

**Attendees**  
**Southcentral Region Access Strategy Meeting**  
**March 4, 2008**

Len Lichvar, Commissioner, PFBC  
Randy Buchanan, TU  
Maurice Chioda, TU  
Loren Lustig, Boating Advisory Board  
Scott Bollinger, PFBC  
Mike Burton, PA Bass Federation  
Mary Liskow, Boating Advisory Board  
Todd Sampsell, The Nature Conservancy  
Bob Stiver, PA Bass  
JoEllen Litz, Swatara Watershed Association  
Lori Yeich, DCNR  
Roy Brubaker, BOF, DCNR  
Matt Beaver, BOF, DCNR  
Heather Bennett, DCNR  
Don Lauver, PFBC  
Bob Pennell, TU  
Mark Lauer, Izzac Walton League  
Dave Swope, TU  
Ken Undercoffer, TU  
Deb Nardone, PA Council of Trout Unlimited - Coldwater Heritage Partnership Program  
Wayne Michael, TU  
Lauren Imgrund, DCNR  
Jeff Johns, DCNR  
Randy Buchanan, PA TU  
Karl King, Allegheny Ridge Heritage Corp.  
Sara Dueling, American Rivers  
Chuck Winters, PA TU  
Derrick Miller, Fort Bedford TU  
Jerry Green, Blair County TU  
Charlie McGarrell, PFBC  
Mike Domain, Lancaster County Planning Commission  
Terry Hough, DCNR  
Debbie Bowman, Central PA Conservancy  
Gene Giza, TU  
Tom Ford, DCNR  
Meredith Hill, DCNR  
Laura Hawkins, Allegheny Ridge Heritage

## **Southcentral Region Meeting Notes Harrisburg-March 4, 2008**

Access is:

- |  |                |                 |
|--|----------------|-----------------|
| ✓ Opportunity                              | ✓ Unreliable   | ✓ Free          |
| ✓ Fun                                      | ✓ Essential    | ✓ Accessible    |
| ✓ Convenient                               | ✓ My job       | ✓ Multipurpose  |
| ✓ Public                                   | ✓ Vital        | ✓ Important     |
| ✓ Necessary                                | ✓ Desirable    | ✓ Controversial |
| ✓ Critical                                 | ✓ Limited      | ✓ Educational   |
| ✓ Important for<br>Economic<br>development | ✓ Needed       | ✓ Cooperation   |
| ✓ Valuable                                 | ✓ Future       | ✓ Available     |
| ✓ Expensive                                | ✓ Generational | ✓ Dickey        |
| ✓ Stewardship                              | ✓ Change       | ✓ Strategic     |
|  | ✓ Freedom      |                 |
|  | ✓ Privilege    |                 |

### **What are the current issues with the regard to access in PA?**

- Getting across Norfolk Southern rail
- Privatization and posting
- Appraising the value to capture the rights
- Campsites in long term leases especially in floodplains
- Ramp etiquette – managing multiple uses for user conflict
- Land owner user relationships
- Landowner education so that they understand what their options are
- Unofficial access points that are non-sustainable that need to be made official
- Parking
- Great fishing area creates a parking situation with local township which posts no parking signs
- Connecting natural resource protection like erosion control and invasive species
- Confusion between legal definitions – navigable streams and landowner rights
- Need more municipal interest and support
- Identify Organizations that can help landowners with riparian buffers, etc.
- Tie the community with the access
- Distribution of access
- Liability
- Improving relationships with landowners – education, stream clean ups, partnerships
- Locals fear of opening access to the public – it will be overused
- Education to address public fear of opening access
- Responsible use of existing sites – litter pick up, not vandalizing signs or toilet facilities, using enforcement
- Evolving use and capacity
- Development in greenway areas causing loss of access
- Can fisheries sustain increased pressure once access has been established?

## Southcentral Region Meeting

- The need for linear protection and not just point of entry. Anglers need to be able to wade from hole to hole.
- Mapping
- Looking at specific and the general

Is there enough access in the region? No

Is there enough access in the state? No

### **What should criteria be for new powered access?**

Need, public desire, resource quality, cost, threat of the site, opportunity, special situations, ADA accessible

How do you define need? Survey users. Look at access sites that already exist to see how they are being used (look for user conflict). Determine and describe upstream and downstream access.

Is there a standard distance between access sites? Depends on characteristics of the waterway (e.g. dams). Every 5 miles? Where it is ADA accessible?

Use, number served, motorized/non, existing strategic plan, relationship to other access, new or renovation of access

### **Define need/criteria for unpowered?**

Talk to people at boating shops to figure out what the informal access areas are and how to make them public

Target organizations like water trail groups, canoe clubs, recreation departments, coordinate with conservancies and municipalities,

Work with municipalities to embrace the resource

Tie access in with other restoration activities like dam removal

Make access a part of long term regional planning as well as short term planning

### **Define need/criteria for Wading?**

Get information from Local TU chapters, where streams have been upgraded, local watershed organizations

Landowner education about need

What is the type of fishery; What are the regulations for the fishery?

What are the access needs for the non-angler or for the occasional user or former user (people who are limited to participating because of access)?

There should be a kid's category – panfish

Stream quality, types of fish, accessibility to the water, relationship to other access areas, and existence of strategic plan

Wading anglers need linear access of a corridor so that they can move around once they get to the stream.

## Southcentral Region Meeting

### **Criteria for Land acquisition**

Ownership, strategic plan, relationship to other facilities, matching funds, habitat quality, Rationale for ownership being in municipality's name rather than non-profit? Will allow for ownership in perpetuity.

Does PFBC want to own more property? No, but it will take ownership if that is the only way to get it. Based on site by site basis. Best entity should own the site. Local group is the best because they can take care of maintenance.

### **Why are sites being posted?**

Bad behavior, parking, overnight camping, trash – ask people who posted sites why. Fishermen can shoot themselves in the foot.

Signage can help direct people to parking

Newsletters can provide information and education

People trying to make money off of fishing – fishing clubs taking ownership of stream beds.

Stocking patterns may help redistribute use – spread out the users

PFBC used to stock more places

Look at select streams and perhaps mimic Letort Regional Authority (LRA), multi-municipal cooperation controls Letort Spring Run

Look at potential threats to watershed when planning access

Parking used to be a way of controlling carrying capacity

### **How do you pay for access?**

NY state landowners receive some compensation from parking program at access areas

NY program has a steady stream of funding so that they can keep working toward an access area

Multi source agency approach in PA (PFBC, DCNR, townships, developers)

Visitors bureau can use money from visitor taxes to fund access

NY uses money from license plate to fund land purchases

Develop a list of uniform and coordinated rules between agencies

Attendees  
Northwest Region Access Strategy Stakeholder Meeting  
March 25, 2008

Sam Concilla, Commissioner, PFBC  
Kim McCullough, DCNR  
Kylie Daisley, WPC  
Tom Fuhrman, Lake Erie Region Conservancy  
Dave Skellie, PA Sea Grant  
Tom Savko, TU  
Linda White, US Forest Service  
Wade Ion, Harmony Borough  
Don Benczkowski, PA DEP  
Jack Williams, PA Council Trout Unlimited  
Dan Martin, PFBC  
Mike Bialousz, PFBC  
Jackie Kramer, PFBC  
Robert Nestor, PFBC  
Tom Edwards, PFBC  
Ken Anderson, PFBC  
Jack Kokavec, PFBC  
Jen Novak, PEC  
Davitt Woodwell, PEC

## Northwest Region Meeting Notes Meadville - March 25, 2008

Access is:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ✓ Exciting  | ✓ Expensive   |
| ✓ Our future  | ✓ Hard to define  |
| ✓ Best when done right  | ✓ Difficult   |
| ✓ Community development   | ✓ Paramount to use and protection<br>of natural resources |
| ✓ How we are going to get younger<br>people involved in fishing | ✓ New challenge   |
| ✓ Critical  | ✓ Perpetual   |
| ✓ Important   | ✓ Partnership   |
| ✓ Confusing   |   |

**Navigability question** – on a stream by stream basis. DEP maintains a list of navigable waterways. Understand the difference between navigable and non-navigable. Where is the line that shows public access? What can you do in the public access area (picnic, camp, etc)? Report needs to have a plain English summary of the laws – Cy Fox.

### **Conflicts between landowners and public –**

- Public is only allowed to trespass on the property in the easement.
- If PFBC can get the anglers to the stream, there are very few conflicts because the stream is usually at the end of the yard, beyond what the landowner considers to be their private area. Anglers have to stay in the stream.
- Time restrictions to access helps prevent additional postings.
- Success of Lake Erie Program due to law enforcement program. They respond quickly to calls and act as a mediator. Users think they own the world.
- Public access does not mean 24 hour access 365 days/yr. Most municipal parks and state parks have opening and closing times.
- Are there communication issues regarding regulations? Only option is to post signs and hope that users follow them.

### **Is there enough access in NW PA?**

Motorized boat – need more for Lake Erie? Latest statistics show that Lake Erie has enough docks and launches. Conneaut Lake needs more motorized access areas. Maybe need more emphasis on launches away from the lake.

Number one access that needs to be created is family access areas (wading access). Suffering segment – you can't just walk up to a creek with your family and wade, walk along the creek, picnic, etc.

## Northwest Meeting

Access for non-motorized boats

Desire for non-motorized access areas on streams and rivers.

Issues for water trail development: money, access areas not well defined, not enough parking, lack of other amenities, maintenance may be limited because of endangered mussels, special permits in Wild and Scenic Areas

### **Wading Access Criteria**

- ✓ parking
- ✓ water
- ✓ habitat
- ✓ restrooms
- ✓ signage
- ✓ connectivity (to highways, rails to trails, parks, etc.)
- ✓ shortening the distance between put ins and take outs
- ✓ emergency communication system
- ✓ close to state or township roads
- ✓ picnic area
- ✓ safe easy access (ramps, steps, access paths, not too steep, etc.)
- ✓ way from parking area to the stream so that people of different ages can use it
- ✓ need to know how far the easement goes
- ✓ clean, maintained port o johns

### **How do you pay for access points?**

- Grant money
- Need to think long term about maintenance long after grant money is gone.
- Look at other types of projects (transportation funds – rails to trails)
- PASPG (Section 404 permits) for pipelines or transportation corridors – require easements to be put on wetland and waterway crossings. Angler access should be tied into the easement. Developers are trying to get rid of these lands. PFBC can step forward and receive the parcels for free.
- Communities with master plans include access as part of their open space plans.
- Look at headwater streams to preserve the downstream water quality
- Talk to community foundation about the importance of this initiative
- County bond issues
- Townships can give money to conservancies for easements

### **Miscellaneous Conservations**

How do outsiders figure out where they are going? Websites where you can download maps. Direct calls to park or agency offices.

Are there different levels of access points? Range is from family sites to slopes that require people to crawl down.

Attendees  
Northcentral Region Access Strategy Stakeholder Meeting  
April 8, 2008

Jeff Prowart, DCNR  
Matt Marusiak, Elk County Planning Commission  
Alice Trowbridge, Northcentral PA Conservancy  
Elizabeth Lynch McCoy, Clinton County Planning Commission  
Wes Fahringer, DCNR  
Jason Detar, PFBC  
Brian Burger, PFBC  
Spring Reilly, PFBC  
Laurel Anders, PFBC  
Scott Bollinger, PFBC  
Mike Bialousz, PFBC  
Davitt Woodwell, PEC  
Jen Novak, PEC

## **Northcentral Meeting Notes Bald Eagle State Park - April 8, 2008**

Access is:

- |               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| ✓ Exciting    | ✓ Imperative   |
| ✓ Great       | ✓ Conservation |
| ✓ Complicated | ✓ Threatened   |
| ✓ Vital       | ✓ Endangered   |
| ✓ Free        | ✓ Challenging  |
| ✓ Critical    | ✓ Bewildering  |

**What is access?** The right to get to point A from point B

### **Motor boating access**

Is access sufficient? There are 3 dedicated state parks in this region that allow motorized boating on their lakes. There aren't a lot of low powered lakes. Some people don't want to put their boats in some waters because of the perception that they are dirty. There are some lakes that are currently electric only that can be converted to gas powered.

### **Community access points**

PPA needs to be included in discussions because of conservation subdivisions or themed subdivisions.

### **Strengths of access in the region**

- Wide range of experiences (urban and rural)
- Wild experience regardless of how many people are using it
- Water trails – Allegheny River, Clarion River, West Branch, Pine Creek

### **Weaknesses in the region and statewide**

- AMD
- Inconsistent regulations from agencies to agencies
- Example – Game Commission owns land, PFBC leases the access so whose regulations do you follow? Game Commission does not allow camping, but other agencies do. Possible opportunities for land swamps among agencies. Public shouldn't have to know all of the rules.
- Across the state, areas that aren't owned by the Game Commission should be opened to the public
- Multi-use conflicts – areas aren't big enough for both anglers and boaters. Conflicts on lakes between boaters and jet skis.
- Land owner conflicts with other users (like ATVs and dumpsites) but anglers, boaters, and hunters pay the price.
- Need for education and signage. So many bridges do not have stream signs.

- Signage can be overbearing. Try to do a lot electronically and have small and subtle signs.

## **Northcentral Meeting**

### **Opportunities for Access**

- Growth in urban centers – Sunbury, Lock Haven, etc. – grant money is available to encourage access in urban centers
- Limestone streams are a great resource that are being gobbled up by other sources. A very finite resource that is being lost to access and quality.
- There are enough resources that people can spread out and the carrying capacity won't be an issue.
- Control access by setting limits to the numbers of fish that people can harvest.
- Provide information and signage so that people know where to go and where they can spread out.
- Posting of land is an assault on principles.
- If there is a public investment to clean up a stream, there should be a public investment or plan to allow for access. Work with DEP.
- With the success of PA Wilds, the region should expect to see an increase in the number of people getting into the outdoors.
- Involve local elected officials in discussion on access. Outreach program to counties who can work with local elected officials. Use COGs.
- Need to capture input from WCOs

### **Criteria**

Don't have homogenous standards because you don't want every experience to be the same. Look at diversity of experiences. (Karthus – Keating stretch of the river should not be broken – wilderness area should be preserved).

### **Miscellaneous Conversations**

- ERIE stamp – only part of state with dedicated funding source for access. Would it be possible to have another body of water included in a stamp (like Susquehanna or Shad stamp)? Maybe interesting to try it on the Delaware to see if it would work. Would too many stamps turn people off? Could there be one conservation stamp?
- Is buying easements a good thing? When people start posting, more people will start posting. It is like a disease. In the past, posting was socially unacceptable. A lot of people allow free access. As we purchase easements, more and more people will want to be paid to allow access. Should look for more creative ways to fund easements – tax credits. Make champions of people who allow free access.
- Not all easements allow for public access (conservancies, agricultural, etc.). All PFBC easements require public access.
- Perhaps extra compensation for some of these easements to allow a corridor access – streambank improvements or erosion control.
- Tack an extra dollar to the cost of every license to fund access statewide.

**Attendees**  
**Southwest Region Access Strategy Stakeholder Meeting**  
**April 9, 2008**

Stefanie Chitester, Friends of the Mon  
Emil Svetahor, PFBC  
Lenny Lichvar, PFBC Commissioner and ML TU  
David Beale, Armstrong CD  
Ron Steffey, Allegheny Valley Land Trust  
Dennis Tubbs, PFBC  
Jon Lucadavro, Venture Outdoors  
Scott Bollinger, PFBC  
Mike Bialousz, PFBC  
Hannah Hardy, PEC  
Davitt Woodwell, PEC

## Southwest Region Meeting Greensburg - April 9, 2008

Access is:

- ✓ Partnerships
- ✓ Exciting
- ✓ High priority
- ✓ Income
- ✓ A connection
- ✓ Use
- ✓ Inviting
- ✓ Everything
- ✓ Unadvertised
- ✓ Limited by funding
- ✓ Desirable

### What is access?

Safe entry and exit to water

Legal entry

Connected to the community

Linear access to anglers (can't just get to the water, but have to move up and down creek)

Need access to access

Need parking

Signage (regulations, safety concerns, environmental issues)

Definition of navigability

Not all accesses have to be improved, some people like primitive access

Size should be relative to where it is (Pgh access has to be large because it is widely used)

Certain rivers have safety issues so signage is needed

### Is there enough motorized access in SW PA? No

Three rivers pool – 2 access areas not enough

Lock and Dam system would need pool by pool access especially if it shuts down (Allegheny)

Access on the opposite side of the river makes traveling to it difficult especially in areas where there are few bridges (Al and Mon)

Don't know what access exists on the Mon – people go elsewhere to boat

Siltation of some access sites have limited use (Cowanshannock Creek)

Sufficient access but Limited parking on Ohio River

Issues getting to the river because of railroads (Beaver)

Sufficient access in lakes

### Enough legal non motorized access? No

Demand is growing

Majority of legal access is PFBC

In Pgh pool, Friends of the Riverfront has access sites

Desire for water trail on Connoquenessing has caused the development of new access sites.

Many are on municipal properties. There may be informal sites that are legal on municipal property.

Trail groups consider river access on the Allegheny

Municipalities view the access as a liability issue

## Southwest Region Meeting

### **How do you get municipalities involved?**

Local governments really don't want more properties to be responsible for

Liability issue

Some municipalities don't maintain the site. PFBC gets calls about it whether they are responsible for maintaining it or not.

Long term O&M must be addressed

What do the municipalities really need for an access site?

Funding may be limited to land trail maintenance only.

Clean up from floods requires more immediate maintenance – can't wait for grant funding

Economic impact depends on the size of the municipality too. Some small municipalities don't have stores and don't have an interest in developing access areas.

### **Is there enough wading access?**

Access has improved because of the rails to trails since the groups usually own to the water.

Some places need more walk-in access

Smaller watersheds are getting locked in because of posting.

Rural populations don't like city people coming to their property.

Some people have posted because of rude behavior

People near delayed harvest areas like the special regulations because it takes the pressure off the property

Much of the problem occurs on opening day

### **What are the current issues regarding access?**

In rural areas, hunters, ATVs, underage drinkers, etc. may cause problems which will then cause people to post.

User groups on all lands create problems. Illegal users create problems (people dumping caused the property owner post, so the angler pays for it).

Angler may get blamed for things he didn't cause.

There is an outreach program to landowners who would allow anglers, but no other uses.

Private facilities can shut non-members out and prevent them from the access. No matter where the access is, there needs to be public access.

Is there a landowners relation program that is cheaper than an easement program? Gives people the right to exclude people from their property, but allows certain people in a certain area to fish.

Wading anglers who thank landowners and conduct clean up or stream improvement projects really go a long way.

TU isn't a fishing group, it is a coldwater resource group. The stream improvement projects will increase the number of fish in the stream.

Special regulations reduce landowner-angler conflicts. Basis of special regulations is due to resource. Is there something that can be done to reduce the conflict not related to the resource?

Maybe commission should redistribute the stocking so that areas near public access are stocked.

Not allowing people after dark or camping takes away the party atmosphere. Leads to less disturbance.

## Southwest Region Meeting

### **Do users understand their responsibility? No**

People don't want to learn.

Strengthening the water trail program will help – the free guides offer information about where they can and can't go.

New users don't know all of the information that they need to know.

Is there a way to educate people at the access sites without requiring a lot of reading? PFBC sites have signs up. Problem is with public using non-regulated land.

### **How do we pay for this?**

Let non-profits partner with the PFBC for access grants

Require a 50% match for non profits since they can use DCNR money to match

Wildlife stamp for all users – people who use state parks and forests and for people who fish, hunt, etc. – a method to get the recreational user to help pay for the resources. What do you do for enforcement.

License plate program.

Drainage stamp (Ohio, Delaware, etc.) – the problem is that you would need to get multiple stamps to fish in PA

Need political support to do many of these projects. Many politicians would see this as a tax  
PFBC gets funding from licenses, federal money, some innovative programs

Broader funding program for access other than PFBC

EZ Pass on larger boat ramps – Launch permit is required

**Attendees**  
**Northeast Region Access Strategy Stakeholder Meeting**  
**April 24, 2008**

Rick Biery, NTRPNC  
Linda Thoma, North Branch Land Trust  
Brian Wagner, Trout Unlimited  
David Buck, EMHR  
Lorne Possinger, DCNR  
Andy Gegaris, Luzerne County  
Dennis DeMara, DCNR  
Bernie Kiesnoski, PFBC  
Sally Corl, PFBC  
Kris Kuhn, PFBC  
Walt Dietz, PFBC  
Scott Bollinger, PFBC  
Jackie Kramer, PFBC  
Mike Bialousz, PFBC  
Davitt Woodwell, PEC

## Northeast Stakeholders Meeting Luzerne County -April 24, 2008

### Access is?

- ✓ Needed
- ✓ Challenging
- ✓ Opportunity
- ✓ Safety
- ✓ Complicated
- ✓ Critical
- ✓ Necessity
- ✓ Muddy
- ✓ Integral
- ✓ Expensive
- ✓ Good
- ✓ Connection
- ✓ Convenience
- ✓ Awesome (if you have it)
- ✓ Free

### What are the criteria for access points?

- ✓ Shallow; grade of the slope; ease of access
- ✓ Ample parking
- ✓ Water condition-level of difficulty
- ✓ Appropriate distance to next take out
- ✓ Public interest as to whether or not to put in access-public support
- ✓ Functionality-are the actually usable-a good site-appropriate site
- ✓ Proximity to population centers-
- ✓ Safety-adequate portage ability
- ✓ Partner willing to maintain facility
- ✓ Ample habitat
- ✓ Proximity to population
- ✓ Access to information-website, TPAs, PFBC, outfitters

### Is there enough urban access?

It is improving

Better use by the experience user

The perception of the river is/was negative. This is being worked on by other groups to encourage more usage by exposing more people to the resource.

### Capacity of access in the region (are there enough motorized access points)?

Depends on where (Harvey's Lake-could be improved)

There are smaller private lakes which generally do not allow public access

### Capacity of access in the region (are there enough non-motorized access points)?

No-there are needs along the river, small streams, lakes, ponds

Growing use of canoe and kayaking in the region-need access to accommodate this

### Wading access?

Could definitely use more

Upper Delaware should be a high priority

Go into an access point and open it up to fishing along the streams

PEMA-purchased areas because of past flooding-potential access here

### How should the commission go about getting this type (wading access) of property?

Condemnation

Be aware of what is going on in the local areas-purchase and easements

Increase education of land owners along the waterways

Develop a cooperative agreement between PFBC and the land owner

## Northeast Meeting

Need to focus on riparian buffers

Municipal planning code changes to provide more statewide approach

Link more with Greenways Planning organizations and land trusts

Talk to DCNR and perhaps partner for the fair market value of the property

**How do we pay for this?** Charge more for fishing licenses; combination of local, state and federal monies; bond issue (Monroe and Pike have done official open space bonds). Luzerne purchased the Theta watershed lands to add to open space; would anyone pay extra for a stamp (conservation stamp)? some but not necessarily the general public but need to work in flexibility people want the money they donate to stay local; could also have a check box to indicate where you want the money to go; pay for parking; license plates stamps

### **What are the biggest issues facing access?**

- |                                    |                                       |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ✓ Lack of funding                  | ✓ Privatization                       |
| ✓ Local operation and maintenance  | ✓ PFBC staff capacity                 |
| ✓ Lack of available properties     | ✓ Costs to the outfitters (bonded)    |
| ✓ Lack of local municipal planning | ✓ Launch permits are difficult to get |
| ✓ Potential land owner fear        |                                       |

### **Status of the existing launches?**

Muddy-pretty rough and makes access difficult

Signage is lacking

For not seeing an O&M staff they look pretty good

Port-o-John issues-vendors may not want to provide them anymore due to vandalism

### **Education issue revisited:**

PFBC trains TU & Water trail groups to educate landowners about riparian buffers

Use PALTA for landowner workshops on riparian buffer

Program developed to do direct outreach to landowners – i.e. Mailings to landowner

### **Miscellaneous conversation and questions to be considered when deciding access**

#### **locations:**

- Habitat quality criteria perhaps should be considered-the PFBC grants are access purposes not preservation of habitat
- If a site has habitat that needs to be protected, will the PFBC easements cover that?
- There are other opportunities outside of these projects that will cover habitat preservation
- Completed water trails (water access via water), do we look at where the access fits based on water trails or do we look at parks, trails (water access via land). It depends on what you are looking at and where you are.
- Main street programs; river towns are DCNR and DCED investments-and how to tie that into access to promote connections.
- Type of access (primitive, concrete, etc) is dependent on the need at the site.
- Should there be a “need” criteria?
- GIS will be used and all different layers can be added to evaluate the site-over lay of layers (i.e. PNDI, land trust, trail, etc)
- Do people know which access points require boats to be licensed?
- Are people using websites?
- Is handicapped accessibility a requirement or discussed?



**Attendees**  
**Southeast Region Access Strategy Stakeholder Meeting**  
**April 29, 2008**

Sarah Thorp, Delaware River City Corp.  
Lynn Woodwell, Lancaster County Conservancy  
Sue Fordyce, Schuylkill River  
Bob Fawell, SPHA  
Paul Racette, PEC  
Mike Domin, Lancaster County Planning Commission  
Jonathan Pinkerton, Lancaster-York Heritage Region  
John Shobert, PFSC  
AnnaShobert, PFSC  
Ryan Walt, PFBC  
Ray Bednarchik, PFBC  
John Buzzar, PFBC  
Mike Bialousz, PFBC  
Jackie Kramer, PFBC  
Davitt Woodwell, PEC

## **Southeast Region Meeting Reading - April 29, 2008**

### **Access is:**

- ✓ Rewarding
- ✓ Availability
- ✓ Experience
- ✓ Open to the public for multi-purposes
- ✓ Challenging Dream (Philly Area)
- ✓ Essential
- ✓ Experience
- ✓ Partnership
- ✓ Interesting Issue
- ✓ Free
- ✓ Very important (Susquehanna River)

### **Is there enough motorized Access in SE PA?**

- Yes & maybe
- Delaware is lacking – especially when shad are running
- Susquehanna lacking
- Motorized may be too broad of a term – just because its motorized doesn't mean any power boat is appropriate

How do we deal with this?

- Size the ramp and parking area appropriately
- Education/signage
- Good mapping – web sites, signage at put ins

### **Is there enough non-motorized Access in SE PA?**

- Need more on Schuylkill & Susquehanna

### **Who is responsible for (and does it) access?**

- PFBC encourages applying to DCNR to also achieve other opportunities besides just fishing and boating
- Should be government responsibility primarily → state, local depending on uses desired
- DCNR, local and non-profits doing it now – and sportsman's groups

### **What other uses are we interested in?**

- Trails/hiking
- Nature study
- Picnicking/passive recreation
- Birding
- Interest in access for public/families to simply enjoy outdoors and watch people fishing & boating – passive recreational opportunities

### **Is there a need for more coordination among agencies and non-profit, local government?**

- Most definitely
- A non-profit including an access in a plan cannot be funded via boating facilities grant unless a local government signs on
- Can grants work on state property? PFBC has not done this to this point (i.e. Curwensville dam)
- This coordination is definitely an issue and it is desired to see the agencies collaborate more – this should be a recommendation of the Plan to work with DCNR, DEP, PGC, etc

## Southeast Region Meeting

### **Is there enough fishing/wading access in SouthEast Region? Linear access**

- More is needed (unanimous)
- Locations – NC Berks

### **What areas are underserved by access?**

- The cities – Philly is prime example – new administration is focused on access now – needs to be well-guided and thought out
- Most towns and cities are on waterways and could all benefit from increased access
  - Is it high on municipal agendas?
    - Depends – some can't get to riverfront because of RR (i.e. Phoenixville)
      - Should we involve RR companies??? CSX is preventing access in certain areas! They have not been involved to this point but probably need to be. Involve PennDOT maybe.

### **How do we work with municipalities to better understand access? Should we work with them to educate on access opportunities?**

- Right now its an untapped opportunity – current municipal grants in Lancaster County almost all involved waterways which seems like a natural connection
- Simply need more communication – via Counties and municipalities themselves
- A municipal resource guide to access would have to address fears – liability, etc
  - Use case studies to illustrate
  - Schuylkill – study on the frequency is needed and not available yet. Maybe certain municipalities don't need access as one is right upstream and downstream
- Standards are coming out but are not hard and fast rules

### **What are the criteria for access of all types?**

- Safety (especially Delaware River)
- Appropriate sizing (see above notes)
- What kind of recreation do we want to support? How you design it determines who will be there
- Strategic plan – link into community facilities/development
- Best practices only when designing and constructing (standards) – sensitive to the environment in context where they are built
  - Impervious surfaces, keeping stream buffer, environmental sensitivity, aquatic/terrestrial habitat, stormwater concerns (especially in this Region)
  - Community concerns – link to CBD, trails, greenways, coordination with existing Plans

### **If you had ability to look at any considerations to overlay with access, what would you use?**

- Vehicle access
- Towns/communities – economic generator too
- Public ownership – long term maintenance is especially the benefit
- Strategic plans – greenway plans, conservation corridor plans – both directions → access should look at plans, plans should look at access

## Southeast Region Meeting

### **How do we pay for Access?**

- Reverse the pyramid to focus on non-motorized access since this is trend and you get more for the buck
- Licensing of canoeists/kayakers (launch permits) based on how many boats are owned → also need non-motorized outreach program as perception is PFBC doesn't care about them
  - Definite increase in launch permits being sold – more easily available now but it really needs to be one-stop shopping (outreach to outfitters so they provide right when the boat is purchased – bonding issue)
  - Simplify what people need!
- Show that the local money invested in match makes money in the future
- Bond issues – amenable to including access
- Donations via tourism board
- Specialty license plate
- Boat trailer tag – all PennDOT right now. Special trailer tag
- Check off when buying license

### **Is there anything in this Region that might be stamp-able?**

- Blue Marsh
- Shad stamp? Would be definite opposition in this area
- Conservation stamp for multiple uses? Would need a lot of education to make this successful
  - Donations via tourism board
  - Check off when buying license

### **Miscellaneous**

Confusing as to who owns what

So much – how do we communicate this to the public?

Arrangements with landowners to communicate where you are not trespassing

Explanation of navigable waters and public trust/ownership of bed of stream will be part of plan

Maintenance of access areas – Brandywine example

Maintenance costs is a big issue – partnering with local governments and organizations

- Look into cooperative agreements – what costs less???
- Adopt a launch program

Turn back a few key access points to local municipalities – if we are struggling with 300 maybe this is the way to go.

Evaluate the existing 300 and go from there

Maybe the access point is more for other uses now

Carrying capacity for the launch itself – maybe we need another because existing access is maxed out. Maybe we just need to tell tubers/swimmers to use this trail to get to water or use a different parking space.