

Mid-Atlantic Non-Consumptive Recreation Workshops Regional Summary

Between September and November 2017, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO) and the Surfrider Foundation, held a series of four public stakeholder workshops in the Mid-Atlantic region on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB)¹ Non-Consumptive Recreation Work Group. Workshops engaged the public in a discussion in support of implementation of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan (OAP)² action on Non-Consumptive Recreation to *"Identify, characterize, and share information about measures to maintain the recreational value of important non-consumptive recreational areas and the activities they sustain"* (OAP pages 69-71)³.

Workshop objectives included:

- To begin to define what it would mean for ocean and coastal uses and areas to be considered important for non-consumptive recreation;
- To solicit ideas for a process to identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources; and
- To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users.

This report provides a summary of themes from each of the four workshops. Themes and concepts included are not necessarily listed in priority order. More detailed individual summaries of each of the four workshops are included here as Appendices I-IV (Appendix I- New York, Appendix II- Maryland and Delaware Joint Workshop, Appendix III- New Jersey, Appendix IV- Virginia).

Discussion Session One: **Defining Important Areas**

In order to begin to identify what makes an area important for non-consumptive recreation use, participants were asked the following questions:

- What factors should be considered when defining an area as important for non-consumptive recreation? (examples from OAP include: intensity of use, contributions to local economies, maintaining dark skies and natural sounds).
- How can these factors be prioritized?
- Does the MARCO Ocean Data Portal cover these factors adequately? If not, where could we get that information?

¹ <https://www.boem.gov/Mid-Atlantic-Regional-Planning-Body/>

² <https://www.boem.gov/Mid-Atlantic-Regional-Ocean-Action-Plan/>

³ *This report does not reflect the views of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean or its States, the Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body (RPB), or the RPB.*

Feedback included an emphasis on factors to consider when defining an area as important (see separate section below for recommendations related to MARCO Ocean Data Portal).

Naturalness

- Limited development
- Level of pristine/aesthetic quality
- Natural features of the ecosystem

Access for a variety of recreational uses; access that is:

- Affordable
- Safe
- Sufficient for a particular use
- Provides opportunities for raising public ecological awareness

Cleanliness

- Low pollution- water quality, litter and animal waste on beach
- Sanitary facilities

Historical and/or cultural connection

- History, culture and cultural activity (e.g. shipwrecks or other historic sites) occurring in same area
- Also described as having regular, repetitive interest in returning to specific area for a recreational activity

Intensity of uses/level of crowdedness

- Current and potential uses changing over time
- Likelihood of long-term sustainable capacity of an area to provide for that recreational use/balance with ecological features and functions

Economic contributions

- Realized and potential
- Role in supporting long-term management of a site
- Broader indirect contributions to local economy

Discussion Session Two:

Conflicts and Impacts

To begin to understand a process for identifying and assessing potential impacts and use conflicts important to non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources, participants were asked the following questions:

- How can we further identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses (also other recreational uses)?
- How can we further identify potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources?
- How can these impacts and conflicts be prioritized?

In this session, participants organically emphasized discussion of the types of potential perceived or real conflicts and interactions between non-consumptive recreational uses and other uses, as well as interactions and potential impacts on marine and coastal resources. Examples include beach use and pollution, swimmers and speedboats, swimmers and surf-fishing, motorized watercraft and non-motorized watercraft (e.g. kayaks and paddleboards), beach renourishment and surfing, among others. Please see the individual summaries of each of the four workshops in Appendices I-IV for additional conflicts and resources mentioned.

Suggestions related to a potential process for identifying and assessing potential impacts and use conflicts important to non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources included:

- Continue to convene local non-consumptive recreational users to identify specific conflicts
- Use suggested criteria and factors from stakeholder discussions to inform the development of guidelines to assess the impacts and conflicts
- Reduce conflicts by addressing easily avoidable conflicts and impacts
- Incorporate best ecological management practices to reduce the conflicts
- Encourage governmental coordination among all regulators (environmental, revenue, safety, parking)
- Create feedback points as conflicts are assessed and prioritized for action by incorporating the suggestions for improving engagement in communications
- Educate non-consumptive recreational users, their community, the groups representing what is impacted or in conflict to understand the most difficult conflicts
- Assess the non-consumptive recreational use values, study the trade off among human uses, and assess the lost economic value of the ecosystem impacted

Discussion Session Three:

Effective Engagement

To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users, participants were asked the following questions:

- What do you see as the current barriers to effective two-way engagement processes where state and federal agencies are sharing information with and soliciting input from ocean recreation users?
- What is working/not working now?
- How can we improve engagement?

- Do other models exist?

Feedback included an emphasis on information related to barriers, the target audience, engagement tools and mechanisms and topics in need of improved communications.

Current barriers

- Localized issues need local attention
- Limited time to participate in workshops and meetings
- Limited access to decision-makers at multiple levels
- Lack of knowledge about authorities, rules and regulations, who to contact in event of a conflict and how to reach them
- Distrust among decision-makers and the public (as it relates to information sharing about projects and activities)
- Lack of knowledge about where to access needed information

Target audience

The target audience should be broadened to not only include those groups most likely to be interested in non-consumptive recreation, (such as membership-based local environmental organizations, “friends groups” of parks or other recreational areas, local outfitters, aquariums and boating associations, among others), but to also include a broader demographic (such as Native Americans, lifeguards, marine enforcement personnel, tourism and resort associations, scientific and academic communities, master naturalist and gardeners, marinas, schools, municipal and civic league gatherings).

Engagement tools and mechanisms

The mechanism for giving public notice about meetings and/or proposed projects that may affect non-consumptive recreational uses should reflect the expanded demographic described above in “target audience” and be as early as possible in a process. Participants suggested utilizing organizational email lists to further provide information to various memberships, post flyers at local libraries, outfitters, restaurants and events, and to include local newspapers and television stations.

In-person meetings are preferred to webinars, the latter of which was described as lacking in opportunities for bi-directional communication. In either setting, questions posed to recreational users should be more clearly articulated, straightforward, and limited in number to allow for tighter focus of group discussions. Opportunities for regular engagement should be provided, with clear follow-up opportunities, while at the same time limited in number to avoid stakeholder fatigue and in consideration of limited time of the general public.

Subject matter experts or governmental representatives should attend all meetings to provide for direct access and two-way dialogue. Experts and governmental representatives should also attend and participate as speakers at meetings hosted by other organizations.

Technology like social media, Meetup groups and real time apps should be explored to keep the public informed and provide for simple, efficient methods of surveying and polling users, reporting problems and to facilitate community discussion.

General awareness of non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources can be improved with additional signage, utilization of diver down flags, and maps that illustrate use restrictions. Photos and graphics should be included wherever possible to transcend language barriers.

Topics in need of improved communications

Participants identified the following topic areas as in need of improved communications:

- Proposed projects that may affect non-consumptive recreational uses (e.g. detailed descriptions of projects, easier access to related informational studies to facilitate public review and comment)
- Transparent, user-friendly information on governmental authorities, roles and responsibilities (e.g. focused on giving clarity to tourists)
- Advice on what to do when experiencing a use conflict (e.g. who to call to report an issue, etc.)

MARCO Ocean Data Portal

A number of suggestions were made in relation to the MARCO Ocean Data Portal through workshop discussions. It was suggested that the Portal could:

- Provide information on potential conflicts between uses
- Highlight areas where multiple uses co-occur
- Be integrated with state and local websites
- Provide real-time updated regulatory information
- Include an interactive mapping function that includes crowd sourced information
- Include a matrix of recreational areas with their uses and amenities
- Provide additional information with temporal or seasonal components
- Include layers on:
 - public access points
 - locations of surfing
 - locations of paddling
 - locations of sightseeing
 - locations of kayaking
 - locations of diving
 - sites of turtle and bird nesting
 - marine debris
- The Portal could also be further introduced to outside organizations like tourism bureaus and various levels of government, and continue to provide training opportunities.

Additional feedback:

Some feedback offered suggestions for managing or reducing conflicts, or other comments about aspects that should be considered by decision-makers when further exploring non-consumptive recreational use management. This feedback included:

- **Increase Enforcement:** Participants felt there was a need for increased enforcement of existing policies regarding inappropriate activities, and to emphasize a friendly approach to one-on-one enforcement interactions between recreational users and enforcement agents.
- **Prevent Pollution, Trash and Environmental Damage at the Source:** Participants expressed the importance of continuing to explore ways to limit trash entering the waste stream and thus preventing marine debris. Particularly important items to intercept included single use plastic, straws and food containers at beach/waterfront establishments. Provide dune walkways and additional trash receptacles throughout the area.
- **Develop Best Management Practices:** Participants made a series of suggestions that could inform the development of potential best management practices for recreational use management. Examples include: 1) consideration of areas that are repeatedly used in the long-term over time when determining the carrying capacity of an area, 2) planning ahead to avoid multiple use conflicts- (e.g. siting kayak launch sites where there would be less interaction with commercial shipping or military vessels), and 3) consider opening up new areas to recreation that have not been open before to lessen the burden on currently heavily visited areas.
- **Balance Economic Value with Ecological Value:** Participants expressed the importance of seeking balance with economic considerations, such as the contribution to local and state economies from user fees and associated tourism (e.g. hotels and restaurants near recreational area). Factors mentioned included: 1) revenue from beach driving stickers or parking to fund enforcement of appropriate use, or building dune walkways or emptying trash cans, 2) selective privatization of land as a method to reduce further over use, 3) opening access to new areas for non-consumptive recreational use but with usage fees/permits to slow use (no cars, permits to camp, limited parking, hours of use), and 4) foregoing property tax revenue from privatizing land ownership to allow access for non-consumptive recreational use.

Next Steps

Following the workshops, this Regional Summary and individual summaries of each of the four workshops were provided to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB) Non-Consumptive Recreation Work Group for further consideration.

Appendix I

New York Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop Summary September 27, 2017 Stony Brook University Long Island, New York

The New York Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop was held the evening of September 27, 2017 at Stony Brook University in Long Island, New York. Sixteen participants gathered for a background presentation and discussion. The evening workshop was co-hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO) and Surfrider Foundation, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB) Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group, to engage the public in a discussion in support of implementation of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan (OAP) action: *Identify, characterize, and share information about measures to maintain the recreational value of important non-consumptive recreational areas and the activities they sustain.*

Workshop objectives included:

- To begin to define what it would mean for ocean and coastal uses and areas to be considered important for non-consumptive recreation;
- To solicit ideas for a process to identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses, as well as potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources; and
- To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users.

Sherryll Jones, New York Department of Environmental Conservation, offered welcome remarks, provided a background presentation on the RPB and Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan process, results of a regional summary conducted in summer 2017 to inform workshop discussions, and outlined discussion questions. Sherryll also offered a brief overview of New York's Ocean Action Plan. Click [here](#) to see the presentation slides.

Summary feedback from each discussion included:

Defining important areas

Discussion questions included:

- What factors should be considered when defining an area as important for non-consumptive recreation? (examples from OAP include: intensity of use, contributions to local economies, maintaining dark skies and natural sounds).
- How can these factors be prioritized?
- Does the MARCO Ocean Data Portal cover these factors adequately? If not, where could we get that information?

Feedback included:

Naturalness

- Ecological awareness
- Biodiversity
- Offshore areas of biological importance
- Key habitat features (e.g. seagrass bed) attracting users to an area

Access for a variety of recreational uses; access that:

- Has long-term viability
- Allows for both coastal and offshore access
- Allows for community educational involvement to inform the public about the importance of natural resources
- Enhanced with infrastructure to provide higher value experience (e.g. a public pier for fishing)
- Flexible to allow for additional space to alleviate incompatible use conflicts (e.g. “intensity of use leads to abuse”)
- Ability to be modified or repaired to respond to changes in housing density and from storm damage
- Includes affordable parking
- Includes docks as points of entry
- Has amenities like shower/bathroom infrastructure, including temporary seasonal infrastructure, and water filling stations
- Availability of docks (public access/points of entry)

Cleanliness

- Swimmable water quality

Historical and/or cultural connection

- Historical or cultural importance of the area for non-consumptive recreational use
- Regular, repetitive interest in returning to specific areas
- Understanding what was previously “important”- consider possibility of reverting back to making a place available and attractive for a certain use

Intensity of uses/level of crowdedness

- Consider planning ahead for the opening of areas that have not been available in the past to reduce pressure on same area for multiple uses at high density
- Consider the likelihood of long-term sustainable capacity of an area to provide recreational use (e.g. National Seashores having protected status)
- Some non-consumptive recreational uses have associated destructive impacts due to limited access (e.g. surfers arriving in individual vehicles); improved access may reduce certain destructive behaviors
- Additional mitigation for destructive behaviors could include dune walkways and trash cans
- Some uses like swimming are typically confined more than may be necessary due to proximity to facilities or for safety concerns
- New inlets, while controversial, also provide ecological benefits like flushing out the bay; maintaining an ecological function can also then provide the availability of an ecological service or viability of a key habitat (e.g. seagrass beds) that attracts non-consumptive recreational users
- Need to balancing ecological risk with an activity occurring in a place
- Areas with multiple uses in the same area should be prioritized

Economic considerations

- The importance of economics should be taken into account when considering uses, values and the sustainability of a location to carry a non-consumptive recreational use
- Recreational users traveling to a specific location to engage in their recreational activity also make contributions to the local economy through restaurants, hotels, parking fees and taxi use. Traveling denotes value of a location to that recreational user.
- Ecotourism also offers the opportunity for community involvement and restoration projects
- Beach renourishment should take into account all recreational uses of the beach and whether there is a public benefit.
- Consider economic implications of beach closures due to poor water quality; coordination is needed between jurisdictions to avoid closures to the extent possible

Suggestions for additions to the MARCO Ocean Data Portal included:

- Layers for specific individual non-consumptive recreational uses including:
 - paddling
 - sightseeing
 - kayaking
- Additional suggestions for new information included public beach access points and private housing density.

Identifying potential impacts and use conflicts

Discussion questions included:

- How can we further identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses (also other recreational uses)?
- How can we further identify potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources?
- How can these impacts and conflicts be prioritized?

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses:

- Any actions that may limit potential future use of or access to an area (e.g. state privatizes land)
- Marine debris and non-consumptive recreational uses
- Personal watercraft interacting with other uses
- Offshore fishing (e.g. trawling) can create impacts to nearshore areas and beaches (e.g. flotsam, oil slicks, tar balls, debris, damage to eelgrass beds, bycatch), diminishing use of those areas
- Beach renourishment (specifically the placement of new sand) and surfing (safety concerns of changing break locations/angles)
- Paddle boarders/ kayakers paddling in channels or in areas with boat traffic
- Diminished water quality and swimming
- Personal watercraft and data collection

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses and marine and coastal resources:

- Wildlife viewing and harassment; personal watercraft interactions
- Offshore fishing (e.g. trawling) can create impacts to nearshore areas and beaches (e.g. flotsam, oil slicks, tar balls, debris, damage to eelgrass beds, bycatch)

- Poorly planned parking or lack of adequate parking and improper dune crossings
- Trash (single use packaging, plastics)/lack of ocean friendly restaurants/single use plastics available in vending areas and associated environmental and wildlife impacts
- Low water quality due to wastewater treatment, fertilizers
- Interactions between uses and eelgrass beds due to lack of awareness of presence of beds (e.g. jet ski intakes)
- Oil spills on beaches

Feedback included these suggestions as ways to resolve or reduce certain conflicts:

- Better coordination between government planning and resource management programs- (e.g. aligning state and county water quality programs)
- Environmental Conservation Officers (ECOs) should engage in outreach to teach recreational users how to fish, for example, rather than focusing on writing tickets and enforcement work; develop program for ambassador rangers
- Need to create a culture of ecological awareness and connection back to nature-changing behavior and attitudes is the best way to reduce impacts and conflicts; this can also enable self-policing; also consider communities located farther inland, not just immediately coastal
- Outfitters should educate users about water safety requirements like PDFs and leashes for paddle boarders
- Further discussion should be held among users regarding the use of social media to encourage wildlife viewing in certain locations; need to consider benefits (e.g. raising ecological awareness and an interest in wildlife) and costs (e.g. too many individuals visiting a specific location repeatedly to seek a viewing opportunity)
- Bottle refilling stations should be more readily available at rest stops and beach locations to encourage less of a reliance on the purchase of single use plastics
- Additional signage should be posted to notify users of presence of eelgrass beds
- Eliminate single use plastics from entering the waste stream and work with coastal businesses to voluntarily become “ocean friendly”; emphasize community responsibility ethic for business owner to participate due to income benefit of having business near the beach
- Consider areas of ecological importance when developing best practices for non-consumptive recreational use; consider physical properties, survivability of a species/habitat, ecosystem functions provided naturally (e.g. oyster reefs providing pH balance), as well as by humans (e.g. new inlets provide flushing while also considered controversial by non-recreational users who were using a space); aim to balance ecological risk with an activity occurring in a location and consider associated mitigation practices.
- Consider how places may change in the future from climate change and sea level rise

Developing effective engagement

Discussion questions included:

- What do you see as the current barriers to effective two-way engagement processes where state and federal agencies are sharing information with and soliciting input from ocean recreation users?
- What is working/not working now?
- How can we improve engagement?

Current barriers

- Time and access to decision-makers and information; some similar issue meetings are too frequent; others are too infrequent and only offer superficial approach to soliciting input; information on major projects is lacking or made available too late in the process
- Distrust between broader community and government in general; lack of confidence among public that people will be engaged effectively and genuinely
- Lack of coordination across multiple jurisdictions; difficulty sharing information and dialogue between different levels of government
- Funds for enforcement and education

Target audiences

- Non-consumptive recreational users in general (although it was indicated this term was confusing to some as a phrase even after defined)
- Educators
- Inland communities (as well as immediately coastal communities)
- Citizen scientists
- Decision makers
- Enforcement officers

Engagement tools and mechanisms

- Demonstrating change as a result of stakeholder input; showing that an individual's opinion matters to gain the public's confidence in a process that their time will be well spent if they participate
- Frequency of meetings should be increased to allow for follow-up opportunities and allow for stakeholders return to a discussion on a topic after having more time for reflection between engagement opportunities
- Provide access to participants to workshop summaries and names of individuals to follow-up
- Focus on "high value messaging" and avoid frequent updates with more general information/updates
- Ask questions in more clear and specific way and more tightly manage for discussions going off-topic in group setting

- Explore alternative ways for a stakeholder to become involved that doesn't involve attending meetings and/or reviewing the Federal Register (e.g. expand citizen scientist programs to get communities involved in water quality monitoring or marine debris photo apps)
- Emphasize commonalities when trying to change behaviors rather than divisiveness
- More conservation officers should be assigned to facilitate public engagement and outreach and not necessarily enforcement
- Leverage social media as a platform to discuss provide information and discuss issues (e.g. posting questions to an online forum, surveys, other apps)
- Real time apps should be developed for reporting problems, using crowd- sourced data (e.g. City of Portland allows for users to geolocate the presence of graffiti)
- Make information easier to access and less of a time commitment to disseminate/solicit input (e.g. beach signage that asks two quick survey questions)
- Breakdown jurisdictional logjams at various levels of government to more effectively collaborate on the management of a moving, shared resource like sand moving from a state beach to a town beach and the related access issues.
- Explore federal, state and county parks in other states like California for potential models (e.g. availability of affordable access stickers funds enforcement capabilities; enforcement officers play multiple roles including educator, ranger and EMS.)

Workshop findings were reported to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group.

Attendees:

Jordan Christensen	Citizens Campaign for the Environment
Karen Chytalo	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Matt Gove	Surfrider Foundation
Kevin Hassell	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Colleen Henn	Surfrider Foundation
Sherryll Jones	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Ashe Kopelman	Coastal Research and Education Society of Long Island
Emily Mariconite	Stony Brook University School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences
Caroline Montencoro	Stony Brook University/surfer
Kate Morrison	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Zack Reagin	Stony Brook University
Mark Reiss	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 2
Doug Simpson	U.S. Coast Guard
Rachel Silver	Stony Brook University/Institute Ocean Sciences
Jeff Tenenbaum	Surfrider Foundation and LIBAG.org

Paul Tompkins
Jeff Waldner

Stony Brook University/surfer
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Ocean Energy
Management

Appendix II

Maryland and Delaware Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop Summary October 5, 2017 South Coastal Public Library Bethany Beach, Delaware

The Maryland and Delaware joint Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop was held the evening of October 5, 2017 at the South Coastal Public Library in Bethany Beach, Delaware. Fourteen participants gathered for a background presentation and discussion. The evening workshop was co-hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO) and Surfrider Foundation, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB) Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group, to engage the public in a discussion in support of implementation of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan (OAP) action: *Identify, characterize, and share information about measures to maintain the recreational value of important non-consumptive recreational areas and the activities they sustain.*

Workshop objectives included:

- To begin to define what it would mean for ocean and coastal uses and areas to be considered important for non-consumptive recreation;
- To solicit ideas for a process to identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses, as well as potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources; and
- To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users.

Nicole Rodi, Delaware Coastal Programs, and Lisa Gutierrez, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, offered welcome remarks, provided a background presentation on the RPB and Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan process, results of a regional summary conducted in summer 2017 to inform workshop discussions, and outlined discussion questions. Click [here](#) to see the presentation slides

Summary feedback from each discussion included:

Defining important areas

Discussion questions included:

- What factors should be considered when defining an area as important for non-consumptive recreation? (examples from OAP include: intensity of use, contributions to local economies, maintaining dark skies and natural sounds).

- How can these factors be prioritized?
- Does the MARCO Ocean Data Portal cover these factors adequately? If not, where could we get that information?

Feedback included:

Naturalness:

- Natural state of resource; pristine aesthetic scenery
- Natural sand dunes
- No vehicles on beach
- Open bays
- Marshes and creeks
- Sandy beaches
- Quiet and clean
- Beach in natural state without development or commercialization, including signage with advertisements
- Place where certain uses are minimal or not occurring (e.g. vehicles on beach were interpreted to be disruptive to some participants)

Access for a variety of recreational uses; access that is:

- Safe
- Varied and accommodates multiple related uses (e.g. availability of sandy beaches for picnics from kayakers)
- Has parking, sanitation facilities and amenities in general
- Includes kayak launch sites, in particular ramps not docks and with less mosquitos
- Also offered in more remote areas

Cleanliness

- Limited trash
- Good water quality (more important to users of coastal bays rather than open ocean)
- Concern about future changes to water quality with outfall proposals
- Limited pet waste

Historical and/or cultural connection

- Desire for sustainable management and use conflict reduction between vehicle driving on beaches, surf-fishing and other uses, due to local cultural heritage value of maintaining the ability to drive a vehicle on the beach.

Intensity of uses/level of crowdedness

- Improved balance among uses is needed (e.g. the convenience of driving vehicles on beaches balanced against the desire for those same areas to be pristine)
- Recognition that multiple uses can co-occur if they are managed well, but not if certain uses are allowed to continue at high levels of intensity

- Certain uses require the same space and the spatial extent of each use should be better managed (e.g. surf fishing vehicles and beachcombing)
- Certain uses require places to be not overly crowded, clean and relatively quiet (e.g. bird watching)
- Dogs off leash and dog waste unbagged
- Lack of adequate sanitation facilities for both humans (e.g. potty tents) and pets (e.g. unbagged pet waste)
- Additional comments specific to surf-fishing and vehicles on the beach included:
 - There are more beaches available for the vehicles than for the people that do not intend to drive on the beach
 - Walking along the beach is difficult with multiple surf-fishing lines in the water which may have been deployed just to reserve the right to drive a vehicle on the beach rather than with the intent to be actively fishing
 - There has been environmental cost, such as disruption of bird nesting areas and dune stability, in order to maintain access to vehicles on beach

Economic contributions

- Need to balance potential revenue/economic contributions against negative impacts (e.g. car sticker fee vs. sand environment- driving vehicle on a beach with softer sand environments often requires cars to be dug out of the sand)

Identifying potential impacts and use conflicts

Discussion questions included:

- How can we further identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses (also other recreational uses)?
- How can we further identify potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources?
- How can these impacts and conflicts be prioritized?

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses:

- Dogs off leash and dog waste and water quality and beach cleanliness for human use
- Driving on beach with other human beach uses
- Swimming and surf-fishing
- Boaters (motor, sail, personal watercraft) and kayaks
 - Boat crowding
 - Boats and kayaks collision high speed
 - Paddling and jet ski spray/interactions- irresponsible use
- Between boaters and swimmers - proximity of speedboats to shore

- Not packing out- hazards to both wildlife and humans (e.g. clipped line with fish hook on beach)
- Drinking and dining in/near ocean
- Plastic straws at beach restaurants/outdoor events
- Digging large holes and not filling back in
- Overall beach crowdedness
- Cultural heritage shipwrecks; artifacts- beach goers and other enthusiasts for treasure/metal detecting/responsible beach combing
- Wind turbines- consideration of positive and negative aspects of alteration to aesthetics/viewshed [e.g. ability to make clean energy available vs. need to maintain open viewshed; loss of potential revenue from tourism from those who dislike viewshed/potential gain in revenue from tourism from those who seek out locations that are leaders in offshore wind]

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses and marine and coastal resources:

- Human waste and water quality
- Vehicle driving on beach impacting sand and vegetation- dunes; bird nesting
- Boaters anchoring on sandbars near channels
- Boaters and swimmers – conflict with wildlife - dolphins
- Not packing out- hazards to both wildlife and humans (e.g. clipped line with fish hook on beach)
- Wind turbines- consideration of positive and negative aspects of alteration to aesthetics/viewshed [e.g. cost balance between potential impacts to wildlife (including noise and avian mortality) and benefits of clean energy]

Developing effective engagement

Discussion questions included:

- What do you see as the current barriers to effective two-way engagement processes where state and federal agencies are sharing information with and soliciting input from ocean recreation users?
- What is working/not working now?
- How can we improve engagement?
- Do other models exist?

Feedback included:

Current barriers

- There is not an industry behind non-consumptive recreational uses, instead it is a diffuse set of activities and uses which makes it difficult to identify and create engagement opportunities for

Target audiences

- “Friends of” groups that relate to coastal areas or non-consumptive recreational use; members and volunteers of those groups (e.g. Delaware Center for the Inland Bays)
- Residents of coastal towns and counties
- Visitors to non-consumptive recreational use areas

Engagement tools and mechanisms

- Local television, newspaper, press releases, flyers, social media, surveys
- Use environmental or “friends of” lists to push further to membership lists and to leverage social media accounts
- Webpages, event calendars and social media accounts of coastal towns and counties
- Post information at places people gather- e.g. bars, libraries, restaurants
- Stewardship and recreational use courses (e.g. beach driving clinics) should be developed and strengthened where they exist to include ecological elements
- Volunteers should be trained in ecology and provide outreach to visitors on site (e.g. explaining the importance of staying off dunes when the posted sign was not sufficient to prevent the behavior)
- Participants thought webinars would offer less effective engagement and discussion, but that webinars may be sufficient just to share information one way
- Participants felt stakeholder fatigue on this issue in that they had received a lot of solicitation for input in relation to similar issues on similar timelines

Additional Feedback

Increase Enforcement

- Some progress has been made with the enforcement of vehicle driving on beaches for active surf-fishing, such as a “no stacking rule” to force cars to be single file, but more work needs to be done to manage this use
- There is a lack of enforcement personnel compared to the scale of some unpermitted uses; acknowledgement that beach vehicle driving sticker fees could help to fund additional enforcement
- There are opportunities with volunteerism – roving interpreter or park watchers could provide friendly reminders about rules and regulations, and the ecological or public safety importance and rationale behind those rule(s); this can also help to change the ethic to having ownership of the state lands/parks- this is your’s to enjoy and protect

Develop Best Management Practices

- Suggestion to limit uses- or allocating certain days for certain uses like beach driving
- Requiring a mandatory beach driving course when getting a sticker

Balance Economic Value with Ecological Value

- The threat of the potential loss of revenue to state parks makes it difficult to put in place further restrictions on a use like surf-fishing
- Recognition of the difficulty to balance the mission to offer affordable recreational experiences and the need for revenue to maintain the resources
- Consideration of whether users will respect a resource more if there is a higher user fee to access that resource

Workshop findings were reported to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group.

Attendees:

Jim and Sue Cooney	citizen
Christopher Edginton	citizen
Matt Gove	Surfrider Foundation
Lisa Guitierrez	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Kevin Hassell	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Peggy Hepburn	CIB, birding
Kim Hernandez	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Lee Hoover	Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, State Parks Delaware Seashore
Kate Morrison	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Donna A. Racine	Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, State Parks Delaware Seashore
Nicole Rodi	Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
Laura Scharle	Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, State Parks Delaware Seashore
Amy Stillings	U. S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Jeff Waldner	U. S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

Appendix III

New Jersey Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop Summary October 11, 2017 Monmouth University West Long Branch, New Jersey

The New Jersey Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop was held the evening of October 11, 2017 at Monmouth University in West Long Branch, New Jersey. Eleven participants gathered for a background presentation and discussion. The evening workshop was co-hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO) and Surfrider Foundation, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB) Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group, to engage the public in a discussion in support of implementation of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan (OAP) action: *Identify, characterize, and share information about measures to maintain the recreational value of important non-consumptive recreational areas and the activities they sustain.*

Workshop objectives included:

- To begin to define what it would mean for ocean and coastal uses and areas to be considered important for non-consumptive recreation;
- To solicit ideas for a process to identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses, as well as potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources; and
- To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users.

Kevin Hassell, New Jersey Coastal Management Program, offered welcome remarks, provided a background presentation on the RPB and Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan process, results of a regional summary conducted in summer 2017 to inform workshop discussions, and outlined discussion questions. Click [here](#) to see the presentation slides.

Summary feedback from each discussion included:

Defining important areas

Discussion questions included:

- What factors should be considered when defining an area as important for non-consumptive recreation? (examples from OAP include: intensity of use, contributions to local economies, maintaining dark skies and natural sounds).
- How can these factors be prioritized?

- Does the MARCO Ocean Data Portal cover these factors adequately? If not, where could we get that information?

Feedback included:

Naturalness

- Natural and geologic features; also identifying them as they apply to specific uses like surfing and giant waves
- Natural preservation/nothing there (e.g. Sandy Hook)
- A place that is geographically spread out from another place and therefore less disturbed or undisturbed
- Uniqueness
- Adequate balance among uses in the area and ecological importance of place

Access for a variety of recreational uses; access that is:

- Not impeded by coastal development
- Includes manmade structures like jetties and groins (e.g. importance to diving)
- Safe (e.g. no strong undertow)
- Convenient and “meaningful” (e.g. getting to a launch for stand up paddleboards, canoes or kayaks; no gates)
- Not limited or eliminated by coastal development patterns (e.g. privatization)
- Different for each kind of use; allowing for multiple activities to co-occur
- Has parking (e.g. near shipwreck locations for divers- people don’t want to carry heavy gear back and forth over long beach for a 40 minute dive)
- Maintained (e.g. certain points or stairs have been closed for multiple years after storm events)
- Has amenities to accommodate carry out programs
- Regulated
- Adjacent to population center
- Potential new access sites or areas should be mapped to explore whether a region has the capacity to have an activity (e.g. access, beach width, etc.)

Cleanliness

- Good water quality

Historical and/or cultural connection

- Includes cultural icons (e.g. lighthouse or fishing pier) that identifies a place; another reason to go to a place beyond the recreational use
- Places that have been historically accessible or activity has been happening for quite some time

Intensity of uses/level of crowdedness

- Areas should include easements that are limited for specific uses (e.g. fishing only)
- The number of people potentially affected if access was taken away- how many people are being displaced- should be taken into account when prioritizing importance of factors; should also consider historical and cultural uses and environmental considerations
- Public lands should make continued and new recreational use priority activity; as uses change a public park can be managed in a way to accommodate new and emerging uses or changing use patterns

Identifying potential impacts and use conflicts

Discussion questions included:

- How can we further identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses (also other recreational uses)?
- How can we further identify potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources?
- How can these impacts and conflicts be prioritized?

Feedback included:

- Need to continue to ask people about potential conflicts and provide more before and after information about projects like renourishment so that people can see the impacts to natural resources
- Emphasis on concerns about limiting access from development or due to liability and safety reasons (the latter being more important to an agency than allowing access)
- Requiring access for municipalities to get certain funds is best practice (e.g. USACE beach renourishment projects; ““open it up for access if you want to get the sand””)
- Good land use planning can protect important areas and separate uses that don’t make sense to co-occur (e.g. access point next to where anglers casting lines or where motor boats come in)
- Concerns cited about inebriated boaters causing safety problems
- Concerns cited about public access restrictions (as above)

Developing effective engagement

Discussion questions included:

- What do you see as the current barriers to effective two-way engagement processes where state and federal agencies are sharing information with and soliciting input from ocean recreation users?
- What is working/not working now?
- How can we improve engagement?
- Do other models exist?

Feedback included:

Current barriers

- Issues are not always newsworthy
- Feeling that agencies don't genuinely listen to stakeholder concerns
- Engagement opportunities are too infrequent or not meaningful
- Lack of easily accessible information about before and after impacts from projects

Target audiences

- Municipal boards and committees
- Specific user groups of each recreational use

Engagement tools and mechanisms

- Participate in general municipal engagement to draw connections to local land use planning (if a municipality knows they have a use in their area they should acknowledge it and plan for it in their area)
- Offer stand alone public hearings on projects rather than incorporation of item into a general town meeting agenda; hold additional hearings and engagement opportunities even if not necessarily required
- Earlier public notice on Army Corps projects
- Provide easier access to before and after studies on projects (without requiring a Freedom of Information Act request)
- Good signage to help reduce impacts; expand use of diver down flags
- Enforcement personnel
- Maps and story maps for targeted user groups that illustrate restrictions and how changes to bathymetry (e.g. from dredging) may have made some previously safe areas unsafe for a certain use
- Improve and expand education/ocean literacy programs for paddlers and others
- Provide additional detailed information for uses on Portal

Workshop findings were reported to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group.

Attendees

Glenn Arthur	New Jersey Council of Diving Clubs
Kevin Hassell	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Helen Henderson	American Littoral Society
Kate Morrison	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Diana Pittet	Surfrider Foundation
Margo Pellegrino	Blue Frontier Campaign
Chris Scraba	U. S. Coast Guard
Doug Simpson	U. S. Coast Guard
Amy Stillings	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Jeff Waldner	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
John Weber	Surfrider Foundation

Appendix IV

Virginia Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop Summary November 8, 2017 Chesapeake Bay Foundation Brock Environmental Center Virginia Beach, Virginia

The Virginia Non-consumptive Recreation Workshop was held the evening of November 8, 2017 at the Chesapeake Bay Foundation Brock Environmental Center in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Thirty-six participants gathered for a background presentation and discussion. The evening workshop was co-hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO) and Surfrider Foundation, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body's (RPB) Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group, to engage the public in a discussion in support of implementation of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan (OAP) action: *Identify, characterize, and share information about measures to maintain the recreational value of important non-consumptive recreational areas and the activities they sustain.*

Workshop objectives included:

- To begin to define what it would mean for ocean and coastal uses and areas to be considered important for non-consumptive recreation;
- To solicit ideas for a process to identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses, as well as potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources; and
- To explore ideas for effective two-way engagement processes to share information with and solicit input from ocean recreation users.

Laura McKay, Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program, offered welcome remarks, provided a background presentation on the RPB and Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan process, and outlined discussion questions, and Nick Meade, Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program, summarized preliminary results of a regional summary conducted in summer 2017 to inform workshop discussions. Click [here](#) to see the presentation slides.

Summary feedback from each discussion included:

Defining important areas

Discussion questions included:

- What factors should be considered when defining an area as important for non-consumptive recreation? (examples from OAP include: intensity of use, contributions to local economies, maintaining dark skies and natural sounds).

- How can these factors be prioritized?
- Does the MARCO Ocean Data Portal cover these factors adequately? If not, where could we get that information?

Feedback included:

Naturalness

- Sense of wilderness/isolation
- Large natural areas; pristine/natural state; preserved
- Natural sounds/lack of human sounds
- Abundance of wildlife
- Uniqueness
- Remoteness
- Areas protected in perpetuity
- Natural habitats/sanctuaries
- Protection of wildlife

Access for a variety of recreational uses; access that is:

- Varied for different types of users
- Easily accessible
- Safe (mentioned by some participants to be a top priority factor); including:
 - Safe beach breaks
 - Fewer riptides
 - Low density use/restrictions on certain activities (i.e., kayaks v. jet skis)
 - Allows for relaxation
 - Uncrowded, but with officers nearby
 - Ways to get information to find your way and know where you are going
- Has amenities and facilities (especially for users with kids)
- Affordable (e.g. nominal fee of \$2) or free parking
- Allows for educational opportunities/increases awareness, particularly among seasonal users
- Specific to sea kayaking, including:
 - Geographic proximity (i.e., available day trips) and good put-in/take-out sites
 - Need long unobstructed trails
 - Periodic access – every 10 miles

Cleanliness

- Availability of trash and recycling cans
- Lack of pollution (air and water)

Historical and/or cultural connection

- Areas that offer these connections in general

Intensity of uses/level of crowdedness

- Places that balance natural beauty/aesthetics with access
- Places that are managed properly and allow for multiple recreational uses in one area, but incompatible uses are segregated and compatible uses are co-located
- Surrounding land use is taken into consideration when planning for recreational uses (e.g., Grandview Beach – it's secluded and you can bring dogs off-season)

Suggestions for Additions to the MARCO Ocean Data Portal

- Resources and tutorials to assist individuals in learning how to use the Portal on their own time
- Portal *How Tuesdays* should be continued; also introduce to tourism bureaus
- Matrix of places and their uses and amenities (e.g. National Park Service does)
- Temporal information/seasonality
- Diving areas
- Turtle and bird nest sites (e.g. the latter to also inform dog owners to avoid certain areas)
- Boat maintenance facilities (leaks oil/gas, etc.)
- Public boat pump out (human waste) facilities
- Cross state information
- Integration with locality web sites
- Change in regulations provided by states automatically updated
- Interactive map – crowd-sourced information (“great bird spot”)

Identifying potential impacts and use conflicts

Discussion questions included:

- How can we further identify and assess potential impacts and use conflicts to important non-consumptive recreational uses from other human uses (also other recreational uses)?
- How can we further identify potential impacts and conflicts between non-consumptive recreational uses and marine and coastal resources?
- How can these impacts and conflicts be prioritized?

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses:

- Shipping industry transportation and recreational boating (e.g. near Ft. Monroe)
- Boating and kayaking
- Commercial fishing near shore and non-consumptive recreational uses in general
- Fast traffic in no-wake zones and near marshes
- Many types of boats at different speeds in the same area
- Military area and vessel restrictions on boating and kayaking
- General understanding of public and private areas for access
- Surfers and swimmers and recreational fishers
- Local residents and tourists/tourism
- Beach renourishment done in a poor way or with poor sand (e.g. low quality, coarse underfoot or too fine to hold)
- Coastal development- commercial and residential
- Point and nonpoint source pollution and diminished water quality (e.g., sewer breaks, fuel spills, medical waste, residential and farm waste, fertilizer) and non-consumptive recreational uses
- Marine debris and non-consumptive recreational uses

Feedback included these examples of conflicts between uses and marine and coastal resources:

- Nesting sites (turtles and birds) and beach use
- Pollution (e.g., medical waste, farm fertilizer, animal waste, sewer breaks, fuel spills) and estuaries and beaches
- Marine debris (e.g. fishing line), trash, plastics and wildlife and natural features
- Watercraft and seagrass beds and shore erosion
- Philosophical view of the motivation behind a human use (e.g. recreational vs. survival)

Developing effective engagement

Discussion questions included:

- What do you see as the current barriers to effective two-way engagement processes where state and federal agencies are sharing information with and soliciting input from ocean recreation users?
- What is working/not working now?
- How can we improve engagement?
- Do other models exist?

Feedback included:

Current barriers

- Localized issues need local attention
- Not knowing who to reach out to/where to hear about information
- Not knowing the laws about uses and impacts to uses (e.g. presence of derelict fishing gear) and what to do
- Language barriers (when no graphics are used)

Target audiences

- Concept that demographic should be expanded from typical audience
- Local users and tourists are different audiences
- Membership of recreational use clubs and organizations or of organizations that care about an environment
- Customers of surf shops and outfitters
- Lifeguards and marine police officers
- Scientific and university communities
- Master naturalists and gardeners
- Native Americans
- Civic leagues

Engagement tools and mechanisms

- Develop a recognizable “brand”
- Regular and reliable periodic communications through a mix of in person and email
- Build larger notification list through recreational use clubs and organizations, resort associations, and environmental organizations (e.g. ENGOs, Elizabeth River Project (ERP), James River Association (JRA), Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Surfrider Foundation, Lynnhaven River NOW) as well as civic leagues; Include other non-recreational use related organizations with connections to nature (e.g., no child left inside); provide information to their websites and newsletters and send expert speakers to meetings
- Share information at surf shops, outdoor gear shops, recreation centers and marinas (e.g. promote education rather than simply regulation with marinas)
- Involve the local schools to reach the children
- Reach out to lifeguards and marine police who witness conflict
- Collaborate on academic studies on tourism and recreation
- Develop partnerships (could include Virginia Living Museum, Virginia Aquarium, Coastal Virginia Magazine, Tourism Bureau (coupon book), Department of Conservation and Recreation, Boat US, AAA, Beach and Waterways Commission, sanitation departments)
- Provide state liaisons to other organizations that conduct cleanups or water testing
- Additional workshops and webinars with an emphasis on conversation
- Photos can help mitigate for language barriers
- Leverage MeetUp groups, Streetmap, online surveys and social media for updates as well as polling for feedback
- Information should be provided about:
 - Roles and responsibilities of different authorities

- Who to contact in event of problem or wildlife notification (e.g. charismatic megafauna hotline like at Virginia Aquarium)
- Compiled information on city models for conflict resolution (e.g. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, CA) or good model cleanup programs (e.g. “Clean Marinas”)
- Develop program of beach “rangers” and leverage volunteer programs; work with lifeguards to share information with visitors
- Billboards or at beaches should be used in the summer; share information at boat shows
- Boater education/licensing courses should include education on potential conflicts

Additional Feedback:

- Separate activities that could cause injury
- Manage the expectations of users
- Manage the proper use of space
- Develop best use practices and guidelines for multiple use areas
- Educate/inform visitors, with a particular emphasis on infrequent users
- Educate users about marine debris and using the ocean as bathroom
- Educate users about high speed causing boat wake which causes erosion in marshes
- Enforce the rules
- Use social media to track crowdedness or to suggest a new place to go
- Reach out to localities to share their local use information

Workshop findings were reported to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body’s Non-consumptive Recreation Work Group.

Attendees:

Peter Ahl	Salvage
Nick Ansu	Virginia Beach Chapter Surfrider Foundation
Kristina Dasher	Virginia Beach CPS
Barbara Duke	Lynnhaven River NOW
Jeff Flood	Kerr Environmental Consulting
Kaity Goldsmith	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Ashley Gordon	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Matthew Gove	Surfrider Foundation
Katie Guttenplan	Ecology and Environment
Megan Hale	citizen
Rip Hale	citizen
Kevin Hassell	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Ryan Jiorle	None
Helen Kuhns	Lynnhaven River NOW

Jenna Livernois	Jennette's Pier - North Carolina Aquariums
Laura Macpherson	None
Laura McKay	VA Coastal Zone Management Program/ MARCO/Mid-A Regional Planning Body State Co-lead
Jill McKinley	Surfrider Foundation
Bill Mckinley	Surfrider Foundation
Megan Mckinley	Surfrider Foundation
Kelsea McKinley	Surfrider Foundation
Nick Meade	Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program
Mike Middleton	Organizer- Hampton Roads Hikers, recreational sailor
Sean Milcetic	Recreational user of the ocean
Sara Miller	Surfrider Foundation, Virginia Beach Chapter
Mary Anne Morrison	Navy; local resident
Meredith O'Brien	East Coast Run Project/Tidewater Striders
Michael Reiss	U. S. Coast Guard Auxiliary
Sonya Robinson	Hampton Roads Hikers
Doug Simpson	U.S. Coast Guard
Mark Swingle	Virginia Aquarium & Marine Science Center
Judy Tucker	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Jody Ullmann	Lynnhaven River NOW
Jeffrey Walaszek	Chesapeake Paddlers Association (member)
Anita Wills	None
Kathleen Yetka	Recreational user of the ocean