTP funding authorized by Congress for use by States each year of the program. Under MAP-21, the States return 1 percent annually to FHWA for program administration: up to $841,600.

The funds were allocations in 1993, 1996, and 1997, but the funds were apportionments for 1998-2013.

### Table 1 – RTP Apportionments:
All States, All Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RTP Funding</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993 Allocation</td>
<td>$7,275,000</td>
<td>$5,696,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Allocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,581,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Allocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Allocation</td>
<td>$14,688,000</td>
<td>$11,595,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Allocation</td>
<td>$14,688,000</td>
<td>$16,256,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Apportioned</td>
<td>$29,550,000</td>
<td>$14,691,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Apportioned</td>
<td>$39,400,000</td>
<td>$33,750,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$44,161,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$44,826,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$47,586,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Apportioned</td>
<td>$48,929,875</td>
<td>$44,915,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Apportioned</td>
<td>$57,656,952</td>
<td>$43,957,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Apportioned</td>
<td>$59,160,000</td>
<td>$43,459,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Apportioned</td>
<td>$68,468,400</td>
<td>$57,983,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Apportioned</td>
<td>$74,160,000</td>
<td>$65,913,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Apportioned</td>
<td>$79,160,000</td>
<td>$62,787,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Apportioned</td>
<td>$84,160,000</td>
<td>$81,113,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Apportioned</td>
<td>$84,160,000</td>
<td>$52,908,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Apportioned</td>
<td>$96,570,196</td>
<td>$88,649,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Apportioned</td>
<td>$78,569,033</td>
<td>$68,360,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Apportioned</td>
<td>$79,212,744</td>
<td>$65,371,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2013 Totals</td>
<td>$1,063,558,200</td>
<td>$860,874,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2013 Obligation Rate</td>
<td>82.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----- NOTES ----- 

Table 1 (Page 9) and Table 3 (Page 11) 
The difference in the totals in Table 1 and Table 3 (Page 11) is due to the different “sources” providing the information (see the notes below) and the manner in which a State obligates its funding (e.g., some States obligate funds every other year). Additionally, the RTP Database does not currently have complete data for all States; data collection and validation for the RTP Database is an ongoing effort. Data will be regularly entered into the Database as it is received from the States and the District of Columbia.

The obligation rate represents the percentage of funds committed to projects compared to the funds available. The obligation rate for the overall Federal-aid highway program averages about 95 percent over time. The obligation rate for the RTP has trended in the 80 to 85 percent range. There are many reasons why the RTP has a lower obligation rate. The obligation authority for the Federal-aid highway program is lower than the apportionments, so some States give priority to other Federal-aid highway programs. Some States select projects on two-year cycles (even-numbered years tend to have lower obligation rates). Some States delay project selection and implementation when there is uncertainty about the reauthorization of the program, or take time to implement the program after each new authorization act.

**Sources**
The source for the data in Tables 1 and 2 is the Federal Highway Administration’s Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS).

The source for the data in Tables 3 (Page 11) and 4 (Page 23) is information provided by the States for the Recreational Trails Program Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org).

ONLINE RESOURCE: 
For current apportionments to States and details of year by year apportionments and obligations:

http://goo.gl/hVwBl8
This table shows the number of projects per State for Federal FY 2013.

It shows RTP funds apportioned to each State for the most recent year of the program. Half of the funds are distributed equally among all States, and half are distributed in proportion to the estimated amount of off-road recreational fuel use in each State: fuel used for off-road recreation by snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles, off-road motorcycles, and off-road light trucks.

This table also shows obligations by State. Obligations are the Federal government’s legal commitment (promise) to pay or reimburse the States or other entities for the Federal share of a project’s eligible costs.

1 State’s FY 2013 projects awaiting Federal approval
2 State’s Governor opted out of the RTP but obligated past funds
3 State’s Governor opted out of the RTP
4 State has not yet provided a breakdown of the number of FY 2013 projects
5 State’s FY 2013 projects are combined with an earlier or later fiscal year

**ONLINE RESOURCE:**
Recreational Trails Program Apportionments and Obligations, FY 2013 by State

http://goo.gl/otqYnB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2013 Projects</th>
<th>FY 2013 Apportionment</th>
<th>FY 2013 Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,728,824</td>
<td>$1,692,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$1,509,617</td>
<td>$815,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,911,683</td>
<td>$1,402,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,476,071</td>
<td>$749,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$5,687,230</td>
<td>$5,352,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,572,584</td>
<td>$1,620,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$950,689</td>
<td>$308,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$894,830</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$815,214</td>
<td>$777,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,461,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$1,719,290</td>
<td>$1,551,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$948,958</td>
<td>$1,239,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$1,690,068</td>
<td>$1,580,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,507,024</td>
<td>$1,017,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,187,313</td>
<td>$1,423,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,358,046</td>
<td>$360,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$1,407,311</td>
<td>$387,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,499,462</td>
<td>$815,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$1,425,457</td>
<td>$937,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$1,110,159</td>
<td>$1,110,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$912,751</td>
<td>$1,147,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,819,765</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$2,387,104</td>
<td>$2,088,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,345,608</td>
<td>$2,048,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,643,471</td>
<td>$954,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$1,587,457</td>
<td>$1,582,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,202,802</td>
<td>-$22,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$1,341,682</td>
<td>$1,170,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,252,754</td>
<td>$1,227,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$1,212,060</td>
<td>$1,870,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,412,701</td>
<td>-$600,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,178,146</td>
<td>$4,984,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,594,230</td>
<td>$2,347,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,118,321</td>
<td>$626,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,651,822</td>
<td>$1,500,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,765,674</td>
<td>$2,118,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1,590,864</td>
<td>$16,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,967,410</td>
<td>$337,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$854,671</td>
<td>$969,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,196,710</td>
<td>$902,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$1,123,570</td>
<td>$986,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,620,959</td>
<td>$540,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$3,946,964</td>
<td>$460,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,543,141</td>
<td>$1,455,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$1,015,694</td>
<td>$271,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,508,866</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1,863,672</td>
<td>$1,863,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,295,368</td>
<td>$846,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$2,141,784</td>
<td>$3,085,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$1,456,812</td>
<td>$1,284,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to States</strong></td>
<td><strong>1110</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,212,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,371,220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows the number of projects funded plus the amount of funding by State for Federal FY 1993-2013. It shows the total RTP funds obligated by each State during the period. In addition the “Total Other Funding” column shows how much additional match was provided by project sponsors. Note that the matching funds are generally higher than the 20 percent minimum required by RTP. In 12 States the match is higher than the total RTP funds apportioned.

Table 3 – RTP Database Projects and Funding
Federal FY 1993-FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1993-2013 Projects</th>
<th>Total RTP Funding</th>
<th>Total Other Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>$20,066,923</td>
<td>$5,942,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>$12,325,767</td>
<td>4,363,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>17,292,994</td>
<td>4,868,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>13,223,525</td>
<td>5,230,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>48,888,077</td>
<td>16,534,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>13,160,320</td>
<td>22,590,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12,166,629</td>
<td>7,776,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware¹</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6,005,446</td>
<td>5,008,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,183,193</td>
<td>1,673,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida²</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20,047,426</td>
<td>14,281,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>23,769,613</td>
<td>21,681,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>9,548,569</td>
<td>2,434,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>17,024,171</td>
<td>16,110,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>23,737,909</td>
<td>9,887,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16,725,694</td>
<td>5,534,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23,806,113</td>
<td>5,951,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas³</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>15,721,863</td>
<td>9,849,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>15,326,986</td>
<td>15,340,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>18,970,407</td>
<td>16,151,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>13,127,483</td>
<td>4,740,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>16,533,217</td>
<td>6,794,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts⁴</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>9,776,289</td>
<td>7,728,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>35,712,001</td>
<td>25,745,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>23,215,944</td>
<td>32,170,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>18,192,726</td>
<td>4,548,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>19,960,387</td>
<td>21,374,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>15,861,003</td>
<td>14,395,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12,050,910</td>
<td>6,465,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>14,313,731</td>
<td>9,429,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>11,427,381</td>
<td>14,673,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>16,826,488</td>
<td>40,516,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>14,124,652</td>
<td>5,958,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York⁵</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>25,323,736</td>
<td>11,378,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>23,428,343</td>
<td>31,992,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12,219,504</td>
<td>3,587,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>21,737,271</td>
<td>21,288,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>19,476,002</td>
<td>9,614,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>17,112,548</td>
<td>18,759,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>28,638,118</td>
<td>16,416,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>6,818,425</td>
<td>2,844,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina⁴</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>12,787,852</td>
<td>4,800,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>32,103,011</td>
<td>18,703,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>20,738,959</td>
<td>6,308,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>47,315,568</td>
<td>17,580,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>19,736,133</td>
<td>21,473,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>11,833,347</td>
<td>17,277,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia¹</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>19,924,288</td>
<td>8,968,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>24,523,475</td>
<td>35,504,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>11,732,747</td>
<td>33,235,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>23,100,075</td>
<td>31,229,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>16,763,196</td>
<td>13,401,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>951,826,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>710,136,013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ State’s FY 2013 projects awaiting Federal approval
² State’s Governor opted out of the RTP but obligated past funds
³ State’s Governor opted out of the RTP
⁴ State has not yet provided a breakdown of the number of FY 2013 projects
⁵ State’s FY 2013 projects are combined with an earlier or later fiscal year
Wisconsin's Wild Goose State Trail is one of the many RTP-funded success stories in the Database. Since the program's inception in 1993, this trail has received five RTP grants. With the community's support, equal matching funds were raised, and 34 miles of multi-use trail were built to join Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties.

The FHWA funds the RTP Database project to provide a central repository for RTP project data that is usable by the FHWA, Congress, the States, all levels of policy makers, RTP administrators, project managers, stakeholders, and the general public. In an effort to promote program transparency, FHWA seeks to know how States use RTP funds in a manner that provides sufficient information to the public without undue burden on State program administrators.

The RTP Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org) includes over 19,400 projects that have received over $951 million in funding. These projects have been matched with over $710 million. Updating the RTP Database is important because there are over 1,000 new RTP projects each year. An update to the RTP project Database has made this wealth of information about RTP-funded projects across the country more accessible to the public.

In 2012, FHWA contracted with KMS Enterprises, Inc. (which subcontracted with American Trails) to develop, operate, and update a searchable RTP Database to be available on a website, and to

Access the RTP Database at:
www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org
provide annual reports on RTP funding. An important part of the work is assisting the States in providing project information in a timely manner to keep the Database up-to-date. Requests for updated data are regularly sent to States and the District of Columbia, and also obtained from the Federal Management Information System (FMIS). Data collection is an ongoing effort and data is regularly being entered into the Database as it is received from the States, District of Columbia, and other sources.

Photographs are also gathered for the Image Library to provide good examples of permissible uses and managed uses for trails, related facility construction, and other project types.

As of 2013, the Database has been developed so that data can be searched by State, County, Congressional District, Trail Name, Project Name, Permissible Use Category, and Year Awarded. Reports can be printed from the results pulled. In addition to the fields that can be searched, users can view a record of the project for more information. A link to a brief webinar on how to navigate and utilize the RTP Database is located on the homepage.

The RTP Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org) includes over 19,400 projects that have received over $951 million in funding. These projects have been matched with over $710 million. Updating the RTP Database is important because there are over 1,000 new RTP projects each year.
RTP funding gives States the flexibility to respond to the needs and interests of the public.

Use of Recreational Trails Program Funds

States may use RTP funds for a variety of specific project types and expenditures which fall under eight categories of Permissible Uses. The sections below provide more detail and examples of the eight Permissible Uses. The RTP legislation identifies these general Permissible Use categories as:

- Trail maintenance and restoration
- Trailside and trailhead facilities
- Equipment for construction and maintenance
- Construction of new recreational trails
- Acquisition of trail corridors
- Assessment of trail conditions
- Education for safety and environmental protection
- Administration

See the text of the authorizing legislation defining Permissible Use categories:

http://goo.gl/C5Z0y
**PERMISSIBLE USE**

**Trail maintenance and restoration**

**Category A:** Maintenance and restoration of existing trails: trail maintenance, restoration, rehabilitation, or relocation. This category may include maintenance and restoration of trail bridges, or provide appropriate signage along a trail.

---

**Project Example**

**Windsor Trail - Greeley No. 2 Canal, Colorado**

This project upgraded an existing natural surface trail to pavement, which now provides year-round access and meets guidelines for accessibility for people with wheelchairs, as well as strollers and skates. As a primary off-street corridor, the trail provides a safe nonmotorized route to Grandview Elementary School, Windsor Middle School, Windsor High School, and the Windsor Community Recreation Center, as well as neighborhoods and local businesses.

The trail location is on an existing easement with the New Cache La Poudre Irrigation Company for recreational trail development. The dirt surface was often impassable in poor weather, and usually in poor condition as it is used for ditch maintenance vehicle access. It was also subject to infestation of puncturevine weeds. The improved trail offers safe, alternative transportation and supports Windsor’s Trails Master Plan as well as the Town Board’s Strategic Plan.
PERMISSIBLE USE

Trailside and trailhead facilities

Category B: Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages for recreational trails. Typical eligible work includes parking areas, toilets, horse and vehicle unloading facilities, signs, and seating.

Project Example

Ouachita Trail Shelters, Oklahoma

The Ouachita National Recreation Trail stretches 223 miles through the beautiful mountains of Arkansas and Oklahoma. It is a nonmotorized single track trail open only to foot traffic and partially open to mountain bicycles, so a shelter every 10 to 12 miles is important to foster multi-day excursions.

The shelter expansion program was initiated and led by Friends of the Ouachita Trail, whose goal is to build an additional 12 shelters on the west end of the trail. For this project, four substantial shelters were built for a $35,100 grant and $10,000 match. Construction was largely done by volunteers with help from AmeriCorps teams.
Equipment for construction & maintenance

Category C: Purchase and lease of recreational trail construction and maintenance equipment. Examples include snow trail grooming equipment, mechanized trailbuilding equipment, vehicles for trail maintenance, and other equipment to help maintain the trail surface, drainage, adjacent vegetation, etc.

Project Example

Snowmobile North Dakota Trail Program Equipment Project

Winter trail activities are an important part of North Dakota’s outdoor recreation. To take advantage of the long and snowy winters, well-maintained snow trails are essential. The ND Parks and Recreation Department has used RTP grant funds to match Department funds to purchase trail maintenance equipment for both cross country ski trails and snowmobile routes. The goal is to provide trail systems with fuel efficient, low maintenance, and environmentally friendly equipment. Snow trail grooming equipment that is replaced is typically over 30 years old and in poor condition.

The Snowmobile North Dakota Trail Program is contracted to manage the State’s snow trail system, which consists of 2,800 miles of marked and groomed trails. The trails are established by local club members, who provide the volunteer time and effort in preparing and maintaining the trails each season.
The 2.7-mile Zoar to Zoarville extension of the trail represents an inspirational example of civic volunteerism. Much of the project required the construction of two large boardwalks to protect wetlands. To save on the expense, more than 150 volunteers provided equipment and labor over 12 weekends. Others involved in the completion of this project included: the Friends of Tuscarawas County, who helped raise funds for the lumber; a local lumber yard, Holmes Lumber, provided materials at a discount; and the Bolivar Rotary provided lunches for the volunteers on all the workdays. The project was undertaken through a partnership between the Tuscarawas County Park Department and the Ohio & Erie Canalway Coalition.

**Construction of new recreational trails**

**Category D:** Construction of new recreational trails. This is the largest category of expenditures in most States, and includes paved and unpaved trails, water trails, snow trails, and bridges. The needs of local communities, agencies, and trail users are reflected in the great variety of trail construction that has been accomplished. Urban trails, greenways, natural surface pathways, paddling routes, and recreational vehicle routes are all well represented in RTP funding.
Project Example

Mark West Regional Park and Open Space Preserve, California

RTP funding assistance totaling $212,682 was obligated to help acquire the $6,000,000 Sonoma County property. Match funds include the State of California Habitat Conservation Fund, National Park Service Land and Water Conservation Fund, California Natural Resources Agency River Parkways Grant, California Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Restoration Grant Program, Wildlife Conservation Board, and Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District Funds.

The 276-acre acquisition will serve as the gateway to a new 1,100-acre regional park and open space preserve and will provide access to 20 miles of existing trail. This former ranch can be readily used for park and recreation purposes because the roads and bridges are suitable for hiking, biking, and equestrian trails. To acquire this land, a collaborative partnership between the Sonoma County Regional Parks, the Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District and Sonoma Land Trust was formed. Since this property is highly desirable for estate-style development with its sweeping views, close proximity to urban areas, easy access from major roads to Napa County and population centers of Sonoma County, this timely acquisition will preserve public trail use opportunities for generations.

PERMISSIBLE USE

Acquisition of Trail Corridors

**Category E**: Acquisition of easements and fee simple title to property for recreational trails or recreational trail corridors. This category may include acquisition of old road or railroad bridges to be converted to trail use. Acquisition of any kind of interest in property must be from a willing landowner or seller.
Assessment of trail conditions

**Category F:** Assessment of trail conditions for accessibility and maintenance. Authorizes specific projects to assess trails to determine the level of accessibility for people who have disabilities, to develop programs to provide trail access information, and to assess trails for current or future maintenance needs.

States may provide funds for trail assessments through:

- Hiring professional trailbuilders or assessors
- Hiring professionals to provide on the job training for others to do trail assessments
- Using youth conservation or service corps, State or local staff, volunteers, etc.

**Project Example**

**Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest Nonmotorized Trail Assessment, Georgia**

This project contracted with Applied Trails Research, with assistance from Kay-Linn Enterprises and Trail Dynamics, to provide field-based trail assessment and spatial analysis for more than 220 miles of nonmotorized trails throughout the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest. The products of the assessment were comprehensive recommendations that provide the USDA Forest Service with solutions to problems and guidance for resource protection and visitor experience management across the Forest. The project also included extensive volunteer outreach and education, with a weekend-long trails education seminar, three field-based education sessions, and four on-the-ground demonstration projects.
Education for safety & environmental protection

Category G: Development and dissemination of publications and operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection.

A State may use up to 5 percent of its apportionment each fiscal year for the operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection as those objectives relate to the use of recreational trails.

PERMISSIBLE USE

Living Wetlands Interpretive Nature Trail, Montana

This project in Averill's Viking Creek Wetland Preserve enabled the design and installation of an interpretive nature trail in a 29-acre wetland now protected by the Whitefish Lake Institute (WLI). It included building the trail, interpretive trail signs, a main trailhead kiosk and two satellite kiosks, with the goal of creating a variety of outdoor educational opportunities.

WLI hosts all ages of students from preschool through high school, college, and older adults with the Road Scholar program. Students and their teachers enjoy planned tours and events or use the Trail Guide for a self-guided tour. WLI also developed the “Discovery Guide” workbook of fun activities for youth. Bordered by the 215-acre Murdock Nature Conservancy Easement, the whole area provides further opportunities for wetland restoration.

In addition to RTP funds, the project united the funds and support of 18 community organizations. This publicly accessible preserve is an excellent example of how citizens and developers can work together to protect open space in the wildland/urban interface, while allowing for economic growth in the community.

FHWA guidance is available at:

http://goo.gl/gM3AZo
Pennsylvania Trails Advisory Committee

In 1992, the Pennsylvania Recreational Trails Advisory Board was created to represent both motorized and nonmotorized trail users in accordance with Federal RTP funding. The Commonwealth's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) also called for the creation of a statewide trails committee to help implement a land and water trail network for recreation, transportation, and healthy lifestyles.

In 2012, trail leaders came together to form what is now called the Pennsylvania Trails Advisory Committee, with the goal of helping guide the future of trails in the State as well as to help carry out action items in the Outdoor Recreation Plan. Trail experts and decision-makers are key supporters of this process, which envisions a trail in every community throughout the Commonwealth. Partner organizations across the State will promote these trails and jointly sponsor training for trail construction and maintenance. The Committee will continue to do so.

Work that is being done to develop, maintain, and promote trails under the leadership of the Pennsylvania Trails Advisory Committee includes organizing trail work crews, constructing additional trail miles, improving trail access, leading trail sojourns, building useful trail websites and mobile apps, guiding trail construction and funding, and posting signage for trail users. Trail projects will continue to build on connections, lessons learned, and ideas shared at summits, workshops, and volunteer trainings.

PERMISSIBLE USE

Administration

Category H: Payment of costs to the State incurred in administering the program.

In addition to staff time to administer the program and grants, other activities related to recreational trails are eligible under this category, including:

- Costs related to the State recreational trail advisory committee - newsletters, websites, or other communications
- Publications and conferences related to trail planning, design, construction, maintenance, operation, and assessment
- Statewide trail planning

A State may use up to 7 percent of its apportionment each fiscal year for State administrative costs in that fiscal year. Any funds not used for administration within a fiscal year must be used for on-the-ground trail projects.

FHWA guidance is available at:

http://goo.gl/IM1GDu
This table shows the number of projects in the RTP Database categorized by Permissible Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Category Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Maintenance and Restoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Relocation</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Grooming</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Maintenance</td>
<td>3231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Relocation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Trailside and Trailhead Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead Work</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Features</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Ramps</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Equipment for Construction and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Construction of New Recreational Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Acquisition of Trail Corridors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Assessment of Trail Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Education for Safety and Environmental Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (Maps &amp; Brochures)</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Programs</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Programs</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educational Programs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some projects may qualify under more than one Permissible Use category.*

RTP funds may be used to finance projects within the eight different Permissible Use categories listed in the table. Shown are the numbers of projects that have been funded within each category since the inception of the program with some categories broken down to further specify the project type.

Note that many RTP projects qualify under more than one category. Maintenance and restoration projects prove to be the most commonly funded, followed by trail facility projects and new trail construction projects, respectively.

The source for the data in Tables 3 (Page 11) and 4 is information provided by the States for the Recreational Trails Program Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org).
Managed Uses

Managed Uses include a wide variety of both motorized and nonmotorized trail activities that are appropriate to recreational trails. The RTP legislation defines the term “recreational trail” as “a thoroughfare or track across land or snow, used for recreational purposes,” and includes the following activities:

A. Pedestrian (including Wheelchair Use)

Eastern Shore Trail, Alabama

B. Skating or Skateboarding

Great Northern Historical Trail, Montana

C. Equestrian Activities

Hatfield-McCoy Regional Recreation Area, West Virginia

D. Nonmotorized Snow Trail Activities

Youghiogheny River Trail, Pennsylvania
**Bicycling or Use of Other Human Powered Vehicles**

- **Mountain Biking**
  - Ridgeline Trail, Oregon

- **Other Human Powered Vehicles**
  - Santee Lakes Observation Trail, California
  - Willamette River Trail, Oregon

**Aquatic or Water Activities**

- **Motorized**
  - Alabama Scenic River Trail, Alabama

- **Nonmotorized**
  - Three Rivers Heritage Trail and Water Trail, Pennsylvania

**Motorized Vehicular Activities**

- **Snowmobiling**
  - Black Hills snowmobile trail system, South Dakota

- **ATV/UTV Riding**
  - Shoshone Trail System, Nevada

- **4-Wheeling/Light Truck Driving**
  - Iron Range OHV Recreation Area, Minnesota

- **Other Motorized**
  - Minooka OHV Park, Alabama

- **Motorcycling**
  - Redbird State Recreation Area, Indiana
RTP Benefits

The RTP provides many benefits beyond providing funds for trails, including benefits for the economy, youth employment, accessibility, safe and livable communities, health and fitness, habitat conservation, and transportation. A review of the RTP Database shows clearly the diversity of local impacts of RTP funding.

In particular, RTP is the foundation for State trail programs across the country. It leverages hundreds of millions of dollars of additional support from other sources for trails, encourages productive cooperation among trail users, and facilitates healthy outdoor recreation and associated, badly needed economic activity in countless communities.

There are a number of key benefits and trends that emerge from reviewing the years documented by the RTP Database.

While the variety of projects is highly diverse, there are some key topics that illustrate important benefits of RTP project development in every State.
Economic stimulus

Many studies note that trails and greenways promote economic activity through direct spending as well as employment. Increased property values, tourism, and recreation-related spending on equipment, bicycles, food, and lodging are just some of the ways trails positively impact community economies. One major benefit of trail tourism is that visitors spend money in rural towns and in more economically disadvantaged areas.

Early on, we did an economic feasibility study. Today, the City of Gilbert will be quick to admit that it has brought in businesses. Six years ago, when all the Range cities were downsizing and had a lot of empty houses because mining was shut down, Gilbert was building new businesses. It certainly helped the community. The fact that we have all three motorized uses there attracts a lot of tourism. A snowmobile trail and the nonmotorized Mesabi Trail also run through the area.

— Ron Potter, Policy and Program Manager, Minnesota Division of Parks and Trails

Project Example

Iron Range Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Recreation Area, Minnesota

Formerly a taconite mine pit in Minnesota’s Iron Range, the OHV Recreation Area was developed using $750,000 in RTP funds. In areas where the decline in mining has depressed the economy for decades, these State OHV recreation areas have a significant potential for return on funds invested, especially for local communities.

With the opening of the Iron Range OHV Recreation Area near Gilbert in 2002, the community began to see an influx of visitors and their dollars. A boom in area restaurants, OHV rentals, and motel and campground expansions are largely attributable to visitors to the recreation area. Since the opening of the park, the nearby cities of Eveleth and Virginia have requested access to the park directly from their towns. To build on this economic success, the City of Virginia is working with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and user groups to open an expansion of the park, more than doubling its size.

Construction was completed through a partnership between the Minnesota DNR, OHV clubs, the area tourism board, and the community. Most of the 30 miles of trails were constructed and signed by volunteers from OHV clubs, who also helped build perimeter fencing and clean up an area that at one time was a public dump.
Youth employment

There are many examples of youth and conservation corps performing work for RTP-funded projects. These corps are State and local programs engaging primarily youth and young adults in service. Corps members receive training and mentoring, a modest stipend, and opportunities for education and career preparation. By partnering with resource and recreation providers, these young people have a chance to do important work for our public lands. Many agencies see another important benefit: nurturing a pool of potential employees who are able to step into jobs with both skill and enthusiasm.

Project Example

Iowa DNR AmeriCorps Trail Crew

Iowa’s program uses AmeriCorps funds and Lake Restoration funds, combined with both State and Federal recreational trail dollars administered by the State DOT to build and maintain multi-use trails in Iowa’s State Parks. A full-time program staff of three manage full-time and seasonal AmeriCorps members who use both hand tools and mechanized equipment to build sustainable trail and maintain old trail systems, many of which were laid out by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Trail crew members learn environmental stewardship, community service, leadership, teamwork, and a responsible work ethic. Crew members carry forth these lessons and passion into their communities and future endeavors. The State also provides trainings to park friends groups and trail user clubs in basic trail preventative maintenance and environmental stewardship.

Each year the crew assists in trail development and maintenance. Work includes building pedestrian bridges, boardwalks, retaining walls, benches, trailhead signs, accessible facilities, fencing, and handrails, providing safe, sustainable, and stable trail tread. Projects vary widely and are selected using a list of criteria developed by Iowa DNR trails program staff encompassing concerns such as safety, environmental impact, immediate need, and volunteer support.
Accessibility improvements

A long-term trend has been to make trail activities more available to all Americans. This means improving trails for persons with disabilities, but also understanding the needs of older people, families with children, and those who are new to trail activities. For managers, a more accessible and barrier free trail is easier for all trail users to enjoy, and requires less maintenance. RTP funding has been used in every State to make accessibility improvements.

Project Example

Lakeview Trail, Virginia

Claytor Lake State Park constructed this 0.8-mile trail along the shoreline of Claytor Lake so that all guests may enjoy the scenic landscape and the park’s many features. The Lakeview Trail was designed to be accessible with less than a 5 percent grade throughout. The trail is open to bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities including wheelchairs and power-driven mobility devices. The creation of the fully accessible trail made travel safer, moving the pedestrian traffic off the road, where it had been since the park’s inception nearly 70 years ago.

The trail starts near an accessible fishing pier, and links to picnic areas, shelters, and the gift shop and meeting facility, all of which are accessible as well. Other destinations are the Claytor Lake beach where visitors can enjoy the swimming area and beach, and the park’s new cabins overlooking the lake. The trail also provides van-accessible parking at both ends.

Shortly after the trail’s completion Lakeview Trail was featured in an accessibility newsletter. Craig Fabian, the quadriplegic author, wrote the article after picking up a travel guide which told of Virginia State Parks being voted number one in America. Mr. Fabian decided to see if the vote was accurate for ALL visitors. The newsletter goes on to say, “Claytor Lake State Park hit the bulls-eye as far as accessibility goes.”

— Tim Nolen, Claytor Lake State Park
Safe and livable communities

Trails are an important part of our transportation infrastructure. Cities, suburbs, and towns all benefit from trails and greenways that make our communities more attractive to residents as well as employers. Trails also improve the economy through tourism and civic improvement, and provide opportunities for physical activity to improve fitness and mental health.

In addition, trails help our parks and open space by reducing crime and illegal activity through regular use and high visibility of users. Modest increases in property values near trails have also been documented.

---

Since pedestrian and bike accommodations have been lacking throughout the town and with the highway bridge being the most dangerous area of all, this pedestrian bridge and adjoining trails will allow safe passage over the creek and encourage students and recreationists to safely walk and ride bikes while enjoying the beautiful stream area.

— Ron Long, Chairman of the Pedestrian Committee.

**Project Example**

**Wendell Mee Memorial Bridge, Montana**

The pedestrian bridge was developed with $90,000 in Federal grant funding from the RTP that is administered by Montana State Parks. In addition to the RTP Federal grant, the Highwood Commercial Club has received grants for building the trail from the Lippard-Clawiter Foundation, Northwest Farm Credit, the Leroy and Claris Strand Foundation, Chevron Humankind Match Program, and the Treacy Foundation, along with many private donations, both financial and in-kind.

The new Pedestrian Bridge/Biking Trail is dedicated to the memory of Wendell Mee, a student walking home from a school concert who was killed in a pedestrian-automobile crash.

Before the bridge and trail were built, the narrow highway discouraged bicycle and pedestrian travel.
Health and fitness

Trails can help reduce physical and mental health risks by providing pleasant places to exercise, which help control weight, blood pressure and cholesterol levels, build strength and endurance, and help prevent depression. Public health researchers find that providing convenient access to places for physical activity, such as trails connecting to parks or other recreational facilities, increases the level of physical activity in a community.

Project Example

Greenville Hospital System Swamp Rabbit Tram Trail, South Carolina

The 17-mile long trail extends from Greenville to the town of Travelers Rest, offering an accessible opportunity to get fit and be active at no cost. The Greenville Hospital System University Medical Center (GHS) is a vital supporter of the movement for healthier living. Knowing that physical activity and good eating habits are the most effective ways to prevent obesity, GHS and the Greenville County Recreation District partnered to create what is now known as the GHS Swamp Rabbit Tram Trail.

The trail project, which dovetails with efforts to reclaim the river and improve the downtown environment, is a key part of a movement to make the entire region healthier. Trails, parks, greenways, bike routes, and transit are all part of the vision, called LiveWell Greenville. “Making the healthy choice the easy choice” is the goal of the LiveWell Greenville coalition. More safe places to walk, bike, and play, promotion of healthy living by employers, and opportunities for physical activity in child care and after school programs are all part of the LiveWell Greenville plan.

Read more about the project in “Greenville, SC trail system is key to livability and the fight against obesity”:

http://goo.gl/GiTa5x
Habitat conservation

Trails promote natural resource management strategies that help ensure environmental quality. The positive contributions of trails include restoring degraded stream corridors and other habitats in the process of trail building, and guiding visitors away from sensitive wildlife habitat and into more adaptable settings. RTP funding is also commonly used for projects involving acquisition of land for protection and reroutes to avoid habitat impacts. Often the environmental work is done by volunteers and conservation corps crews.

Project Example

Seven Oaks Preserve Trail, North Carolina

The Seven Oaks project has contributed to a larger initiative that has successfully preserved an important natural habitat area. The 2.6-mile natural surface trail winds its way along the shoreline of Lake Wylie in Gaston County and connects into Daniel Stowe Botanical Garden. The trail weaves through the Seven Oaks Preserve, a 77-acre permanently protected area conserved by the Catawba Lands Conservancy, and is part of the Carolina Thread Trail, a 15-county, two-State initiative designed to inspire and facilitate the creation and development of a regional network of trails, blueways, and conservation corridors that will link more than 2.3 million residents.

Funding to purchase and conserve the Seven Oaks Preserve, and construct the trail and trail amenities was generously provided by the Seven Oaks Farm, Daniel Stowe Botanical Garden Foundation, Pam Warlick Foundation, W. Duke Kimbrell Family Foundation, North Carolina Clean Water Management Trust Fund, Rodgers Builders, Inc., and the RTP. In a remarkable example of leveraging the State grant, RTP funding totaled $69,385 while funding from other sources totaled $2,424,959.
Active Transportation

A significant amount of RTP funding is helping build transportation networks in cities across America. The term “active transportation” refers to bicycling, walking, and other nonmotorized transportation modes. Often these trail and sidewalk networks are well integrated with public transit. Active transportation networks can also enhance recreation, and people will use attractive and safe trails as a way to get to school, work, or shopping instead of driving to the gym. Trails can be both efficient modes of transportation as well as linear parks and habitat corridors.

Project Example

Clipper City Rail Trail, Massachusetts

This project created a nonmotorized transportation link running between a commuter rail station and the shoreline of the Merrimack River near downtown Newburyport. Students and teachers at two nearby public schools, and commuters now regularly use the trail to walk to downtown, the harbor, parks, and other destinations. The multi-use asphalt pathway is 10 feet wide for walkers, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized users. In a relatively short distance, the trail corridor cuts through hills and climbs above the harbor, passing through a variety of environments from the industrial park, a densely developed neighborhood, and the waterfront.

To attract even more visitors to the trail the city facilitated a variety of figurative, abstract, and interactive sculptures, a mural, custom signage, a garden installation by the local “Green Artists League,” and a boardwalk, pedestrian bridge, and other functional elements designed to be aesthetically pleasing. Over $160,000 was contributed by individuals, local businesses, nonprofit organizations, community yard sales, charitable foundations, and other grants to support these enhancements to the trail. A $31,553 RTP grant was matched with $70,000 in other funding.
National Trends and Issues

The flexibility of RTP funds enables States to direct grants to projects that respond to changing public needs. Local project sponsors and public land managers have used RTP funding for trail projects that address current issues of health, livability, climate change, and safety. This section identifies some of these key nationwide trends along with issues of national significance affecting trail use, public lands, and community improvement.

Promoting Physical Activity

The US Department of Health and Human Services states that “Promoting physical activity among children and adults is a priority national health objective in the United States.” According to Active Living Research, “A growing body of evidence shows that the built environment can positively influence physical activity for both recreational and transportation purposes.” Our schools, parks, trails, and other outdoor recreation spaces are exactly the kinds of facilities designed for physical activity.

The term “active transportation” describes the efforts by cities, towns, and suburban areas to plan and build interconnected networks of trails that tie in with open spaces as well as the built environment. In addition to providing recreation, trails and greenways can function as nonmotorized transportation corridors to help pedestrians and cyclists access schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods.

“The Power of Trails for Promoting Physical Activity in Communities” from Active Living Research provides key research results and a wealth of references.

http://goo.gl/GV1qOd
Accessibility

A long-term trend has been to make communities, trails, and recreation facilities more available to all Americans. This means improving trails for persons with disabilities, but also understanding the needs of older people, families with children, and those who are new to trail activities.

The US Access Board is developing new accessibility guidelines that would add shared use paths (trails for transportation purposes) to forthcoming rules for pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way. These guidelines will apply to the design, construction, and alteration of pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks and shared use paths.

In September 2013, the US Access Board released “Final Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas” under the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) of 1968. The guidelines provide specifications for accessible recreational trails and other components of outdoor developed areas on Federal lands or constructed by a Federal agency. According to FHWA, “Although the guidelines do not necessarily apply to Federal-aid projects (unless on Federal land), they provide best practices that States may adopt to ensure equivalent compliance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).”

Youth Service and Conservation Corps

The top nine States following existing Federal law to “encourage” use of corps spent over $4.65 million on over 80 corps-involved projects between 2009 and 2013 out of a total available funding base of $86 million (over 5 percent).

The California Conservation Corps has been involved with 47 out of 355 California projects (13 percent). The funding spent on projects involving California Conservation Corps since the inception of the RTP is approximately $5 million. This is out of approximately $48 million of RTP funding received by California since the inception of the program (10 percent).

A proposal for a 21st Century Conservation Service Corps resulted from a high-level initiative to identify ways to put more young people to work. With funding being a crucial obstacle, the RTP has been suggested as an important resource. Derrick Crandall, President of the American Recreation Coalition, cites US Department of Transportation estimates that nonhighway recreational fuel tax revenues are more than $200 million: “If in the next surface transportation measure (post-MAP 21) RTP funding climbed to $200 million, and 10 percent of that was used for corps-related projects, we would have some 2,500 corps jobs funded annually. This could be achieved with no increases in Federal spending.”

Coconino Rural Environment Corps

Coconino Rural Environment Corps is one of several youth conservation and service corps which work on contract for Arizona RTP projects.

Arizona’s Trail Maintenance Program provides RTP funds up to $30,000 for trail maintenance and/or realignment. These projects use the State Parks contracted trail crews who are paid directly by State Parks. The youth conservation and service corps trail crews currently on contract include: American Conservation Experience, Coconino Rural Environment Corps, Northwest Youth Corps, and Southwest Conservation Corps.
Our trails and parks are vulnerable to major damage, just as our communities and transportation systems are. Extreme weather events in recent years have provided more visibility of damaged trails and parks. Whether or not these events could be categorized under “Climate Change,” a significant amount of funding is being applied to weather-related repairs:

- Flooded recreation facilities
- Washed-out trails and erosion damage
- Tornados and wind-damaged buildings and campgrounds
- Blown-down trees in parks and forests

In “Strategic Issues Facing Transportation,” the Transportation Research Board provides a definition of climate change in the context of our infrastructure for mobility:

“Climate change presents a fundamental challenge to engineering and planning practice given that transportation infrastructure has traditionally been planned and designed based upon historical climate data under the implicit assumption that the climate is static and the future will be like the past. Climate change challenges this assumption and suggests that transportation professionals might need to consider new kinds of risks in facility design and system operations.”

In this context, as with Sustainability, trail managers may find that poor design and location of trails is the most pressing problem. Events and trends related to climate change will affect trails, but improving our trails in the long run will make them more resilient and less costly to maintain.

In discussions about the role of human effects and interventions related to climate change, trails are seen as having a positive effect. In making efforts toward reducing greenhouse gases, for instance, facilities and improvements to encourage more bicycling and walking can reduce driving.

Finally, trails make an important contribution to the environment by preserving green space. Trail and greenway corridors provide an opportunity for replanting trees as well as creating and rehabilitating wetlands and other habitat. In urban areas in particular, trail corridors maintain open space that is a respite from the built environment. Often trails run along former industrial areas that present opportunities for new plantings that create cooling corridors through our cities.

The FHWA’s “Climate Change and Extreme Weather Vulnerability Assessment Framework” is a guide for transportation agencies interested in assessing their vulnerability to climate change and extreme weather events.

http://goo.gl/FvwOhA
Safety and Environmental Education

RTP funding has been used in every State for educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection. OHV safety training and educational materials have been the largest type of RTP expenditures for this category.

The emerging popularity of human-powered boating and designated water trails has brought out new safety issues for the trails community and outdoor recreation managers. There are specific risks associated with water trails and a variety of needs for education on boating safety. States and organizations are providing information for recreationists and creating new safety programs. Safety is a key part of training and resources they provide for planning, managing, and promoting water trail facilities.

Trails and the natural areas they pass through are outdoor laboratories for schools as well as adults. For children active in natural settings, research seems to indicate a number of benefits in better understanding of the environment as well as improvements in physical and mental health. While trails promote environmental education, it is not about advocacy. It is an educational process that teaches about economic, social, and ecological interdependence while experiencing nature and the outdoors.

Tillamook County Water Trail

A 2013 RTP project funded printing and map development for a guidebook for the Tillamook County Water Trail, Oregon. The State provided $24,680 in the category of Education for Safety and Environmental Protection. Funding from other sources totalled $35,835. The project sponsor was Tillamook Estuaries Partnership, which facilitates volunteer involvement and stewardship, and works to educate users about relevant issues and best practices for nonmotorized water recreation. The goal of the Water Trail, which is also a designated National Recreation Trail, is to create “a recreational and educational experience that promotes and celebrates the value of Tillamook County’s waterways with direct benefit to the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the County.”

Sustainability

FHWA highlights sustainability as a key issue for highway projects, citing “context sensitive project development, habitat restoration, ecological connectivity, and site vegetation” in award criteria. For trails, sustainability may mean using more environmentally sustainable practices, mitigation of impacts, using recycled materials, and reducing erosion.

To trail managers, an important aspect of sustainability is reducing expenditures on maintenance by better design of trails, and the use of appropriate materials and structures. RTP funding applied to training is most often specifically intended to improve the quality of trail development by project sponsors.
Nevada's Tahoe-Pyramid Bikeway was a 2012 award winner; this suspension bridge over the Truckee River was substantially funded by a $200,000 RTP grant.

Annual Achievement Awards
for RTP-funded Projects

The Coalition for Recreational Trails (CRT), a federation of national trail-related organizations, hosts an annual achievement awards program to recognize outstanding trail projects funded by the Recreational Trails Program. The winners are recognized each year in Washington, DC during the American Recreation Coalition’s Great Outdoors Week in early June. The awards are part of the Coalition’s ongoing effort to build awareness of RTP accomplishments. Award winners are selected from projects nominated by public agencies, State administrators, organizations, or project sponsors.

Read more about the CRT Annual Achievement Awards and see details of the many projects that have been recognized since 2000:

http://goo.gl/0ts5CQ
About the Coalition for Recreational Trails

The CRT members work together to build awareness and understanding of the RTP. CRT was formed in 1992 following the passage of the ISTEA to ensure that the National Recreational Trails Fund Act (now known as the RTP) established by that legislation received adequate funding. During the six years of ISTEA, CRT worked to ensure that program was continued and strengthened as part of the ISTEA reauthorization process.

Following the enactment of TEA-21 in 1998 and SAFETEA-LU in 2005, both of which increased RTP funding, the CRT focused its efforts on supporting the continued, effective implementation of the RTP. CRT efforts supported continuing the program under MAP-21 with a set-aside of funding up to $84.1 million for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

Learn more about the CRT at:
http://goo.gl/iqgx3T
2013 CRT Award Winners

**Northern Erie Sno-Seekers Trail Grooming Equipment**
State: New York  
Sponsor/Partner: Northern Erie Sno-Seekers, Inc.

In Western New York, the Northern Erie Sno-Seekers, Inc. maintains over 120 miles of trails. This project, funded with $151,000 from the RTP, strengthens stewardship of the statewide winter trails system. Equipment purchased with funding from the RTP grant enables volunteers to groom the trails more often and more efficiently, enhancing the quality of trails. The new equipment will also enable an additional 15-20 mile expansion into Niagara County, creating new trail linkages and improving the continuity of the Snowmobile Trail System.

**School Messaging Project**
State: Minnesota  
Sponsor/Partner: Coalition for Recreational Trail Users; National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council

This project funded colorful, 5-by-5 foot posters in elementary, middle, and high schools in Minnesota. They didn’t publicize summer school, the final baseball game of the season, or prom. They promoted off-highway vehicle safety, and were seen by over 20,000 students, plus their teachers, school administrators, and parents.

**East and West Twin Creek Bridges**
State: Michigan  
Sponsor/Partner: Cycle Conservation Club of Michigan

The replacement of the two Twin Creek bridges addressed soil erosion and sedimentation issues and allowed for the continued and safe use of over 140 miles of designated motorized trails in Lake County, Michigan. The Little Manistee and Lincoln Hills Motorcycle Trails and Route system provides important OHV and snowmobile riding opportunities on State forest lands.
2013 CRT Award Winners

Multiple-Use Management & Corridor Sharing

Longleaf Trace Equestrian Trail Improvements and Extension
State: Mississippi
Sponsor/Partner: Pearl & Leaf Rivers Rails-to-Trails Recreational District

The Pearl & Leaf Rivers Rails-to-Trails Recreational District manages this multi-use trail on an abandoned railroad line in southeast Mississippi. Equestrian users organized a volunteer group, which, along with RTP funding, helped extend and improve a 23-mile dirt equestrian pathway parallel to the asphalt trail.

Environment and Wildlife Compatibility

Seneca Bluffs Trail and Trailhead Facility
State: Maryland
Sponsor/Partner: Friends of Seneca Creek State Park

The trail was planned by several trail user groups with Park personnel to accommodate horses, hikers, and bikers. While the park was riddled with old unauthorized trails, this new trail was sited along the ridge to both protect the watershed from undue erosion while providing trail users a fabulous view high above Great Seneca Creek.

Accessibility Enhancement

Beaman Park Accessible and Interpretive Trail
State: Tennessee
Sponsor/Partner: Friends of Beaman Park

The project enabled construction of a paved, accessible trail and boardwalk at the Beaman Park Nature Center. Work included: construction of a 500-foot paved accessible walking trail with trail signage; construction of a 300-foot accessible boardwalk and interpretive trail with signage; and construction of a 300-foot accessible firm-surface and interpretive trail with signage. The project improved the connection between the park’s new nature center and the existing trail system and was completed in 2012.
2013 CRT Award Winners

Use of Youth Conservation/Service Corps

Leicester Hollow Loop Trail
State: Vermont
Sponsor/Partner: Green Mountain National Forest; Vermont Department of Forests, Parks & Recreation; Vermont Youth Conservation Corps; Vermont Mountain Bike Association; Moosalamoo Association

This project relocated a historic trail out of a floodplain and completed watershed restoration activities for Leicester Hollow Brook. It also restored and expanded recreation access on the Green Mountain National Forest. RTP funding supported eight Vermont Youth Conservation Corps crews, totaling 65 crew members, over a span of three years. The project facilitated outreach efforts to attract more visitors to the region and to engage local groups and individuals in contributing to stewardship of Federal land.

Outstanding State Recreational Trails Advisory Committee

Wisconsin
The Wisconsin State Trails Council consists of representatives from 11 recreational trail user groups, covering the full range of motorized and nonmotorized activities. Because of the members’ long experience, and strong ties to trail users, the Council is well respected by the Wisconsin Legislature and offers a strong voice in promoting the RTP grants, shaping the program, and evaluating projects and grant applications.

Outstanding State Trail Program

West Virginia
For 20 years, the State’s RTP program has been staffed by personnel whose extensive outdoor recreation experience, plus long-term knowledge of State government, have ensured a high level of project efficiency. The staff’s commitment to timely investment of funding where it makes a critical difference has ensured the success of the RTP, which is the only source of dedicated trail funds in West Virginia.
Conclusions

RTP funding has been an essential ingredient in creating and improving over 19,400 trail-related projects nationwide, including urban greenways, nature centers, and horse, hiking, mountain bike, and motorized trails, as well as snow and water routes. States continue to add miles of trails as well as needed maintenance and improvements through grants to local project sponsors each year. Like other Highway Trust Fund programs, the RTP provides benefits to virtually every county in the United States.

In addition to this Federal funding, local sponsors have leveraged hundreds of millions of dollars in additional support from other sources for trails. The program encourages use of cost-effective youth and conservation corps, while also supporting thousands of volunteers who are performing trail work.

A review of RTP-funded projects also reveals many benefits to employment, environmental education, health, resource conservation, and community development. The program has encouraged productive cooperation among agencies and jurisdictions, facilitated healthy outdoor recreation, and supported badly needed economic activity in communities as well as rural areas.
The RTP is the foundation for State trail programs across the country. Every State has established its own initiatives with a designated administrator for assistance on trail issues and coordination of trail planning.

RTP funding is highly leveraged by community and State funds, as well as contributions from organizations and businesses. Of the projects completed between 1993 and 2013, total RTP funding was over $951 million with additional funding of over $710 million, showing that RTP funds were matched by nearly 75 percent in other funds. Further efficiencies are seen by the use of youth conservation and service corps working in cooperation with private contractors, agency or community staff, and volunteers.

In searching through the RTP Database, it is clear that the variety of projects is highly diverse. Because the funds are distributed for both motorized and nonmotorized trail work, all trail interests have incentives to cooperate and learn from each other. In every State, equestrians and cyclists, hikers and snowmobilers, ATV enthusiasts and paddlers have joined in support of local as well as regional efforts to meet the trail needs of all users.

Access the RTP Image Library and the RTP Database at:

http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org

Photographs of many examples of RTP-funded projects have also been gathered in the Image Library which is part of the online RTP Database. Photos from all 50 States and the District of Columbia are included along with examples of permissible uses of RTP funds for trails, related facility construction, and other project types.
For more information on many topics related to RTP funding as well as technical resources on trails of all types, see the following resources.

**Recreational Trails Program**

- Recreational Trails Program Database: [http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org](http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org)
- For policies and funding in every State, see the State RTP Administrators List to find program contacts and websites: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/rtpstate.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/rtpstate.cfm)
- The Coalition for Recreational Trails gives awards each year for outstanding projects funded through State RTP grants: [http://www.americantrails.org/awards/CRTawards.html](http://www.americantrails.org/awards/CRTawards.html)

**Accessible trails**


**Resources for trail planning, development, and management**

- For many resources on trail planning, design, construction, management, funding, and training, for both motorized and nonmotorized trails, see the National Trails Training Partnership Resources & Library: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/trailbuilding/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/trailbuilding/index.html)
- Trail management and maintenance: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/ManageMaintain/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/ManageMaintain/index.html)
- Trail user protection, safety, and risk management: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/safety/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/safety/index.html)
- Trail training resources: [http://www.americantrails.org/http/default.htm](http://www.americantrails.org/http/default.htm)
- Online calendar of trail training and education opportunities: [http://www.americantrails.org/Calendar.html](http://www.americantrails.org/Calendar.html)

**Youth and Conservation Corps**

- More about opportunities with corps nationwide at The Corps Network: [http://www.corpsnetwork.org](http://www.corpsnetwork.org)
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