

COASTAL ZONE  
INFORMATION CENTER



# Proceedings of the Tri-State Recreation Conference October 23-24, 1978

Myrtle Beach South Carolina

Washington, D.C.  
May 1979



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**  
Office of Coastal Zone Management

GV191.22  
.T7  
1978  
c.2

Opinions expressed by conference participants reproduced in this document do not necessarily represent policy positions held by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Office of Coastal Zone Management.

COASTAL ZONE  
INFORMATION CENTER



# Proceedings of the Tri-State Recreation Conference October 23-24, 1978

Myrtle Beach South Carolina

Edited by Martin Chorich

Washington, D.C. 20235

May 1979

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

Juanita M. Kreps, Secretary

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

Richard A. Frank, Administrator

**Office of Coastal Zone Management**

Robert W. Knecht, Assistant Administrator

**US Department of Commerce**

**NOAA Coastal Services Center Library**

**2234 South Hobson Avenue**

**Charleston, SC 29405-2413**

U.S. National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration  
Office of Coastal Zone Management  
NOAA Coastal Services Center Library  
2234 South Hobson Avenue  
Charleston, SC 29405-2413  
May 5 1997

## Table of Contents

October 23, 1978

Morning Session . . . . .	Page 1
Afternoon Session . . . . .	16

October 24, 1978

Panel Session . . . . .	36
List of Conference Participants . . . . .	48

## Introduction and Acknowledgements

The Tri-State Recreation Conference, held October 23 and 24, 1978, in Myrtle Beach, S.C., represents what is hoped will be the first in a series of conferences sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office of Coastal Zone Management to look at marine recreation in the context of coastal management. Despite its obvious importance, recreation has often taken a back seat to other concerns in many coastal management programs.

With this in mind, the recreation conference had a number of purposes. Most importantly, the conference increased the visibility of recreation in the minds of coastal managers and the public. The conference presented a wide range of speakers from government, industry, and the public who discussed recreation in concrete, tangible terms. In doing so, recreation became an issue of equal rank to other established coastal concerns such as habitat protection, energy development, and so on. Most certainly, the Tri-State conference does not provide the last word on coastal recreation. The presentations reproduced here do, however, go along way toward according recreation due consideration in coastal zone management program.

These proceedings consist of carefully edited remarks made at the conference. Speakers had the opportunity to review their edited presentations. The editing process was immeasurably aided by the fine work of Julie Wright in South Carolina and Brenda Young in Washington. Special thanks also to the Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina CZM programs and Sea Grant for cosponsoring the conference.

-- Martin Chorich

MORNING SESSION, OCTOBER 23, 1978

Mayor Eric Ficken of Myrtle Beach welcomed the conference participants. Mr. Dallas Miner then introduced Senator James Waddell, Chairman of the South Carolina Coastal Council.

SENATOR WADDELL: I would like to welcome you all to South Carolina and start off by saying that recreation means different things to different people. We each have our varied interests.

The thing that bothers me about Coastal Management is that time is running out. The coast is subject to tremendous pressures. I see it building up every day. It is imperative that we act decisively and rapidly. We must also look at new ideas and concepts. We cannot solve today's problems with the time tested methods of the past.

The Coastal Zone Management bill that I sponsored in the South Carolina General Assembly didn't please either the environmentalists or the developers, and I think it's a good thing.

Our first speaker today is Dr. Leon Abbas, an outstanding gentleman from the University of North Carolina Sea Grant Program speaking on the topic "The Extent of Coastal Recreation in the Tri-State Region."

DR. LEON ABBAS: Thank you Senator. There's a large and growing demand for outdoor recreation in the coastal zone, and if there were enough to go around we wouldn't be here today. If the resources weren't fragile, we wouldn't be here. If people didn't want to come to the coast and have a good time, there would be no need for a meeting like this.

There isn't enough to go around, so there has to be some sort of an allocation process. This applies to both public and private sector resource users. A whole lot of folks want a piece of the action.

At this conference, I'd hope for us to exchange information. If we're lucky, we might even get into an argument.

There is a fixed supply of coastal land. This makes its allocation particularly important. In the tri-state region, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, we have 10 percent of the US coastline, 12 percent of the beaches, 2 percent of the bluffs, and 23 percent of the coastal marshes. Now, who owns what? Two hundred-twenty three miles of beach are in public hands and open to the public, 52 miles are owned by the military, and a whopping 1,955 miles, 88 percent of our total, is privately owned.

Who's doing what? Boat registration has gone up 30 percent during the years from 1974 to 1977. Travel related expenditures in the three states totaled \$11,759,000,000 in 1977. North Carolina experienced a 49 percent increase in travel expenditures from 1974 to 1977. Some people estimate that travel expenditures will go up another 75 percent from 1977 to 1985. Of course, these figures include data from the entire state, and not just the coastal zone.

In the 20 North Carolina counties, \$426,000,000 was spent in 1977. The travel industry employed 18,000 workers in 3,287 firms somehow involved in producing travel goods and services.

Economists have looked at the topic of where the tourist dollar goes. Thirty-eight cents of every dollar goes to travel and lodging with the next largest amount, 22 cents going to gasoline and automobile supplies. Fourteen cents of the tourist dollar went to passenger carriers, with the same amount accruing to recreation and tourist attractions. The last 12 cents fell into the miscellaneous category.

Many of these expenditures are not site specific. Many businesses complain that tourists come from within the state with their gas tanks full, their trunks full of groceries, pulling their own boat, and with all other supplies, not spending a thing in the coastal zone. But looking at expenditures, we must look at the whole state. The impact of coastal recreation does not center on the coast. It affects everybody in the state.

Of course, if you go to the coast for a month or so, coastal zone expenditures will increase. A study of the Wrightsville beach area, however, showed the average stay to be four days.

As another index of coastal recreation, we found 54 marinas in North Carolina, each with an average capital investment of \$432,000. This reinforces the Senator's statement that coastal recreation is big business.

Even with all of this data, we still have little idea of the full extent of coastal recreation. I would like to list the number of people who launched their surfboard or sailboat, how long people spent in the water, the hours spent on piers, but I can't do that. But we know this is all very important.

There are also many activities that occur in the coastal zone but are not specific to coastal zone resources. The message here is that people want to go to the seashore for many reasons.

On what basis can we predict the demand for marine recreation? Population size is a major indicator. Income also affects recreation demand. Even with inflation, incomes are rising on a real basis. Our

leisure time is also increasing. Technological advances also create demand for recreation. Consider how the recreational vehicle has led to an increase in outdoor camping.

Even though our country was built on the work ethic, which is a good thing, attitudes on work and leisure are changing. People now play just as hard as they work.

Many resources are subject to peak uses, further complicating the allocation process. In a lot of ways, recreational resources are in the wrong place; too far from where people live. Most of the national forests are in the western part of the country, far away from the highly populated east.

There many barriers to access. Natural barriers such as water, and swamps are a problem in North Carolina. You can't build a bridge to these areas without spoiling them. You can't launch boats without ramps. Usually, if the public sector doesn't provide access, the private sector won't either. We also have unstable areas, erosion, and areas with windstorms and dangerous high tides which make them unsafe.

The Intercoastal Waterway (ICW) is a tremendous recreational resource, but it was built for commercial users. But as much as the ICW is an opportunity, it is a danger because of the commercial ship traffic.

This is just one example of a resource use conflict. Other conflicts involve industrial activity, air and water quality, and dredging. Users conflict with each other. Fishermen conflict with divers, pier fishermen conflict with surf fishermen. Bathers conflict with surfers.

We also have the question of socio-economic barriers to entry. Some people are too poor to participate in coastal recreation. This brings up the question of user fees. If we charge fees to ration resources uses, we're going to exclude some people.

We have visual access barriers; buildings that block the view of the resource. There are private users who block public users. For example, you can't get your boat into the water because a processing plant stands in the way.

So we do have market failure in allocating Coastal Zone resources. Market failure falls into three categories. Externalities occur when someone else's activities affect you. If someone builds a beach house next to yours, and bulldozes a protective sand dune to go so, in losing your protection you become affected by the externality associated with that person's activity. Public goods are those which have public interests attached to them whether the goods are publicly or privately owned. Common property resource is a term that usually concerns fisheries. These are resources that nobody owns, but everybody has access to.



Market failures result in inefficient goods allocations. What do we need to do to avoid market failure? We need to take account of externalities in some way. The private sector should realize that the public has an interest in how they use their property. In the public sector, we need to provide incentives to the private sector to use their property to maximum public benefit. That's a large part of what coastal zone management is all about.

Overall, in coastal zone management we need to encourage compatible uses of resources. We need to avoid conflicts. Part of the reason we are not able to do this well is that we simply don't understand the conflicts. Part of the reason is ignorance; we do not understand how many of these processes occur. Decisions, to some extent, are being made with imperfect information.

So let's make the right decisions as best we can and if we have to take risks, let's do it. It's risky anyway, so we might as well be imaginative and innovative in the best sense we can. That concludes my comments.

SENATOR WADDELL: I like to use the word program instead of plan. When you say the word plan most people think of an exact blue print. We are living with an ever changing resource. The trouble with plans is that by the time they get printed they're out of date. We work on a case-by-case basis and evaluate our decisions on the basis of performance criteria. We have adopted performance criteria in South Carolina which will lend itself to the changes that will inevitably occur in the 1980's. Now we've got a lot of people on the coast, but we've all got to live together.

Our next speaker is Patrick Doyle, Manager of Environmental Communications for the Outboard Marine Corporation of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

PATRICK DOYLE: Senator Waddell is a hard act to follow. At this conference we are a gathering of special interest groups. The recreational boating and outboard motor industry will go almost anywhere to participate with government in designing programs to enhance public recreation in the coastal zone. A sociologist once said, "Labor and leisure are the two sides of man's basic shield, both protect him. Labor enables him to live, and leisure makes the good life possible."

Seventy-four percent of our population lives on only 1.5 percent of our land. Recreation, tourism and leisure spending in this country contribute more than \$110 billion annually to the national economy and employ 4 million people, about one in twenty jobs. The recreational boating industry is comprised of 10,000 firms engaged in producing and selling marine products. This consists of 16,500

retail dealers and 2,500 marine product manufacturers. It employs 500,000 people with retail sales totalling \$5 billion. The annual payroll for these industries amounts to over \$2.25 billion. The value of all engine powered recreational boats in the US represents assets worth \$15 billion. Fifty-four million people take to the water each year in recreational boats.

In regards to the boating industry's economic importance, in 1974, during the oil embargo, an early version of that year's energy bill classed power boating as a low priority fuel use. Our industry formed a task force to produce an economic impact statement. We persuaded the House Ways and Means Committee to eliminate power boating from the lists of non-essential fuel uses in the stand-by rationing plan. We received support from Federal Energy Administrator, William Simon who promised to deal with the recreation industry in an equitable manner because leisure industries form the economic backbone of many communities. While still on the subject of fuel, those 54 million recreational boaters consume less than one half of one percent of the nation's total fuel, or about a quarter tank of gas in every car in America.

During the past couple of years, I served on the Wisconsin Coastal Zone Citizens' Advisory Council. Most people do not consider Wisconsin a coastal state, but we are. In 1975, the University of Wisconsin Recreational Resource staff estimated that boating activity would increase by 200 percent by 1995. The survey also revealed that 14 percent of Wisconsin's Great Lakes shoreline was in public ownership, with 58.5 miles of park lands along the shore. There are 52 public beaches on the Great Lakes shorelines and 234 miles of hiking trails in the coastal counties. Wisconsin's coastal communities provide 3,190 slips at 47 marinas. For both great lakes there are 245 boat launch ramps at 160 sites. Conducted at the height of the summer boating season, the survey found all marinas operating at full capacity, with 4,000 boat owners on waiting lists for slips. Only 42 percent of the boaters rating Great Lakes launch facilities as adequate.

If the demand projections presented in this report are accurate, there needs to be a significant response from the public sector to meet the expected 200 percent increase in boating activity expected by 1995. The goal we pursue in the marine recreation industry is to strike a harmonious balance between wise use and no use philosophies concerning coastal zone resources and their public recreation development potential.

Our industry sponsored a survey on boating facilities availability and need. We surveyed 233 marinas in 13 coastal states. We found 26,000 slips in use, 14,000 additional slips needed at this time, 10,000 boatmen on waiting lists for slips, and 21,000 additional slips potentially available if stumbling blocks to expansion of existing facilities were removed.

With regard to these stumbling blocks, one marina project we know planned for the Illinois coast, was going to be the second greatest thing since Marina Del Rey in California, with plans for 3,000 slips; a marvelous and much needed project. The project has been battered from pillar to post because government has been hamstrung by emotionalism from certain groups. Three or four marvelous marinas in Illinois have been blocked in this manner.

Concerning recreational activities, we ask, "What do people in coastal areas want?" The Interior Department Heritage Conservation Recreation Service (HCRS), formerly the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, found a few years ago that 44 percent of our coastal population preferred water dependent recreation activities. HCRS also stated that the percentage of population within 50 miles of our shoreline is increasing far more rapidly than any other land area in the country.

We in the boating industry believe that the close proximity of water to a large portion of our population bodes well for energy conservation. The Department of Energy applauded us when we told them of our efforts over the next 10 to 15 years to encourage the development of boating facilities near large urban areas. People will be able to go boating close to home and not have to travel hundreds of miles to get to their boats.

In reflecting on limited coastal recreation resources, Calvin Trillin the writer, noted in a magazine article, "The fight for a foothold on Iwo Jima may have been the bloodiest in history but Martha's Vineyard and Cape Cod are no picnics either. In a soft economy, the only safe investment is in a company manufacturing 'No Trespassing' signs." He also said, "Any citizen can use the beach at East Hampton as long he is willing to leave his car near Times Square and walk the rest of the way."

Of the 101,800 miles of shoreline fronting the seas and Great Lakes, only one third is considered suitable for recreation. Only five percent is in public ownership, with three percent restricted to military use, and 91 percent in private ownership. On the Atlantic coast, only 336 miles of shoreline are publicly owned for recreation, and this is only three percent of the recreational shoreline. What we do to expand recreational use of those tens of thousands of miles of undeveloped shoreline will be one of the key tasks of the State and Federal coastal zone management program.

To expand coastal recreation we are going to have to make it extremely attractive for private developers to invest in these areas. This is no small task because of the proliferation of regulatory agencies since 1970. In 1972, an Interior Department recreation planning draft stated by the end of the year, some 90 agencies, commissions and committees would be engaged in 260 separate outdoor recreation programs. In addition, there are countless state, regional, and local government bodies capable of regulating land and water recreation projects.

A major accomplishment since then was the passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. As the national coastal management program unfolds, we in boating believe it vital that we provide incentives for private investment in recreational area development. Government alone cannot develop coastal recreation opportunities and must establish a partnership with private industry.

We need recreational areas so badly that there must be incentives as well as regulations for their development. We have some excellent examples to build on this. The Tennessee Valley Authority has had one of the greatest land and water programs around. In Wisconsin, we have a truly magnificent program similar to the TVA where vast numbers of people can be handled without environmental degradation. The State of Wisconsin works aggressively to attract over two million people each summer to enjoy the very compact ten miles long, quarter mile wide Wisconsin Dells area. This is about the same number of people that visit the huge expanses of Yellowstone National Park annually.

The point in mentioning the Dells is that vast acreage is not necessary for a successful outdoor recreation attraction if a sound resource management program is practiced. According to an article in the Milwaukee Sentinel, "Wisconsin has better forests than in the 1930's, ten times more deer than in the 1900's, water quality is better now than a quarter century ago in most recreational areas of the state, and we are envied by many for the quality of our environment and tourist income...\$2.8 billion annually." All it takes is sound management.

I must confess, in 1969 when the Stratton Commission published "Our Nation and the Sea," those of us in water based recreation were disheartened when we found this 305 page report devoted only one and one-quarter pages to the subject of recreation and boating.

For my last comment, I should like to request to NOAA that recreational boating be amended into the Coastal Zone Management Act as one of the aims of state coastal management plans.

SENATOR WADDELL: I'd like to know what we mean by public access. You have public access at Sea Pines or Hilton Head if you rent a room. If they didn't have public access at Sea Pines, they'd go broke. In South Carolina, we have roughly 240 miles of coast-line not counting the estuaries and 80 miles is in the public domain already. So when you say we need more land in the public domain, I don't know if you really mean that because the 80 miles we already have is inaccessible to 99 44/100 percent of the South Carolina Public. I wish everybody would keep in mind the recreational use of the publicly owned lands. We have a five mile strip at Hunting Island that will accommodate over a million and a half visitors while we have 80 miles that won't see a thousand or 1,500 visitors. So how do we utilize the resources we already have?

Our next group of speakers includes William (Buddy) Jennings, Director of the Division of Planning for the South Carolina Department of Parks Recreation and Tourism. Buddy's topic is "Future Demands for Coastal Recreation."

MR. JENNINGS: Thank you, Senator. During the previous session, we have been reminded of the ever growing extent of recreation in our tri-state region. At first glance, the United States seems to offer ample beach for everyone's recreation. Two-hundred-ten million Americans share 84,240 miles of shore. But more than half of this coast is in Alaska, and of the remainder, only 12,150 miles is beaches. Just 6.5 percent of the total national shore is in the public domain, much of it reserved for military use. Only four percent of the coast-line is suitable and available for public recreation. One third of this amount is National Park Service or National Seashore frontage. It's no wonder throughout the nation coastal recreation has become a major issue.

What are the causative factors, pressures if you will, which will continue to mount in the years ahead? What are the trends in beach use and coastal vacations? These projections can logically be translated into demand.

Fifty-four percent of the nation's population lives within the 50 mile coastal strip that comprises only eight percent of our nation's land. When you add to the fact that three-fourths of all Americans reside in nine of the ten largest states, you can see what magnitude this demographic data has. Our own three states are part of this group and share in the factors just enumerated. Present and future demands for coastal recreation may also be accounted for as the result of an exploding urban population enjoying an improved standard of

living. More people, with more leisure time, and more disposable income have more demands for recreation. New roads, parking areas, campgrounds, vacation homes and marinas require large amounts of land, consume large amounts of tax dollars and change the character of seaside towns.

Development pressures for industrial and commercial concerns have been affected by the energy shortage. Electric power plants, refineries and shore support facilities for offshore production compete with established industrial and recreational land uses. These could adversely affect, if not eliminate, those attributes that comprise our tri-state recreation base.

Recreation spending, including recreation products, equipment, vacation spending, recreational trips and second homes, contribute about \$110 to \$115 billion annually to the US economy and supports four to five million jobs. Coastal recreation has a profound impact on regional economic development. Recent surveys show that the beaches are South Carolina's greatest single attraction. Travel and tourism has developed into a \$1.7 billion industry in South Carolina, and the second largest in the state. This figure includes an annual payroll of \$350 million for 67,000 workers. The most recent statistics show that visitors to the state have increased their spending 197 percent during the last five years. Beach demand from both day visitors and vacationers will continue to increase in the next fifteen years. Total day-use demand for South Carolina beaches was conservatively estimated at 5.6 million user days by 1975. This survey conservatively projected growth in this figure to 5.9 million user days in 1980, 7.2 million occasions in 1985, and 8.1 million occasions in 1990. Although the demand distribution may be altered by expanding beach access, the total potential demand will not diminish. Day visitor access is a problem for the entire South Carolina coast, especially in the Charleston area, most specifically with respect to parking.

Traffic congestion in popular beach areas has increased to the extent that residents of the beach communities are strongly opposed to additional development of facilities in their community. These communities are also threatened by inordinate fiscal burden as they serve as playgrounds for nonresidents.

To sum up, we can safely say that we can expect strong leisure market growth through the 1980's due to demographic and socioeconomic trends. This growth will require dispersing beach access. The private sector will play an important role in developing facilities to attract vacationers. Whether by acquisition, regulation, or other means, state and local governments must expand beach access and recreational opportunities to meet future demand or face the consequences of losing the natural, social, and economic benefits derived from its beaches.

SENATOR WADDELL: We're gaining knowledge so fast and things change so rapidly that when you start talking about 10 years or 20 year projections, that's a lot of hogwash. If you can predict five years ahead, you're doing great.

Our next speaker is Stephen Moler, Park and Recreation Consultant to the North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development.

STEVEN MOLER: Thank you, Senator. We're talking about North Carolina today. I would like to begin with some quotes about our coastal area. "The Outer Banks possesses a uniqueness which is found nowhere else in the United States. Uncongested beaches and the right to roam as one desires. The almost bleakness of the Outer Banks is certainly a major component of this uniqueness. The Outer Banks is certainly an area where a man can get off by himself, away from the pressures and conformity which our society requires in our every day lives. The mere fact that the Outer Banks has not developed to its true potential is another important result of this study and the fact that night clubs do not dot each intersection makes the Outer Banks truly a family vacation area." These quotes come from a 1970 study done for the Greater Nags Head Chamber of Commerce by the 3M Company. The study was based on 500 face-to-face interviews of visitors to that area.

Of course, things have changed since then, but those statements are still mainly true. Growth and commercialization have to take place. But our beaches remain still relatively uncongested. We would like to promote the fact that eastern North Carolina is a family vacation oriented beach area, uncongested and quiet. We haven't developed as fast as Fort Lauderdale or Ocean City, Maryland. One of the reasons our beaches remain relatively uncongested is access. In North Carolina we have a bunch of two lane roads that weave in and out of the coastal area. We have only one center of population, 52,000 people in Wilmington.

North Carolina is extremely fortunate to have about 125 miles of state and federal land in reservation. The lack of drinking water also restricts development of the Outer Banks. The road network, the amount of State and Federal ownership, the water supply, and the fact that we don't have a liquor-by-the-drink law helps control our growth.

My theory is that if we were to throw this thing out of balance by, say, building a new bridge to the Banks, this would open this whole string of islands to tremendous road development. The people of Dare County just turned down a liquor-by-the-drink resolution. So they will retain a family orientation on the beaches. What I'm trying to get at is that if you drive one thing out of balance, you're going to get the kind of demand that you have down here.

I agree, things are changing so fast that we can't begin to talk about 15 to 20 years ahead. We've got to talk about next year, and the next five years. Our predictions only cover the next five years. In the demand area, recreational use of the North Carolina coastal zone will increase only eight to ten percent per annum over the next five years. I predict that North Carolina's coastal areas will be able to accommodate this growth. If we identified additional access points, we could get that growth to the beach without any additional construction in Eastern North Carolina.

Predicting activities is a risky business. I predicted that over the next five years, surfing, bicycling, jogging, scuba diving, and off-road vehicle usage will increase at a greater rate than other activities. This will create management problems. We already have problems controlling off road vehicle use on the national seashore. It still remains a problem to predict new demands. Outdoor rollerskating has gone crazy on the California coast. Who could have predicted that?

A lot of people coming to our coast want to do the same things they do at home. Racquetball, tennis, bicycling and so on. We must try to accommodate tourist demand along with resident demand.

In terms of planning, I believe that planning will go unchanged in eastern North Carolina for the next five years. Individual and small scale studies will continue. No major comprehensive plans will be developed for this area. Our Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) plan is in full swing in North Carolina, but it will not have any major effect on predicting or handling recreational demand in the coastal area.

We have received \$350,000 in North Carolina for coastal planning and management. In looking at these grants, I found four or five of them were planning grants. The rest of them were zoning, subdivision, regulations update, water and sewer treatment, and so on--recreation, practically nil. Under the CZMA guidelines, recreation is priority three. There's no money left after priorities one and two are taken care of.

Regarding communication, commercial recreation facility managers, government officials, local merchants, Chambers of Commerce and even some county commissioners will not improve their communications with people.

All things considered, the quality of experience is what it's all about. We are trying to maintain it. But I predict over the next five years, as long as crowds come to our coastal areas, our quality of experience will decline. However, as quality declines for some of us,



we will seek new locations to find what we want. We will become satisfied with less. Even our gems, as I call them, the National Seashore and state parks, the Wildlife areas will feel the pressure. Even the quality of those sites will decline. I don't know how we can stop it.

SENATOR WADDELL: Our next speaker is Kurt Fanstill, Supervisor of the Comprehensive Planning Unit of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

KURT FANSTILL: Thank you. I'm going to cover several points. First, I am going try to establish some definition of the basic assumptions we all share. Second, I will talk about Georgia's demand study and how incredibly wonderful it is. Third, I will talk about some limitations.

First of all, I don't think we all realize just how important demand studies are. I have sifted among several definitions of planning and the most appropriate one seems to be, planning is the allocation of scarce resources. Recreational resources are indeed scarce. The demand is there, but we can't measure it accurately. Without accurate measurement, we cannot compete in the marketplace with the other claims on capital resources. I do not necessarily think there has to be a competition between the public and private sectors regarding recreation. The competition exists between recreation suppliers and other interests with legitimate claims on coastal resources.

Demand is a tricky concept. I don't think we've tried to define it. A simple definition might read, demand is a conditional statement of the participation that might occur at a given time, at a given place, under a specific set of circumstances. Many studies I've seen which purport to be demand analyses aren't, they are participation studies. They take current participation rates and extrapolate from these using population projections to forecast future levels of participation.

One thing we tried to do in Georgia is to do a real demand study and not just a participation study. Secondly, we do not believe in the concept of "need," and instead use the term "unmet demands." This puts "need" in the context of supply and demand. All too often need is measured by arbitrary standards, for example, so much square feet per thousand people. Arbitrary standards are useful as general rules of thumb, but they have no use in a planning process.

Finally, one of the greatest difficulties in discussing demand in the public sector is that there is no pricing mechanism. How do you determine the price of something that is perceived as a public good? Nevertheless, to do a good demand analysis you need, if not price, some surrogate measure for price.

We have devised demand studies in Georgia to do several things for us. First of all, we wanted to describe the existing recreation market. We wanted this information on a statewide basis. We wanted it on a regional planning division basis. Finally, we wanted it on a county-by-county basis.

We wanted to project demand for 21 different recreational activities plotted over five year increments, from five to 15 years into the future.

Thirdly, we wanted flexibility. If you can't accommodate changes and new trends, your model is quite useless. Consequently, we came up with a computer simulation model based on many variables. Some of the main variables include participation rates, population size, recreation trends, and existing supply. Other variables include exclusionary supply, that is supply in private hands closed to other users, undesignated supply, facilities such as streets and sidewalks that can be used for recreational purposes, resource attractiveness, and population willingness to travel.

We applied our model in determining the recreational consequences of the King's Bay submarine base in Camden County. We estimated recreational demand for a number of population size variables. Another application of the model is determining how many people might use a new park, and how this park will affect existing recreational facilities.

We have had some large problems though. I would like to discuss them for three reasons. One, I think people learn well from others' mistakes. Two, I am just incredibly honest. And three, I have a great fondness for public speakers who admit mistakes.

One, we have no data on tourism. Secondly, we use only statewide participation rates which is a problem because there are regional differences. Although I mentioned we monitor 21 activities, there are really more than 21 activities. We don't know how many there are or how many people use them. We don't address the question of substitution. If you don't have enough of a certain kind of resource, what are they going to use instead?

Let's also consider access to supply. We're not certain we have the access to the ocean that we should. The extent of boat ramps, marinas, parking lots, and support facilities play an enormous role in estimating the demands and burdens of access.

Our study is not compatible with most studies of other states. We need information from North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Wisconsin, you name it. Every state does their studies differently, and the information is very hard to exchange.

We have only begun to collect socio-economic data on recreation participants. This data is essential for equity considerations of recreation policy.

We attach no monetary value to unmet demand. Until we, the public agree on the value of recreation, recreation cannot compete with industry and commerce in cost-benefit analyses.

From our studies, we have drawn the following conclusions. First, all trends indicate a dramatically increased demand for coastal recreation. This increase in demand exceeds the increase in population. Second, reliable demand studies are needed if recreation is to compete with other claims upon coastal resources. Third, our coastal resources are finite and perishable. Georgia has 385 miles of coastline, 1.7 percent of the US total. Maine has over 2,600 miles of coastline. In Maine, they believe if they make a few management mistakes, they've got the room to make up for them. But with 385 miles in Georgia, we can't afford mistakes. Fourth, demand studies are helpful if they are well done or reasonably objective. Demand itself, however, is not objective. It is a measurement of subjective choices. In some ways, it is a preconditioned response as supply decisions made this year will affect demand in 1981. Demand is very much a function of supply.

MR MINER: I'd like to open a discussion period on this session by first calling upon Ron Stone, a representative of the National Boating Federation, of the Boating Industries Association, Chicago, Illinois.

MR STONE: Thank you Dallas. The Boating Industries Association are very encouraged to see due attention given to recreation policies to preserve the public's opportunity to enjoy the nation's shoreline. We commend the Office of Coastal Zone Management and hope this conference will produce policies and guidelines promoting public recreation in the seacoast areas.

Among the ways which exist to determine recreation needs in the geographic sphere of influence of this conference is to look at the needs and demands of the boating public in the perspective of the boating industry. BIA surveyed 10,000 boat owners throughout the country. The survey response from the Southeast indicated a definite need for more facilities for boating. Trends show an 18 percent increase in inboard power boat registrations in the Tri-State area from 1974 to 1977, while outboard registrations grew 10 percent. BIA market research has shown consumers able to buy boats. 1976 per family real income was close to \$15,000 in 1973 dollars. Consumers are not over extended financially. Boats appreciate, which makes banks willing to extend credit to buy them.

Americans are better than they ever were before. From this it seems probable that this will lead to an expanded recreation industry. Our research and marketing outlook indicates an ever increasing number of boats in use.

Multitudes of boat are manned by taxpayers who are a little miffed that there are no places to store or launch them. One hand does wash the other. We satisfy recreational demand by building boats, but we need the states to respond to this demand by building more facilities for boaters. It is the responsibility for all recreation oriented states to consider the options for making recreation easier. Most pertinent are increasing restrictions on shoreline development due to local concerns, environmentalists and preservationists. The red tape and cost involved in securing permits from government agencies have left us discouraged about the development of shoreline areas for recreational boating even in places where it is theoretically permitted. I am disturbed, for example, by arbitrary pronouncements in state coastal zone management programs which label power boats energy wasters and polluters unworthy of consideration. These statements have no substantiation and offer no scientific data to back up these claims.

We are also concerned about shortsightedness of present day recreation policy as it affects boating. New boating facilities are not being built where a majority of boaters live. In hauling their boats tremendous distances to facilities, boaters use more fuel getting boats to water than actually expended in running the boats. More accessible marinas would save energy. A recent BIA survey shows 4,000,000 trailered boats. Considering this, we believe it's time for coast to provide more facilities to accommodate recreation.

In discussing this morning's presentations, let me first say that the North Carolina Presentation suggested to me that less is more, in other words, the less crowded the coasts, the more enjoyment for the few who visit it. Why can't we have a more is more philosophy? Why can't the state provide more recreation to more people who have never had the chance to enjoy the coast because of lack of facilities? The way I read most coastal plans, states seem to prefer preserving as much land as possible which is good news for waterfowl and marsh grass. But what about people?

MR. MINER: Ron is correct in saying there is a very strong environmental perspective in coastal zone management. If you read the Coastal Zone Management Act, it is clear that it is one of Congress' intents to preserve, protect, and enhance the resources of the coastal zone. Congress also recognizes the need for economic development. This has been embodied in the act in the recognition of the concept of public benefit in coastal management, among them, recreation. We will now adjourn for lunch.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

MR. MINER: Our first topic this afternoon will be "Competition and Constraints." Our moderator this afternoon is Dr. J. Parker Chesson. Among his many other accomplishments, Dr. Chesson has served on the North Carolina Coastal Resources Commission since its founding in 1974.

DR. CHESSON: I would like to say a few things about North Carolina's Coastal program. Our program officially started in 1974 when a comprehensive coastal management act passed the General Assembly. The management program covers 20 counties. You may also be aware that North Carolina was the first Southern State to have its program approved by the Office of Coastal Zone Management.

One of the people involved in our program made a joking statement when we first got started in 1974 which has always stuck in my mind. He said, the only way to get most people involved in something is to hurt them or at least make them feel like they are going to get hurt. To get people involved is a tough job.

If there is a weak link in our management plan it is in the subject of this conference, recreation. Steve Moler already talked about this when he referred to the lack of grass roots support in local government for recreation planning. When our land use plans were first being done in 1974, many counties refused to touch the topic of recreation. The more conservative counties still feel this is not something that requires a high priority effort. We and other citizens need to educate these officials about these needs.

In covering the topic of competition and constraints, Mr. Charles Fraser will first talk about competition. Mr. Fraser was a member of President Johnson's Citizen Advisory Committee on Outdoor Recreation and a past member of the Federal Coastal Zone Advisory Commission.

MR FRASER: Let us first put the competitive forces on the coast in order. First we have competition between public agencies and private facilities. In my opinion, whatever competition we used to have here has disappeared because the private sector does not have the planning or financial resources to provide the kind of "action vacations" Americans seek today. You all remember the photos of people in chairs crowded together sitting in the Miami Beach sun. Today people now take action vacations involving everything from whitewater rafting to tracking, climbing, biking, fishing, sailing, canoeing, houseboating, scuba diving, soaring, and ballooning. For these activities, the public sector can best provide facilities. Public agencies do some things better than private firms and vice versa, so there really is no competition for resources.

Private firms do best in such areas as packaging tours. Club Med, the French outfit which packages vacations for nearly naked people, is an example of something the private sector can do better than the public. They aren't giving anything away for free in Club Med. They are charging for it with gusto. Old line resorts are changing with the times. Now we have resorts adding hot tubs and saunas. They even have a trade journal called Spar and Sauna.

Out West there is a big battle between the commercial outfitters who have traditionally run rubber rafting trips down the Colorado River and the free lancers who want to do it themselves. There is literally not enough space on the river to have a meaningful experience--to go half a mile free.

I urge the maximum cooperation to utilize the full resources of government and private interests to offer the new action vacations on the Southern Coast that would provide this part of the country the sort of outdoor experience more common in the West. One of our dilemmas is that when we acquire places and move them into public hands, they then become open to the public. Still in many cases, more people make use of private recreation areas than public ones. More jog down the beach of Sea Island, Georgia, one of the nation's most exclusive resorts, than jog down the 20 times as extensive state and federal beaches in Georgia. So, in a sense, our public places are public only as far as they are administered by the state and federal agencies.

We have some strange attitudes on access. In the US, if we have a beautiful mountain peak, we let only the most healthy mountain climber see it. In Switzerland or France, they build chairlifts and trains to carry people of all ages and sizes to savor the mountain tops. We need to develop recreation for the widest range of our population, not just the most healthy, youngest, or energetic. Thank you.

DR. CHESSON: Our next speaker will be Neil Mingledorf, president and manager of Docktile Iron Company of America, and is very much involved in pleasure boating as the Commodore of the Savannah Yacht Club and President of the Isle of Hope Marina.

MR. MINGLEDORF: Rules and regulations are a good thing, but I hope I can convince a few people today that we have to be careful that the small print doesn't discriminate against the small businessman. I may sound like a capitalist, but after 20 years of running a marina, I don't think I qualify anymore. I have spent more money in the permit process than with the original purchase price of the entire marina. We have had all kinds of problems with government regulatory agencies.

I am convinced that stronger steps must be taken at all levels of government to protect the small businessman. When the marshland protection act first came in Georgia, it was a great thing. There was a large business that wanted to come in and do a lot of strip mining. The public hearings turned down the project. I'm in favor of things like that, because I am against wholesale destruction of the marshes area.

The original act contained language that says, "encourage recreational boating." I was asked to comment on the rules and regulations written to implement the act. Of course, you all know that rules and regulations can vary quite a bit from the intent of the original act. It is very easy for people writing regulations to forget about the legislation they are implementing. Recreational boating has not been written out of the protection act, but we must constantly remind government of these things.

In expanding my marina, for just the first hearing we had to provide petitions, pictures, the whole business. The first step took us a year. Then we had to do a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It took us two years to supply the information, and then a year for them to write it. There were something like 21 steps we had to go through with the government. When you consider all of this took three years, you imagine what it would cost you for one little permit.

I think that with the taxes today, and government regulations, marinas will have to be built by the states and counties. I don't think that private individuals can handle the controls required. It has become just too complicated and is beyond the small businessman's ability to finance these things. I hope you will think about these regulations in writing them and try to write the rules so they are fair to everyone.

DR. CHESSON: Thank you Neil. Our next speaker is Dr. Ray Burby of the University of North Carolina.

DR. BURBY: This afternoon I would like to give you a broad look at recreational land development in the coastal zone based on the experience of some 33 coastal land developers and 146 coastal public officials who have been interviewed during the past year. These data were collected in connection with a study of "Water Resource Consequences of Second Home and Recreational Land Development." The study is being conducted with support from the Water Resources Research Institute of the University of North Carolina.

One of our first discoveries in this project is no surprise to anyone familiar with the coast. A considerable amount of second home and recreational land development has occurred in the 20 counties covered by the North Carolina Coastal Area Management Act. Based on U.S. Census and HUD OILSR records, we estimate that in 1976 there were about 84,000 second home/recreational lots located in the North Carolina coastal area. About three-fourths of this development was concentrated in four coastal counties with ocean access, Brunswick (Southport), New Hanover (Wilmington), Dare (Manteo), and Carteret (Beaufort/Morehead City).

Most of the coastal developers we queried felt that the market for recreational property in the coastal zone would continue to be strong. For example:

1. Two thirds of those responding thought that the market for improved leisure home subdivisions would expand over the next 10 years. Only 10 percent saw a decrease in demand.
2. Fifty-five percent of the 33 developers who responded thought that the market for detached leisure homes would expand and that the market for unimproved lots would expand. Less than a quarter thought that the market for these types of property would fall off.
3. On the other hand, the developers were less sanguine about the market for resort condominium units, time-sharing units, and high-amenity leisure home communities. Less than a majority saw an increase in the market for condominium and time-sharing units and only 30 percent thought that the market for high-amenity communities would expand.

What constraints do developers see on their ability to serve this growing market for coastal recreation property? Most of the developers who responded saw very few, although there was some concern for growing government regulation. We attempted to get at the governmental regulation question in three ways. First, we asked developers whether delays in governmental approvals was a serious problem on their current land development project. Forty percent thought that delays caused by the Department of Housing and Urban Development were a serious problem, and 29 percent complained about delays caused by state agencies. Only 16 percent cited delays due to local agencies or the Corps of Engineers as a serious problem.

Next, we asked developers whether they thought there would be more or less regulation from various agencies of government. Seventy-nine percent thought there would be greater local regulation of development and 93 percent thought that there would be greater state regulation of development. Four out of five developers (83 percent) looked toward greater enforcement of those regulations that were promulgated.

Finally, we asked developers how they thought various types of governmental regulation would affect the land development industry--whether the regulation would have a desirable effect, undesirable effect, or no effect on the industry. We were surprised to find that there were some forms of regulation that a majority of these developers thought would have a desirable effect on their industry. For example, 61 percent thought that local zoning would have a desirable effect; 52 percent thought that building regulations would have a desirable effect; and 76 percent thought that sand dune protection regulations would have a desirable effect. Almost a majority, 48 percent, thought that local subdivision regulations would have a desirable effect. Here I should note that coastal developers were much more favorably inclined toward local regulation of development than were land developes in the North Carolina mountains.



While developers were more likely to see positive rather than negative effects from local regulation, the opposite was true of their perceptions of state regulation. For example, 69 percent of the developers thought state regulation of areas of environmental concern would have a negative effect on the development industry; 71 percent saw negative effects from environmental impact statement requirements; and 48 percent thought that the effects of dredge and fill regulations were unfavorable.

To summarize our findings regarding developers' perception: developers tend to view the market for recreational property as either stable or expanding, but definitely not diminishing; they tend not to have been adversely affected by current governmental regulations, while the exception of delays from HUD; they believe that the level of governmental oversight of the land development process will increase; and a significant proportion of developers think that local regulation will have beneficial effects on their industry. On the other hand, attitudes toward state intervention are not nearly so favorable.

The reason for increasing government intervention, of course, is concern about the potential negative impacts of recreational land development. How do local officials view these impact? To find out, we interviewed 146 officials in the North Carolina coastal zone and asked them about their perceptions of economic benefits and public service, social, and environmental impacts from development that had occurred in their jurisdiction. We also asked for a bottom line evaluation--had the benefits from recreational land development outweighed any negative impacts?

Before reporting the results from this survey, I should note that officials' perceptions varied directly with the amount of second home and recreational land development that had occurred in their jurisdictions. The more development that had occurred the more likely they were to perceive both benefits and impacts. The results I will report are those we obtained from officials in the counties that had the most second home development and where positive and negative effects are most noticeable.

First, let us examine the economic impacts of development. We asked about impacts of development on land prices, agriculture, fishing and jobs. Ninety percent of the officials thought that second home development in their county had led to general increases in land prices. More officials, 28 percent, thought this was a positive factor for farmers than thought development had had negative impacts on agriculture, 17 percent. The majority, 55 percent, thought that development had neither positive nor negative effects on agriculture in the coastal zone. A majority of the officials also thought that second home development had not affected the fishing industry, but a sizable minority, 42 percent, saw negative impacts. The key finding with regard to economic effects, however, is officials' overwhelming perception that second home and recreational land development was an important generator of jobs for their county. In the counties where extensive development has occurred, every official

interviewed thought that the industry was important to the county economy and 25 percent thought second home development was of critical importance. In contrast, in the coastal counties where little development has occurred, less than 40 percent of the officials interviewed saw the development industry as an important element in the local economy.

While second home development produces jobs, it can also result in an increased demand for public services. We found that local officials were well aware of this. Over 80 percent of those we interviewed in the high-development counties mentioned increased demands for police protection, solid waste collection, fire protection, planning and land use regulation, building, plumbing and electrical inspection, mosquito control, and health care for the elderly. However, the officials also thought that development was paying its own way. In the high development counties, 35 percent thought that increased property taxes exceeded increased public service costs while only 18 percent thought that revenue had fallen short of costs.

Officials' perceptions of social problems tended to be about three times more likely in counties with extensive second home development as in counties where development has been more sparse. For example, in the low-development counties less than a third of the officials thought that second home development had produced traffic congestion or increased crime. In the high-development counties, 80 percent of the officials mentioned traffic congestion and 68 percent mentioned increased crime as a product of second home and recreational land development.

The officials were also aware of some negative impacts on recreation. A major worry was problems with public access. In the high-development counties, nine out of ten officials mentioned problems of inadequate parking for beach access; three quarters were aware of conflicts between shoreline property owners and the general public over access to the beach; eight out of ten thought that overcrowding of parks was becoming a problem.

In the case of environmental impacts, a majority of the officials interviewed in the high-development counties were aware of the following specific problem situations in their jurisdictions: water and sewer not available and needed (85 percent); septic tank failures (80 percent); pollution of shellfish beds (50 percent); dune erosion due to lack of access ramps (80 percent); shore erosion due to failure of groins and other protective works (65 percent); primary dune destruction (53 percent); roadside litter (79 percent); road washouts and erosion (58 percent); and potential for property damage because of inadequate home construction (60 percent). These and other environmental problems resulting from second home development were about twice as likely to be perceived by officials in counties with extensive second home development as in those counties where less development had occurred.

In spite of the environmental, economic, and social problems that have accompanied recreational land development in the coastal zone, officials view the economic benefits of development as outweighing the costs. In fact, the more development that has occurred, the more likely officials are to view the benefits as exceeding the costs. For example, in the high-development North Carolina coastal counties, 85 percent of the officials we interviewed saw second home and recreational land development as beneficial for their county. In the low-development counties, 42 saw development as beneficial at this time.

As all of you are aware, North Carolina has a major state effort under way to better plan for the coastal region. In concluding, I would like to briefly mention how coastal officials feel about selected aspects of this program. First, about two-thirds of the officials believe that the program is fair to landowners and that coverage of areas of environmental concern has been adequate. Three-fourths feel that enforcement procedures give adequate weight to local governments. About three-fourths believe that opportunities for public input into implementation of the program has been excellent or good. Thus, the North Carolina coastal zone management process stacks up pretty well in a procedural sense. Local officials are generally satisfied.

We also wanted to know whether the coastal zone management effort, in the officials' opinions, was having any effect. In the opinion of these 146 officials, it was. Over 40 percent thought that environmental problems resulting from second home development were being reduced as a result of the coastal zone management process. A majority, 55 percent, could cite specific instances where they had used land classification plans produced as part of the coastal zone management process in their official decision-making. Finally, almost two-thirds, 63 percent, thought the coastal zone management process was beneficial for their jurisdiction; 29 percent saw no benefit; and only 7 percent thought the process had been harmful.

In summary, the data reinforce the fact that coastal recreational land development is here and more is coming. While it has produced negative impacts, from local coastal officials' viewpoints, the benefits far outweigh the costs. Finally, there is a strong management process under way which officials generally view in a favorable light.

DR. CHESSON: Our next speaker, George Rounds, comes to us from the Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers Trade Association.

MR. ROUNDS: I want to do a couple of things. One is to update the information given earlier about the survey we did on recreational boating facilities. We have been involved in coastal facilities since 1928 when NABM coined the word "marina". We project 737,840 slips, marina, or dry dock stack berths exist in the country. We estimate that 217,800 people are now waiting for slips. In other words, we have another 300 percent

more boatmen who want to put their boats somewhere. At the current minimal net growth rate and facilities, it would take 15 years to satisfy not the future, but the present demands. We also asked marina owners how many slips they could build on their present land if they were not restricted by zoning, environmental problems, or lack of cash. They replied, 422,000 slips, almost twice the present demand. We don't need to acquire more marsh, we don't need more water. If marina owners can just get their permits, we can build these slips on existing properties.

What is the situation in the Tri-State region? We project 226,000 slips and moorings in this area with 23,000 added in the past five years, not counting the 8,500 lost because the marina went out of business or was purchased by a condominium. You need 74,000 new slips in this area, and there are about 58,000 people on waiting lists for them. The potential for expanded slips on the Atlantic coast is 126,000 if we just had the cash, a 50 percent increase in the present capacity.

Demand is expanding infinitely. We don't know where it will end. But there is only a finite supply of coastline. Many nonrecreational demands compete for this space such as private homes, industry, ports and energy facilities. Some facilities need to be on the water, others don't.

Conflicts and constraints are present today in the coastal zone. Twenty years ago, they weren't there. What kind of solutions can we look at? The first is the authoritarian solution. The more American approach is the cooperative solution. In today's age of anxiety, cooperative approaches may be impossible, but they must be taken. It requires public awareness and education.

The alternative is the authoritarian approach which involves regulatory constraints, and constraints on individual freedom. Mass ignorance is another very major constraint.

We have got to simplify the regulatory process. We have got to more clearly identify the demands and use our options. We have to recognize that the doctrine of the greatest good for the greatest number doesn't hold any more. The time may be approaching when only a privileged few can recreate.

We should gear coastal recreation to those activities which depend upon water. Such activities as tennis, racquetball, and golf can be done just as well inland. We should talk about water dependent activities such as boating, surfing, fishing, and so on.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

FROM THE FLOOR: Is the operation of a marina a profitable business venture?

MR. ROUNDS: Yes, it can be, but on a national basis, we are looking at a three percent profit. At that rate, you'd be better off putting your money in a bank.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Rounds, you referred to preservation as a "non-use" in the coastal zone.

MR. ROUNDS: Preservation is a non-use except to look at. I don't, however, see it as a improper use. A non-use is a valid constraint or a valid competition.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Rounds, given the low profit incentive, and the high frustration deterrent, do you see any solutions for demand?

MR. ROUNDS: Yes, there are a couple of solutions. One is public development of facilities. As long as it doesn't compete with private facilities, very often you can reach a balance when the city or town agrees to charge equivalent rates. Another option is to combine federal, state or private capital. Another approach currently being followed in the Pacific Northwest is the condominium approach to development. You literally sell the slip to the boat owner.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Fraser, you mentioned the "action vacation." Have you identified the demographics behind the action vacation?

MR. FRASER: I would say that many action vacations require a heavy budget. But there is tremendous participation in places like Colorado. There is much less of this in the East.

MR. CHESSON: Our first speaker this afternoon is Bob Baker, Regional Director of the US Interior Department Heritage Conservation Recreation Service. Bob came out here after experience in the California State Coastal plan.

MR. BAKER: I want to address my presentation to those of you who do not represent government agencies. I've worked with the coastal zone since 1962 in California where the density of development is absolutely incredible. I'm not sure we made a whole lot of progress in the concerns that Neil Mingledorf expressed about the regulatory process. But what we come to these conferences for is to exchange information.

Let me begin, then, by sharing some basic information. At HCRS we're in the business of preserving natural and cultural resources of national significance and assisting state, regional, and local government, and even the private sector in preserving these resources as well as providing technical assistance.

What does the future look like as far as we are concerned? I have three basic perceptions. One of them is that at the federal level, and probably at the State and local level as well, governments will have fiscal constraints - will have to do more with less. I think we will see severe belt tightening at all levels of government. Proposition 13 hit in June of 1978 and has just covered the country like wildfire.

Secondly, things change so rapidly that our program will have to be very, very flexible.

Thirdly, citizens will be increasingly involved in government decision-making, and that decision-making process will undoubtedly take longer. There are some advantages to this. Perhaps developers will be more sensitive to the interests of the general public and plan ahead for the regulatory process anticipating public demand and constraints.

If we are to achieve the goals of the Coastal Zone Management program we must include the following components. First of all, we need more channels of communication; not just with various layers of government, but among federal agencies, and among state agencies. We all used to have a territory to protect. Those days of parochialism are gone now. Chris Delaporte, director of HCRS, in an effort to improve cooperation, has signed an interagency agreement with the Office of Coastal Zone Management coordinate planning assistance activities, encourage interagency cooperation, and coordinate financial support delivery.

Another example of the direction in which we need to move is the EPA's section 208 and 201 programs. This is a \$50 billion public works program to clean up America's waters. We need to realize there is

tremendous opportunity to become involved in this program as we can use it to gain access to rivers and coast, manage the coastline, and other fantastic opportunities for integrating our diverse public activities.

In terms of federal-state cooperation in the Tri-State region, one of the things we've done was to join in a beach access study with the South Carolina Department of Parks Recreation and Tourism (PRT). There are many other opportunities for us to join with states and local governments in expanding recreation in the coastal zone. Are there similar studies to the one I just mentioned? These studies now occur with a number of state and local agencies. We'd be delighted to provide technical or financial assistance to do similar studies with others. But if we assist you, the study will proceed with total involvement from all interested parties.

Certainly no one can dispute the importance of the coordinated federal and state approach to planning programs in coastal areas. But let's not fool ourselves, the real challenge and responsibility rests with local governments. In envisioning future programs, it is essential that federal and state officials know the capabilities of local governments.

We provide technical assistance not just in the coastal zone, but all over the country. I could talk about our programs all day, so I'll be delighted to talk to you about them and how at HCRS we might assist you. Thank you.

MR. MINER: Our next speaker is Dr. James Timmerman, Jr., Executive Director of the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department.

DR. TIMMERMAN: The South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department (SCWRMD) is acutely aware of the sharpening conflicts among the various recreational demands upon the state's coastal zone. The steadily increasing demand for recreation, residential development, and industrial development place ever-increasing demand upon the region's natural resources.

The SCWRMD is committed to maintaining a high quality environment in the coastal region. We realize that South Carolina's coastal zone contains more than its share of the state's natural diversity and productivity.

These environmental amenities require careful management and comprehensive planning to ensure that future programs will meet the recreational needs of the public. From our department's standpoint, I would like to explain our coastal zone recreation programs, look at areas to be developed to meet future demands, and some of the problems natural resource managers must address.

The state's living marine resources play a vital role in the coastal recreation picture. Sportfishing, shellfish gathering, recreational shrimping and crabbing are becoming more and more popular with our residents and out of state tourists. This in itself represents one of our greatest needs; finding out just how important recreational fisheries are to South Carolina's economy.

We know the economic impact of marine recreational fisheries is considerable. The latest available information (1975) indicates an annual per angler expenditure of \$210. Other information indicates a four percent annual growth rate of anglers in the South Atlantic Region. Based on this data, we estimate 248,000 resident saltwater anglers. Multiplying the number of anglers by their expenditures, we estimate an annual impact of \$52 million to the South Carolina economy. Even this figure does not include non-resident anglers, which we estimate at least equal the number of resident anglers, and other recreational fishing activity such as shrimping, crabbing and shellfish gathering.

Recreational shellfishing continues to increase in importance as a recreational activity. We have a number of areas open to public harvesting designated under state law. The recreational harvest is known to be a significant and heavy draw upon existing shellfish resources. We have not yet determined participation rates, the size of the recreational harvests or its economic impacts just yet.

The SCWMRD has the primary responsibility to manage and develop the state's marine recreational resources. These activities are conducted by a Recreational Fisheries Section within the Marine Resources Division. During the past eight years, several marine recreational fisheries programs have been developed, many of which have become a meaningful part of the coastal recreational experience for many individuals.

One state saltwater game fish program keeps records of the largest (by weight) gamefish caught each year in South Carolina. In another program, money donated by the South Carolina Saltwater Sportfishing Association paid for a game tagging program in which interested anglers received free tagging kits upon request. Various fishing clubs have benefitted from moves to establish a fishing tournament program. Biologists receive funds to verify and document all billfish landed in South Carolina. Under this program, anglers landing billfish receive frameable certificates attesting to their catch. With regard to surveys, we have conducted a mail survey on recreational shrimping, an economic and biologic study of the South Carolina pier industry, economic analysis of the state's artificial reefs, and a summer survey of fishing in the Murrell's Inlet.



We have surveyed 29 public and state shellfish grounds, posted signs, and published a guide to them. We've built nine artificial reefs with state and federal funds.

Despite all of this progress, many of these programs are quickly becoming inadequate as the demands upon these resources increase each year. Similarly, the number of requests for our saltwater recreation publications has increased to the point that our supply is exhausted as soon as we receive them from the printers. Other indications of this increased demand are indicated by the rising number of complaints we hear about the lack of oysters on our public oyster beds, the expanding number of scuba divers on our artificial reefs, the depletion of fish on our artificial reefs due to over fishing, the growing number of gill nets along the coast, and other similar problems.

We are currently expanding our recreational fishing program where possible and seeking additional funds to meet these increased demands. One of our greatest needs is to document the number of participants and the economic impact of recreational fishing in the coastal zone.

During the past three months, seven new state shellfish grounds have been designated for public use. However, many public shellfish grounds remain inadequate. We need a state oyster seeding program.

A similar situation exists with our artificial reef program. South Carolina's tenth reef will be built off Hilton Head Island with the sinking of the liberty ship Betsy Ross. Besides this new reef, no funds are available to increase the size of the other nine now in existence. We are also working with the state Department of Health and Environmental Control to develop a plan to utilize scrap automobile tires as artificial reefs instead of burying them as solid waste.

In anticipating growing conflicts between the different segments of the commercial and recreational fishing communities, we have prepared proposals to develop management planning profiles on certain coastal finfish such as sea trout, channel bass and flounder as well as for certain shellfish including blue crabs, oysters, and clams.

On the whole, the future looks bright for coastal recreation as it is becoming more important to a greater number of people. Our living marine resources are limited so they must be managed wisely and effectively for the benefit of future generations. Already, our services no longer meet demands. We have a lot to do.

Looking now at wildlife programs and future needs, we find the Department involved in providing consumptive and non-consumptive opportunities for the use of wildlife and fisheries. The department's Game Management Areas allow hunters places to hunt. All together, these areas comprise 61,200 acres of big game, small game and waterfowl hunting. In addition, many of these areas also allow for fishing for both freshwater and saltwater anglers.

The Department's Heritage Trust Program protects the unique environmental features and diverse habitat conditions of other coastal zone properties. These properties include the Santee Coastal Reserve, South Island, North Island, part of Cat Island, Capers Island, and Turtle Island. The department has reserved these areas for non-consumptive wildlife uses such as camping, photography, birdwatching, natural history, and other activities.

While the Department's main management objective is to open these areas to public recreation, the Department must accomplish this without damaging the resources. Given current land ownership patterns, in the coastal zone, we have limited opportunities for opening new land for public uses. Another management problem involves the lack of knowledge on the environment's ability to tolerate various recreational uses and how to design recreational facilities to limit their environmental harm.

While the Department is making every effort to accommodate maximum public access consistent with sound wildlife management we hope city governments and the private sector will help us by providing intensive recreation facilities such as non-primitive camping and day use beaches. This would relieve pressure on state facilities.

To conclude, I would like to point out that the SCWMRD seeks to combine sound coastal management with expanding public recreation opportunities. In essence, societies recreational preferences and resource management policies will determine the department's future recreation policies.

In short, the public is the key to all future recreation programs in all sections of the state. As resources become scarcer, the public will become more involved in allocating and using coastal zone resources.

For this and other reasons, the Department has implemented a state-wide public involvement program so we can get their opinions in order to tailor our program to meet their demands. Thank you.

MR. MINER: Our next speaker is Mr. James T. Brown, Assistant Director of the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. I might add that Mr. Brown received the Governor's Conservation Award in 1972.

MR. BROWN: This environment we talk about contributes many things to many people. Therefore, we must consider a lot of interests in our decisions.

For instance, in the case of marinas, we heard a little while ago that people were paying \$7,000 to \$15,000 for outright titles to boat slips at Wrightsville Beach. In essence, they are buying the public bottom from the developer who doesn't own it. A lot of people have been dissatisfied with this sort of arrangement and have forced us to look at the wisdom of many of our policies.

We know there is a need for marinas and for the past five years, our policies have called for marinas to be built on land. No longer can someone buy a half or quarter acre of land and build a five acre marina out in the water, thus consuming 4 1/2 acres of public waterway.

There are a lot of pros and cons involved in erosion protection. We think in terms of protecting buildings and houses. Sometimes this doesn't look to rational to a guy from Salt Lake City who is helping foot the bill. People resent paying what they regard as fantastic amounts of money to control beach erosion on private property of a relatively few, more affluent, individuals.

I often feel very inadequate as an individual, as I suppose most of us do, in planning for coastal recreation. There are many legitimate and often conflicting uses and a maze of federal agencies, state agencies, and local governments involved in the process. As yet, I don't think we've adequately defined coastal recreation which covers a wide range of uses. We have heard about demands from some users and we've experienced some elements of use - competition and constraints. In my own mind, I believe very few of us understand the individual and collective interactions of these users, of the competitions involved or of the constraints included.

To me, coastal recreation is anything that someone does in the coastal area for recreational purposes. It could include blue marlin fishing, skinny dipping, hang gliding from a ridge or even hunting bear. There is another type of coastal recreation I enjoy. I don't imagine that a lot of you have thought of it, but when I'm in New Orleans, I like to mix with local people and hear the "Cajun" dialect and the tales they tell. I do the same thing in Charleston where it's the "Geechee" dialect and a different type of humor. In my area, it's what we call the Downeasters of Outerbankers who have a distinct dialect and yet an entirely different kind of local stories and tales.

Although 54 percent of the US population lives within 50 miles of the coast and will increase to 80 percent by 2000, that's not true in North Carolina, and I'm glad. So far, we have an area that's relatively isolated. Even so, I feel that the native people in our coastal areas are being left out in this planning process - like the American Indians, they are being pushed aside. Any plans we effect in the future should consider these people because they've been there so many years, but because, in some respects, they are almost as much a part of the natural scene as are the Outer Banks themselves.

In planning for recreation in the coastal area, we need better and more all inclusive data upon which to base decisions. We must identify all uses and also consider the conflicts in these uses.

There are some things that you wouldn't normally think of as conflicts. For instance, maintenance of the Intracoastal Waterway (ICWW) for boat traffic conflicts with many forms of boating recreation.

Along the 25 miles of waterway channel through Bogue Sound, we have low lying spoil islands which tend to separate the waterway from the remainder of the sounds. Water skiers and pleasure boaters can really tear up a \$10,000 speed boat by running on to them.

What is the resource need and also the capacity of particular recreational resources? In recreational fishing for instance, what is needed for "quality of experience"? Can the resource provide this quality at present and for how long in the future? At what level does over-crowding of users themselves destroy the recreational atmosphere? In some areas of the country, these factors have already reached upper limits. In management we should realize promoting one use may destroy another.

Committees formed to study project proposals have done a really fine job, but I think the time is here when they have to look at coastal recreation needs in terms of one giant puzzle and find projects which fit into the puzzle. Some proposed research proposals need to be modified to better provide use interaction data. We can no longer approve or disapprove funding of projects without first looking at if or how they might be changed to better fit into the total picture.

Traditionally, there has been a reluctance to change a persons' project. The committee must look at how the results produced by projects will meet information needs. In the past, its been almost too easy to get money to fund most study proposals but almost impossible to get funding to implement many of the findings.

So far, I've been very general because there's so much to say and so little time allotted. However, let's look at just a few of the interactions and situations in my field of marine fisheries. I have already mentioned competition with navigation. We also have competition between fishermen fishing for the same fish, and between fishermen fishing for different fish. Most of them use boats and boat used by other boating enthusiasts like waterskiers are irritating to someone sitting still and trying to fish. The fisherman will look for alternative places to fish, thus putting pressure on other resources.

Many people don't think of oyster and shrimp gathering as recreational, but they are. Most of our commercial fishing licenses are sold to such recreational fishermen. We have learned more about some species such as oyster and shrimp because we have been concentrating on these species in our studies. Competition for oysters is so great that it has almost become a "put and take" fishery. Also, continued land drainage in the coastal area is seriously reducing oyster and shrimp habitat. Good shrimp harvests are now limited to years of little rainfall. Thus, we have a conflict with an otherwise acceptable land activity.

We need management controls. Controls cost money, but who should pay? Jim Timmerman mentioned the possibility of licensing sport fishermen. This is just one possibility. Coastal management efforts under the Coastal Area Management Act are just about the only mechanism I've seen which approaches putting the puzzle together. Coastal zone management gives us a way out, but we can and probably will still run into bottlenecks in various agencies. We often seem to have contradicting controls and too many autonomy within too many agencies.

As an example, let me conclude with mentioning the National Parks Service's effort to eliminate off-road vehicles on the national seashores. This will work to exclude serious surf fishermen from the more remote beaches (such as the 58 miles of the Cape Lookout National Seashore and the 73 miles of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore) as these vehicles are essential to provide access and movement along the beach. I won't attempt to go any further as the day is getting long, everyone looks pretty restless and we have another speaker waiting. Thank you.

MR. MINER: Our final speaker this afternoon is Mr. Joe Tanner, Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

MR. TANNER: I'd like to make two quick observations regarding coastal recreation and resource management based on my experience in the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. First, because the Georgia DNR combines all natural resources concerns under one agency, it gives us the opportunity to cover all issues from fish and game, to parks, to environmental protection, to historic preservation, to coastal zone management. With all of these things under our control, we should be able to deliver services to the public and solve some of the problems we have.

One of the things we've tried to do in Coastal Georgia is to do just that, do a better job of delivering services to the people. We created the Coastal Resources Division to better serve the people and the resources in the coastal zone. The increasing coastal activity has warranted this regional administrative approach to handling problems peculiar to the area.

Georgia is unique among eastern seaboard states because of its relatively undeveloped coastal zone. We have 13 barrier islands surrounded by 500,000 acres of relatively unspoiled marshlands. There are wilderness islands, and yet a few highly developed islands. We have golf courses and motels on the beach in some places, yet, we have some wonderfully unspoiled barrier islands.

If we view all of our resources as a whole, the potential exists to improve tremendously the recreational opportunities in our state. For example, along the oceans, beaches and islands, the Intracoastal

Waterway is a potential recreational resource. Presently, it is underdeveloped, and I can't think of any area which holds more promise for the boating enthusiast. Now, it's primarily used only by full-time coastal residents.

In Georgia, the Supreme Court has ruled that the beaches are public, has held that the riverbottoms are owned by the state, and has decided that the marshes are owned largely by the state. To complement this public trust ownership, the State has been fortunate in recently acquiring some of the remaining undisturbed barrier islands. Our latest and perhaps most significant purchases involved no Federal money. If acquisition can be accomplished without Federal money, greater discretion and flexibility falls to the State in determining future management options.

We face several critical resource management problems regardless of barrier island ownership. One among these is the management of our beaches. I am talking here about shore protection, protecting sand dunes and the natural flow of sand up and down a beach. Public ownership of the beaches to the high water mark does not by itself protect the dynamic beach system. Additional measures of protection are necessary. If not available, we may pay a terribly high price when a beach system is destroyed. At the same time, I don't think we should regulate private industry out of existence, or keep people away from the barrier islands and beaches. Somewhere, we must find the right answer. This will probably involve giving assistance to private owners in managing their land consistent with the public benefit. In addition, we must avoid situations where millions of dollars have to be spent to correct a problem that was our fault in the first place.

My second observation is that Governments will increasingly feel fiscal constraints over the next few years. Our Governor has told us we cannot exceed last year's spending. This means in real terms, a \$1.8 million cutback in our operations. I have no doubt that we all will feel the heat of Proposition 13. I believe the Federal Government will eventually have to live with a balanced budget. The fiscal constraints of the future will be a big challenge and will affect everything we've involved in.

In closing, let me say that in whatever we do, we should be careful not to destroy the resource base that makes an area attractive for recreation in the first place. For example, once a mistake is made with respect to beaches, one ends up with walls, concrete jetties, and unsightly groins which may never restore the beach. We must avoid these situations. My message, then is to simply encourage you to keep in mind that while developing recreational opportunities, protect rather than destroy the resource upon which all of these opportunities are based.

MR. MINER: I'd like to call on Gill Radonski, Executive Secretary of the Sport Fishing Institute.

MR. RADONSKI: I do not have a 15 minute dissertation, so I would like to throw things open to discussion.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Jacqueline E. Jacobs. I'm a professional biologist and Executive Director of the South Carolina Wildlife Federation. I served with the South Carolina Outdoor Recreational Plan Committee for one year and served as an appointed member to the Coastal Council.

Throughout this entire dialogue this morning and afternoon, I've felt very uncomfortable. I came to this meeting by invitation and have heard a great many people use the word "environmentalist" in a very slurring manner. Being a biologist, I have to be interested in the environment. I wouldn't be here if I wasn't. But I feel I am a rational, responsible human being.

I have a position of responsibility, but I think it is high time that government at all levels realizes that simply because some of us feel strongly that we have to develop wisely does not put us on the other side of the fence of progress. As I say I feel very uncomfortable with some speakers who think that if you care about how resources are developed that you oppose all development.

I think you miss the boat when you don't realize that we can all sit down and talk about some of the things that bother us. If we can't do this, we're in real trouble.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Baker, you talked about government cooperating with private industry in acquiring coastal land. How did this work?

MR. BAKER: To begin with, we worked with state and local government. There are a lot a philanthropic organizations and individuals who are very interested in preserving resources and providing technical assistance so they can donate the lands and receive tax benefits.

FROM THE FLOOR: Dr. Timmerman raised the point of having poor information on recreational fisheries. The federal government has recently devised a survey on recreational fishing, and I wonder if Dick Stone would describe it.

MR. STONE: We're really excited about the survey which will kick off November 1. One of the things that really excites me is its flexibility. Even though this is a nation-wide survey, we will be working very closely with the states to collect the kind of data they need to make decisions. During the course of the survey, if we see problems with sample size or something, we can correct our methodology in mid-stream.

To give you an example how this will work, let's say South Carolina is already doing some recreation fishing surveys. Here we come with our national survey. They can contribute money to our survey and get the information they were after with their surveys but with larger sample sizes and more reliable results. We will also work with other federal agencies such as the Interior Department and the Office of Coastal Zone Management to talk about continuing this over a number of years.



## PANEL SESSION--TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1978

MR. DEWY BENEFIELD: During this part of the program we will have time for some presentations we didn't have time for yesterday. Our first speaker today will be Paul Pritchard, Deputy Director for Programming of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, US Department of Interior.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'd like to begin my comments on "The Way we Think at HCRS" by laying out some of the premises we follow at HCRS. We believe we have four equal partners in all of our activities. Our first two partners are other federal agencies and state/local government. Our third partner is private industry, but we break them down into two important subgroups, the private non-profit and the private profit sectors. We consider these four groups the key actors in any decision we make.

We conduct our operations based on three important principles. First, is the need for leadership by one of the active parties. Sometimes the private sector leads best. They may want to achieve a goal just as actively as any governmental agency. Other times, a government agency may take the lead.

Secondly, we believe in citizen involvement. The private sector needs citizen involvement just as much as we do. Without market forces, there is not private enterprise.

One of the most important books I've read this year is "Reclaiming the American Dream" by Richard C. Cornuelle. In this book, Cornuelle suggests that the nonprofit private sector is the most important yet most overlooked American institution. Cornuelle mentions that as long ago as the early 19th Century, DeTocqueville concluded that our ability to form private nonprofit associations was the most important force in our society. These associations were the most adept at serving public needs and most responsive to public demands.

Our third principle involves respect for economic forces. Each of the four actors has some economic influence. Some actors have more resources than others. The point is that every economic action that one of the players takes will influence the economic actions of other players. Even when we at HCRS don't spend money to meet a public demand, this decision has an economic dimension, because one of the other actors may step in and fill the gap.

Having said that, I'd like to talk about HCRS' very small but important role in coordinating the activities of other federal agencies. We are aggressive about federal coordination because everything we do affects the other actors. HCRS' concern is to ensure that other federal agencies recognize their obligation to recreation, historic resources and

natural areas. We are not the only ones involved with these resources. Sometimes the best protection of historic resources, for example, comes from individual families, the other private sector actors, or state and local governments.

Let's run down how we spend our money at HCRS. First of all we have the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). In a given fiscal year, this could run from \$700 million to \$900 million. About half the money goes to federal agencies with the other half going to state and local governments. The federal money acquires, but not develops, new federal parks, fish and wildlife areas, Bureau of Land Management resources, and so on. State and local governments use their funds to acquire and develop recreational opportunities, natural areas, and historic sites.

The second source of funds, the Historic Preservation Fund, amounts to \$60 million a year. This is used principally by state historic preservation agencies for planning and survey work. Obviously, when you put all 55 states and territories together and split up \$60 million, you only have about a million dollars per state. There is a third funding source which is not really ours. This is the Tax Reform Act, Section 2124 which allows the owner of an historic site considerable tax advantages in exchange for the preservation of a commercial site.

A new funding source passed by Congress during the final days of the last session is the Urban Park and Recreation Fund which provides money for rehabilitation of existing parks and recreation facilities. The bill appropriates \$150 million from which up to 85 percent matching funds can go to communities to renovate their existing facilities.

Urban waterfronts provide an especially interesting application for LWCF funds. Other programs such as acquisition of railroad right-of-way rehabilitation can also qualify for funds.

Let me now talk about some other HCRS programs. In terms of being aggressive about achieving inter-agency cooperation, one of more important activities is developing Memoranda of Understanding; agreements with other agencies to cooperate to seek common goals. Other agencies spend millions of dollars on projects which affect "our" interests. EPA will spend ten to 20 times as much money in a year than our entire Land and Water Conservation fund. Many of their projects, especially capital projects such as sewers and wastewater treatment plants, can affect historic and recreational resources. We hope to use the EPA 201 and 208 programs to provide more recreational opportunities.

We are also developing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Office of Coastal Zone Management to better tie together coastal planning money with HCRS three objectives. We are also working with HUD, VISTA, EDA, DOT, to develop logical ties between their programs and ours.

A third Program is joint studies. A joint study conducted among 25 federal agencies led to the establishment of the HCRS itself. Right now we're working on joint studies of barrier islands and urban waterfronts. In terms of urban waterfronts, we are concerned that people have cultural recreational opportunities close to where they live. To us, the urban waterfront is a unique area where we can provide recreation and historic preservation. We also feel that barrier islands are a very important national resource. In our study, we have identified 200 barrier islands and have broken them down into those protected, those developed, and those undeveloped. We want to know how to protect all three types of islands. Even if an island is owned by the federal government, this does not necessarily insure its protection. In the study, we coordinate 20 federal agencies who administer 30 different programs, all of which have great affects on barrier islands.

To conclude, let me emphasize that we must cooperate. We should have no more confrontations but instead understand our mutual needs. We are all in the business of protecting resources and making them available to the public. In the Southeast, the South Carolina and the SCORP HCRS Exchange Council have shown what can be done through cooperation. Many Southeastern private developers have also demonstrated the sort of leadership we need. The Georgia Department of Natural Resources and the State of Florida have shown creative ways of protecting natural resources. We should remember the words, "We have no eternal friends or perpetual allies. The only things that are perpetual and eternal to us are our goals and our ideals."

MR. BENEFIELD: Before we proceed, are there any question for Paul?

FROM THE FLOOR: Could you explain the relationship between HCRS and the National Park Services?

MR. PRITCHARD: HCRS is one of the agencies under the Assistant Secretary for Fish Wildlife and Parks. The Fish and Wildlife Service, the Park Service, and HCRS are all equal services under this Assistant Secretary.

MR. BROWN: I understand the Parks Service is preparing management plans for the Outer Banks areas. Is HCRS reviewing these plans?

MR. PRITCHARD: We aren't just yet. A hard review will occur when federal money is requested. When federal dollars from the Land and Water Resource Conservation fund are identified as needed by the Park Service, then we review the plans and report to the assistant Secretary.

MR. BROWN: Does this mean it is too late for citizen participation in this study?

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't deny it. We assume that public participation has already occurred at that level.

MR. BROWN: To assume that public participation has already occurred when you review a funding request seems like a sort of daydream. Most people don't know what a wilderness designation is.

MR. PRITCHARD: The dilemma we have is that we don't have enough personnel to cover all federal programs. Given the resources we have, it is difficult for us to be involved as much as we would like to be. But I wonder if it is a good thing for agencies to be constantly looking over each other's shoulders. I'd rather see the other actors I described seeing whether things were right or wrong.

MR. BROWN: If someone doesn't criticize, things can get out of hand. In the sections of the barrier island study I've read, things seem jumbled and it looks like it needs someone to go through it, checking for accuracy. I found three different dates for the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore over 151 pages.

MR. PRITCHARD: We are very much aware of the editing that will be needed. Still we find ourselves in a dilemma. We welcome advice, but often are under pressure to get something out quickly. In this case, we thought initial reactions from people were more important than editing.

MR. BROWN: The biggest problem here is that a reviewer will let things go because thorough reviews take a lot of time. If the reviewer had really had time to look closely, he would admit that more changes were necessary.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm not sure there's a simple answer to this. The Department has just not developed agency-wide public participation criteria. That's one way to solve this problem. Another is through the political process. When people feel that they aren't being heard, they find other ways of reaching us. We see it in the number of Congressional letters we receive.

FROM THE FLOOR: One of the problems I've had is with the bureaucratic process. If you don't feel happy with a response, do you write a higher authority? The letters will go right back to the person who gave you an unacceptable response in the first place.

MR. PRITCHARD: One of the most effective means is the Congressional letter. Every federal agency responds to a letter from Congress. But I should recommend this as a last resort.

DR. JACOBS: One of the big problems I see is public apathy. They feel a little bit intimidated about getting involved. I think we need new ways of communicating with people. Hearings are incredibly ineffective in my estimation because when you go to hearings, everything has been decided anyway.

MR. PRITCHARD: Let me suggest that you pick up a document entitled "Public Participation" issued by the White House, which explains the various tools federal agencies use in stimulating public participation. It is difficult for us in the executive branch to give a simple approach to this problem. I do think your statement is excellent. The two examples with which I am most familiar are the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Both programs to take decision making to the local level. In terms of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we do not undertake projects which are not first suggested at the local level. That's where all the proposals come from.

MR. BENEFIELD: Our next panel will address the topic "Coastal Recreation and Opportunities for Future Interaction." We'll hear first from Rick Cothran, Chief of the Coastal Zone Management Section, Coastal Resources Section, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

MR. COTHRAN: We've been involved with the Coastal Zone Management program in Georgia for about four years. I've been working with local governments and struggling with citizen input. Everywhere I go, people are concerned about public participation, but it's one of the most difficult things to handle.

Our management system will allow us to do what I think is the most important aspect of CZM, and that is taking government to the people. To me, that's what CZM is all about; serving the people, making things better for the local citizens, helping local governments, protecting the resources, providing recreational opportunities, and working with port authorities and planning agencies.

We have had problems in our state, with many people even our own department seeing coastal zone management as a threat. Slowly but surely, we are beginning to convince people in our own agency, other state agencies and local governments that coastal zone management should be seen as an opportunity instead of a threat.

This year, we received our final CZM planning grant and also received two waterfront development grants and a coastal fisheries management study grant. Through these grants, we believe we will really deliver some services to local government.

Another important aspect of coastal zone management is the relationship between the states and outer continental shelf oil and gas development. To me, one of the more important OCZM programs is the Coastal Energy Impact Program. I recently read that Congress might separate CEIP from Coastal Zone Management. This would create problems since states must now participate in the Coastal Zone Management Program to receive CEIP grants. States have become very interested in CZM with CEIP as an incentive.

I am glad to see Memoranda of Understanding being developed with federal agencies arranged through the Office of Coastal Zone Management. We are finally beginning to build the coastal zone constituency everybody says we haven't had.

As far as recreation goes, our local governments have spent some of their Coastal Zone Management funds on limited recreation planning, but we still haven't coordinated our recreation programs as much as we should in Georgia. We need to see much more interaction between our own department and other people addressing coastal recreation problems in the recreation sphere. The three states represented at this conference each are geographically unique and have different problems. You just can't apply a single solution to these states' recreation problems.

For instance, the state or federal government owns most of Georgia's barrier islands and we receive a lot of criticism for not allowing public access to them. Each island is different, and when we talk about access, we are talking about several kinds of access. Access to the beaches of remote islands is one problem. Access to beaches on islands with causeways is not so much an access problem as it is a parking problem.

Another problem is taxation. Georgia's tax assessors often tax for what appears as the highest, best use of the land rather than current use. Lands which are currently green spaces are being developed much more rapidly than they would be if they were taxed more equitably.

There is one thing I would like to emphasize. Coastal recreation opportunities are different from inland recreation opportunities and they need to be evaluated differently. I don't think you can treat coastal and inland recreation the same from any aspect. Thank you very much for having us here.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am wondering if you are running into any problems with the consistency of the National Flood Insurance Administration. In North Carolina we designated inlet and coastal erosion hazard areas. We can pretty well predict that there will be problems in a relatively short time. This requires a permit to develop within so many feet of the ocean front or an inlet. Yet the Federal Insurance program can turn around and use tax dollar base to guarantee an insurance policy on a house that is built in an area that probably won't be there four years from now. It seems inconsistent for the federal government to provide this insurance.

MR. BROWN: We have flood insurance people in our program, and they promised us relief from this situation. The last thing they told me was they decided they didn't want to back down on the policies they had already issued.

MR. COTHRAN: My personal opinion is that federal flood insurance is a direct contradiction to what Coastal Zone Management is all about.

FROM THE FLOOR: Have you heard anything from the Georgia Conservancy about trying to keep people from fishing for either a quarter or half mile from shore from Cumberland Island?

MR. COTHRAN: I really don't know the inner workings of the situation there, but it is my understanding that the National Park Services only own the highland and the state still maintains its claim to the marshes and the beaches.

FROM THE FLOOR: They will run you off the beaches there.

MR. COTHRAN: They will run you off the creeks too, but I believe we have worked out an agreement to tell them they can't do that. Here we have a conflict between user groups.

MR. BENEFIELD: Our next panelist is Dave Owens, Director of Planning and Technical Services, North Carolina Office of Coastal Management, Department of Natural Resources in Community Development.

MR. OWENS: I am going to briefly lay out the framework of what we've been doing recently and then sit down and listen to what people in the audience think we should be doing about these problems. Since Dr. Chesson already covered the general North Carolina program, I will cover recreation in the state's coastal zone.

The North Carolina program differs from South Carolina's and Georgia's somewhat in that our legislation was passed in 1974 and has already received Federal approval. The concerns that led to its passage in many respects predated the federal Coastal Zone Management Act. In some ways, we have had trouble trying to fit the two together. When the North Carolina Act was passed in 1974, we didn't have to fight to get people's attention. Sometimes I wish it was just the opposite. When the legislature comes to town, we sometimes felt like just sitting under our desks and hope nothing monumental comes along.

Several activities we have underway concern recreation. First, we are now revising our local planning guidelines. As part of this, we are attempting a major evaluation of how well the local plans are working, including their use to local decision makers, their use to the state permitting process and their value as a guide to state and federal investment decisions. This evaluation will lead to a revision of our guidelines in terms of what the state will require localities to address in their local plans.

Our program states that provision of access is primarily a local responsibility. When we initiated the local grant program this year, we received no funding requests for recreational planning or access. We took advantage of a delay in the federal approval cycle to develop some new guidelines to establish priorities for local grant money.

In these new guidelines we identified beach access as a fairly high priority issue. We also set the matching level of the grant on a sliding scale ranging from 100 percent funding of the highest priority projects down to 50 percent. We thought this would be a useful incentive to get people to address high priority issues while leaving it to them to decide whether they really wanted to get into it. Under this program, we are now making preliminary decisions on these grant requests. We will tentatively fund ten projects for beach access planning and development totalling \$43,000, three waterfront park projects totalling \$11,000, and three urban waterfront projects totalling \$9,000 for a grand total of \$83,867, almost a quarter of our local grant money. I think this is an interesting example of how with a little incentive you can get people to address these issues.

In addition to revising our local planning guidelines, we are now to revising our Areas of Environmental Concern Guidelines. We are more than midway through revising our estuarine shoreline guidelines. This whole process provides an opportunity for people to look at our AEC guidelines to see if we are unduly constraining recreational development, or if on the other hand we are allowing inappropriate development in hazard areas. Our program has been in existence long enough for us to ask ourselves if it is really working.

One final thing I would like to mention is that there are a number of related non recreational issues we handle. We have a lot of responsibilities in environmental protection, economic development, and so on. All of these things are hard to balance, but they all have an effect on recreational development.

To conclude, let's recognize it's easy to go to a conference and talk about coordination, but it is much more difficult to put it into practice. It is difficult to find time to eat lunch with other people in government much less work out detailed Memoranda of Understanding with them. With all the issues we work with and the pressures we face, coordination frequently exists more as rhetoric than practice. I would be most interested in specifically hearing how we can do a better job with the federal government, with Sea Grant, or whoever to work on these issues, but unless an issue a pressing problem, it is unlikely that it will be addressed except in a very general way. With that thought, I'll just sit down and ask for help.

MR. BENEFIELD: Our next panelist needs no introduction. Let me give you Dr. Wayne Beam, Executive Director of the South Carolina Coastal Council.

DR. BEAM: I would like to give you a very brief overview of the South Carolina Coastal program. We now have preliminary approval from the Office of Coastal Zone Management and are well on the way of achieving section 306 approval sometime in 1979. I would also like to reiterate that we have some strong support in the General Assembly and other interest groups including environmentalists and local governments.



Let me make a few comments about intergovernmental coordination. In South Carolina, our program does not try to take over the responsibilities of other agencies. We do make other agencies a little nervous from time to time, because we expect them to administrate their programs very vigorously. To date, we have signed memoranda of agreement with 14 other agencies and have about three more to go.

I believe these agencies realize the important role they play in making this a successful coastal management program. I would especially like to mention Parks, Recreation and Tourism, and the SCORP Exchange Council for their cooperation on recreational concerns.

I'd like to say a couple of things about public involvement. I know public involvement is difficult to quantify. In South Carolina we set up eight coastal citizens working groups in the eight coastal counties. We have one inland county working group to consider the interests of the people in the state's 38 inland counties. We also have an advisory committee of citizens and experts on erosion, beach access and energy facility siting.

I believe we have adequate public involvement in the program. We could have gotten by with a lot less involvement, but that is not the way we designed the program. The future program will reflect this philosophy that the public should be involved in formulating the coastal management program.

We are already considering some issues and permits which will affect coastal recreation. We have issued one fairly sizable marine permit on Bohicket Creek in Charleston County. We have some local people who didn't believe that this was the best place for a marina, while others just as forcefully agreed with us. The matter is now under litigation, and will stand as a precedent setting example in regards to the future of marinas. I expect a lot of controversy with some other marina permits especially those accommodating 200, even 300, slips.

All things considered, we are hopeful that we are developing a viable coastal program.

I would like to thank three members of my staff who helped put on this conference; Miss Julie Wright and Mrs. Linda Brechko who helped with registration, and Ken Klyce who handled press relations.

MR. BENEFIELD: This concludes our formal presentation. We will now open the floor to final questions or discussion.

FROM THE FLOOR: Paul, in your discussion of the Urban Park and Recovery Act, how can we influence the definition of 'urban' to include rural North Carolina so that the people there can receive grant funds.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is an important issue. Many times people overlook the basic language of a law, especially when it involves money. If you look at the legislation, you will find Congress specified that this bill will help major urban areas. So where do you go? You go back to Congress.

MR. COTHRAN: Paul, could you and Dallas address how the Urban Waterfront Redevelopment and the OCZM urban waterfront programs dovetail?

MR. PRITCHARD: Both our agencies have been working on this for over a year, and there have been several areas of progress. One was drafting of a Memoranda of Understanding. We are also trying to coordinate our environmental evaluation activities in this and trying to work together to better serve these areas.

MR. MINER: OCZM has very little opportunity for land acquisition. We do have management capabilities which can be linked with other federal agencies through consistency.

MR. BROWN: I have some concerns about access. Our coastal management has conditioned a number of grants on provision of public access to resources. The Corps of Engineers has long required providing public access in areas benefitting from erosion control projects. This does clear up a lot of questions about who owns and controls the shoreline, but we're still talking about a gray area. Since we have the time, can we discuss this?

MR. MINER: I think many states, particularly the Great Lakes states, who don't have much in the way of acquisition funds, have looked at many other opportunities for providing public access. Conservation easements and so forth can work very well in some areas. But it often works well where the property owner are not going to develop anywhere and have no particular reason to request a conservation easement to lower their tax rate. It is another matter to convince property owners to provide public access.

MR. BROWN: These property owners we are referring to are in imminent danger of losing everything to erosion, so they become quite eager about providing access. We have state funds for erosion assistance that don't involve federal money. Through CZM program and CAMA permit we have incorporated an easement requirement so the public gets something out of erosion control.

MR. MINER: On the West Coast, perhaps more so than here, they are conditioning development permits on provision of public access. I believe as coastal resources become more and more scarce, there will be more trade offs of this kind between the public and private sectors. There are East Coast states with as little as one percent of their coastline open to public access which may become more interested in transactions like that.

MR. FEEHAN: Thank you, Dallas. The problem is with the dry sand beaches. In order to get to the beach, you have to have the dry sand beach and some economic right to use it. If you own land on it, or rent it, this enables you to use the beach in front of the facility, like the beach in front of this hotel. It sounds like quite a problem if the shorefront owner owns the beach to mean high tide line. Private owners can use their dry sand ownership to deny access to that part of the beach in public ownership below this line.

DR. JACOBS: I don't think this is a problem at Myrtle Beach. There are access points up and down the beach and there has never been any attempt to keep people from using the beach. It is considered public domain and has been that way for years and years.

MR. FEEHAN: I own a house at Bethany Beach, Delaware. Under Delaware law, the shorefront owner owns down to mean high tide. But there is no effort to keep the public off the dry sand beach. Maybe ownership in these cases is more theoretical than real.

MR. BROWN: In Oregon, the legislature passed a bill seven years ago granting the public rights to the beach above high water, even though the property is in private hands. They've had bad problems there. This could become a problem here too.

MR. BROWN: I'd like to say one thing. The Coast Guard has jurisdiction over bridges and landfill and would certainly benefit from working closer with CAMA and the state permit system. There is probably more room for improvement in this area of relationships than any area I know. Often the Coast Guard rules quite differently than the Corps of Engineers. This is an area where we need more coordination.

MR. MOLER: I'm recreation oriented and there are a lot Coastal Zone Management people gathered in this room. I've heard Dallas admit that the federal Act does not really consider recreation planning. Rick said the Georgia program is not really geared for recreation. Dave just admitted that the grants he has received for recreation don't go far enough to solve the problems. It seems to me that the major program on the state and federal levels do not address one of the major functions of our coastal areas.

Somebody made a good comment about public participation. The Coastal Zone Management people seem to be putting on this conference to get responses on what should be done, but I get the feeling that we have been talking about coastal recreation for two days now and that will be the end of that.

I would like to hear a commitment from the state or federal agencies to go back and rewrite these programs. We are not addressing the effect of recreation on the coastal areas. I would like to have some sort of inner feeling that someone will put recreation into real contention than just say "Hey, we really appreciate your comments."

MR. MINER: Since OCZM issued the first grants to states in 1974, we have developed the management process to the point to where several states have gone from the planning phase to implementation. From our point of view, we are at a period where the process is beginning to take shape.

The Coastal Zone Management Act contains many references to recreation as an important public and economic use. We are beginning to concentrate on it and we have several options available to increase its importance. One is to go for legislative changes. This would not be impossible during this legislative session or the next.

The way the act is structured now, there are broad and even too general guidelines that states must follow to qualify for implementation funding. They haven't been specific, but that's the nature of the Act.

Our authorization runs out in 1983, so we will be working with Congress in the next legislative session. Should there be a continued federal program, and if so, what form should it take? Should it remain general, or should the government take some very specific initiatives? How far do we have to go? Do we concentrate our focus on permit simplification for example? What are our technical needs?

This is not a pointless conference. There is a purpose to it. This is just the first in a series of conferences we hope to arrange all around the country.

MR. MOLER: I think this conference was a good one, but let's not spin our wheels. Let's take useful information and transfer it into guidelines and address one of the major aspects of coastal resources.

DR. ABBAS: I would like to make some observations. My own particular role is a recreation specialist with the North Carolina Sea Grant program. Speaking for the national Sea Grant office is a co-sponsor of this conference, let me say we are committed to quality recreation programs. This holds true especially where grants to states are concerned.

If the Sea Grant program is not doing what you think it should be doing, put pressure on the Sea Grant Director and Advisory Committee.

Sea Grant is divided between education and research. We are not a regulatory program as we have no police power. We are strictly an education and research program. I would like to say to the CZM people, we are a sister agency; we are all under the Commerce Department. We would like to discuss the problems. When we can't do that, we would like to be honest.

MR. BENEFIELD: At the risk of prematurely ending this, are there any more questions? Thank you all very much.

## Tri State Recreation Conference Participants

Senator James Waddell  
Chairman, South Carolina Coastal Council  
116 Bankers Trust Tower  
Columbia, South Carolina 29901

Dr. Leon Abbas  
UNC Sea Grant Program  
105 1911 Building  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Patrick Doyle  
Outboard Marine Corporation  
P.O. Box 663  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

William Jennings  
Director, Division of Planning  
South Carolina Department of Parks  
Recreation and Tourism  
Suite 113, Edgar A. Brown Building  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Stephen Moler

Kurt Fanstill  
Parks and Historic Sites Division  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
270 Washington Street, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Ronald Stone  
Boating Industries Association  
401 North Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60611

J. Parker Chesson  
Chairman, North Carolina Coastal  
Resources Commission  
P.O. Box 1752  
Elizabeth City, North Carolina 27909

Charles Fraser  
Sea Pines Plantation Corporation  
Hilton Head, South Carolina 29948

Neil Mingledorf  
Isle of Hope Marina  
P.O. Box 14145  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

George Rounds  
National Association of Boat  
Manufacturers  
P.O. Box 555, Grand Central Station  
New York, New York 10017

Bob Baker  
Heritage Conservation and Recreation  
Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
148 International Boulevard  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

James Timmerman, Jr.  
South Carolina Wildlife and Marine  
Resources Department  
P.O. Box 167  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

James T. Brown  
Division of Marine Fisheries  
North Carolina Department of Natural  
Resources and Community Development  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Joe Tanner  
Commissioner  
Georgia Department of Natural  
Resources  
270 Washington Street, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Rick Cothran  
Coastal Resources Section  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
1200 Glynn Avenue  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Dave Owens  
Chief, Planning and Technical Services  
North Carolina Department of Natural  
Resources and Community Development  
P.O. Box 27687  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Wayne Beam  
Director, South Carolina Coastal Council  
1116 Bankers Trust Tower  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Paul Pritchard  
Heritage Conservation and Recreation  
Service  
U.S. Department of Interior  
Washington, D.C. 20240

COASTAL ZONE  
INFORMATION CENTER

