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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the Arizona Game \& Fish Department (AGFD), and the Arizona State Parks Board (ASPB) are required, under Arizona Revised Statues (Sec. 28-5926), to conduct a study every three years on watercraft fuel consumption and recreational watercraft usage. The primary purposes of this effort are as follows:

- To determine the percentage of total state taxes paid to Arizona for motor vehicle fuel that is used for propelling watercraft; and
- To determine the number of days of recreational watercraft use in each of the state's counties by boat use days and person use days.

The fuel consumption data is collected to determine the allocation of motor vehicle fuel tax to the State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF). The information on recreational watercraft usage patterns on Arizona's lakes and rivers is necessary, in part, to determine the distribution of SLIF funds to applicants.

In addition to collecting the above mandated information, this study also collected selected attitudinal and behavioral data on the following subjects:

- Water-based and non-water-based recreational activities participated in;
- Boating and water-based recreational facility needs;
- SLIF fund utilization priorities;
- Adequacy and focus of watercraft law enforcement activities; and
- Attitudes about selected watercraft and outdoor recreation issues.

The information contained in this report is based on two key study components:

- A statistically valid and projectable telephone survey of 6,828 registered watercraft owners in Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah.
- An audit/survey of the fuel sales and consumption patterns of:
(1) marinas; (2) public agencies, and (3) concessionaires, commercial boat operators and excursion operators.

In addition to the boat owner surveys and the marina, agency and concessionary audits, this study also included a launch ramp survey. The launch ramp survey was conducted to check the ratio of in-state to out-of-state boaters at ten selected Arizona lakes and rivers.

The methodology utilized on the boat owner segment of this study paralleled the methodology used by BRC in the 1994, 1997, 2000 and 2003 Watercraft Studies. The one exception to this is that unlike the 2003 study, this study included Utah boaters since the State of Utah agreed to release their boat owner database for use in this study.

To develop the most accurate data possible, the data collection effort was divided into 24 separate data collection segments spread over the 12-month period from June 21, 2005 to June 8, 2006. Using this format, a total of approximately 564 interviews were conducted each month with one-half being conducted between roughly the 1st and 5th of the month and one-half between roughly the 16th and 20th of the month. During each of the 24 interviewing segments, boaters were asked to recall their boating patterns for only the two weeks prior to the interview.

This study was designed and executed under the direction of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of representatives from each sponsoring agency. The Behavior Research Center (BRC) wishes to thank each of the following TAC members for their indispensable assistance in the successful completion of this most important project:

- John Semmens, ADOT
- Tanna Thornburg, ASPB
- Kevin Bergersen, AGFD

The information generated from this study is presented in two volumes. VOLUME IEXECUTIVE SUMMARY presents a brief summary review of the key study findings and the methodology employed. VOLUME II - TECHNICAL REPORT presents an in-depth analysis of the study findings and a detailed explanation of the study methodology.

The Behavior Research Center has presented all of the data germane to the basic research objectives of the project. However, if the TAC requires additional data retrieval or interpretation, we stand ready to provide such input.

BEHAVIOR RESEARCH CENTER

### 2.0 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

## Fuel Consumption Data

- Total gasoline used to propel watercraft in the state of Arizona between June 1, 2005 and May 31, 2006 is estimated to be 46,970,760 gallons using Protocol Method Number Two as agreed upon by the agencies in 1991. This total represents 1.7157 percent of the total 2,737,702,381 gallons of taxable gasoline sold in Arizona during the study period. This is the percentage which should be used for the SLIF allocation.


## WATERCRAFT FUEL CONSUMPTION OF ARIZONA GASOLINE -- GALLONS



- The 2006 SLIF allocation of 1.7157 is up from the 2003 percentage of 1.4514 . The primary reason for the increase from 2003 is that the percent of boaters who used their watercraft on Arizona lakes and rivers in the prior two weeks increased from 8.0 percent in 2003 to 10.2 percent in 2006.
- The boating classification which continues to account for the largest amount of non-marina consumption is Class 2 (predominantly jet skis) with a reading of 37.8 percent. Among California boaters this class accounts for 56.1 percent of consumption. In Arizona Boat Class 5 ( 16 ' to 25 ' inboard and in/out) accounts for 42.2 percent of consumption.
- Gasoline is used to propel 99 percent of all boats, with the remainder utilizing diesel and aviation fuel.
- $\quad 94$ percent of Arizona boaters purchase Arizona fuel compared to 72 percent of California boaters, 39 percent of Utah boaters, and 19 percent of Nevada boaters. These figures are consistent with those recorded in 2003.
- $\quad 90$ percent of Arizona boaters purchase their Arizona fuel at a non-marina location compared to 89 percent of California boaters, 88 percent of Nevada boaters, and 70 percent of Utah boaters.


## Use Of Watercraft In Arizona

- $\quad 10.2$ percent of registered watercraft owners in Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah use their boats in Arizona during any given two week period - up from 8.0 percent in 2003. Among Arizona watercraft owners, usage reaches 16.4 percent - up from 14.1 percent in 2003.
- As might be expected, the Arizona usage figure is above those for the other three states studied with 8.3 percent of California owners, 15.9 percent of Nevada owners, and 2.2 percent of Utah owners indicating use in Arizona during any two-week period. The percentage of California owners using their boats is up from 2003 (5.4\%), as is the percentage among Nevada owners (12.9\%).
- As noted in the previous studies, while the California use figure may look minimal compared to Arizona's, this is not the case due to the sheer volume of boats registered in California. For example, the California two-week use figure translates into 28,944 California owners using Arizona lakes and rivers ( $8.3 \%$ of 348,725 total owners). The comparable number for Arizona is 31,396 (16.4\% of 191,440 ).


## BOAT USE IN ARIZONA IN ANY GIVEN 2-WEEK PERIOD



- $\quad 38.2$ percent of all watercraft owners in the four state survey universe utilized their boat in Arizona during the prior year - down from 40.6 percent in 2003. Among Arizona users the figure reaches 57.5 percent compared to 32.7 percent among California owners, 42.6 percent among Nevada owners, and 13.3 percent among Utah owners.
- Total boat use days in 2006 were $4,793,501$, a 48 percent increase over the $3,229,153$ boat use days recorded in 2003. Similar to the prior three studies, Mohave County is the dominant boating location in Arizona with 49.9 percent of total boat use days - up from 40.8 percent in 2003. The study also reveals increased boat use in Maricopa, La Paz, Coconino, Gila and Yuma Counties.

BOAT USE DAYS BY ARIZONA COUNTY


- Person use days also increased from 14,781,894 in 2003 to 23,409,303 in 2006 - a 58 percent increase. As in the case with boat use days, Mohave County is the dominant boating location in Arizona accounting for 52.2 percent of all person use days.
- Arizona boaters account for 47.8 percent of boat use days followed by California boaters with 42.7 percent, Nevada boaters with 5.6 percent and Utah boaters with 3.9 percent. These figures represent increases in boat use days among boaters from Arizona and California since the last study, while boat use days are little changed among Nevada boaters.


## BOAT USE DAYS BY STATE GIVEN 2-WEEK PERIOD



- California boaters account for the largest share of person use days. Thus we find that California boaters account for 47.4 percent of person use days followed by 43.7 percent for Arizona boaters, 5.0 percent for Nevada boaters and 3.9 percent for Utah boaters. The primary reason for California's high percentage is the fact that California boaters tend to have larger boating parties.
- Lake Havasu continues to be the state's most utilized lake in terms of both boat use days $(1,324,161)$ and person use days $(6,636,491)$.


## PERSON USE DAYS BY STATE GIVEN 2-WEEK PERIOD



## Additional Boating Data

- The average daily expenditure for a boating trip in Arizona is \$352-up from \$232 in 2003. The typical Arizona boater spends $\$ 184$ per day compared to $\$ 624$ for California boaters, $\$ 150$ for Nevada boaters, and $\$ 600$ for Utah boaters.
- Launch ramps (24\%) and public restrooms (21\%) continue to be the most frequently mentioned needed facilities at boaters' favorite lakes.
- When boaters are asked to evaluate each of 22 specific boating and water-based recreational facilities at their favorite lake, the facility registering the highest net positive reading continues to be paved access roads ( $+44 \%$ ). Informational signs receive the next highest net positive reading (+32\%), followed by parking facilities for vehicles (28\%), campgrounds (+28\%), and launching ramps (+27\%). Three items register net negative readings from roughly one-quarter of boaters or more: emergency telephones (-29\%), drinking water outlets ( $-28 \%$ ) and trash dumpsters accessible by boat ( $-24 \%$ ).
- Eight percent of boaters are aware of the SLIF program, similar to the nine percent recorded in 2003 and ten percent in 2000. As might be expected, awareness is highest in Arizona with a reading of 12 percent.
- When boaters are asked if they feel the program's funds should be used mostly for renovations or new building, a majority of boaters select renovations over new building -- 55 percent vs. 31 percent. This reading for renovation is virtually unchanged from the 2000 and 2003 readings.
- When boaters are asked how important they feel each of six SLIF funding functions are, four of the functions are rated very or somewhat important by over eight out of ten boaters: 1) the construction of first-aid stations and other safety facilities ( $88 \%$ ); 2) the purchasing of law enforcement and safety equipment such as patrol boats, radios and lights ( $87 \%$ ); 3) the construction of water-based boating facilities such as marinas, launch ramps and piers (86\%); and 4) the construction of recreation support facilities such as restrooms, campgrounds and picnic tables ( $85 \%$ );. These four functions have remained at the top of the importance list over the past three studies.
- A new question was added to the 2000 study to determine boaters' preferences for the uses of a new lake, should one be developed. Seven different boating activities were evaluated and, as was the case in 2000 and 2003, four received ratings of very or somewhat important by more than 80 percent of the boaters: 1) general pleasure boating ( $95 \%$ ); 2) fishing ( $91 \%$ ); 3) water skiing ( $85 \%$ ); and 4) power boating ( $84 \%$ ). Jet skiing again received the lowest preference rating with 63 percent of boaters offering a very or somewhat important rating.
- $\quad$ Stopping people who are boating recklessly (52\%) and stopping people who are boating while drunk ( $50 \%$ ) continue to be the two law enforcement activities which boaters would most like to see increased at their favorite lake or river. Also relating to law enforcement and safety issues at Arizona lakes, roughly three out of four boaters or more agree with the following attitudes:
- That hands-on training should be required for boat rental customers (86\%).
- That boating law violators should be required to take a boating safety class (82\%).
- $\quad$ That laws and regulations are being adequately enforced (79\%).
- $\quad$ That the minimum age for boat operators should be 16 years old ( $73 \%$ ).
- Eight out of ten boaters (80\%) support boating safety educational centers at Arizona lakes virtually unchanged from 79 percent in 2003.
- A majority of boaters ( $61 \%$ ) do not believe their favorite lake is too crowded while 36 percent do.
- $\quad 55$ percent of boaters would support designating special areas for use only by jet skis down from 60 percent in 2000 and 57 percent in 2003.
- A majority of boaters (51\%) believe their favorite lake needs additional developed campgrounds - unchanged from 51 percent in 2003 - and that it needs additional primitive campgrounds (52\%) - up from 50 percent in 2003.
- 50 percent of boaters believe their favorite lake needs additional RV hook-ups - up from 46 percent in 2003.
- Boaters continue to be split on whether the launch ramps at their favorite lake are too crowded ( $49 \%$ agree, $47 \%$ disagree) and whether the number of people using a lake should be restricted during high use periods ( $48 \%$ agree, $48 \%$ disagree). These readings are virtually unchanged since 2003.
- Boaters' top three single favorite boating activities continue to be fishing (30\%), general pleasure boating ( $26 \%$ ) and water skiing (19\%). The water skiing reading has dropped from the top spot in 2000 and 2003.


### 3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Introduction

To properly address the Departments' informational needs, it was necessary to collect information from a variety of population universes which either consume or sell Arizona fuel or utilize Arizona's lakes and rivers for recreational purposes. The specific universes studied during the course of this project were as follows:

Surveyed Universes:

- Arizona registered owners;
- Non-Arizona registered boat owners who utilize Arizona's lakes and rivers;

Audited/Surveyed Universes:

- Concessionaires, commercial boat operators and excursion operators who consume Arizona fuel;
- Public agencies which consume Arizona fuel; and
- Marinas servicing Arizona lakes and rivers which sell fuel.

The purpose of this section of the report is to address the procedures followed to collect the necessary information from these universes.

### 3.2 Boat Owner Survey - Sample Selection

In order to get an accurate picture of boaters' use of Arizona's lakes and rivers, this project component utilized a very large random sample of 6,828 Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah watercraft owners. A sample of this size is very unusual but was deemed necessary for this project due to its importance.

The sample of 6,828 watercraft owners utilized on this project component represents 1.08 percent of the 634,586 owners in the four-state region studied. As an example of how large this 1.08 percent sample of the total universe is, the typical statewide Arizona sample consists of approximately 800 respondents, or .0004 percent of Arizona's estimated 2,211,235 households, while the typical national United States sample consists of 1,500 respondents, or . 00001 percent of the United States' estimated 112,267,302 households.

The following several pages of this report offer a detailed description on how the boat owner survey was conducted.

To determine the percentage of all fuel sold in Arizona attributable to propelling watercraft, it was first necessary to determine the total number of gallons sold to watercraft within the state. To arrive at this figure, the consumption patterns of two distinct user groups were studied: (1) Arizona registered boats for which gasoline is purchased in Arizona, and; (2) non-Arizona registered boats for which gasoline is purchased in Arizona.

A total of 634,586 Arizona and non-Arizona registered boat owners stratified by boat class were systematically random-sampled via telephone from current boat registration lists obtained from each state included in the study (Arizona Game and Fish Department, California Department of Motor Vehicles, Nevada Division of Wildlife and Utah Division of Motor Vehicles) to determine their fuel consumption and usage patterns during the study period. These figures were then projected to total boat registrations and the findings presented later in this report were calculated. The nonArizona boaters' sample was drawn from the neighboring California counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego and San Bernardino, the Nevada county of Clark and the state of Utah.

As may be seen on the following table, a total of 634,586 watercraft are registered in the sample universe. Of this total, 54.9 percent are located in California while 30.2 percent are located in Arizona, 3.1 percent in Nevada and 11.8 percent in Utah.

In addition to the sheer volume of watercraft California contributes to the sample universe several other interesting findings are also worth noting in Table 1:

## Arizona Watercraft:

- High proportions of watercraft in 4 ( 16 ' to $25^{\prime}$ outboards).


## California Watercraft:

- High proportion of class 2 watercraft (under $16^{\prime} \&$ in/out which is predominately jet skis).


## Nevada Watercraft:

- $\quad$ High proportion of watercraft in class 5 ( 16 ' to $25^{\prime}$ in/out \& in) and class 8 (over 25 ' in \& in/out).


## Utah Watercraft:

- High proportion of watercraft in class 5.

State of Registration $\qquad$
TOTAL

|  | Arizona |  | California |  | Nevada |  | UтAh |  | Number | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASS | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |  |  |
| 1 | 39,525 | 20.7 | 54,391 | 15.6 | 2,606 | 13.3 | 14,628 | 19.5 | 111,150 | 17.5 |
| 2 | 38,513 | 20.1 | 118,189 | 33.9 | 4,748 | 24.3 | 14,810 | 19.8 | 176,260 | 27.8 |
| 3 | 605 | . 3 | 14,615 | 4.2 | 21 | . 1 | 417 | . 6 | 15,658 | 2.4 |
| 4 | 45,568 | 23.8 | 43,018 | 12.3 | 2,896 | 14.8 | 13,073 | 17.5 | 104,555 | 16.5 |
| 5 | 56,306 | 29.4 | 95,053 | 27.3 | 7,495 | 38.3 | 28,088 | 37.5 | 186,942 | 29.4 |
| 6 | 1,423 | . 8 | 9,900 | 2.8 | 155 | . 8 | 720 | 1.0 | 12,198 | 1.9 |
| 7 | 2,350 | 1.2 | 1,227 | . 4 | 267 | 1.4 | 998 | 1.3 | 4,842 | . 8 |
| 8 | 6,910 | 3.6 | 8,531 | 2.4 | 1,302 | 6.7 | 2,021 | 2.7 | 18,764 | 3.0 |
| 9 | 240 | . 1 | 3,801 | 1.1 | 61 | . 3 | 15 | . 1 | 4,217 | . 7 |
| Total | 191,440 | 100.0\% | 348,725 | 100.0\% | 19,551 | 100.0\% | 74,870 | 100.0\% | 634,586 | 100.0\% |
| Cumulative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 30.2 |  | 54. |  |  |  | 11.8 |  |  |  |

To develop the most accurate data possible, the data collection effort was divided into 24 separate data collection segments spread over the 12-month period from June 21, 2005 to June 8, 2006. Using this format, a total of approximately 564 interviews were conducted each month ( 242 Arizona, 242 California, 50 Nevada and 30 Utah) with one-half being conducted between roughly the 1st and 5th of the month and one-half between roughly the 16th and 20th of the month. During each of the 24 interviewing segments, boaters were asked to recall their boating patterns for only the two weeks prior to the interview.

At the beginning of this process, an analysis was made of the gasoline consumption variances that existed within each of the nine size/propulsion categories from the 2003 Arizona Watercraft Survey to determine the best method to stratify the current sample of boat owners to optimize sampling accuracy and efficiency. This analysis revealed that certain categories are very homogeneous and thus render relatively small standard deviations, while other classes are very heterogeneous and thus render relatively large standard deviations. This situation called for the use of a disproportional stratified sample in this segment of the study.

| CLASS | LENGTH | Propulsion |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | Under 16' | Outboard (prop) |
| 2 | Under 16' | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) |
| 3 | Under 16' | Other (sail, oar, electric) |
| 4 | $16^{\prime}$ to 25' | Outboard (prop) |
| 5 | 16' to 25' | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) |
| 6 | 16' to 25' | Other (sail, oar, electric) |
| 7 | Over 25' | Outboard (prop) |
| 8 | Over 25' | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) |
| 9 | Over 25' | Other (sail, oar, electric) |

In disproportional stratified sampling, disproportionate sampling fractions are used to manipulate the number of cases selected from each strata (in this case, the nine size/propulsion classes), with the strata's standard deviations being used as the basis for allocation of cases. Those classes with proportionately larger standard deviations receive a proportionately larger number of cases, while those with proportionately smaller standard deviations receive a proportionately smaller number of cases. In essence, this sampling method allows us to select fewer cases from homogeneous classes and more cases from heterogeneous classes, thereby increasing overall sampling efficiency and accuracy. As a result, the final gasoline consumption estimates are sensitive to variations in consumption within the size/propulsion classes, thereby increasing the accuracy of the final estimate. In addition, this methodology meets the contractrequired minimum of a margin of error of less than five percent at a 95 percent confidence level.

## TABLE 2: TOTAL SAMPLING DISTRIBUTION

| BOAT Class | LengTh | Propulsion | 2003 Watercraft Survey |  |  |  |  | DisproPORTIONAL Stratified SAMPLE | +/- Margin of Error at 95\% Confidence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Avg. (Mean) Daily Fuel Consumption | Standard Deviation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% OF } 2005 \\ & \text { REGISTRATIONS } \end{aligned}$ | Proportional SAMPLE Distribution | +/- Margin of Error at 95\% Confidence |  |  |
| 1 | Under 16' | Outboard (prop \& jet) | 7.0 | 7.6 | 17.5 | 1,134 | 3.0 | 1,100 | 3.0 |
| 2 | Under 16' | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) | 14.7 | 16.3 | 27.8 | 1,801 | 2.3 | 1,650 | 2.5 |
| 3 | Under 16' | Other (sail, oar, electric) | 5.4 | 6.6 | 2.4 | 156 | 8.0 | 200 | 7.1 |
| 4 | $16^{\prime}$ to $25^{\prime}$ | Outboard (prop \& jet) | 9.9 | 13.2 | 16.5 | 1,070 | 3.1 | 1,100 | 3.0 |
| 5 | $16^{\prime}$ to $25^{\prime}$ | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) | 17.3 | 45.8 | 29.4 | 1,905 | 2.3 | 1,780 | 2.4 |
| 6 | $16^{\prime}$ to $25^{\prime}$ | Other (sail, oar, electric) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 123 | 9.0 | 150 | 8.1 |
| 7 | Over 25' | Outboard (prop \& jet) | 12.7 | 12.4 | 0.8 | 52 | 13.9 | 125 | 8.3 |
| 8 | Over 25' | Inboard \& In/Out (prop \& jet) | 32.6 | 30.9 | 3.0 | 194 | 7.2 | 275 | 6.0 |
| 9 | Over 25' | Other (Sail, oar, electric) | 7.0 | 12.0 | 0.7 | 45 | 14.9 | 100 | 8.5 |
| Total |  |  | 13.4 | 16.5 | 100.0\% | 6,480 | 1.2 | 6,480 | 1.2 |

To properly address this study's informational needs, the total interview sampling base was distributed among Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah watercraft owners in the following fashion. This distribution is similar to the 2000 study, in that it does not exactly reflect the Boat Use Days distribution derived from the prior Watercraft Survey. This distribution was used because it allows for more sensitive county use data (since few Californians use any Arizona lakes except those adjacent to the Colorado River) without harming the ability to estimate the required fuel consumption data.

## TABLE 3: SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION - BY STATE

| STATE | BOAT USE <br> DAYS 2003 | SAMPLE <br> PERCENT | SAMPLE <br> NUMBER |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | 44.0 | $44.0 \%$ | 2,850 |
| California | 48.9 | 44.0 | 2,850 |
| Nevada | 7.1 | 8.0 | 520 |
| Utah | UNK | $\underline{4.0}$ | $\underline{260}$ |
| TOTAL | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | 6,480 |

On the following table is presented a review of the total number of interviews conducted by state and boat class. As Table 4 reveals, a total of 6,828 interviews were conducted during the course of this study - 2,939 Arizona, 2,917 California, 609 Nevada, 363 Utah. This volume is higher than the 6,480 initially planned for because additional interviews were conducted during each of the 24 interviewing segments.

TABLE 4: NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS COMPLETED

| Boat Class | State of Registration |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| 1 | 1,133 | 578 | 434 | 73 | 48 |
| 2 | 1,719 | 583 | 941 | 145 | 50 |
| 3 | 242 | 25 | 193 | 0 | 24 |
| 4 | 1,111 | 653 | 337 | 73 | 48 |
| 5 | 1,776 | 808 | 676 | 196 | 96 |
| 6 | 242 | 73 | 120 | 25 | 24 |
| 7 | 147 | 74 | 24 | 24 | 25 |
| 8 | 290 | 121 | 96 | 49 | 24 |
| 9 | 168 | 24 | 96 | 24 | 24 |
| Total | 6,828 | 2,939 | 2,917 | 609 | 363 |

### 3.3 Boat Owner Survey -- Questionnaire Development

The survey questionnaire utilized on this project was developed by BRC in conjunction with the TAC (see Appendix B). The question areas were as follows:

## Watercraft Use:

- Number of days watercraft used (prior 2 weeks, annually)
- Reasons for non-use
- Specific Arizona lakes and rivers visited (prior 2 weeks, prior 12 months)
- Number of boating trips made (prior 2 weeks)
- Presence of boat engine
- Horsepower of boat engine
- Types of fuel used
- Average daily fuel consumption
- Types of vendors from which fuel purchased
- Percent of fuel purchased in Arizona


## Destination Information:

- Most frequently visited lakes or rivers
- Average dollar amount spent on typical boating trip


## Recreational Use Data:

- Boating activities engaged in during the recreation day
- Number of people per boating party on a typical outing


## Boater Opinion:

- Types of boating and water-based recreational facilities needed at lake or river most often visited
- Evaluation of water-based recreation facilities at lake or river most often visited
- Adequacy of boating law enforcement and the safety and education programs at lake or river most often visited
- Awareness of State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF)
- SLIF program funding priorities
- General attitudes on selected boating issues

After approval of the preliminary draft questionnaire, it was pre-tested with a randomly selected cross-section of watercraft owners. The pre-test focused on the value and understandability of the questions, adequacy of response categories, questions for which probes were necessary and the like. Several minor changes were made following the pre-test and the final form received TAC approval.

This survey utilized a "split" sample methodology. Using this methodology, selected survey questions were designated core questions and asked of all survey respondents while other survey questions were asked of only one-third of the survey respondents. This methodology is commonly used when the volume of information desired is particularly extensive and the number of interviews to be conducted is of adequate size to justify splitting. Questions 1 through 17a were designated core questions for the purpose of this survey and asked of all study respondents. The remaining questions were asked of approximately one-third of the study respondents.

### 3.4 Boat Owner Survey -- Data Collection

All of the interviewing on this project was conducted at BRC's Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) facility in Phoenix where each interviewer worked under the direct supervision of BRC supervisory personnel. All of the interviewers who worked on this project were professional interviewers of the Center. Each had prior experience with BRC and received a thorough briefing on the particulars of this study. During the briefing, the interviewers were trained on (a) the purpose of the study, (b) sampling procedures, (c) administration of the questionnaire, and; (d) other project related factors. In addition, each interviewer completed a set of practice interviews to assure that all procedures were understood and followed.

As noted earlier, telephone interviewing on this study was conducted during 24 two-week time segments starting in June 2005 and ending in June 2006. During each segment, interviewing was restricted to Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays in order to avoid those days (Friday through Monday) on which the target universe (boat owners) was most likely to be away from home using their watercraft. Further, during the interviewing segment of this study, up to four separate attempts, on different days and during different times of day, were made to contact each selected boat owner. Only after four unsuccessful attempts was a selected boat owner substituted in the sample. Using this methodology, the full sample was completed and partially completed were not accepted or counted toward fulfillment of the total sample quotas.

One hundred percent of the completed interviews were edited and any containing errors were pulled and the errors corrected. In addition, 15 percent of each interviewer's work was randomly selected for validation to ensure its authenticity and correctness. No problems were encountered during this phase of interviewing quality control.

As the data collection segment of this study was being undertaken, completed and validated interviews were turned over to BRC's in-house coding department. The coding department edited, validated and coded the interviews. Each interview that received final coding department approval was then transferred to the BRC computer department where a series of validity and logic checks were run on the data to insure it was "clean."

The final step prior to running computer analysis of the survey data was to "weight" the data to reflect the actual distribution of watercraft found in the sample universe as revealed earlier in Table 1. This weighted data was only used in analyzing the attitudinal data collected in the survey, not in calculating the fuel consumption and boat use data.

### 3.5 Study Audits/Survey

The second major data collection component on this project consisted of conducting audits of: (1) concessionaires, commercial boat operators and excursion operators; (2) government agencies, and; (3) marinas.

Each of these groups were audited/surveyed to collect the following information:

- Concessionaires, Commercial Boat Operators and Excursion Operators: To determine the amount of non-marina, Arizona gasoline they purchased.
- Government Agencies: To determine the amount of non-marina, Arizona gasoline subject to tax they purchased.
- Marinas: To determine the amount of gasoline purchased from Arizona distributors they sold.

In order to conduct these audits/surveys, it was first necessary to generate lists of each subject group. This was accomplished: (a) by using the lists compiled in previous Watercraft Surveys; (b) by reviewing telephone and Internet directories from around the state; (c) by reviewing AGFD's watercraft registration data base; (d) through discussions with selected chambers of commerce; (e) by referrals from other operators, agencies and marinas, and; (f) through discussions with AGFD Regional Supervisors.

All those on the identified lists were mailed a self-administered questionnaire along with a postage-paid, return mail envelope. Respondents were given approximately two weeks to respond to the mailing before follow-up telephone contact was undertaken and continued until a response was achieved. The audit/survey forms utilized during this study component are included in Appendix B of this report.

## TABLE 5: NUMBER OF AUDITS/SURVEYS COMPLETED

## MARINAS

Total forms mailed ..... 65
No fuel sold/No Arizona fuel sold ..... 28
Sell Arizona gasoline ..... 23
No longer in business ..... 11
Did not respond after multiple attempts/refused ..... 3
Concessionaires
Total forms mailed ..... 223
No fuel used/No qualified fuel used ..... 87
No longer in business ..... 76
Arizona fuel used ..... 52
Did not respond after multiple attempts/refused ..... 8
Government Agencies
Total forms mailed ..... 107
No fuel used/No qualified fuel used ..... 48
Qualified Arizona fuel used ..... 51
Did not respond after multiple attempts/refused ..... 8

### 3.6 Launch Ramp Survey

The final major data collection component on this project consisted of conducting a launch ramp observation survey to determine the ratio of in-state to out-of-state boaters on selected Arizona lakes and rivers. The ten lakes and rivers selected for inclusion into this study phase were chosen by the TAC and included the inland and border waterways listed below. A total of six observations were conducted at each site during the peak launching hours from 6:00 a.m. and noon. The six observations were distributed so they covered the following time periods: 1) two weekday observations (one in the on-season, one in the off-season); 2) three weekend observations (two in the on-season, one in the off-season), and; 3) one holiday observation (Memorial Day, Fourth of July or Labor Day).

| LAKE/RIVER | LOCATIONS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bartlett | Public Ramp |
| Havasu | Lake Havasu Marina/ <br> Sandy Point Marina |
| Martinez | Marina Ramp |
| Mead | Temple Bar |
| Mohave | Katherine's Landing/ <br> Willow Beach |
| Parker Strip | Buckskin Mountain State Park |
| Pleasant | Marina/Public Ramps |
| Powell | Wahweap Marina |
| Roosevelt | Marina/Cholla Ramp |
| Saguaro | Public Ramps |

Following completion of the boat owner surveys, the study audits/surveys, and the launch ramp surveys the data presented in the remainder of this report was compiled.

### 4.0 OVERALL USE OF ARIZONA LAKES AND RIVERS

Watercraft owners were asked to indicate whether or not they utilized their boats on Arizona lakes and rivers during the two weeks prior to being interviewed or at any time during the prior 12 months.

Looking first at use during the prior two weeks, we find that 10.2 percent of registered watercraft owners in Arizona, California, Nevada and Utah use their boats during any given two week period - up from 8.0 percent in 2003. Among Arizona watercraft owners, usage reaches 16.4 percent, which is above the 14.1 percent recorded in 2003.

The Arizona usage figure is above those for the other three states studied with 8.3 percent of California owners, 15.9 percent of Nevada owners and 2.2 percent of Utah owners indicating use in Arizona during any two-week period. The percentage of California owners using their boats in Arizona is up from 2003 (5.4\%) as is the percentage among Nevada owners (12.9\%).

As noted in the previous studies, while the California use figure may look minimal compared to Arizona's, this is not the case due to the sheer volume of boats registered in California. For example, the California two-week use figure translates into 28,944 California owners using Arizona lakes and rivers ( $8.3 \%$ of 348,725 total owners). The comparable number for Arizona is 31,396 (16.4\% of 191,440 ).

Looking next at the 12-month figures, we find that 38.2 percent of all watercraft owners in the four state survey universe utilized their boat in Arizona during the prior year, which is down from 40.6 percent in 2003. Among Arizona users, the figure reaches 57.5 percent compared to 32.7 percent among California owners, 42.6 percent among Nevada owners and 13.3 percent among Utah owners.

TABLE 6: WATERCRAFT USE ON ARIZONA
LAKE AND RIVERS -- PAST 2 WEEKS/PAST 12 MONTHS
"To start, was your boat used on Arizona lakes and rivers, including the Colorado River, during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH)?"
"Did you use your boat on Arizona lakes and rivers including the Colorado River, any time during the past 12 months?"

|  | Used Past 2 WEEKS |  |  |  |  | Used Past 12 Months |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | AriZona | California | Nevada | Utah | Total | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| Total-2006 | 10.2\% | 16.4\% | 8.3\% | 15.9\% | 2.2\% | 38.2\% | 57.5\% | 32.7\% | 42.6\% | 13.3\% |
| -2003 | 8.0 | 14.1 | 5.4 | 12.9 | UNK | 40.6 | 61.4 | 32.3 | 46.4 | UNK |
| -2000 | 8.9 | 16.9 | 5.7 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 37.8 | 61.9 | 29.6 | 49.1 | 22.6 |
| BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3.8\% | 6.9\% | 2.3\% | 8.2\% | 0\% | 21.5\% | 41.2\% | 11.3\% | 24.7\% | 6.2\% |
| 2 | 14.5 | 17.7 | 14.3 | 18.6 | 6.0 | 50.3 | 63.8 | 49.3 | 45.5 | 24.0 |
| 3 | 1.4 | 8.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 4.2 | 8.6 | 36.0 | 7.3 | 0 | 12.5 |
| 4 | 10.4 | 18.8 | 4.5 | 13.7 | 0 | 36.3 | 57.6 | 22.8 | 42.5 | 4.2 |
| 5 | 10.4 | 18.1 | 7.8 | 16.8 | 2.1 | 41.6 | 62.1 | 37.6 | 44.4 | 13.5 |
| 6 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 24.0 | 4.2 | 17.3 | 49.3 | 11.7 | 48.0 | 12.5 |
| 7 | 18.6 | 20.3 | 16.7 | 29.2 | 12.0 | 46.8 | 66.2 | 20.8 | 58.3 | 28.0 |
| 8 | 17.1 | 33.9 | 7.3 | 14.3 | 0 | 46.2 | 78.5 | 19.8 | 53.1 | 37.5 |
| 9 | 4.4 | 25.0 | 1.0 | 8.3 | 0 | 11.8 | 50.0 | 3.1 | 33.3 | 4.2 |
| Summarized CLASSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 16' (1-3) | 9.8\% | 12.3\% | 9.8\% | 14.7\% | 2.8\% | 37.5\% | 52.2\% | 34.9\% | 38.7\% | 15.3\% |
| $16^{\prime}$ to 25' (4-6) | 10.2 | 18.3 | 6.6 | 17.4 | 1.5 | 38.7 | 59.9 | 31.6 | 44.0 | 10.8 |
| 26'+(7-9) | 15.0 | 30.3 | 5.6 | 17.9 | 4.9 | 39.7 | 73.4 | 15.3 | 46.4 | 29.3 |

Table Note: $\quad 2$ week data based on 700 users ( $10.2 \%$ of 6,828 ), 12 month data based on 2,610 users (38.2\% of 6,828).

The main reasons Arizona watercraft owners give for not using their boats in the state is that they are either too busy (39\%) or have lost interest ( $26 \%$ ). The main reason among California, Nevada and Utah owners is that they only use their boats in their home state (California 42\%, Nevada 30\%, Utah 50\%).

## TABLE 7: MAIN REASONS FOR NOT USING BOAT

 WITHIN THE LAST 12 MONTHS"Was there any particular reason your boat wasn't used in Arizona?"

State of Registration
Arizona California Nevada Utah

Too busy, no time
Loss of interest, prefer other forms of recreation, medical
Boat is inoperable, broken down, in storage
Out-of-state resident, use only in other state The expense is too much Distance to Arizona lakes and rivers is too far
All other responses
$\begin{array}{llll}2 & 13 & 8 & 25\end{array}$
$39 \%$
26
16
$8 \quad 42$
42
4

7
$25 \%$
9\%
26
13

4

7
Totals exceed 100\% due to multiple responses.

On Table 8, data is presented on use days and trip frequency during the past two weeks and the past 12 months. The following patterns are revealed:

## Usage Past 2 Weeks

- Number of use days - Owners used their boats on Arizona lakes and rivers an average of 3.4 days in the past two weeks -- unchanged from in 2003.
- Number of trips - The typical owner that used their boat in the past two weeks made only one trip (57\%) during the two-week period - unchanged from 2003.


## USAGE PAST 12 MONTHS

- Number of use days - Owners used their boats on Arizona lakes and rivers an average of 15.1 days in the past 12 months -- down from 16.1 days in 2003. Arizona owners' use decreased from 17.8 days in 2003 to 16.8 days in 2006.
- Number of trips - Fifty-one percent of owners who used their boats in Arizona during the past two weeks made 10 or more trips in the past 12 months - virtually unchanged from 53 percent in 2000.

TABLE 8: USE DAYS AND NUMBER OF TRIPS --
PAST 2 WEEKS/PAST 12 MONTHS (Among Owners Using Boats In Arizona)

|  | TOTAL |  |  | State of Registration - 2005 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| Number of Use Days | Past 2 Weeks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 18\% | 20\% | 18\% | 26\% | 10\% | 22\% | 0\% |
| 2 | 30 | 26 | 25 | 28 | 30 | 38 | 37 |
| 3 | 18 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 20 | 23 | 21 |
| 4 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 16 | 7 | 3 |
| 5 to 6 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 35 |
| 7 or more | $\frac{9}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{10}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{12}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{8}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{11}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{6}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{4}{100 \%}$ |
| MEAN - 2006 | 3.4 | NA | NA | 3.3 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 4.3 |
| - 2003 | NA | 3.4 | NA | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.2 | UNK |
| -2000 | NA | NA | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 3.6 |

## Number of Trips

| 1 | $57 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 19 | 31 | 0 |
| 3 or more | $\underline{19}$ | $\underline{21}$ | $\underline{20}$ | $\underline{21}$ | $\underline{17}$ | $\underline{22}$ | $\frac{3}{102}$ |
|  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\underline{100} \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

(CONTINUED)
(CONT.) TABLE 8: USE DAYS AND NUMBER OF TRIPS -PAST 2 WEEKS/PAST 12 MONTHS
(Among Owners Using Boats in Arizona)

| TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |

State of Registration - 2005
200620032000 Arizona California Nevada Utah

Number of Use Days

## Past 12 months

| 1 to 5 | 34\% | 30\% | 31\% | 31\% | 37\% | 36\% | 41\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 to 10 | 24 | 27 | 27 | 23 | 26 | 21 | 28 |
| 11 to 15 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 28 |
| 16 to 24 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| 25 to 49 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 12 |
| 50 or over | $\frac{4}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{5}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{6}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{6}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{3}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{6}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{1}{100 \%}$ |
| Mean - 2006 | 15.1 | NA | NA | 16.8 | 13.6 | 18.6 | 11.8 |
| - 2003 | NA | 16.1 | NA | 17.8 | 14.4 | 19.8 | UNK |
| - 2000 | NA | NA | 15.9 | 19.7 | 13.3 | 15.8 | 10.5 |

## Number of Trips ${ }^{1}$

| 1 to 4 | 27\% | 27\% | 28\% | 16\% | 36\% | 25\% | 59\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 to 9 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 18 | 26 | 14 | 41 |
| 10 to 14 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 0 |
| 15 to 24 | 18 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 12 | 22 | 0 |
| 25 to 49 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 0 |
| 50 or over | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 0 |
|  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

${ }^{1}$ Only asked of those owners who also used their boat in past 2 weeks.

### 5.0 FUEL CONSUMPTION

In this section of the report we present an analysis of the percentage of total Arizona fuel consumed by watercraft within the state.

### 5.1 Boat Owner Survey

Looking first at general fuel consumption patterns, we present Table 9 which reveals the following findings:

- Gasoline is used to propel approximately 99 percent of all boats, with the remainder utilizing diesel and aviation fuel.
- 94 percent of Arizona boaters purchase Arizona fuel compared to 72 percent of California boaters, 39 percent of Utah boaters and 19 percent of Nevada boaters. These figures are consistent with those recorded in the 2003 Survey.
- 90 percent of Arizona boaters purchase their Arizona fuel at a non-marina location compared to 89 percent of California boaters, 88 percent of Nevada boaters and 70 percent of Utah boaters. Marina purchasing reaches its highest level among Utah boaters (30\%).
- The typical Arizona boater who utilized their boat in the prior two weeks purchased 43.0 gallons of Arizona fuel, while the typical California boater purchased 36.0 gallons, the typical Utah boater 34.5 gallons and the typical Nevada boater 7.8 gallons. These figures represent a sizeable increase of 6.6 gallons among Arizona boaters since 2003. California boaters reveal a decrease of only .7 gallons over the same period while Nevada boaters reveal a decrease of 7.4 gallons.

TABLE 9: FUEL CONSUMPTION PATTERNS AMONG
BOATERS UTILIZING WATERCRAFT IN ARIZONA DURING
PRECEDING 2-WEEK PERIOD

Type of fuel used
Gasoline
Other
Percent of fuel
purchased in Arizona

| 2006 | 93.6 | 72.2 | 19.0 | 38.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2003 | 95.1 | 72.8 | 21.6 | NA |
| 2000 | 89.8 | 83.6 | 42.0 | 45.9 |

Location Arizona
fuel purchased
Non-Marina
Marina
Arizona purchased
gallons used preceding
2-week period -- Mean

| 2006 | 43.0 | 36.0 | 7.8 | 34.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2003 | 36.4 | 36.7 | 15.2 | NA |
| 2000 | 40.9 | 42.1 | 15.9 | 32.4 |

Non-marina, Arizona
purchased gallons used
preceding 2-week period -- Mean

```
2006
2003
2000
Marina, Arizona purchased gallons used preceding 2-week period - Mean
```

| 2006 | 4.3 | 4.1 | .9 | 10.3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2003 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 4.7 | NA |
| 2000 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 9.5 |

Tables 10 through 19 present the gasoline consumption figures based on the results of the boat owner survey. These tables present fuel consumption for each state surveyed and for the total study universe.

Below is the formula used to develop the consumption figures presented in the tables. This formula is based on the following factors:

A - Average number of days individual boat was used during twoweek period.

B - Average number of gallons of gasoline used per day by individual boat.

C - Average number of gallons of gasoline used during two-week period by individual boat.

D - Percent of gasoline purchased from Arizona suppliers by individual boat.

E - Average number of gallons of Arizona gasoline purchased during two-week period by individual boat.

F - Percent of gasoline purchased from non-marina sources by individual boat.

G - Average number of gallons of non-marina, Arizona gasoline purchased during two-week period.

H - Number of boats in class using Arizona lakes and rivers during two-week period.

I - Total gallons of non-marina, Arizona gasoline purchased during two-week period by boat class.

J - Total number of study periods - 24 .
K - Total gallons of non-marina, Arizona gasoline purchased by boat owners over 12-month period.

## Gasoline Consumption Formula

| 1st: | A $\times B=C$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| 2nd: | $C \times D=E$ |
| 3rd: | $E \times F=G$ |
| 4th: | GXH $=1$ |
| 5th: | I X J $=\mathrm{K}$ |

The following main findings from the boat owner survey are revealed in the fuel consumption summaries presented on Tables 10 and 11:

- A total of 51,943,296 gallons of non-marina Arizona gasoline was purchased to propel boats during the study period. This figure represents a 72.1 percent increase over the 30,176,496 gallons recorded during the 2003 study which do not include Utah gallons. When the 928,152 2006 Utah gallons are added to the 2003 to 2006 comparison, the increase is 69.1 percent. The primary reason for this significant increase in non-marina gasoline purchasing by boaters is that the percent of boaters who used their watercraft on Arizona lakes and rivers in the prior two weeks increased sharply from 8.0 percent in 2003 to 10.2 percent in 2006 . Additionally, the number of boats registered in Arizona, California and Nevada increased by nearly three percent between 2003 and 2006.

Perhaps the best explanations for the increase in consumption from the prior study goes back to the United States' economy woes and Arizona's continuing drought during the period the 2003 survey was conducted.

- Total Arizona fuel consumption (non-marina plus marina) increases sharply in 2006 over 2003 within the key two states participating in the surveys:
- Arizona consumption increased 88.6 percent - from 17,354,808 to 32,213,736.
- California consumption increased 43.7 percent - from 17,424,192 to 25,034,352.
- The boating classification which continues to account for the largest amount of non-marina consumption is Class 2 (predominantly jet skis) with a reading of 37.8 percent. Among California boaters this class accounts for 56.1 percent of consumption. In Arizona Boat Class 5 (16' to 25' inboard and in/out) accounts for 42.2 percent of consumption.
- The total number of gallons of Arizona gasoline, both marina and nonmarina, purchased during the study period is $59,313,312$ gallons -- up sharply from $35,859,216$ gallons in 2003 (excluding Utah gallons).

TABLE 10: WATERCRAFT FUEL CONSUMPTION OF ARIZONA, NON-MARINA GASOLINE (BOAT OWNER SURVEY)

| BOAT <br> CLASS | TOTAL | ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA | NEVADA | UTAH |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $1,609,248$ | 909,720 | 691,464 | 8,064 | 0 |
| 2 | $19,613,112$ | $6,279,264$ | $12,330,960$ | 269,136 | 733,752 |
| 3 | 26,160 | 8,640 | 17,520 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | $5,886,744$ | $4,587,120$ | $1,238,736$ | 60,888 | 0 |
| 5 | $18,871,632$ | $12,043,320$ | $6,683,280$ | 145,032 | 0 |
| 6 | 448,656 | 2,328 | 251,928 | 0 | 194,400 |
| 7 | 590,880 | 532,344 | 56,376 | 2,160 | 0 |
| 8 | $4,888,272$ | $4,182,528$ | 705,744 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 8,592 | 8,592 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL 2006 | $51,943,296$ | $28,553,856$ | $21,976,008$ | 485,280 | 928,152 |
| TOTAL 2003 | $30,176,496$ | $14,635,512$ | $14,807,160$ | 733,824 | NA |
| TOTAL 2000 | $41,987,664$ | $21,990,456$ | $17,051,856$ | $1,282,128$ | $1,663,224$ |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ ~ |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 11: WATERCRAFT FUEL CONSUMPTION OF ARIZONA GASOLINE -- ANY SOURCE (BOAT OWNER SURVEY)

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { BOAT } \\ \text { CLASS }\end{array}$ | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | | $\begin{array}{c}\text { NON- } \\ \text { MARINA }\end{array}$ |
| :---: |
| 1 |$\left.r \begin{array}{c}\text { MARINA }\end{array}\right]$| $1,756,896$ | $1,609,248$ | 147,648 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | $21,889,080$ | $19,613,112$ | $2,275,968$ |
| 3 | 26,160 | 26,160 | 0 |
| 4 | $6,345,648$ | $5,886,744$ | 458,904 |
| 5 | $22,096,152$ | $18,871,632$ | $3,224,520$ |
| 6 | 490,944 | 448,656 | 42,288 |
| 7 | 723,912 | 590,880 | 133,032 |
| 8 | $5,973,552$ | $4,888,272$ | $1,085,280$ |
| 9 | 10,968 | 8,592 | 2,376 |
| TOTAL 2006 | $59,313,312$ | $51,943,296$ | $7,370,016$ |
| TOTAL 2003 | $35,859,216$ | $30,176,496$ | $5,682,720$ |
| TOTAL 2000 | $48,312,576$ | $41,987,664$ | $6,324,912$ |

## TABLE 12: ARIZONA GASOLINE CONSUMPTION - NON-MARINA GALLONS - AZ BOATS

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons Purchased Past 2 Weeks | Total AZ <br> Registered <br> Boats | \% AZ <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number Of <br> AZ Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2x3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1x4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months (5x24) |
| 1 | 13.90 | 39,525 | 6.9 | 2,727 | 37,905 | 909,720 |
| 2 | 38.38 | 38,513 | 17.7 | 6,817 | 261,636 | 6,279,264 |
| 3 | 7.50 | 605 | 8.0 | 48 | 360 | 8,640 |
| 4 | 22.31 | 45,568 | 18.8 | 8,567 | 191,130 | 4,587,120 |
| 5 | 49.24 | 56,306 | 18.1 | 10,191 | 501,805 | 12,043,320 |
| 6 | 1.67 | 1,423 | 4.1 | 58 | 97 | 2,328 |
| 7 | 46.50 | 2,350 | 20.3 | 477 | 22,181 | 532,344 |
| 8 | 74.38 | 6,910 | 33.9 | 2,343 | 174,272 | 4,182,528 |
| 9 | 5.96 | 240 | 25.0 | 60 | 358 | 8,592 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 28,553,856 |


|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons Purchased Past 2 Weeks | Total AZ Registered Boats | \% AZ <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number Of AZ Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2×3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1x4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months (5x24) |
| 1 | 0.47 | 39,525 | 6.9 | 2,727 | 1,282 | 30,768 |
| 2 | 5.08 | 38,513 | 17.7 | 6,817 | 34,630 | 831,120 |
| 3 | 0 | 605 | 8.0 | 48 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 1.45 | 45,568 | 18.8 | 8,567 | 12,422 | 298,128 |
| 5 | 5.23 | 56,306 | 18.1 | 10,191 | 53,299 | 1,279,176 |
| 6 | 0 | 1,423 | 4.1 | 58 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 11.62 | 2,350 | 20.3 | 477 | 5,543 | 133,032 |
| 8 | 19.30 | 6,910 | 33.9 | 2,343 | 45,220 | 1,085,280 |
| 9 | 1.65 | 240 | 25.0 | 60 | 99 | 2,376 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 3,659,880 |

## TABLE 14: ARIZONA GASOLINE CONSUMPTION - NON-MARINA GALLONS - CA BOATS

|  | (1) | (2) | -3 | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons Purchased Past 2 Week | Total CA Registered Boats | \% CA <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number Of CA Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2x3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1x4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months $(5 \times 24)$ |
| 1 | 23.03 | 54,391 | 2.3 | 1,251 | 28,811 | 691,464 |
| 2 | 30.40 | 118,189 | 14.3 | 16,901 | 513,790 | 12,330,960 |
| 3 | 5.00 | 14,615 | 1.0 | 146 | 730 | 17,520 |
| 4 | 26.66 | 43,018 | 4.5 | 1,936 | 51,614 | 1,238,736 |
| 5 | 37.56 | 95,053 | 7.8 | 7,414 | 278,470 | 6,683,280 |
| 6 | 32.10 | 9,900 | 3.3 | 327 | 10,497 | 251,928 |
| 7 | 11.46 | 1,227 | 16.7 | 205 | 2,349 | 56,376 |
| 8 | 47.20 | 8,531 | 7.3 | 623 | 29,406 | 705,744 |
| 9 | 0 | 3,801 | 1.0 | 38 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 21,976,008 |


|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons Purchased Past 2 Weeks | Total CA Registered Boats | \% CA <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number Of CA Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2x3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1x4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months (5x24) |
| 1 | 3.84 | 54,391 | 2.3 | 1,251 | 4,804 | 115,296 |
| 2 | 3.08 | 118,189 | 14.3 | 16,901 | 52,055 | 1,249,320 |
| 3 | 0 | 14,615 | 1.0 | 146 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 3.46 | 43,018 | 4.5 | 1,936 | 6,699 | 160,776 |
| 5 | 8.52 | 95,053 | 7.8 | 7,414 | 63,167 | 1,516,008 |
| 6 | 2.16 | 9,900 | 3.3 | 327 | 706 | 16,944 |
| 7 | 0 | 1,227 | 16.7 | 205 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 8,531 | 7.3 | 623 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 3,801 | 1.0 | 38 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 3,058,344 |

TABLE 16: ARIZONA GASOLINE CONSUMPTION - NON-MARINA GALLONS - NV BOATS

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons Purchased Past 2 Weeks | Total NV Registered Boats | \% NV <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number of NV Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2X3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1X4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months (5X24) |
| 1 | 1.57 | 2,606 | 8.2 | 214 | 336 | 8,064 |
| 2 | 12.70 | 4,748 | 18.6 | 883 | 11,214 | 269,136 |
| 3 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 6.39 | 2,896 | 13.7 | 397 | 2,537 | 60,888 |
| 5 | 4.80 | 7,495 | 16.8 | 1,259 | 6,043 | 145,032 |
| 6 | 0 | 155 | 24.0 | 37 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 1.16 | 267 | 29.2 | 78 | 90 | 2,160 |
| 8 | 0 | 1,302 | 14.3 | 186 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 61 | 8.3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 485,280 |


| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat <br> Class | AZ Gallons <br> Purchased <br> Past 2 Weeks | Total NV <br> Registered <br> Boats | (4) NV <br> Boats Used <br> Past 2 Weeks | Number of <br> NV Boats Used <br> Past 2 Weeks <br> $(2$ X3) | Total AZ Gallons <br> Past 2 Weeks <br> $(1$ X4) | Total AZ Gallons <br> Past 12 Months <br> $(5$ X24) |
| 1 | .31 | 2,606 | 8.2 | 214 | 66 | 1,584 |
| 2 | 2.28 | 4,748 | 18.6 | 883 | 2,013 | 48,312 |
| 3 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 2,896 | 13.7 | 397 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | .15 | 7,495 | 16.8 | 1,259 | 189 | 4,536 |
| 6 | 28.55 | 155 | 24.0 | 37 | 1,056 | 25,344 |
| 7 | 0 | 267 | 29.2 | 78 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 1,302 | 14.3 | 186 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 61 | 8.3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

TABLE 18: ARIZONA GASOLINE CONSUMPTION - NON-MARINA GALLONS - UT BOATS

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat Class | AZ Gallons <br> Purchased Past 2 Weeks | Total UT Registered Boats | \% UT <br> Boats Used Past 2 Weeks | Number of UT Boats Used Past 2 Weeks (2X3) | Total AZ Gallons Past 2 Weeks (1X4) | Total AZ Gallons Past 12 Months (5X24) |
| 1 | 0 | 14,628 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 34.39 | 14,810 | 6.0 | 889 | 30,573 | 733,752 |
| 3 | 0 | 417 | 4.2 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 13,073 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 28,088 | 2.1 | 590 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 270.00 | 720 | 4.2 | 30 | 8,100 | 194,400 |
| 7 | 0 | 998 | 12.0 | 120 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 2,021 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 928,152 |


| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boat <br> Class | AZ Gallons <br> Purchased <br> Past 2 Weeks | Total UT <br> Registered <br> Boats | (6) UT <br> Boats Used <br> Past 2 Weeks | Number of <br> UT Boats Used <br> Past 2 Weeks <br> $(2$ X3) | Total AZ Gallons <br> Past 2 Weeks <br> $(1$ X4) | Total AZ Gallons <br> Past 12 Months <br> (5X24) |
| 1 | 0 | 14,628 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 6.90 | 14,810 | 6.0 | 889 | 6,134 | 147,216 |
| 3 | 0 | 417 | 4.2 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 13,073 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 30.00 | 28,088 | 2.1 | 590 | 17,700 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 720 | 4.2 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 998 | 12.0 | 120 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 2,021 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 115 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |

### 5.2 Study Audits/Survey

- Concessionaires, Commercial Boat Operators and Excursion Operators

Total consumption of non-marina, Arizona gasoline among the operators surveyed is 388,820 gallons, up from 365,924 in 2003.

## - Government Agencies

Total consumption of non-marina, Arizona gasoline subject to tax among the agencies surveyed is 42,994 gallons, up slightly from 37,930 in 2003.

- Marinas

Total sales of Arizona gasoline among the marinas surveyed is $4,508,813$, down slightly from 4,877,597 in 2003.

### 5.3 Total Annual Gasoline Consumption Calculations

Presented in Table 20 is the summarized data on gasoline consumption from each of the various study components.

In 1991 ADOT, AGFD and ASPB signed an agreement (see Appendix) that established a protocol on how the SLIF allocation percentage was to be calculated in the later surveys. The specifics of this protocol are as follows:

Variables (In gallons)
$A=$ Boaters' reports of marina fuel purchases
$B=$ Marinas' reports of fuel sales
C = Boaters' reports of non-marina fuel purchases
D = Commercial and government reports of watercraft fuel purchases
$\mathrm{E}=$ Total statewide gasoline sales on which Arizona tax was paid

Step 1: Compare Variables A and B.

- If $A$ divided by $B$ is 1.25 or less, use Method \#1.
- If $A$ divided by $B$ is more than 1.25 , use Method $\# 2$.


## Step 2: Calculate SLIF Percentage.

Method \#1:

$$
(A+C+D) \div E=\text { SLIF Percentage }
$$

Method \#2:

$$
([B+D+(C \times B / A)] \div E) \times 1.25=\text { SLIF Percentage }
$$

As required by the protocol, the first step in calculating the SLIF allocation percentage is to compare the fuel estimates from the boater survey and the marina audits/surveys. This step indicates that the variation is 1.63 .

|  | Marina Fuel Sales Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2002- \\ & 2003 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ |
| A. Marina Purchasing Estimate From Boat Owner Survey | 7,370,016 | 5,682,720 | 6,324,912 |
| B. Marina Fuel Sales Estimate From Marina Audit | 4,508,813 | 4,877,597 | 6,360,809 |
| Variation (A/B) | 1.63 | 1.17 | . 99 |

According to the protocol, the 1.63 variation calls for the use of method 2 for calculating the SLIF allocation. Applying this formula to the collected data, we estimate the 2006 SLIF allocation at 1.7157 percent.

SLIF Using Method $2([B+D+(C \times B / A)] \div E) \times 1.25=$ SLIF $([4,508,813+431,814+(53,345,765 \times 4,508,813 / 7,370,016)] \div 2,737,702,381) \times 1.25$ 1.7157

## TABLE 20: ANNUAL WATERCRAFT FUEL CONSUMPTION SUMMARY TOTALS

|  | Gallons |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |
| Registered Boat Owner's Consumption Of Non-Marina, Arizona Gasoline |  |  |  |
| Arizona registered | 28,553,856 | 14,635,512 | 21,990,456 |
| California registered | 21,976,008 | 14,807,160 ${ }^{1}$ | 17,051,856 |
| Utah registered | 928,152 | 1,244,092 | 1,663,224 |
| Nevada registered | 485,280 | 733,824 | 1,282,128 |
| Total From Survey | 51,943,296 | 31,420,588 | 41,987,664 |
| Plus Adjustment For Non-Surveyed Boaters (Other Out-of-State) Consumption-2.7 | 1,402,469 | 848,356 | 1,333,667 |
| Total (C) | 53,345,765 | 32,268,944 | 43,121,331 |
| Commercial Operators (Concessionaires, Commercial Boat Operators, Excursion Operators) Consumption of Non-Marina, Arizona Gasoline (D) | 388,820 | 365,924 | 333,586 |
| Public Agencies Consumption of Taxable Non-Marina, Arizona Gasoline (D) | 42,994 | 37,930 | 38,616 |
| Marina Fuel Sales - Total From Boat Owner Survey (A) | 7,370,016 | 5,682,720 | 6,324,912 |
| Marina Fuel Sales - From Marina Audits/Surveys (B) | 4,508,813 | 4,877,597 | 6,360,809 |
| Total Gallons Of Taxable Gasoline Sold In Arizona Between June 5, 2005 and May 31, 2006 (E) | 2,737,702,381 | 2,642,538,772 | 2,450,738,376 |
| ${ }^{1}$ To arrive at the 2003 Utah consumption figure the 2000 figure was reduced by $25.2 \%$, the same reduction recorded in Arizona, California and Nevada. |  |  |  |

### 6.0 RECREATIONAL WATERCRAFT USE BY COUNTY

In this section of the report we present data on watercraft usage in each Arizona county by Arizona, California, and Nevada boat owners. Watercraft usage in this section is calculated and presented using two different data sets. The first data set is based on lake utilization during the two weeks prior to being interviewed and is identical to the format followed since the 1994 Watercraft Survey. The second data set is based on lake utilization during the 12 months prior to being interviewed and excludes any boater who utilized their boats in the two weeks prior to being interviewed. This data set was first included in the 2000 Watercraft Survey at the request of the Arizona State Parks Board in order to get a broader representation of lake/river use in Arizona. This process again proved successful in that 59 lakes/rivers are represented when the data is calculated using the 12 month data set compared to only 35 when the two week data set is used.

### 6.1 Two Week Data Set

The total number of days of use for each lake by boat class was obtained by summing days of use for all respondents in the sample for each class at each lake. In order to assure that each boat class was proportionately represented in the final calculation of boat usage at each lake, the total number of boats in a class was divided by the total number of respondents in each class. As a result of this division, a survey sample factor was generated for each class.
$\underset{\text { Factor }}{\text { Sample }}=\quad$ Survey Respondents in Class 1

$$
=\frac{39,525}{578}
$$

$$
=68.38
$$

Days of usage at each lake or river from each boat class were then multiplied by the respective class sample factor and number of study segments (24) to obtain the total usage days for the lake or river for the respective class. By aggregating the calculated usage days over all classes, the total boat usage for each lake was determined.


Person use days for each lake were then calculated by multiplying the boat use days at each lake by the average boating party size for that lake.


TABLE 21: SURVEY SAMPLE FACTOR

| BOAT CLASS | Total Boats In Class | Respondents In CLASS | SAMPLE FACTOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona |  |  |  |
| 1 | 39,525 | 578 | 68.38 |
| 2 | 38,513 | 583 | 66.06 |
| 3 | 605 | 25 | 24.20 |
| 4 | 45,568 | 653 | 69.78 |
| 5 | 56,306 | 808 | 69.69 |
| 6 | 1,423 | 73 | 19.49 |
| 7 | 2,350 | 74 | 31.76 |
| 8 | 6,910 | 121 | 57.11 |
| 9 | 240 | 24 | 10.00 |
| California |  |  |  |
| 1 | 54,391 | 434 | 125.33 |
| 2 | 118,189 | 941 | 125.60 |
| 3 | 14,615 | 193 | 75.73 |
| 4 | 43,018 | 337 | 127.65 |
| 5 | 95,053 | 676 | 140.61 |
| 6 | 9,900 | 120 | 82.50 |
| 7 | 1,227 | 24 | 51.13 |
| 8 | 8,531 | 96 | 88.87 |
| 9 | 3,801 | 96 | 39.59 |
| Nevada |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2,606 | 73 | 35.70 |
| 2 | 4,748 | 145 | 32.75 |
| 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 2,896 | 73 | 39.67 |
| 5 | 7,495 | 196 | 38.24 |
| 6 | 155 | 25 | 6.20 |
| 7 | 267 | 24 | 11.13 |
| 8 | 1,302 | 49 | 26.57 |
| 9 | 61 | 24 | 2.54 |
| Utah |  |  |  |
| 1 | 14,628 | 48 | 304.75 |
| 2 | 14,810 | 50 | 296.20 |
| 3 | 417 | 24 | 17.38 |
| 4 | 13,073 | 48 | 272.35 |
| 5 | 28,088 | 96 | 292.58 |
| 6 | 720 | 24 | 30.00 |
| 7 | 998 | 25 | 39.92 |
| 8 | 2,021 | 24 | 84.21 |
| 9 | 115 | 24 | 4.79 |

The next two tables provide summaries of boat use days (Table 22) and person use days (Table 23). Looking first at boat use days, we find that total boat use days in 2006 were 4,793,501, a 48 percent increase from the $3,229,153$ boat use days recorded in 2003. Similar to the prior studies, Mohave County is the dominant boating location in Arizona with 49.9 percent of total boat use days a figure which is up from the 40.8 percent recorded in 2003. Also note the increased boat use in Maricopa, La Paz, Coconino, Gila, and Yuma counties.

TABLE 22: BOAT USE DAYS BY COUNTY -
OVERALL SUMMARY (2 WEEK DATA)

|  | $\underline{2006}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Mohave | 2,393,398 | 49.9\% | 1,318,838 | 40.8\% | 2,480,072 | 50.0\% |
| Maricopa | 701,931 | 14.6 | 650,668 | 20.2 | 510,469 | 10.3 |
| La Paz | 624,518 | 13.0 | 442,153 | 13.7 | 608,650 | 12.3 |
| Coconino | 412,568 | 8.6 | 320,626 | 9.9 | 885,744 | 17.9 |
| Gila | 302,518 | 6.3 | 161,640 | 5.0 | 161,464 | 3.3 |
| Yuma | 290,325 | 6.1 | 216,476 | 6.7 | 100,090 | 2.0 |
| Apache | 34,766 | . 7 | 35,348 | 1.1 | 84,744 | 1.7 |
| Santa Cruz | 13,241 | . 3 | 48,881 | 1.5 | 29,596 | . 6 |
| Pinal | 8,374 | . 2 | 0 | 0 | 22,980 | . 5 |
| Cochise | 8,363 | . 2 | 22,998 | . 7 | 31,072 | . 6 |
| Navajo | 2,920 | . 1 | 5,203 | . 2 | 16,574 | . 3 |
| Yavapai | 581 | * | 3,721 | . 1 | 4,906 | . 1 |
| Graham | 0 | 0 | 2,602 | . 1 | 16,422 | . 3 |
| Pima | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,974 | . 1 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,793,501 | 100.0\% | 3,229,153 | 100.0\% | 4,958,757 | 100.0\% |

[^0]Looking next at person use days, Table 23 reveals that person use days decreased from $14,781,894$ in 2003 to $23,409,303$ in 2006 - a 58 percent increase. As in the case with boat use days, Mohave County is the dominant boating location in Arizona accounting for 52.2 percent of all person use days followed by La Paz County with 13.5 percent, Maricopa County with 12.5 percent and Coconino County with 10.0 percent.

TABLE 23: PERSON USE DAYS BY COUNTY -
OVERALL SUMMARY (2 WEEK DATA)

|  | $\underline{2006}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Mohave | 12,232,373 | 52.2\% | 6,437,111 | 43.5\% | 11,385,613 | 49.8\% |
| La Paz | 3,165,071 | 13.5 | 2,238,893 | 15.1 | 2,799,389 | 12.2 |
| Maricopa | 2,928,754 | 12.5 | 2,478,485 | 16.8 | 2,044,948 | 8.9 |
| Coconino | 2,339,770 | 10.0 | 1,511,979 | 10.2 | 4,761,240 | 20.8 |
| Yuma | 1,417,070 | 6.1 | 1,067,745 | 7.2 | 422,297 | 1.9 |
| Gila | 1,110,862 | 4.7 | 674,120 | 4.6 | 742,721 | 3.3 |
| Apache | 92,508 | . 4 | 111,920 | . 8 | 300,313 | 1.3 |
| Cochise | 66,902 | . 3 | 54,103 | . 4 | 107,241 | . 5 |
| Santa Cruz | 32,824 | . 1 | 179,535 | 1.2 | 56,358 | . 2 |
| Pinal | 16,747 | . 1 | 0 | 0 | 70,005 | . 3 |
| Navajo | 5,840 | * | 19,078 | . 1 | 46,624 | . 2 |
| Yavapai | 581 | * | 3,721 | * | 67,526 | . 3 |
| Graham | 0 | 0 | 5,203 |  | 56,890 | . 3 |
| Pima | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,894 |  |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 23,409,303 | 100.0\% | 14,781,894 | 100.0\% | 22,885,059 | 100.0\% |

Boat and person use days are analyzed by state of registration in the next two tables (Tables 24 and 25). The following key findings are evident in these tables:

- Arizona boaters account for 47.8 percent of boat use days followed by California boaters with 42.7 percent, Nevada boaters with 5.6 percent and Utah boaters with 3.9 percent. These figures represent increased boat use days among boaters from Arizona and California since the last study while boat use days are little changed among Nevada boaters.
- California boaters account for the largest share of person use days. Thus we find that California boaters account for 47.4 percent of person use days followed by 43.7 percent for Arizona boaters, 5.0 percent for Nevada boaters and 3.9 percent for Utah boaters. As in the prior studies, the primary reason for California's high percentage is the fact that California boaters tend to have very large boating parties.

TABLE 24: BOAT USE DAYS BY COUNTY AND STATE (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY | TOTAL | State of Registration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| Mohave | 2,393,398 | 754,593 | 1,318,693 | 256,654 | 63,458 |
| Maricopa | 701,931 | 684,826 | 15,269 | 1,836 | 0 |
| La Paz | 624,518 | 213,856 | 408,260 | 2,402 | 0 |
| Coconino | 412,568 | 236,544 | 48,217 | 6,424 | 121,381 |
| Gila | 302,518 | 302,518 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yuma | 290,325 | 34,577 | 255,748 | 0 | 0 |
| Apache | 34,766 | 34,766 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Santa Cruz | 13,241 | 13,241 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pinal | 8,374 | 8,374 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cochise | 8,363 | 8,363 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Navajo | 2,920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,920 |
| Yavapai | 581 | 581 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pima | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL - 2006 | 4,793,501 | 2,292,239 | 2,046,187 | 267,316 | 187,759 |
| TOTAL - 2003 | 3,229,153 | 1,420,711 | 1,579,573 | 228,869 | NA |
| TOTAL - 2000 | 4,958,757 | 2,129,455 | 1,814,187 | 890,175 | 124,940 |

TABLE 25: PERSON USE DAYS BY COUNTY AND STATE (2 WEEK DATA)

State of Registration

| COUNTY | TOTAL | State or Registration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| Mohave | 12,232,373 | 3,722,574 | 7,230,744 | 1,024,181 | 254,874 |
| La Paz | 3,165,071 | 914,230 | 2,241,709 | 9,132 | 0 |
| Maricopa | 2,928,754 | 2,883,010 | 36,566 | 9,178 | 0 |
| Coconino | 2,339,770 | 1,299,476 | 244,140 | 128,486 | 667,667 |
| Yuma | 1,417,070 | 83,891 | 1,333,179 | 0 | 0 |
| Gila | 1,110,862 | 1,110,862 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Apache | 92,508 | 92,508 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cochise | 66,902 | 66,902 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Santa Cruz | 32,824 | 32,824 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pinal | 16,747 | 16,747 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Navajo | 5,840 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yavapai | 581 | 581 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pima | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL-2006 | 23,409,303 | 10,223,606 | 11,086,338 | 1,170,978 | 928,381 |
| TOTAL - 2003 | 14,781,894 | 5,826,659 | 7,916,334 | 1,038,901 | NA |
| TOTAL - 2000 | 22,885,059 | 9,007,475 | 9,440,324 | 3,565,658 | 871,602 |

On the next table it may be seen that Lake Havasu continues to be the state's most utilized lake in terms of both boat use days $(1,324,161)$ and person use days $(6,636,491)$. Each of these figures is up sharply from 2003 (679,273 boat use days/3,265,670 person use days).

TABLE 26: WATERCRAFT USE BY SPECIFIC LAKES/RIVERS (2 WEEK DATA)

| LAKE | BOAT USE DAYS | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake Havasu | 1,324,161 | 6,636,491 |
| Lake Mohave | 628,683 | 3,606,251 |
| Lake Mead | 479,107 | 2,217,753 |
| Parker Strip | 432,704 | 2,270,933 |
| Pleasant | 393,331 | 1,562,872 |
| Lake Powell | 370,015 | 2,202,439 |
| Martinez Lake | 280,226 | 1,336,179 |
| Roosevelt | 267,568 | 961,323 |
| Saguaro | 126,526 | 685,503 |
| Bartlett | 76,918 | 273,727 |
| Canyon | 53,965 | 191,910 |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 45,216 | 198,950 |
| Topock Gorge | 41,621 | 198,099 |
| San Carlos | 34,950 | 149,538 |
| Ehrenberg | 30,144 | 165,792 |
| Alamo | 29,254 | 64,697 |
| Apache | 24,430 | 127,769 |
| Horseshoe | 23,416 | 70,248 |
| Big | 15,072 | 30,145 |
| Willow Springs | 14,770 | 29,540 |
| Patagonia | 13,241 | 32,824 |
| Woods Canyon | 11,689 | 35,068 |
| Reservation | 11,488 | 45,951 |
| Lees Ferry | 11,248 | 59,861 |
| Picacho Reservoir | 8,374 | 16,747 |
| Parker Canyon | 8,363 | 66,902 |
| Hawley | 8,206 | 16,411 |
| Grand Canyon | 7,026 | 38,478 |
| Mittry | 6,749 | 67,493 |
| Squaw Lake | 3,349 | 13,398 |
| Salt River | 3,345 | 16,726 |
| Kaibab | 3,171 | 9,513 |
| Cholla | 2,920 | 5,840 |
| Blue Ridge | 1,675 | 3,349 |
| Watson | 581 | 581 |
| TOTAL | 4,793,501 | 23,409,303 |

On the following pages are presented detailed tables on watercraft usage in Arizona. These tables are presented on a state-by-state basis.

| COUNTY: APACHE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { BOAT USE } \\ \text { DAYS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15072 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15072 | 2.00 | 30145 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 8206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8206 | 2.00 | 16411 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 11488 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11488 | 4.00 | 45951 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 19693 | 0 | 0 | 15072 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34766 |  | 92508 |
| COUNTY: COCHISE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |  |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8363 | 8.00 | 66902 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8363 |  | 66902 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: COCONINO BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 | 2.00 | 3349 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 3171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3171 | 3.00 | 9513 |
| Knoll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Powell | 6564 | 55490 | 0 | 20097 | 76938 | 0 | 7622 | 30154 | 0 | 196866 | 6.12 | 1205259 |
| Lees Ferry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 2.00 | 16747 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 14770 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14770 | 2.00 | 29540 |
| Woods Canyon | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 10048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11689 | 3.00 | 35068 |
| TOTAL | 22976 | 58661 | 0 | 40193 | 76938 | 0 | 7622 | 30154 | 0 | 236544 |  | 1299476 |

## TABLE 27 WATERCRAFT USAGE: ARIZONA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: GILA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 31181 | 41221 | 0 | 145701 | 48504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 960 | 267568 | 3.59 | 961323 |
| San Carlos | 9847 | 0 | 0 | 11723 | 13380 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34950 | 4.28 | 149538 |
| TOTAL | 41028 | 41221 | 0 | 157424 | 61885 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 960 | 302518 |  | 1110862 |


| COUNTY: GRAHAM | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: LA PAZ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Alamo | 6564 | 0 | 0 | 21771 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28336 | 2.15 | 61026 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 0 | 15393 | 174 | 7362 | 25769 | 0 | 533 | 10013 | 0 | 59244 | 4.72 | 279479 |
| Parker Strip | 0 | 41221 | 0 | 31820 | 43487 | 0 | 1524 | 8224 | 0 | 126276 | 4.54 | 573726 |
| TOTAL | 6564 | 56614 | 174 | 60953 | 69256 | 0 | 2057 | 18236 | 0 | 213856 |  | 914230 |


| COUNTY: MARICOPALake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Apache | 1641 | 6342 | 0 | 13398 | 0 | 0 | 3049 | 0 | 0 | 24430 | 5.23 | 127769 |
| Bartlett | 3282 | 30123 | 0 | 20097 | 23416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76918 | 3.56 | 273727 |
| Canyon | 4923 | 15854 | 0 | 13398 | 8363 | 0 | 4573 | 6853 | 0 | 53965 | 3.56 | 191910 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23416 | 3.00 | 70248 |
| Pleasant | 27899 | 91956 | 0 | 127279 | 97008 | 2339 | 3049 | 24672 | 5040 | 379241 | 4.03 | 1529186 |
| Saguaro | 6564 | 17440 | 0 | 30145 | 55194 | 0 | 4573 | 9594 | 0 | 123512 | 5.45 | 673446 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3345 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3345 | 5.00 | 16726 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 44310 | 161715 | 0 | 204316 | 210743 | 2339 | 15245 | 41119 | 5040 | 684826 |  | 2883010 |


| COUNTY: MOHAVE |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3345 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3345 | 6.00 | 20071 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 0 | 138537 | 1568 | 66259 | 231922 | 0 | 4795 | 90113 | 0 | 533194 | 4.72 | 2515307 |
| Lake Mead | 3282 | 9513 | 0 | 1675 | 31779 | 0 | 0 | 4112 | 0 | 50360 | 4.17 | 210121 |
| Lake Mohave | 0 | 30123 | 0 | 20097 | 53522 | 0 | 762 | 46602 | 0 | 151106 | 5.81 | 877273 |
| Topock Gorge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10035 | 0 | 3811 | 2741 | 0 | 16588 | 6.02 | 99803 |
| TOTAL | 3282 | 178173 | 1568 | 88030 | 330603 | 0 | 9369 | 143568 | 0 | 754593 |  | 3722574 |

TABLE 27 WATERCRAFT USAGE: ARIZONA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: NAVAJO | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cholla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Clear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Show Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PIMA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Arivaca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PINAL |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 2.00 | 16747 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8374 |  | 16747 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Patagonia | 3282 | 1585 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13241 | 2.48 | 32824 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 3282 | 1585 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13241 |  | 32824 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YAVAPA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 581 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 581 | 1.00 | 581 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 581 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 581 |  | 581 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YUMA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Martinez Lake | 11488 | 6342 | 0 | 13398 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31227 | 2.26 | 70493 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Squaw Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3349 | 4.00 | 13398 |
| TOTAL | 11488 | 6342 | 0 | 16747 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34577 |  | 83891 |

TABLE 28 WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: APACHE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCHISE Lake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |



TABLE 28 WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: GILALake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| San Carlos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: GRAHAM BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: LA PAZ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Alamo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 30144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30144 | 5.50 | 165792 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 902 | 42159 | 0 | 0 | 24635 | 792 | 0 | 3199 | 0 | 71688 | 5.28 | 378709 |
| Parker Strip | 6016 | 150720 | 0 | 21445 | 107988 | 13860 | 0 | 6399 | 0 | 306428 | 5.54 | 1697208 |
| TOTAL | 6918 | 223023 | 0 | 21445 | 132623 | 14652 | 0 | 9598 | 0 | 408260 |  | 2241709 |
| COUNTY: MARICOPA BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Apache | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bartlett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pleasant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12254 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12254 | 2.00 | 24509 |
| Saguaro | 0 | 3014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3014 | 4.00 | 12058 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 3014 | 0 | 12254 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15269 |  | 36566 |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 45216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45216 | 4.40 | 198950 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3681 | 0 | 0 | 3681 | 5.00 | 18407 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 8121 | 379435 | 0 | 0 | 221714 | 7128 | 0 | 28794 | 0 | 645192 | 5.28 | 3408384 |
| Lake Mead | 0 | 54259 | 0 | 64336 | 33746 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152341 | 5.56 | 847178 |
| Lake Mohave | 15040 | 244166 | 0 | 27572 | 155233 | 0 | 6136 | 0 | 0 | 448147 | 5.94 | 2661364 |
| Topock Gorge | 0 | 24115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24115 | 4.00 | 96461 |
| TOTAL | 23161 | 747191 | 0 | 91908 | 410694 | 7128 | 9817 | 28794 | 0 | 1318693 |  | 7230744 |

TABLE 28: WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK) DATA

| COUNTY: NAVAJO | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cholla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Clear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Show Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PIMA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Arivaca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PINAL |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  | USE DAYS |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Patagonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YAVAPA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YUMA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Martinez Lake | 6016 | 99475 | 0 | 49018 | 94490 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248999 | 5.08 | 1265686 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6749 | 10.00 | 67493 |
| Squaw Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 6016 | 99475 | 0 | 49018 | 101239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255748 |  | 1333179 |


| COUNTY: APACHE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCHISE Lake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCONINO |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Knoll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Powell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6424 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6424 | 20.00 | 128486 |
| Lees Ferry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Woods Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6424 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6424 |  | 128486 |

TABLE 29 WATERCRAFT USAGE: NEVADA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: GILALake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| San Carlos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: GRAHAM BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: LA PAZ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Alamo |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 918 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 918 | 4.00 | 3671 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 0 | 549 | 0 | 476 | 459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1484 | 3.68 | 5461 |
| Parker Strip | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 549 | 0 | 476 | 1377 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2402 |  | 9132 |


| COUNTY: MARICOPA |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Apache | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bartlett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pleasant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1836 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1836 | 5.00 | 9178 |
| Saguaro | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1836 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1836 |  | 9178 |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 0 | 4945 | 0 | 4284 | 4130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13359 | 3.68 | 49152 |
| Lake Mead | 85680 | 43230 | 0 | 18090 | 39464 | 1786 | 3473 | 21043 | 183 | 212948 | 4.25 | 905579 |
| Lake Mohave | 2570 | 11790 | 0 | 9521 | 1836 | 1042 | 2671 | 0 | 0 | 29430 | 2.30 | 67615 |
| Topock Gorge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 88250 | 59965 | 0 | 31895 | 46347 | 2827 | 6144 | 21043 | 183 | 256654 |  | 1024181 |

TABLE 29: WATERCRAFT USAGE: NEVADA REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK) DATA


TABLE 30 WATERCRAFT USAGE:UTAH REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: APACHE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USEDAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCHISE Lake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCONINO BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Knoll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Powell | 0 | 78197 | 834 | 0 | 14044 | 21600 | 3832 | 0 | 0 | 118507 | 5.27 | 624553 |
| Lees Ferry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2874 | 0 | 0 | 2874 | 15.00 | 43114 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Woods Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 78197 | 834 | 0 | 14044 | 21600 | 6707 | 0 | 0 | 121381 |  | 667667 |

TABLE 30 WATERCRAFT USAGE:UTAH REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: GILA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USEDAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| San Carlos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: GRAHAM | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: LA PAZ |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Alamo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Parker Strip | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: MARICOPA |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Apache | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bartlett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pleasant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Saguaro | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Mead | 0 | 21326 | 0 | 0 | 42132 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63458 | 4.02 | 254874 |
| Lake Mohave | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Topock Gorge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 21326 | 0 | 0 | 42132 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63458 |  | 254874 |

TABLE 30 WATERCRAFT USAGE:UTAH REGISTERED BOATS (2 WEEK DATA)

| COUNTY: NAVAJO | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cholla | 0 | 0 | 2920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2920 | 2.00 | 5840 |
| Clear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Show Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2920 |  | 5840 |
| COUNTY: PIMA | BOAT CLA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Arivaca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: PINAL | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Patagonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: YAVAPA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: YUMA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Martinez Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Squaw Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |

### 6.2 12 Month Data Set

The next series of tables (Table 31 to Table 39) present the boat and person use data based on the 12 month data set.

TABLE 31: BOAT USE DAYS BY COUNTY -
OVERALL SUMMARY (12 MONTH DATA)

|  | 2006 |  | 2003 |  | 2000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Mohave | 898,435 | 47.4\% | 1,010,198 | 49.4\% | 1,387,780 | 56.8\% |
| Maricopa | 294,486 | 15.5 | 334,043 | 16.3 | 250,430 | 10.3 |
| La Paz | 277,188 | 14.6 | 299,971 | 14.7 | 215,236 | 8.8 |
| Coconino | 209,855 | 11.1 | 196,329 | 9.6 | 306,771 | 12.6 |
| Gila | 89,784 | 4.7 | 69,841 | 3.4 | 109,084 | 4.5 |
| Yuma | 72,509 | 3.8 | 74,294 | 3.6 | 67,217 | 2.8 |
| Apache | 23,767 | 1.3 | 31,209 | 1.5 | 40,172 | 1.6 |
| Cochise | 9,968 | . 5 | 5,830 | . 3 | 12,444 | . 5 |
| Navajo | 8,523 | . 4 | 4,192 | . 2 | 5,390 | . 2 |
| Santa Cruz | 7,497 | . 4 | 18,224 | . 9 | 7,743 | . 3 |
| Graham | 1,675 | . 1 | 0 | 0 | 23,629 | 1.0 |
| Pima | 1,379 | . 1 | 81 | * | 3,345 | . 1 |
| Yavapai | 678 | * | 0 | 0 | 2,367 | . 1 |
| Pinal | 638 | * | 1,469 | * | 10,123 | . 4 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1,896,383 | 100.0\% | 142,046,481 | 100.0\% | 2,441,731 | 100.0\% |

TABLE 32: PERSON USE DAYS BY COUNTY -
OVERALL SUMMARY (12 MONTH DATA)

|  | $\underline{2006}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Mohave | 4,788,074 | 51.8\% | 5,850,043 | 52.2\% | 7,118,810 | 55.7\% |
| Coconino | 1,325,507 | 14.3 | 1,405,410 | 12.5 | 2,075,855 | 16.3 |
| La Paz | 1,170,867 | 12.7 | 1,717,705 | 15.3 | 1,444,027 | 11.3 |
| Maricopa | 1,159,392 | 12.5 | 1,354,593 | 12.1 | 1,006,277 | 7.9 |
| Gila | 307,145 | 3.3 | 242,120 | 2.2 | 440,012 | 3.4 |
| Yuma | 292,870 | 3.2 | 411,738 | 3.7 | 365,989 | 2.9 |
| Apache | 86,435 | . 9 | 101,735 | . 9 | 116,387 | . 9 |
| Cochise | 45,300 | . 5 | 18,949 | . 2 | 50,089 | . 4 |
| Santa Cruz | 29,300 | . 3 | 68,279 | . 6 | 33,352 | . 3 |
| Navajo | 24,219 | . 3 | 30,593 | . 3 | 18,288 | . 1 |
| Graham | 4,187 | * | 0 | 0 | 57,098 | . 4 |
| Pima | 3,578 | * | 2,027 | * | 4,275 |  |
| Yavapai | 1,555 | * | 0 | 0 | 9,320 | . 1 |
| Pinal | 1,277 | * | 3,140 | * | 34,069 | . 3 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 9,239,705 | 100.0\% | 11,206,334 | 100.0\% | 12,773,848 | 100.0\% |

*Indicates \% less than . 1

TABLE 33: BOAT USE DAYS BY COUNTY AND STATE (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY | TOTAL | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mohave | 898,435 | 326,282 | 523,123 | 46,250 | 2,780 |
| Maricopa | 294,486 | 290,592 | 3,412 | 482 | 0 |
| La Paz | 277,188 | 138,429 | 135,568 | 3,179 | 12 |
| Coconino | 209,855 | 85,999 | 31,718 | 4,130 | 88,008 |
| Gila | 89,784 | 86,850 | 1,787 | 1,147 | 0 |
| Yuma | 72,509 | 10,130 | 62,272 | 106 | 0 |
| Apache | 23,767 | 21,863 | 754 | 1,150 | 0 |
| Cochise | 9,968 | 6,255 | 3,713 | 0 | 0 |
| Navajo | 8,523 | 4,984 | 3,539 | 0 | 0 |
| Santa Cruz | 7,497 | 7,497 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham | 1,675 | 1,675 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pima | 1,379 | 1,379 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yavapai | 678 | 678 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pinal | 638 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | - |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL-2006 | $1,896,383$ | 982,614 | 766,523 | 56,445 | 90,801 |
| TOTAL-2003 | $2,046,481$ | 842,502 | $1,088,044$ | 115,935 | NA |
| TOTAL-2000 | $2,441,731$ | $1,094,202$ | 861,200 | 423,311 | 63,017 |

## TABLE 34: PERSON USE DAYS BY COUNTY AND STATE (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY | TOTAL | Arizona | California | Nevada | Utah |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mohave | 4,788,074 | 1,563,717 | 3,024,641 | 169,228 | 30,488 |
| Coconino | 1,325,507 | 457,960 | 174,218 | 27,381 | 665,948 |
| La Paz | 1,170,867 | 563,805 | 597,335 | 9,667 | 60 |
| Maricopa | 1,159,392 | 1,150,087 | 8,341 | 964 | 0 |
| Gila | 307,145 | 297,702 | 7,148 | 2,294 | 0 |
| Yuma | 292,870 | 66,324 | 226,121 | 425 | 0 |
| Apache | 86,435 | 55,138 | 15,072 | 16,225 | 0 |
| Cochise | 45,300 | 21,381 | 23,918 | 0 | 0 |
| Navajo | 24,219 | 11,332 | 12,887 | 0 | 0 |
| Santa Cruz | 29,300 | 29,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham | 4,187 | 4,187 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pima | 3,578 | 3,578 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yavapai | 1,555 | 1,555 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pinal | 1,277 | 0 | 1,277 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL-2006 | 9,239,705 | 4,226,066 | 4,090,959 | 226,185 | 696,496 |
| TOTAL - 2003 | 11,206,334 | 3,834,958 | 6,905,359 | 466,017 | NA |
| TOTAL - 2000 | 12,773,848 | 4,887,729 | 5,588,040 | 1,819,372 | 478,708 |

TABLE 35: WATERCRAFT USE BY SPECIFIC LAKES/RIVERS (12 MONTH DATA)

| LAKE | BOAT <br> USE DAYS | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake Havasu | 602,631 | 2,973,531 |
| Lake Mohave | 209,092 | 1,295,748 |
| Parker Strip | 197,723 | 818,450 |
| Lake Powell | 187,296 | 1,250,306 |
| Pleasant | 141,016 | 517,735 |
| Lake Mead | 129,419 | 726,593 |
| Roosevelt | 80,285 | 282,578 |
| Martinez Lake | 69,645 | 285,123 |
| Saguaro | 42,040 | 171,284 |
| Canyon | 38,364 | 168,345 |
| Bartlett | 37,583 | 134,123 |
| Apache | 33,273 | 162,901 |
| Alamo | 15,435 | 44,364 |
| Parker Canyon | 9,968 | 45,300 |
| San Carlos | 9,499 | 24,566 |
| Reservation | 8,206 | 24,617 |
| Big | 8,065 | 45,003 |
| Patagonia | 7,497 | 29,300 |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 6,674 | 47,260 |
| Topock Gorge | 6,089 | 23,870 |
| Grand Canyon | 4,794 | 18,426 |
| Willow Springs | 4,540 | 11,193 |
| Lees Ferry | 4,503 | 14,474 |
| Long | 4,218 | 8,437 |
| Blue Ridge | 3,873 | 18,108 |
| Ehrenberg | 3,767 | 10,700 |
| Squaw Lake | 2,687 | 7,253 |
| Show Low | 2,530 | 5,376 |
| Woods Canyon | 2,047 | 6,044 |
| Clear Creek | 1,948 | 3,828 |
| Cooley | 1,659 | 9,127 |
| Cresent | 1,573 | 2,831 |
| Arivaca | 1,379 | 3,578 |
| Luna | 1,368 | 2,735 |
| Sunrise | 1,299 | 2,598 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 1,162 | 2,325 |
| Cholla | 1,019 | 1,987 |
| Becker | 957 | 2,393 |
| Black Canyon | 956 | 2,670 |
| Riggs Lake | 837 | 1,675 |
| Roper | 837 | 2,512 |
| Salt River | 823 | 1,925 |
| Ashurst | 811 | 1,887 |
| Bear Canyon | 754 | 9,043 |
| Picacho Reservoir | 638 | 1,277 |
| Cataract | 628 | 3,140 |
| Horseshoe | 558 | 1,744 |
| Knoll | 547 | 1,094 |
| Mexican Hay | 528 | 2,114 |

(CONT'D) TABLE 35: WATERCRAFT USE BY SPECIFIC LAKES/RIVERS (12 MONTH DATA)

| LAKE | $\begin{gathered} \text { BOAT } \\ \text { USE DAYS } \end{gathered}$ | PERSON <br> USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaibab | 502 | 1,507 |
| Verde River | 487 | 974 |
| Lynx | 480 | 960 |
| Rainbow | 410 | 1,231 |
| Tempe Town | 341 | 361 |
| Lyman | 335 | 998 |
| Hawley | 274 | 821 |
| Watson | 198 | 595 |
| Mittry | 176 | 495 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 137 | 274 |
| TOTAL | 1,896,383 | 9,239,705 |

TABLE 36: WATERCRAFT USAGE: ARIZONA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY: APACHE Lake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USEDAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 957 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 957 | 2.50 | 2393 |
| Big | 5812 | 0 | 0 | 349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6161 | 2.22 | 13706 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 1573 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1573 | 1.80 | 2831 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 3.00 | 821 |
| Luna | 1368 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1368 | 2.00 | 2735 |
| Lyman | 137 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 335 | 2.98 | 998 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 528 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 4.00 | 2114 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 1162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1162 | 2.00 | 2325 |
| Reservation | 8206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8206 | 3.00 | 24617 |
| Sunrise | 1299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1299 | 2.00 | 2598 |
| TOTAL | 20788 | 727 | 0 | 349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21863 |  | 55138 |


| COUNTY: COCHISE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 1915 | 859 | 0 | 140 | 3206 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6255 | 3.42 | 21381 |
| TOTAL | 1915 | 859 | 0 | 140 | 3206 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6255 |  | 21381 |


| COUNTY: COCONINO BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 547 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 811 | 2.33 | 1887 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 1710 | 0 | 0 | 2163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3873 | 4.68 | 18108 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Knoll | 547 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 547 | 2.00 | 1094 |
| Lake Powell | 5265 | 26358 | 0 | 12002 | 15889 | 195 | 3589 | 8224 | 0 | 71522 | 5.74 | 410535 |
| Lees Ferry | 2051 | 132 | 0 | 488 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2951 | 3.28 | 9683 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 2.00 | 274 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 2940 | 264 | 0 | 907 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4112 | 2.51 | 10337 |
| Woods Canyon | 410 | 661 | 0 | 0 | 976 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2047 | 2.95 | 6044 |
| TOTAL | 13608 | 27679 | 0 | 15561 | 17144 | 195 | 3589 | 8224 | 0 | 85999 |  | 457960 |


| COUNTY: GILA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 14291 | 5483 | 290 | 27493 | 23067 | 1384 | 2731 | 2570 | 40 | 77351 | 3.53 | 273135 |
| San Carlos | 1094 | 0 | 0 | 8374 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 9499 | 2.59 | 24566 |
| TOTAL | 15386 | 5483 | 290 | 35867 | 23067 | 1384 | 2763 | 2570 | 40 | 86850 |  | 297702 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: GRAHAM |  |  |  |  | OAT CLA |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | USE DAYS |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 837 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 837 | 2.00 | 1675 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 837 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 837 | 3.00 | 2512 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 |  | 4187 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: LA PAZ |  |  |  |  | OAT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Alamo | 8616 | 132 | 0 | 3977 | 1603 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14328 | 2.91 | 41723 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 1394 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1658 | 2.64 | 4373 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 137 | 6138 | 0 | 10319 | 7606 | 125 | 626 | 2153 | 6 | 27109 | 4.75 | 128689 |
| Parker Strip | 25369 | 41816 | 363 | 3698 | 20559 | 0 | 159 | 3369 | 0 | 95333 | 4.08 | 389020 |
| TOTAL | 34122 | 48351 | 363 | 17995 | 31161 | 125 | 784 | 5522 | 6 | 138429 |  | 563805 |


| COUNTY: MARICOPA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Apache | 3282 | 9248 | 0 | 4885 | 12823 | 19 | 1588 | 1428 | 0 | 33273 | 4.90 | 162901 |
| Bartlett | 4308 | 6936 | 0 | 17515 | 5645 | 0 | 95 | 3084 | 0 | 37583 | 3.57 | 134123 |
| Canyon | 3761 | 9116 | 0 | 11095 | 11359 | 1111 | 762 | 800 | 20 | 38024 | 4.39 | 166786 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 488 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 | 3.12 | 1744 |
| Pleasant | 29950 | 24772 | 339 | 34262 | 39793 | 4112 | 1969 | 2798 | 550 | 138547 | 3.70 | 512158 |
| Saguaro | 2872 | 5483 | 0 | 9490 | 22370 | 136 | 318 | 286 | 0 | 40955 | 4.13 | 169114 |
| Salt River | 684 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 823 | 2.34 | 1925 |
| Tempe Town | 274 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 341 | 1.06 | 361 |
| Verde River | 342 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 487 | 2.00 | 974 |
| TOTAL | 45473 | 55556 | 532 | 77735 | 92200 | 5399 | 4732 | 8395 | 570 | 290592 |  | 1150087 |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE |  |  |  |  | OAT CLA |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 137 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1043 | 4.21 | 4386 |
| Grand Canyon | 137 | 925 | 0 | 2093 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3155 | 2.97 | 9358 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 1231 | 55246 | 0 | 92873 | 68450 | 1123 | 5630 | 19375 | 54 | 243982 | 4.75 | 1158198 |
| Lake Mead | 1231 | 10041 | 0 | 2791 | 10663 | 390 | 1302 | 2856 | 70 | 29343 | 5.38 | 157725 |
| Lake Mohave | 0 | 19356 | 0 | 2652 | 18747 | 97 | 286 | 6682 | 0 | 47819 | 4.84 | 231328 |
| Topock Gorge | 684 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 940 | 2.89 | 2722 |
| TOTAL | 3419 | 85633 | 0 | 100618 | 98556 | 1610 | 7409 | 28912 | 124 | 326282 |  | 1563717 |


| COUNTY: NAVAJO | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 479 | 198 | 0 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 956 | 2.79 | 2670 |
| Cholla | 410 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1019 | 1.95 | 1987 |
| Clear Creek | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 1.00 | 68 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 410 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 | 3.00 | 1231 |
| Show Low | 2530 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2530 | 2.13 | 5376 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 3898 | 528 | 0 | 279 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4984 |  | 11332 |
| COUNTY: PIMA BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE <br> DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Arivaca | 821 | 0 | 0 | 558 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1379 | 2.60 | 3578 |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 821 | 0 | 0 | 558 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1379 |  | 3578 |
| COUNTY: PINAL BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |  |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Patagonia | 1436 | 2444 | 121 | 2233 | 1185 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7497 | 3.91 | 29300 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1436 | 2444 | 121 | 2233 | 1185 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7497 |  | 29300 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YAVAPA |  |  |  |  | AT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 410 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 480 | 2.00 | 960 |
| Watson | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 3.00 | 595 |
| TOTAL | 410 | 198 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 678 |  | 1555 |


| COUNTY: YUMA <br> Lake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Martinez Lake | 205 | 4030 | 0 | 1396 | 2369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8000 | 7.53 | 60255 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 1.00 | 70 |
| Squaw Lake | 137 | 528 | 0 | 1396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2061 | 2.91 | 5999 |
| TOTAL | 342 | 4558 | 0 | 2861 | 2369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10130 |  | 66324 |

## TABLE 37 WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)



## TABLE 37 WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY: GILA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 4.00 | 7148 |
| San Carlos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1787 |  | 7148 |


| COUNTY: GRAHAM | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: LA PAZ | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Alamo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 638 | 2.00 | 1277 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2109 | 3.00 | 6327 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 2294 | 14290 | 523 | 2324 | 13011 | 338 | 0 | 116 | 71 | 32966 | 5.09 | 167829 |
| Parker Strip | 4011 | 52878 | 0 | 5234 | 37121 | 0 | 256 | 355 | 0 | 99854 | 4.23 | 421902 |
| TOTAL | 6305 | 67168 | 523 | 8196 | 52241 | 338 | 256 | 471 | 71 | 135568 |  | 597335 |


| COUNTY: MARICOPA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Apache | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bartlett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Canyon | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 9.00 | 1130 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pleasant | 1755 | 0 | 0 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2393 | 2.27 | 5424 |
| Saguaro | 0 | 0 | 0 | 894 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 894 | 2.00 | 1787 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1755 | 126 | 0 | 1532 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3412 |  | 8341 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE |  |  |  |  | BOAT CL |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  | USE DAYS |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 4647 | 0 | 0 | 984 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5631 | 7.61 | 42873 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 1256 | 0 | 383 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1639 | 5.53 | 9068 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 20646 | 128611 | 4703 | 20917 | 117095 | 3045 | 0 | 1040 | 641 | 296698 | 5.09 | 1510462 |
| Lake Mead | 877 | 30018 | 1363 | 4978 | 21232 | 0 | 0 | 1155 | 158 | 59783 | 6.80 | 406577 |
| Lake Mohave | 5389 | 73602 | 1590 | 5744 | 63556 | 1320 | 0 | 3022 | 0 | 154223 | 6.71 | 1034512 |
| Topock Gorge | 627 | 4522 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5148 | 4.11 | 21148 |
| TOTAL | 27540 | 242656 | 7656 | 32023 | 202867 | 4365 | 0 | 5217 | 800 | 523123 |  | 3024641 |

## TABLE 37 WATERCRAFT USAGE: CALIFORNIA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)



| COUNTY: APACHE |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | PERSONUSE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 357 | 0 | 0 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1150 | 14.10 | 16225 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 357 | 0 | 0 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1150 |  | 16225 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE <br> DAYSMEAN PARTY <br> SIZE |  |  |
| COUNTY: COCHISE BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: COCONINO BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Knoll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Powell | 0 | 3013 | 0 | 397 | 115 | 0 | 45 | 133 | 0 | 3702 | 7.17 | 265246 |
| Lees Ferry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 428 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 2.00 | 857 |
| Woods Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 428 | 3013 | 0 | 397 | 115 | 0 | 45 | 133 | 0 | 4130 |  | 27381 |

TABLE 38 WATERCRAFT USAGE: NEVADA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY: GILALake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 | 2.00 | 2294 |
| San Carlos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 |  | 2294 |
| COUNTY: GRAHAM ${ }^{\text {a }}$ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEAN PARTY SIZE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | BOAT CLASS <br> $\mathbf{5}$ [\| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Riggs Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Roper | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: LA PAZ BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alamo | 428 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 468 | 2.92 | 1365 |
| Ehrenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (La Paz County) | 0 | 82 | 0 | 79 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 4.42 | 775 |
| Parker Strip | 0 | 2456 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2536 | 2.97 | 7527 |
| TOTAL | 428 | 2538 | 0 | 198 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3179 |  | 9667 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: MARICOPA BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | BOAT CLASS <br> 5 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apache | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bartlett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Canyon | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 2.00 | 428 |
| Horseshoe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pleasant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 2.00 | 153 |
| Saguaro | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 2.00 | 382 |
| Salt River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Tempe Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Verde River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 482 |  | 964 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: MOHAVE BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | BOAT CLASS <br> 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Grand Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Havasu (Mohave County) | 0 | 737 | 0 | 714 | 69 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 1580 | 4.42 | 6979 |
| Lake Mead | 1785 | 10087 | 0 | 4284 | 14111 | 725 | 479 | 6005 | 145 | 37621 | 3.52 | 132341 |
| Lake Mohave | 785 | 590 | 0 | 1230 | 3059 | 0 | 579 | 797 | 10 | 7050 | 4.24 | 29908 |
| Topock Gorge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2570 | 11413 | 0 | 6228 | 17239 | 725 | 1117 | 6802 | 155 | 46250 |  | 169228 |

## TABLE 38 WATERCRAFT USAGE: NEVADA REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY: NAVAJO | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cholla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Clear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Show Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PIMA |  |  |  |  | AT CLA |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE | MEAN PARTY | PERSON |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | DAYS | SIZE | USE DAYS |
| Arivaca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: PINAL | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZLake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Patagonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: YAVAPA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: YUMA | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTY SIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Martinez Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 106 | 4.00 | 425 |
| Squaw Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 106 |  | 425 |


| COUNTY: APACHE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Big | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bunch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Concho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cresent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Drift Fence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Luna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lyman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mexican Hay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Nelson Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Sunrise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCHISE | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Parker Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |


| COUNTY: COCONINO |  |  |  |  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Ashurst | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bear Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Blue Ridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cataract | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Dogtown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Knoll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lake Powell | 7009 | 31693 | 174 | 1906 | 35695 | 90 | 758 | 10610 | 72 | 88008 | 7.57 | 665948 |
| Lees Ferry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Long | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mormon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Whitehorse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Willow Springs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Woods Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 7009 | 31693 | 174 | 1906 | 35695 | 90 | 758 | 10610 | 72 | 88008 |  | 665948 |

## TABLE 39 WATERCRAFT USAGE:UTAH REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)



TABLE 39 WATERCRAFT USAGE:UTAH REGISTERED BOATS (12 MONTH DATA)

| COUNTY: NAVAJOLake | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BOAT USE } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cholla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Clear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Cooley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Fools Hollow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 0 |
| Rainbow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Show Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| White Mtn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| COUNTY: PIMA BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |  |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Arivaca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |  |
| Silverbell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: PINAL | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Picacho Reservoir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 00 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USEDAYS |  |  |
| COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Patagonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Pena Blanca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE DAYS |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN PARTY } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | PERSON USE DAYS |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Lynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY: YUMA <br> BOAT CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOAT USE <br> DAYS | MEAN PARTYSIZE | PERSON USE DAYS |
| Lake | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Martinez Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mittry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Squaw Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |

### 6.3 Combined Data Set

The next series of tables (Table 40 to Table 41) present the boat and person use data based on the combined two-week data and 12-month data sets. As may be seen, Mohave, Maricopa, La Paz and Coconino Counties generate the highest boat use and person use figures.

## TABLE 40: BOAT USE DAYS AND <br> PERSON USE DAYS BY COUNTY <br> (COMBINED 2 WEEK/12 MONTH DATA)

|  | Boat Use Days |  | Person Use Days |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Mohave | 3,291,833 | 49.2\% | 17,020,447 | 52.1\% |
| Maricopa | 996,417 | 14.9 | 4,088,146 | 12.5 |
| La Paz | 901,706 | 13.4 | 4,335,938 | 13.3 |
| Coconino | 622,423 | 9.3 | 3,665,277 | 11.2 |
| Gila | 392,302 | 5.9 | 1,418,007 | 4.3 |
| Yuma | 362,834 | 5.4 | 1,790,940 | 5.2 |
| Apache | 58,533 | . 9 | 178,943 | . 5 |
| Santa Cruz | 20,738 | . 3 | 62,124 | . 2 |
| Cochise | 18,331 | . 3 | 112,202 | . 3 |
| Navajo | 11,443 | . 2 | 30,059 | . 1 |
| Pinal | 9,012 | . 1 | 18,024 | . 1 |
| Graham | 1,675 | * | 4,187 | * |
| Pima | 1,379 | * | 3,578 | * |
| Yavapai | 1,259 | * | 2,136 | * |
| Greenlee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 6,689,884 | 100.0\% | 32,649,008 | 100.0\% |

TABLE 41: WATERCRAFT USE BY SPECIFIC LAKES/RIVERS
(COMBINED 2 WEEK/12 MONTH DATA)

| LAKE | $\begin{gathered} \text { BOAT } \\ \text { USE DAYS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSON } \\ & \text { USE DAYS } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake Havasu | 1,926,792 | 9,610,022 |
| Lake Mohave | 887,775 | 4,901,999 |
| Parker Strip | 630,427 | 3,089,383 |
| Lake Mead | 608,526 | 2,944,346 |
| Lake Powell | 557,310 | 3,452,745 |
| Pleasant | 534,347 | 2,080,607 |
| Martinez Lake | 349,871 | 1,621,302 |
| Roosevelt | 347,853 | 1,243,902 |
| Saguaro | 168,566 | 856,787 |
| Bartlett | 114,501 | 407,850 |
| Canyon | 92,329 | 360,255 |
| Apache | 57,703 | 290,669 |
| Davis Dam/Topock | 51,890 | 246,210 |
| Topock Gorge | 47,709 | 221,969 |
| Alamo | 44,688 | 109,061 |
| San Carlos | 44,450 | 174,105 |
| Ehrenberg | 33,911 | 176,492 |
| Horseshoe | 23,974 | 71,992 |
| Big | 23,138 | 75,148 |
| Patagonia | 20,738 | 62,124 |
| Reservation | 19,693 | 70,568 |
| Willow Springs | 19,310 | 40,733 |
| Parker Canyon | 18,331 | 112,202 |
| Lees Ferry | 15,751 | 74,335 |
| Woods Canyon | 13,736 | 41,113 |
| Grand Canyon | 11,820 | 56,903 |
| Picacho Reservoir | 9,012 | 18,024 |
| Hawley | 8,479 | 17,232 |
| Mittry | 6,925 | 67,988 |
| Squaw Lake | 6,037 | 20,650 |
| Blue Ridge | 5,547 | 21,457 |
| Long | 4,218 | 8,437 |
| Salt River | 4,168 | 18,651 |
| Cholla | 3,939 | 7,827 |
| Kaibab | 3,673 | 11,020 |
| Show Low | 2,530 | 5,376 |
| Clear Creek | 1,948 | 3,828 |
| Cooley | 1,659 | 9,127 |
| Cresent | 1,573 | 2,831 |
| Arivaca | 1,379 | 3,578 |
| Luna | 1,368 | 2,735 |
| Sunrise | 1,299 | 2,598 |
| (CONTINUED) |  |  |

## (CONT'D) TABLE 41: WATERCRAFT USE BY SPECIFIC <br> LAKES/RIVERS (12 MONTH DATA)

| LAKE | BOAT <br> USE DAYS | PERSON <br> USE DAYS |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Nelson Reservoir |  |  |
| Becker | 1,162 | 2,325 |
| Black Canyon | 957 | 2,393 |
| Roper | 956 | 2,670 |
| Riggs Lake | 837 | 2,512 |
| Ashurst | 837 | 1,675 |
| Watson | 811 | 1,887 |
| Bear Canyon | 779 | 1,175 |
| Cataract | 754 | 9,043 |
| Knoll | 628 | 3,140 |
| Mexican Hay | 547 | 1,094 |
| Verde River | 528 | 2,114 |
| Lynx | 487 | 974 |
| Rainbow | 480 | 960 |
| Tempe Town | 410 | 1,231 |
| Lyman | 341 | 361 |
| Upper Lake Mary | 335 | 998 |
| TOTAL | 137 | 274 |
|  |  |  |

### 7.0 LAUNCH RAMP SURVEY DATA

This section of the report presents the findings of the launch ramp surveys which were conducted at ten Arizona lakes and rivers throughout the study period. As may be seen on Table 42, for nine of the ten lakes surveyed, the launch ramp survey findings parallel the findings generated in the boat owner survey. Only at Lake Mead are the findings quite different between the two surveys: At Lake Mead, the "other" state readings are very different with figures of 16 percent from the launch ramp survey and 58 percent from the boat owner survey. As in prior studies, the main reason for this difference is that the launch ramp survey at Lake Mead was conducted at Temple Bar in Arizona and the vast majority of Nevada residents who utilize the lake launch at one of three Nevada-based sites. Thus, while Nevada residents make heavy use of Lake Mead, they do not show up in the launch ramp counts.

| LAKE/RIVER | STUDY | ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA | ${ }^{3}$ OTHER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bartlett | ${ }^{1}$ Ramp | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | ${ }^{2}$ Survey | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Havasu | Ramp | 40 | 57 | 3 |
|  | Survey | 45 | 54 | 1 |
| Martinez | Ramp | 27 | 73 | * |
|  | Survey | 11 | 89 | 0 |
| Mead | Ramp | 22 | 62 | 16 |
|  | Survey | 10 | 32 | 58 |
| Mohave | Ramp | 18 | 74 | 8 |
|  | Survey | 24 | 71 | 5 |
| Parker Strip | Ramp | 23 | 76 | 1 |
|  | Survey | 29 | 71 | 0 |
| Pleasant | Ramp | 93 | 4 | 3 |
|  | Survey | 96 | 3 | 1 |
| Powell | Ramp | 42 | 23 | 35 |
|  | Survey | 53 | 13 | 34 |
| Roosevelt | Ramp | 98 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Survey | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Saguaro | Ramp | 98 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Survey | 98 | 2 | 0 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Boat distribution from launch ramp survey |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ Other from boat survey only includes Nevada and Utah while other from launch ramp survey may include any state observed. <br> Indicates \% less than . 5 |  |  |  |  |

### 8.0 ADDITIONAL BOATING DATA

This final section of the report presents a variety of attitudinal and behavioral data regarding boat usage. When reading this section, keep in mind that all of the data presented has been computer weighted so that each state and boat classification properly represents its proportional contribution to overall boat registrations in the four-state sample universe.

### 8.1 Trip Expenditures

The average expenditure for a boating trip in Arizona is $\$ 352$ - up from $\$ 232$ in 2003. The typical Arizona boater spends $\$ 184$ per trip compared to $\$ 624$ for California boaters, $\$ 150$ for Nevada boaters and $\$ 600$ for Utah boaters. The greatest increase in any individual category between 2003 and 2006 is in the one containing gasoline which increased from $\$ 66$ to $\$ 124$.

## TABLE 43: TRIP EXPENDITURES

"On your last boating trip in Arizona during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH), how much money did you and the other members of your boating party spend on the following items?"

|  | MEDIAN DAILY |
| :---: | :---: |
| \% SPENDING | EXPENDITURE |
| MONEY | (AMONG THOSE |
| ON ITEM | SPENDING ON ITEM |

For food and beverages purchased at retail stores 84\% \$114
For equipment rental, tackle, bait and gasoline

82
124
For entry fees or permits 58 26
At restaurants and bars 60
144
For gifts, souvenirs, clothing and other personal items 3469

For overnight lodging at hotels and
motels $\quad 31 \quad 270$
For any other items directly related to your boating trip which I haven't mentioned

TOTAL SPENDING ${ }^{1}$ 99\% \$352
Arizona $99 \quad 184$

California 99624 Nevada $97 \quad 150$ Utah 9960
${ }^{1}$ Note: Total is an independent, combined expenditure figure, not a total for the 7 selected items.

### 8.2 Boating And Water-based Recreational Facilities Most Needed

Boat owners were asked to indicate the most needed facilities and the most needed services at their favorite lake. Response to these two questions was very similar so they were combined on the following table for analysis. As may be seen, launch ramps ( $24 \%$ ) and public restrooms (21\%) continue to receive the greatest mention from boaters. Also receiving sizeable response are increased law enforcement (11\%), marinas (11\%), gas stations (10\%) and concessions that sell food, drinks, tackle and the like (9\%). One out of three boaters (31\%) indicate there are no additional facilities or services needed at their favorite lake.

## TABLE 44: BOATING AND WATER-BASED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES/SERVICES NEEDED

"What would you say are the two or three most needed facilities at
(LAKE/RIVER)?"
"And what would you say are the two or three most needed services at (LAKE/RIVER)?"

|  | TOTAL |  |  | State of REGISTRATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 | AZ | CA | NV | UT |
| None | 31\% | 33\% | 36\% | 31\% | 32\% | 28\% | 28\% |
| Launching ramps | 24 | 22 | 20 | 23 | 26 | 30 | 14 |
| Public restrooms | 21 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 26 |
| More law enforcement | 11 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 3 |
| Marinas | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 15 | 21 |
| Gas stations | 10 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 13 |
| Concessions | 9 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| Campgrounds | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| Restaurants/bars | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| Courtesy docks | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Parking facilities | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Boat gas dock | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| Hotel/motel | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Less litter/cleaner | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Beaches | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Improved access roads | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Sanitary dump stations | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| Picnic areas and facilities | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Ramadas/shaded areas | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | * | 9 |
| Trash dumpsters | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| RV park/hookups | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | * | * |
| Jet ski area | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | * | * | 3 |
| Showers | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| (CONTINUED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(CONT.) TABLE 44: BOATING AND WATER-BASED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES/SERVICES NEEDED

|  | TOTAL |  |  | State of Registration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2006}$ | 2003 | 2000 | AZ | CA | NV | UT |
| Drinking water outlets | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | *\% |
| Emergency phones | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Stock fish | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Campsites for boats only | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | * |
| Fish cleaning station | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | * | 2 | 3 |
| All others | 9 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 |

Totals exceed 100\% due to multiple responses.

### 8.3 Evaluation Of Water-based Recreation Facilities

Continuing with this line of questioning, boaters were next asked to evaluate each of 22 specific boating and water-based recreational facilities at their favorite lake. As Table 45 reveals, the facility registering the highest net positive reading continues to be paved access roads (+44\%). Informational signs receives the next highest net positive reading ( $+32 \%$ ), followed by parking facilities for vehicles (+28\%), campgrounds (+28\%), launching ramps (+27\%), picnic areas and facilities (+25\%), and parking facilities for boat trailers (+24\%). Three items continue to register net negative readings from roughly one-quarter of boaters or more: emergency telephones (-29\%), drinking water outlets ( $-28 \%$ ) and trash dumpsters accessible by boat ( $-24 \%$ ).

Listed below are the items that showed the greatest change - either positive or negative since the last survey in 2003. Overall, improved readings are recorded on 11 items while lower readings are also recorded on 11.

## LARGEST POSITIVE CHANGES

- Campgrounds - five-point net improvement;
- Boat gas docks - five-point net improvement;
- Fish cleaning stations - five-point net improvement.


## LaRgest Negative Changes

- Concessions - six-point net decline.
- Campsites accessible by boat only - six-point net decline.
- First aid stations - six-point net decline.

TABLE 45: EVALUATION OF WATER-BASED RECREATION FACILITIES
"Now l'd like to read you a list of various boating and water-based recreational facilities. As I do, please just tell me if you would rate each as excellent, good, only fair, or poor at (LAKE/RIVER)? If any of the facilities I mention aren't located at (LAKE/RIVER), please just say so."

|  | Excellent | Good | Only Fair | Poor | Not Sure | ${ }^{1}$ Net Pos/Neg |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |
| Paved access roads | 15\% | 56\% | 19\% | 8\% | 2\% | 44\% | 40\% | 43\% |
| Informational signs | 11 | 53 | 20 | 12 | 4 | 32 | 30 | 33 |
| Parking facilities for Vehicles | 13 | 50 | 25 | 10 | 2 | 28 | 26 | 14 |
| Campgrounds | 13 | 44 | 20 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 23 | 19 |
| Launching ramps | 16 | 47 | 25 | 11 | 1 | 27 | 26 | 22 |
| Picnic areas and facilities | 13 | 45 | 25 | 8 | 9 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| Parking facilities for boat Trailers | 15 | 46 | 23 | 14 | 2 | 24 | 23 | 18 |
| Swimming beaches | 14 | 41 | 21 | 15 | 9 | 19 | 17 | 17 |
| Boat gas docks | 10 | 43 | 25 | 15 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 5 |
| Concessions that sell food, bait, drinks, tackle, etc. | 10 | 42 | 25 | 18 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 11 |
| Public restrooms | 11 | 41 | 28 | 17 | 3 | 7 | 5 | (1) |
| Fish cleaning stations | 7 | 30 | 15 | 15 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Campsites accessible by boat only | 11 | 32 | 20 | 17 | 20 | 6 | 12 | 11 |
| Sanitary dump facilities | 8 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 25 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| Marinas with overnight docking spaces, boat rental, fuel, and boat repair, etc. | 8 | 36 | 23 | 21 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Courtesy docks | 9 | 37 | 25 | 22 | 7 | (1) | 1 | (4) |
| Picnic areas accessible by boat only | 10 | 31 | 20 | 23 | 16 | (2) | 0 | 8 |
| Fishing piers | 6 | 24 | 19 | 23 | 28 | (12) | (8) | (15) |
| First-aid stations | 5 | 20 | 16 | 25 | 34 | (16) | (10) | (13) |
| Trash dumpsters accessible by boat | 6 | 26 | 20 | 36 | 12 | (24) | (20) | (24) |
| Drinking water outlets | 4 | 21 | 22 | 31 | 22 | (28) | (25) | (25) |
| Emergency telephones | 2 | 18 | 15 | 34 | 31 | (29) | (28) | (30) |

The next table reveals boaters' evaluations of recreation facilities by state of registration. As has been observed in the past, there is considerable variation in boaters' evaluations from state to state

TABLE 46: EVALUATION OF WATER-BASED RECREATION FACILITIES BY STATE

Net Positive/(Negative)
State of Registration

| Paved access roads | $44 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Informational signs | 32 | 37 | 29 | 16 | 45 |
| Parking facilities for vehicles | 28 | 34 | 20 | 19 | 71 |
| Campgrounds | 28 | 30 | 28 | $(3)$ | 32 |
| Launching ramps | 27 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 32 |
| Picnic areas and facilities | 24 | 29 | 22 | 12 | 48 |
| Parking facilities for boat trailers | 19 | 36 | 14 | 18 | 51 |
| Swimming beaches | 4 | 31 | $(8)$ | 67 |  |
| Boat gas docks | 10 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 48 |
| Concessions for food, etc. | 7 | 3 | 19 | $(3)$ | 23 |
| Public restrooms | 7 | 11 | 1 | $(2)$ | 19 |
| Fish cleaning stations | 6 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 25 |
| Campsites accessible by boat only | 1 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 24 |
| Sanitary dump facilities | 0 | 4 | 0 | $(18)$ | $(9)$ |
| Marinas with overnight docking spaces, etc. | 0 | $(1)$ | 0 | 10 | 19 |
| Courtesy docks | $(1)$ | 0 | $(9)$ | 7 | 50 |
| Picnic areas accessible by boat only | $(2)$ | $(6)$ | 2 | $(28)$ | 31 |
| Fishing piers | $(12)$ | $(7)$ | $(17)$ | $(20)$ | $(9)$ |
| First-aid stations | $(16)$ | $(17)$ | $(16)$ | $(24)$ | $(6)$ |
| Trash dumpsters accessible by boat | $(24)$ | $(25)$ | $(20)$ | $(21)$ | $(25)$ |
| Drinking water outlets | $(28)$ | $(26)$ | $(34)$ | $(46)$ | $(6)$ |
| Emergency telephones | $(29)$ | $(25)$ | $(31)$ | $(44)$ | $(36)$ |

### 8.4 Awareness Of SLIF Program

Awareness of the SLIF program has remained relatively steady at about eight to ten percent over the past three studies.

TABLE 47: AWARENESS OF SLIF PROGRAM
"Next, the Arizona State Lake Improvement Fund, or SLIF, is a program designed to assist state and local governments in improving boating related resources and facilities. Were you aware of this program before I mentioned it just now?"

|  | $\%$ YES |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |
|  | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 12 | 14 |
| Arizona | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| California | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| Nevada | 12 | NA | 4 |

### 8.5 Utilization Of SLIF Funds

After boaters had indicated their awareness of the SLIF program, they were asked to indicate how important they felt each of its six funding functions is. As Table 48 reveals, four of the six functions continue to receive very or somewhat important readings from over eight out of ten boaters.

- The construction of first-aid stations and other safety facilities (88\%);
- The purchasing of law enforcement and safety equipment such as patrol boats, radios and lights (87\%);
- The construction of water-based boating facilities such as marinas, launch ramps and piers (86\%);
- The construction of recreation support facilities such as restrooms, campgrounds and picnic tables (85\%).

The remaining two functions - purchasing shoreline property (72\%) and the development of new lakes for boating ( $75 \%$ ) - are considered to be somewhat less important, but still are considered very or somewhat important by over seven in ten residents. These readings are virtually unchanged from the prior studies.
"The SLIF program is funded with revenues from boat registration fees and motor fuel taxes and there are six water-based boating functions for which these funds might be used. As I read them to you, please just tell me if you feel each one is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important."

The construction of first-aid stations and other safety facilities

|  |  |  |  |  | \% VERY/ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very | Some- <br> what | Not <br> Very | Not <br> At All | Not <br> Sure |   <br> 2006 2003 | 2000 |  |
| $56 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| 60 | 27 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 87 | 87 | 84 |
| 55 | 31 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 86 | 85 | 85 |
| 54 | 31 | 10 | 5 | $*$ | 85 | 86 | 89 |
| 38 | 37 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 75 | 72 | 71 |
| 39 | 33 | 18 | 8 | 2 | 72 | 73 | 72 |

In the next SLIF question, boaters were asked if they felt the program's funds should be used mostly for renovations or new building. By nearly a two-to-one margin, boaters prefer renovation over new building ( $55 \%$ vs. $31 \%$ ). This reading for renovation is virtually unchanged from the 2000 and 2003 reading.

## TABLE 49: SLIF FUNDING PRIORITIES

"And if you had a choice, would you prefer to see the SLIF program fund the renovation of deteriorating facilities or the building of new facilities?"

| 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $55 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| 31 | 27 | 27 |
| 9 | 15 | 12 |
| $\frac{5}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{5}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{6}{100 \%}$ |

A new question was added to the 2000 study to determine boaters' preferences for the uses of a new lake, should one be developed. Seven different boating activities were evaluated and, as was the case in 2000 and 2003, four received ratings of very or somewhat important by more than 80 percent of the boaters.

- General pleasure boating (95\%);
- Fishing (91\%);
- Water skiing (85\%);
- Power boating (84\%).

Jet skiing again received the lowest preference rating with 63 percent of boaters offering a very or somewhat important rating - up from 55 percent in 2000 and 59 percent in 2003.

## TABLE 50: PREFERRED USES OF NEW LAKE

"If a new lake is developed for boating, do you feel that it is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important that the following uses be allowed?"

|  |  | Somewhat | Not Very | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Not } \\ \text { At All } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Not Sure | \% VERY/ <br> SOMEWHAT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Very |  |  |  |  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 |
| General pleasure boating | 71\% | 24\% | 3\% | 2\% | *\% | 95\% | 94\% | 94\% |
| Fishing | 65 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 91 | 91 | 90 |
| Water skiing | 54 | 31 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 85 | 84 | 83 |
| Power boating | 59 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 84 | 83 | 81 |
| Canoeing and kayaking | 31 | 44 | 15 | 9 | 1 | 75 | 72 | 73 |
| Sailing | 28 | 38 | 18 | 14 | 2 | 66 | 68 | 69 |
| Jet skiing | 34 | 29 | 16 | 20 | 1 | 63 | 59 | 55 |

General pleasure boating
\% VERY/SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
State of Registration

### 8.6 Law Enforcement Priorities

Stopping people who are boating recklessly (52\%) and stopping people who are boating drunk ( $50 \%$ ) continue to be the two law enforcement activities which boaters would most like to see increased at their favorite lake or river. The percent of boaters indicating more should be done in each of 14 categories remains on par with the levels recorded in 2003.
"As you know, agencies such as the Game \& Fish Department, county sheriffs' offices and other agencies patrol Arizona's lakes and rivers. For each of the following, please tell me whether you think at (LAKE/RIVER) these agencies should be doing more than they are now, about what they are doing now, or less than they are doing now regarding."
\% Indicating "Should Be Doing More"

|  | TOTAL |  |  | State of REGISTRATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2003 | 2000 | AZ | CA | NV | UT |
| Stopping people who are boating recklessly | 52\% | 55\% | 55\% | 55\% | 50\% | 53\% | 43\% |
| Stopping people who are boating while drunk | 50 | 53 | 56 | 50 | 52 | 52 | 16 |
| Providing first-aid stations | 48 | 47 | 48 | 45 | 51 | 47 | 44 |
| Marking submerged rocks and other hazards | 43 | 42 | 43 | 38 | 49 | 55 | 17 |
| Stopping people who overload their boat | 42 | 41 | 43 | 44 | 41 | 47 | 17 |
| Educating boaters on safe boating operations and procedures | 40 | 43 | 45 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 3 |
| Providing safety information on special hazards and conditions on the lake | 38 | 41 | 42 | 36 | 40 | 41 | 20 |
| Stopping boats with excessive noise | 35 | 34 | 33 | 39 | 31 | 38 | 17 |
| Providing weather warnings | 33 | 31 | 39 | 32 | 35 | 23 | 39 |
| Patrolling active use areas | 29 | 31 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 31 | 2 |
| Providing navigational aids | 29 | 25 | 28 | 25 | 33 | 41 | 13 |
| Checking safety equipment on boats | 26 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 22 | 28 | 3 |
| Keeping boaters out of swimming or other restricted areas | 23 | 21 | 27 | 25 | 21 | 26 | 13 |
| Providing rescue and emergency services | 22 | 22 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 23 | 21 |

In a related question, boaters were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with eight statements relating to law enforcement and safety issues at Arizona lakes. This line of questioning indicates that roughly three out of four boaters or more agree with the following attitudes:

- That hands-on training should be required for boat rental customers: 86 percent.
- That boating law violators should be required to take a boating safety class: 82 percent.
- That laws and regulations are being adequately enforced: 79 percent.
- That the minimum age for boat operators should be 16 years of age: 73 percent.

The data also reveals that boaters are split on whether or not operators should be required to complete a mandatory class prior to operating a motorized watercraft ( $56 \%$ agree, $42 \%$ disagree), while less than four out of ten believe operators should be required to obtain a license similar to that required to drive a car ( $38 \%$ agree, $60 \%$ disagree), that all occupants should be required to wear a life jacket ( $23 \%$ agree, $76 \%$ disagree), or that they often experience conflicts with others at their favorite lake ( $17 \%$ agree, $82 \%$ disagree).

## TABLE 53: ATTITUDES ON SELECTED LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SAFETY ISSUES

"Next, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements?"

${ }^{1}$ Question changed to "16 years of age, not" from "higher than" in 2000 and 2003.
NA = not asked

### 8.7 Attitudes On Various Water-based Recreation Issues

Boaters were asked a variety of agree/disagree questions on various water-based recreation issues. As may be seen in Table 54, the responses are little changed from 2003:

- Eight out of ten boaters (80\%) support boating safety educational centers at Arizona lakes.
- A majority of boaters (61\%) do not believe their favorite lake is too crowded while 36 percent do.
- 55 percent of boaters would support designating special areas for use only by jet.
- 51 percent of boaters believe their favorite lake needs additional developed campgrounds, while 52 percent believe it needs additional primitive campgrounds.
- 50 percent of boaters believe their favorite lake needs additional RV hookups while 41 percent do not.
- Boaters continue to be split on whether the launch ramps at their favorite lake are too crowded (49\% agree, 47\% disagree).
- Boaters continue to be split on whether the number of people using a lake should be restricted during high use periods (48\% agree, $48 \%$ disagree).


## TABLE 54: ATTITUDES ON MISCELLANEOUS <br> WATER-BASED RECREATION ISSUES

"Next, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements?


### 8.8 Recreational Activities Participated In

Boaters were next asked to indicate their single favorite boating activity. As was the case in 2000 and 2003, fishing (30\%), general pleasure boating (26\%) and water skiing (19\%) remain the top three activities. Note, however, that water skiing has dropped from the top spot and now trails fishing and general pleasure boating.

## TABLE 55: RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES - SINGLE FAVORITE

"Next, what is your single favorite boating activity on a typical boating trip?"

|  | TOTAL |  |  | State of Registration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2006}$ | 2003 | 2000 | AZ | CA | NV | UT |
| Fishing | 30\% | 25\% | 27\% | 41\% | 18\% | 36\% | 45\% |
| General pleasure boating | 26 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 29 | 19 | 7 |
| Water skiing | 19 | 27 | 29 | 16 | 21 | 17 | 41 |
| Jet skiing | 8 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 0 |
| Knee boarding | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| Tubing or rafting | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Swimming | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 4 | 3 |
| Sailing | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Sunbathing | 1 | * |  | * | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Personal transportation | 1 | * | * | * | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | $\frac{2}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{2}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{10}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{3}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{2}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{4}{100 \%}$ | $\frac{2}{100 \%}$ |

*Indicates percent less than . 5

## TABLE 56: RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES -- TOTAL

"And, what other boating activities do you enjoy on a typical boating trip?"


### 9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- The new data collection sequencing utilized on the past three studies whereby the data collection effort was divided into 24, two-week segments, should be continued. This method produces far more accurate and useful fuel consumption and use data than previous methods.
- Inclusion of Utah boaters in the survey provides valuable data and all efforts should be made to include Utah in the next study.
- Collection of the 12-month data set on boat use and person use days provides valuable data for the State Parks Board and should be continued.


### 10.0 APPENDIX

### 10.1 Survey Questionnaire

10.2 Audit Forms
10.3 Agreement of the Agencies

### 10.1 Survey Questionnaire

Hello, my name is $\qquad$ and I'm calling for Behavior Research Center of Arizona. We're conducting a study for the Arizona Game and Fish Department on boating on Arizona lakes and rivers, and l'd like to talk to you for a few minutes about your $\qquad$ boat. Are you or is someone else in your household the

Arizona... 1
California... 2
Nevada... 3
Utah... 4 primary user of your boat?

ADOT/AGFD/ASPB
2006 ARIZONA WATERCRAFT SURVEY
pinary user of your boat

## IF SOMEONE ELSE: ASK TO SPEAK WITH THAT PERSON. IF NOT AVAILABLE, ARRANGE CALLBACK.

CALLBACK INFO: $\qquad$

1. To start, was your boat used on Arizona lakes and rivers, including the Colorado River, during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH)? For the purpose of this study, any location on the Colorado River or its various lakes is considered Arizona.
2. Did you use your boat on Arizona lakes and rivers including the Colorado River, any time during the past 12 months?
(GO TO Q3) Yes... 1
(GO TO Q2) No... 2
(GO TO Q2) Don't know/Refused.... 3
(GO TO Q2a) Yes... 1
(GO TO Q2b) No... 2
(GO TO Q2B) Don't know/Refused... 3

2a. And on how many total days was your boat used on Arizona lakes and rivers including the Colorado River during the past 12 months?

NUMBER $\qquad$
(GO TO Q15)

2b. Was there any particular reason your boat wasn't used in Arizona? (RECORD ALL MENTIONS; DO NOT READ LIST)

Boat inoperable, broken down... 01
Expense, could not afford... 02 Too busy, no time... 03
Lost interest, prefer other recreational forms... 04
Out-of-state resident, use only in other state... 05
Don't know where to go... 06
Too far to go... 07
Too crowded... 08
$\qquad$ Other (PROBE \& RECORD)... 09
Don't know/Refused... 10

## THANK RESPONDENT AND TERMINATE

3. How many days was your boat used on Arizona lakes and rivers, including the Colorado River, during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH)?

NUMBER $\qquad$
(IF DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO Q16)
4. And on how many total days was your boat used on Arizona lakes and rivers including the Colorado River during the past 12 months?
5. Does your boat have a gas powered motor on it?

(GO TO Q6) Yes... 1
(GO TO Q11) No... 2
(GO TO Q11) Don't know/Refused... 3
6. What type of fuel does your boat use -- gasoline, diesel or aviation?
7. And what is the horsepower of your boat engine?
8. On a typical day boating in Arizona during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH) how many gallons of fuel did you use in your boat per day?
9. What percentage of the fuel you used in your boat did you buy in Arizona?
10. And what percentage of your Arizona fuel did you buy... (READ EACH; MAKE SURE THE TOTAL EQUALS 100\%)

Gasoline... 1
Diesel... 2
Aviation... 3
Don't know/Not sure... 4
HORSEPOWER $\qquad$ 11

GALLONS $\qquad$

PERCENT $\qquad$ 1 $\qquad$

AT ARIZONA GAS STATIONS AT ARIZONA GAS MARINAS

11. Earlier you mentioned that you used your boat a total of (Q3 TOTAL) days in Arizona during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH). What l'd like you to tell me now is first, at which lakes or rivers, including the Colorado River you spent this time, and then second, how many days you spent at each lake or river you visited.

11a. (FOR EACH LAKE/RIVER VISITED, ASK): When you visited (LAKE/RIVER) during the (LAST/FIRST) two weeks of (MONTH), how many people, including yourself, were usually in your immediate boating party?

Colorado River and its lakes... (IF PERSON SIMPLY SAYS "COLORADO RIVER", PROBE FOR SPECIFIC LOCATION)

| Q11 <br> DAYS | Q11a SIZE |  | Q11 <br> DAYS | Q11a SIZE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01-Lake Powell . |  | 39-Horseshoe. |  |  |
| 02- Glen Canyon Dam to Lees Ferry |  | 40- Horsethief Basin |  |  |
| 03- Grand Canyon |  | 41-Kaibab. |  |  |
| 04- Lake Mead |  | 42-Kennedy. |  |  |
| 05- Lake Mohave (Hoover Dam to |  | 43- Kinnikinick |  |  |
| Davis Dam) |  | 44-Knoll |  |  |
| 06- Davis Dam to Topock |  | 45-Lakeside. |  |  |
| 07- Topock Gorge |  | 46- Lee Valley |  |  |
| 08- Lake Havasu.. |  | 47- Little Bog |  |  |
| 09- Parker Strip (Parker Dam to |  | 48-Long |  |  |
| Headgate Rock Dam) |  | 49-Luna |  |  |
| 10- Headgate Rock Dam to Ehrenberg |  | 50-Lyman |  |  |
| 82- EHRENBERG TO THE NORTH END |  | 51- Lynx |  |  |
| OF MARTINEZ LAKE |  | 52- Mexican Hay |  |  |
| 11- Martinez Lake to Imperial Dam |  | 53- Mittry |  |  |
| 12- Mittry Lake (Imperial Dam to |  | 54- Mormon. |  |  |
| Morels Dam) ........... |  | 55- McCormick |  |  |
|  |  | 56- Nelson Reservoir |  |  |
| Other Arizona Lakes |  | 57- Painted Rocks |  |  |
|  |  | 58- Parker Canyon |  |  |
| 13- Alamo. |  | 59-Patagonia. |  |  |
| 14- Alford |  | 60- Pena Blanca. |  |  |
| 15- Apache. |  | 61- Picacho Reservoir. |  |  |
| 16- Arivaca. |  | 62- Pleasant |  |  |
| 17- Ashurst. |  | 63- Rainbow . |  |  |
| 18- Bartlett |  | 64- Reservation |  |  |
| 19-Bear Canyon. |  | 65- Roosevelt |  |  |
| 83- BECKER. |  | 66- Roper |  |  |
| 20- Big. |  | 67- Saguaro |  |  |
| 21- Black Canyon |  | 68- Salt River |  |  |
| 22-Blue Ridge |  | 69- San Carlos |  |  |
| 23- Bunch Lake. |  | 70- Scotts Reservoir |  |  |
| 24- Canyon |  | 71-Show Low |  |  |
| 25- Cataract |  | 72-Silverbell . |  |  |
| 26- Chapparal |  | 73- Squaw Lake |  |  |
| 27- Chevlon. |  | 74-Stoneman. |  |  |
| 28-Cholla. |  | 75- Sunrise.. |  |  |
| 29- Concho |  | 86- TEMPE TOWN. |  |  |
| 84- COOLEY. |  | 76- Upper Lake Mary |  |  |
| 30-Clear Creek. |  | 77- Verde River |  |  |
| 31- Cresent |  | 87- WATSON |  |  |
| 32- Dobson |  | 78- Whitehorse. |  |  |
| 85- DOG TOWN. |  | 88- WHITE MOUNTAIN |  |  |
| 33- Drift Fence |  | 79- Willow Springs |  |  |
| 34-Fire Bird |  | 80- Woods Canyon . |  |  |
| 35- Fool's Hollow |  | 81- Other (PROBE \& REC |  |  |
| 36- Goldwater |  |  |  |  |
| 37- Greer. |  |  |  |  |
| 38-Hawley .................................................. |  |  |  |  |

12. Next, on how many separate trips was your boat used in Arizona during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH)?
13. And on approximately how many total trips was your boat used in Arizona during the past 12 months?
14. On your last boating trip in Arizona during the (FIRST/LAST) two weeks of (MONTH), how much money did you and the other members of your boating party spend on the following items? (READ EACH)
A. For overnight lodging at hotels and motels. $\qquad$ AMOUNT $\qquad$
B. At restaurants and bars $\qquad$ AMOUNT $\qquad$
C. For food and beverages purchased at retail stores
D. For equipment rental, tackle, bait and gasoline $\qquad$
AMOUNT $\qquad$
AMOUNT $\qquad$
E. For entry fees or permits $\qquad$ AMOUNT $\qquad$
F. For gifts, souvenirs, clothing and other personal items $\qquad$ AMOUNT $\qquad$
G. For any other items directly related to your boating trip which I haven't mentioned $\qquad$ AMOUNT $\qquad$
15. You mention that you used your boat a total of (Q2a TOTAL) days in Arizona during the past 12 months. What l'd like you to tell me now is first, at which lakes or rivers, including the Colorado River, you spent this time, and then second, how many days you spent at each lake or river you visited.

15a. (FOR EACH LAKE/RIVER VISITED, ASK): When you visited (LAKE/RIVER) during the past 12 months, how many people, including yourself, were usually in your immediate boating party?

Colorado River and its lakes... (IF PERSON SIMPLY SAYS "COLORADO RIVER", PROBE FOR SPECIFIC LOCATION)


36- Goldw
37- Greer
38- Hawley
80- Woods Canyon
81- Other (PROBE \& RECORD) you go most often during the past 12 months?
17. Next, what would you say are the two or three most needed facilities at (LAKE/RIVER MENTIONED IN Q16)?
$\qquad$

17a. And what would you say are the two or three most needed services at (LAKE/RIVER MENTIONED IN Q16)?
18. (SQ-1) Now l'd like to read you a list of various boating and waterbased recreational facilities. As I do, please just tell me if you would rate each as excellent, good, only fair, or poor at (LAKE/RIVER MENTIONED IN Q16) If any of the facilities I mention aren't located at (LAKE/RIVER MENTIONED IN Q16), please just say so. (READ EACH; ROTATE)
A. Launching ramps ............................................................... 1
B. Marinas with overnight docking spaces, boat rental, fuel, and boat repair, etc. ...................................................... 1

| Excel- |  | Only |  | Not | NA/Are |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| lent | Good | Fair | Poor | Sure | None |

C. First aid stations................................................................ 1
D. Campgrounds ................................................................... 1
E. Swimming beaches........................................................... 1
F. Drinking water outlets ........................................................ 1
G. Parking facilities for boat trailers........................................ 1
H. Sanitary dump facilities ...................................................... 1
I. Informational signs............................................................ 1
J. Picnic areas accessible by boat only.................................. 1
K. Boat gas docks .................................................................. 1
L. Concessions that sell food, bait, drinks, tackle, etc. ........... 1
M. Public restrooms ............................................................... 1
N. Campsites accessible by boat only .................................... 1
O. Picnic areas and facilities .................................................. 1
P. Parking facilities for vehicles.............................................. 1
Q. Paved access roads ......................................................... 1
R. Courtesy docks .................................................................. 1
S. Trash dumpsters accessible by boat .................................. 1
T. Fish cleaning stations ....................................................... 1
U. Emergency telephones ..................................................... 1
V. Fishing piers..................................................................... 1
19. (SQ-1)As you know, agencies such as the Game \& Fish Department, County Sheriffs' offices and other agencies patrol Arizona's lakes and rivers. For each of the following, please tell me whether you think at (LAKE/RIVER MENTIONED IN Q16) these agencies should be doing more than they are now, about what they are doing now, or less than they are doing now regarding... (READ EACH; ROTATE)


20a. (SQ-2) The SLIF program is funded with revenues from boat registration fees and motor fuel taxes and there are six waterbased boating functions for which these funds might be used. As I read them to you, please just tell me if you feel each one is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important. (READ EACH; ROTATE).

|  | Some- | Not | Not | Not |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very | what | Very | At All | Sure |

A. The construction of water-based boating facilities such as marinas, launch ramps and piers......................................
$\begin{array}{lllll}. .1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5\end{array}$
B. The purchasing of law enforcement and safety equipment such as patrol boats, radios and lights .................................. 1
.. 1
23
C. The construction of recreation support facilities such as restrooms, campgrounds and picnic tables .......................... 1 2
D. The purchasing of shoreline property at lakes which can be used for boating access
.1
E. The construction of first-aid stations and other safety facilities ................................................................................ 1


20b. (SQ-2) If a new lake is developed for boating, do you feel that it is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important that the following uses be allowed? (READ EACH;

ROTATE)

| Very | Some <br> what | Not <br> Very | Not <br> At All | Not <br> Sure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $\ldots .1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20c. (SQ-2) And if you had a choice, would you prefer to see the SLIF program fund the renovation of deteriorating facilities or the building of new facilities?

Renovation... 1
New facilities... 2

22. (SQ-3) Next, what is your single favorite boating activity on a typical boating trip?

Water skiing... 01
Fishing... 02
General pleasure boating... 03
Jet skiing... 04
Swimming... 05
Knee boarding... 06
Tubing or rafting... 07
Picnicking... 08
Camping... 09
Personal transportation... 10
Sailing... 11
Sunbathing... 12
Canoeing/Kayaking... 13
Other (PROBE \& RECORD)... 14
Don't know/Not sure... 15
Water skiing... 01
Fishing... 02
General pleasure boating... 03
Jet skiing... 04
Swimming... 05
Knee boarding... 06
Tubing or rafting... 07
Picnicking... 08
Camping... 09
Personal transportation... 10
Sailing... 11
Sunbathing... 12
Canoeing/Kayaking... 13
Other (PROBE \& RECORD)... 14
Don't know/Not sure... 15
COUNTY: $\qquad$ 1 1
$\qquad$
23. And finally, what county do you live in?

Thank you very much, that completes this interview. My supervisor may want to call you to verify that I conducted this interview so may I have your first name so that they may do so? (VERIFY PHONE NUMBER)

NAME: $\qquad$

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA:

INTERVIEWER NAME: $\qquad$ \#: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
\#: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
VALIDATED BY: $\qquad$
CODED BY: $\qquad$ \#: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

BOAT CLASS:
FROM SAMPLE: $\qquad$
PHONE \#: $\qquad$ ) _ـ_ $\qquad$
$\qquad$

### 10.2 Audit Forms

- Marina audits/survey forms
- Public agency forms
- Excursion/livery forms

Winter/Spring 2006
Dear Marina Owner/Operator:
The Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the State Parks Board are required by law to complete an Arizona Watercraft Survey every three years for the purpose of determining the amount of fuel sold within Arizona that is used for propelling watercraft. This percentage is then used in determining the amount of fuel tax revenue to be allocated to the State Lake Improvement Fund for water-based recreation improvements.

We need specific information from you to be able to complete this survey. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed forms and promptly return them to Behavior Research Center in the postage-paid envelope provided for your convenience. Behavior Research Center has been contracted to complete the Arizona Watercraft Survey.

The information you provide will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for statistical purposes. Please return this form even if your facility did not sell any Arizona fuel during 2005. Your information is critical to the successful completion of the study. If you have any questions about this project, please call Bruce Hernandez of Behavior Research Center, (602) 258-4554.

Thank you for your cooperation and information.
Sincerely,

Duane L. Shroufe
Director
DLS:vjv
Enclosures

## 2006 ARIZONA WATERCRAFT SURVEY

## MARINA INVENTORY FORM

Confidential Information
Name of Facility:

> (If the above address label is incorrect, please make any necessary corrections)

Owner/Operator/Contact: $\qquad$
Person filling out form:
(If same, please indicate)
Telephone number: $\qquad$
Please answer the following two questions in the table provided below. If you do not have an exact number or percentage, please give your best estimate. Your information is strictly confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only.

1a. How many gallons of marine fuel did your facility sell during each month of 2005 ?
1b. What percentage of this fuel was sold to non-Arizona boaters each month? Please note that this information will be strictly confidential and used only for statistical purposes.

|  | Q1a <br> NUMBER OF <br> GALLONS SoLD |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Q1b <br> PERCENT SOLD TO <br> NON-ARIZONA <br> BOATERS |
| :---: |
| January 2005 <br> February 2005 <br> March 2005 <br> April 2005 <br> May 2005 <br> June 2005 <br> July 2005 <br> August 2005 <br> September 2005 <br> October 2005 <br> November 2005 <br> December 2005 <br> TOTAL GALLONS |

2. What percentage of total gallons mentioned in Q.1a was purchased from Arizona gasoline distributors?
3. Does your facility have watercraft (i.e., boats, jet skis, houseboats, etc.) available on a rental basis? (Check one of the following)
$\qquad$ No

3a. (IF YES) How many gallons of marine fuel were used by your rental watercraft during 2005? (Please do not report any fuel that was included in Q.1a.)

No. of gallons $\qquad$

Please complete the above information and the enclosed referral form and promptly return to:

> Behavior Research Center, Inc.
> 1101 North First Street
> Phoenix, AZ 85004

A postage paid envelope is provided.
Thank you for your assistance.

## REFERRAL FORM

The following is a list of marinas who have been contacted in past Watercraft Surveys. To help survey all possible marinas, please review those marinas shown in your area. If we have overlooked any, please indicate their names, addresses, and telephone numbers in the space provided below. If we have not overlooked any, please indicate so by writing "NONE" below. Please return this form to us along with your completed Marina Inventory Form. Thank you for your assistance.

## Colorado River Marinas

Ah Ha Quin, Blythe, CA
Big Bend Resort, Parker Dam, CA
Black Meadow Landing, Parker Dam, CA
Blue Water Marine \& RV Park, Parker, AZ
Branson's Resort Marina, Parker, AZ
Buckskin State Park Marina, Parker, AZ
Bullfrog Resort \& Marina, Lake Powell, UT
Callville Bay Resort \& Marina, Las Vegas, NV
Cottonwood Cove Marina, Cottonwood Cove, NV
Echo Bay Resort, Overton, NV
Echo Lodge Resort, Parker Dam, CA
Emerald Cove Resort, Parker, AZ
Fisher's Landing, Yuma, AZ
Five Mile Landing, Topock, AZ
Fox's RV Park \& Tavern, Parker, AZ
Golden Shores Marina, Topock, AZ
Halls Crossing Marina, Lake Powell, UT
Havasu Landing Resort, Havasu Lake, AZ
Havasu Springs Resort, Parker, AZ
Hidden Cove Trailer Park and Marina, Yuma, AZ
Hite Resort \& Marina, Hite, UT
Holiday Shores Store/Marina, Bullhead City, AZ
Imperial Oasis, Yuma, AZ
Lake Havasu Marina, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Lake Havasu Yacht Club, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Lake Mead Resort Marina, Boulder City, NV
Lake Mohave Resort/7 Resorts, Bullhead City, AZ
Las Vegas Marina, Henderson, NV
Lost Lake Resort, Blythe, CA
Martinez Lake Marina, Martinez Lake, AZ
Needles Marina Park, Needles, CA
Park Moabi Marina, Needles, CA
Red Rooster, Blythe, CA
Rio Del Colorado, Earp, CA

River Island Market, Parker, AZ
River Lodge Resort, Parker Dam, CA
Riverland Resort, Earp, CA
Riviera RV Resort \& Marina, Blythe, CA
Sand Point Marina \& RV Park, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Sunset Landing Trailer Park, Bullhead City, AZ
Sunshine Marina, Bullhead City, AZ
Sunshine Resort, Parker Dam, CA
Temple Bar Resort, Inc., Temple Bar, AZ
Wahweap Lodge Marina, Page, AZ
Water Wheel, Blythe, CA
Wheel-er In Family Resort, Earp, CA
Willow Beach Resort, Willow Beach, AZ
Windmall Resort, Earp, CA
Interior Arizona Marinas
Alamo Lake Store, Scottsdale, AZ
Apache Lake Marina \& Resort, Apache Lake, AZ
Barltett Lake Marina, Carefree, AZ
Big Lake Tackle \& Supply, Springerville, AZ
Canyon Lake Marina, Mesa, AZ
Crescent Lake Marina, Springerville, AZ
Hawley Lake Store, White River, AZ
Lake Patagonia Marina, Patagonia, AZ
Lyman Lake Marina, St. Johns, AZ
Parker Canyon Lake Marina, Sonoita, AZ
Pleasant Harbor Marina, Peoria, AZ
Rainbow Lake Lodge Resort, Lakeside, AZ
Ray Ruiz Marina, Apache Junction, AZ
Roosevelt Lake Marina, Roosevelt Lake, AZ
Saguaro Lake Marina, Mesa, AZ
San Carlos Lake Development Corp, Peridot, AZ
Showlow Lake Trailor Park \& RV Sales, Showlow, AZ
Woods Canyon Lake Store/Marina, Heber, AZ

Winter/Spring 2006
Dear Agency Manager:
Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 28-1502.91, requires that the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the State Parks Board complete an Arizona Watercraft Survey every three years for the purpose of determining the amount of fuel sold within Arizona that is used for propelling watercraft. This percentage is then used in determining the amount of fuel tax revenue to be allocated to the State Lake Improvement Fund for water-based recreation improvements.

We need specific information from you to be able to complete this survey. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed forms and promptly return them to Behavior Research Center in the postage-paid envelope provided for your convenience. Behavior Research Center has been contracted to complete the Arizona Watercraft Survey.

The information you provide will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for statistical purposes. Please return this form even if your agency did not use any fuel in boats during 2005. Your information is critical to the successful completion of the study. If you have any questions about this project, please call Bruce Hernandez of Behavior Research Center, (602) 2584554.

Thank you for your cooperation and information.
Sincerely,

Duane L. Shroufe
Director
DLS:vjv
Enclosures

## 2006 ARIZONA WATERCRAFT SURVEY

## PUBLIC AGENCY INVENTORY FORM

## Confidential Information

Name of Agency:
(If the above address label is incorrect, please make any necessary corrections)

Agency Person
Responsible for Watercraft:

Title of Person:
Telephone Number:
A. How many gallons of fuel did your agency
(or agency representative such as Coast Guard auxiliary, water posse, etc., for which your agency purchased watercraft fuel) use on Arizona lakes and rivers, including the Colorado River, in 2005?

No. of gallons $\qquad$
B. What percentage of the total gallons mentioned in Q.A was purchased from commercial marina sources? $\qquad$ \%
C. What percentage of the total gallons mentioned in Q.A did your agency pay fuel tax in 2005? $\qquad$ \%

Please complete the above information and promptly return to Behavior Research Center, Inc., 1101 North First Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004, in the postage paid envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

Winter/Spring 2006
Dear Manager:
The Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the State Parks Board are required by law to complete an Arizona Watercraft Survey every three years for the purpose of determining the amount of fuel sold within Arizona that is used for propelling watercraft. This percentage is then used in determining the amount of fuel tax revenue to be allocated to the State Lake Improvement Fund for water-based recreation improvements.

We need specific information from you concerning the total gallons of fuel your company used during 2005 within Arizona and on the Colorado River to be able to complete this survey. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed forms and promptly return them to Behavior Research Center in the postage-paid envelope provided for your convenience. Behavior Research Center has been contracted to complete the Arizona Watercraft Survey. If you have any questions about this project, please call Bruce Hernandez of Behavior Research Center, (602) 258-4554.

The information you provide will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for statistical purposes. Please return this form even if your company did not sell any Arizona fuel during 2005. Your information is critical to the successful completion of the study.

Thank you for your cooperation and information.
Sincerely,

Duane L. Shroufe
Director
DLS:vjv
Enclosures

# 2006 ARIZONA WATERCRAFT SURVEY 

## EXCURSION/LIVERY INVENTORY FORM

## Confidential Information

Name of Operator:
(If the above address label is incorrect, please make any necessary corrections)

Owner/Operator/Contact:
Person filling out form:
(If same, please indicate)
Telephone number:
A. How many gallons of marine fuel did your company use during 2005 on Colorado River expeditions or in its livery/rental operations at any locations in Arizona?

No. of gallons
B. What percentage of the total gallons mentioned in Q.A was purchased from an Arizona gasoline distributor?
C. What percentage of the total gallons mentioned in Q.A were purchased from commercial marinas?
$\qquad$ \%
$\qquad$ \%

Please complete the above information and the enclosed referral form and promptly return to Behavior Research Center, Inc., 1101 North First Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004, in the postage paid envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

## REFERRAL FORM

The following is a list of excursion/livery operators who have been contacted in past Watercraft Surveys. We are contacting marina operators separately, so please examine the following list as it only relates to excursion/livery operators. If we have overlooked any in your area, please provide us with their names, addresses, and telephone numbers in the space provided. If we have not overlooked any to your knowledge, please write "NONE." Please return this form to us along with your completed excursion/livery inventory form. Thank you for your assistance!

2 Wheels Motorcycle Repair, Bullhead City, AZ
7 Crown Resorts, Irvine, CA
A Rocco's Racing, Phoenix, AZ
A Jet Ski Rental, Phoenix, AZ
A. A. Best, Phoenix, AZ

AAA Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Adrenaline Rush Rentals, Phoenix, AZ
Action Water Sports, Henderson, NV
Adler's Cruises, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Alamo Lake Boat Rentals, Scottsdale, AZ
All Rainbow Rentals, Henderson, NV
All Wet Sports, Bullhead City, AZ
Anchors Away Rental \& Storage, Page, AZ
Antelope Travel \& Rec. Ctr., Page, AZ
Aramark Sports \& Entertainment, Page, AZ
Arizona Aqua, Mesa, AZ
Arizona Aqua Jet, Tempe, AZ
Arizona Aquatics, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Arizona Jet Ski Center, Phoenix, AZ
Arizona Jet Ski Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Avi Resort \& Casino, Laughlin, NV
AZ Jet Ski Rentals, Parker Dam, AZ
AZ River Runners, Inc., Phoenix, AZ
Aztec Storage Center, Tempe, AZ
Barnacle Bill's Boat Rental, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Beach Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Big Boyz Toyz, Phoenix, AZ
Blue Rivers, Flagstaff, AZ
Blue Water Charter, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Blue Water Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Boatel Catamarans, Inc., Page, AZ
Boulder City Water Sports, Boulder City, NV
Buck Bay Canoes \& Kayaks, Bullhead City, AZ
Bullhead City Watercraft Rentals, AZ
Canyoneers, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
Canyon Explorations, Flagstaff, AZ
Canyon Road Storage, Boulder City, NV
Capt. Dan's Charters, Page, AZ
Champion Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Colorado River \& Trail Expeditions, Salt Lk Cty, UT
Copper Cyn Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Corporate Auto/Marine, Phoenix, AZ
Cross Tours \& Explorations, Provo, UT
D and M Sports Shop, Parker, AZ
Del Rio Beach Club, Laughlin, NV
Desert Canoe Rentals, Blythe, CA
Desert River Outfitters, Bullhead City, AZ

Desert River Sports, Bullhead City, AZ
Diamond River Adventures, Page, AZ
Discount Water Sports, Bullhead City, AZ
Dixie Bell, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Dolly's Steamboat Cruises, Apache Jct
Doo Powell, Page, AZ
East Side Watersports, Las Vegas, NV
Encanto Boating Co., Phoenix, AZ
Expeditions, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
Express Jet Ski Rentals, Phoenix, AZ
Fish On Boat Rental, Scottsdale, AZ
Fisherman's Bait\&Tackle\&Ammo, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Foothills Rental Center, Cave Creek, AZ
Fred's Cycle \& Sports, Blythe, AZ
Fun Center Inc., Lake Havasu City, AZ
Fun Time Boat Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Get It Wet Watercraft, Henderson, NV
Gettin' Wet Watercraft, Inc., Mesa, AZ
Glen Canyon Float Trips, Page, AZ
Goertzen Water Cycle, Lake Havasu City
Good Time Rentals, Phoenix, AZ
Grand Canyon Dories, Inc., Altaville, CA
Grand Canyon Expeditions, Flagstaff, AZ
Grand Canyon Expeditions, Kanab, UT
H20 Houseboat Vacations, Lake Havasu City
Hatch River Expeditions, Inc., Vernal UT
Havaski Beach Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Havasu Marina Corp., Lake Havasu City AZ
Hawley Lake Rentals, McNary, AZ
Hays Rents, Forest Lakes, AZ
High Country Rec., Tucson, AZ
High Desert Adventures, St. George, UT
High Image Marine, Page, AZ
Holiday River Expeditions, Salt Lake City UT
Hualapai Tribal River Trips/Tours, Peach Springs, AZ
Island Boat Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
J's Watercraft Rentals, Bullhead City, AZ
Jerry's Marine Service, Page, AZ
Jet-N-Ski, Phoenix, AZ
Jet Action Rentals, Tempe, AZ
Jet Rent, Yuma, AZ
Jet Ski MD, Page, AZ
Jet Ski Unlimited, Phoenix, AZ
Jet Sports Unlimited, Phoenix, AZ
Jettco Jet Ski Rentals, Lake Havasu City AZ
Joey's Watercraft Connection, Phoenix, AZ
John's Watercraft Worx, Bullhead City, AZ

Kayak, Canoe \& Boat Rentals, Glendale, AZ
Lake Havasu Boat Tours, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Lake Mary Fishing Boat Rentals, Flagstaff, AZ
Lake Mead Resort, Boulder City, NV
Lake Pleasant Watercraft Rentals, Glendale, AZ
Lake Powell Limited, Phoenix, AZ
Lake-Time, Page, AZ
Lakeview Boat Storage, Big Water, UT
Laughlin River Tours, Inc., Laughlin, NV
Lee's Ferry Anglers, Ltd., Marble Cyn AZ
Liberty Motorsport, Yuma, AZ
London Bridge Wtrcrft Rntl, Lk Havasu Cty, AZ
Lynx Lake Store/Boat Rentals, Prescott AZ
Marine Abilities, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Martinez Lake Resort, Yuma, AZ
MCC Jet Ski Rentals, Peoria, AZ
McCullock Properties, Lake Havasu City AZ
MDX Whitewater Boats, Mesa, AZ
Mike's Marine Rentals, Henderson, NV
Mike's Trophy Fishing, Snowflake, AZ
Moki Mac River Expeditions, Inc., SIt Lk Cty UT
Monte Vista Marine, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
Morris Travel, Orem, UT
Nauti Bouys, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Northern Arizona Boat Rental, Page, AZ
O.A.R.S., Inc. Angels Camp, CA

Oar, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
Oceanside Motorsports, Apache Jct, AZ
Oceanside Water Sport, Apache Jct, AZ
Old Western Trader, Golden Shores, AZ
Outdoors Unlimited, Flagstaff, AZ
Outfitters, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
Palm Oasis Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Precision Marine, Phoenix, AZ
Precision Outdoor Power, Tucson, AZ
Prescott Equip. Rentals /Sales, Prescott AZ
Primetime Watersport, Bullhead City, AZ
Professional River, Flagstaff, AZ
Raft Adventures, Inc., Flagstaff, AZ
RC Marine, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Rebel Adventure Tours, Las Vegas, NV
Recreation Services, Scottsdale, AZ
Rent-A-Boat, Page, AZ
Rental World, Tempe, AZ
Rentor On-Line/USA Wtrcrft, Bullhead Cty, AZ

Resort Boat Rental, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Rick's Pontoon Boat Rentals, Lake Havasu City, AZ
River Rat Watersports, Laughlin, NV
River Rat Wave Rider Rentals, Lke Havasu City, AZ
River Radness Rentals, Bullhead City AZ
River Travel Center, Pt. Arena, CA
Riverfront Water Sports, Bullhead City, AZ
Riverjetz Watercraft \& ATV Rentals, Bullhead Cty, AZ
Riverside Water Sports, Bullhead City, AZ
Rocket Rentals, Phoenix, AZ
Sail Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ
SB Rentals, Parker Dam, AZ
Scottie's Jet Ski Rentals, Lake Havasu City AZ
Seven Resorts, Temple Bar, AZ
Skip's Prop Shop, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Skipperliner Marine, Page, AZ
Skylite Boat Rental, Bit Water, UT
Splash Watercraft Rentals, Bullhead City, AZ
Starbrite Boat Rentals, Greenhaven, AZ
Summit Drivers \& Water Sports, Flagstaff, AZ
Sun Country RV Service, Glendale, AZ
Sunburst Performance, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Sunrise Peak, Inc., West Jordan, UT
Sunski Rental, Roosevelt, AZ
The Boat Brokers, Marble Canyon, AZ
The Dory Connection, Flagstaff, AZ
Tincanebitts Taxi Service, Meadview, AZ
Tom's Water Sports, Henderson, NV
Total Rentals \& Sales Ctr, Flagstaff, AZ
Tour West, Inc., Orem, UT
Trophy Trout Towers, Marble Canyon, AZ
U-Tow, Phoenix, AZ
Verde River Boat Rides, Camp Verde AZ
Wahweap Lodge, Page, AZ
Water Sport Centers, Inc., Lake Havasu City, AZ
Water Trix - Jet Ski \& Quad Rentals, Gilbert, AZ
Watercraft Adventures, Needles, CA
Watercraft Beach, Bullhead City, AZ
Wave Riders Watercraft Rental, Lake Havasu City, AZ
Western River Expeditions, Salt Lake City, UT
Wet \& Wild, Bullhead City, AZ
Wet Ski Jet Ski Shop, Glendale, AZ
White Magic Unlimited, Mill Valley, CA
Wild Wave Rentals, Kanab, UT
Willow Beach Harbor, Willow Beach, AZ

NAME
ADDRESS

TELEPHONE
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
10.3 Agreement of the Agencies

## AGREEMENT OF THE AGENCIES

For the first time in the history of the Arizona watercraft Survey, the study included a crosstcheck of boaters estimates of fuel purchased from marinas with marinas' estimates of fuel sold. The check revealed a significant difference between the two estimates. The impact of this discrepancy on allocations from the Highway Users Revenue Fund to the State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIE) would be substantial. If we base our calculations on the boaters' estimates of fuel purchased, the SLIF allocation would be 2.0395 percent or approximately $\$ 6$ million annually. However, $i f$ we base our calculations on the marinas estimates of fuel sold, the SIIE allocation would be .9576 percent or approximately $\$ 3$ million annually. Therefore, until the next regular survey in 1994 we have agreed to continue payments to the SLIF at i. 4 percent, the rate established by the 1988 watercraft survey and used for fiscal Years 1988 , 1989, and 1990.

State law requires that motor fuel taxes collected be deposited in the funds reflecting where the taxes were earned. The watercraft survey is intended to determine where these taxes are earned. Consequently, we have agreed that the 1994 survey must be designed to obtain the most accurate data possible, and we will fund the survey at the amount required to obtain this data. We believe an improved survey design will reduce or eliminate the discrepancy between the boaters' and the marinas' estimates

In any case, if the improved survey design does not significantly reduce the discrepancy, we have agreed to resolve the difference by using one of two methods which are shown on the attachment. We will compare boaters' estimates of marina fuel purchases and marinas' estimates of fuel sales. If the difference between the two figures is 25 percent or less, method 11 will be used to calculate the SLIE allocation; if the difference betweep the two figures is more than 25 percent, we will use methgt 2 to/deteyphine tbegrif allocation.
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[^0]:    NOTE: 2006 and 2003 data differs from the prior studies in the following ways: 1) all use on Alamo Lake attributed to La Paz County, not divided equally between La Paz and Mohave; 2) all use on San Carlos Lake attributed to Gila County, not divided equally between Gila, Graham and Pinal; 3) 10\% of Lake Havasu use attributed to La Paz County, not all to Mohave; 4) new category Ehrenberg to north end of Martinez Lake attributed to La Paz County.

    * Indicates \% less than . 1

