

SWOT Analysis - Possible Action Plan

	Strength Helpful to achieving the objective	Weakness Harmful to achieving the objective	Opportunities Helpful to achieving the objective	Threat Harmful to achieving the objective	NMAC Proposal Ideas (PI)
Actively integrate non-motorized boater needs and participation into agency operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Education - to include Navigation Rules, OR law, hands-on & on-line, use partners > Develop and implement programs to reach and inform un-informed masses and casual/weekend recreationists > Educational classes for basic information - experience/hands-on? > Inform/un-inform masses and casual users > Sharing the water/etiquette/stewardship/ environmental ethics based on waterbody. > Etiquette > Education on: Environmental/Stewardship - Regional Approach > Media outlets - social media, blogs, clubs, organizations > Be the resource for all NM boating groups > Information on access maps - GEO mapping heavy use, facility needs, targeting outreach. Critical need for... > Mapping - access/safety/education > Safety issues - high use areas > Public/Private waterways access - landowner rights > Livery outreach/education > Statutes of "boat" and constituency (pool toys) fee tie-in - retailers/liveries 	<p>Good programs exist thru retailers, clubs, online - Overall safer boating - New on-line paddling class - OSMB has staff, website access - Use clubs and their events - Reduce conflict - Quickly disseminate information - Can identify needs/concerns - Use social media - Assigned staff - OSMB exists and legislatively available to work with NM - Infrastructure now exists to inexpensively create/update maps - Real time information - Data is a commodity - Streamlines data entry and operations which is more cost effective - Better use statistics - Some resources already developed - Demand for more safety/awareness/education in urban areas - Process underway to address issue in 2013 through pilot project (at the OR Legislature) - System in place - Best interest of livery to educate - Increase safety on the water, improved response - Change definition to include pool toys to capture this demographic.</p> <p>Attitudes of NM users that rules don't apply - Variety of users (whitewater vs. urban pool toy users) - Interest in participants of learning skills, belief that they don't need education/rules don't apply - rule-learning is fluff - Cost of education - Consistency of how rules/law are interpreted, translated and enforced - Broad audience, what racing rowers in a coached setting need to know is different from, say, whitewater boaters - Need a mechanism to fund - Differentiate defined boater vs. splash & giggle - [Boaters not taking advantage of the education- localized risks - cultural barriers - lack of resources - lack of internet access - Relying on others to disseminate information - Lack of interest - Lack of infrastructure - Compliance gained via LE and enforcement actions on the water - Generally a negative contact, citations - Can't reach all of them - New users every day - We do not have excess time or money to take on this challenge (hands-on) - Not really geared for the NM user - Who will teach? - No personnel or funds to do so - Need to train the trainers - We don't know who they are, so difficult to reach them.)</p> <p>Speed/wakeboard/PWC are generally not organized, get little education - Motor user attitudes - lack of understanding by motor users - (Increasing complaints - Near misses - Commercial complaints increasing) Limited funding for education/stewardship activities - Lack of staff & funding - [Multi agency involvement, issues get lost in the mix - Lack of staffing] - Too many yahoo groups to follow - Hard to get a balance...how much time do you put into it? - [It is difficult for MB staff to be engaged in every user group, club, or organization - Staffing and funding needed - Limited use of NGOs's] - Duh... - NM users do not use website or think of OSMB as a resource - [Lack of exposure and difficulty reaching the casual boaters] - Older audiences may not have interest or skills in on-line information sourcing</p> <p>Education on what the mapping provides - High chance of errors and need to edit - Need better promotion - Need consolidation of multiple resources? - [Need to make maps showing more NM access - lack of resources - lack of funding - Not as user friendly as some] - Lack of understanding of NM boat needs by motor users - Lack of understanding by NM of motorboat users - Navigability/Public rights - Outreach to NM on rights - [Lack of communication, separate interests for agencies, Uninformed public - We have no funds to do much more than sit on an advisory group] - [His or miss inspections - No easy way to access Livery data, location, etc.] - More safety issues/not required to carry PFD, etc - Hard to define/capture this user group - Difficulty on law enforcement - Collection mechanism cost and complexity - They are a user - Impacts to LE & facilities</p>	<p>Growth and acceptance of on-line learning - Increase knowledge/understanding of LE on NM craft - Expand/create one-stop website about NM activities - Partnerships, range of opportunity - Consistency - Make them more than a casual user, become a boater - Become educated, do more! - OSMB create standard for instructor classes - Regional & statewide knowledge - Engage retailers - Point of sale - Online media articles - Use events or situations to illustrate message - Capitalize on large events - Partner more with schools, clubs, share materials, more stewardship, partners, outreach using different stakeholders -Easier to do in urban areas - "Old school" boating clubs help promote safe/shared boating - Specific and localized knowledge, (Safety) - Sharing messaging from liveries/guides, etc. - Boost tourism/economies - Expand to include access/upland - Use partnerships - Working with schools, NGOs - Demonstrate a direct benefit for a fee - Create awareness of environment - Look for more opportunities/activities among varying user groups to share and generate interest - One-stop resource - Many! - One-stop resource - one-agency to work with for grants, LE, etc. - Partner groups; scout or school projects for mapping/signage - Create mobile apps w/real time information and user generated dialog - Can use technology to drive people to rural areas for economic stimulus/development - Create a one-stop website - Market outreach to NM as direct benefit of fee - Drive more traffic/interaction with NM boaters on OSMB website - Stronger NM education - Ramp etiquette outreach - Increase outreach on the opportunities available - Renters have potential to be buyers - Use to educate - Excise tax at point of sale - Education opportunity about the waterway and boating - Incorporate to require PFD - Safety benefits</p>	<p>Increased need for resources - Potential waste of resources & funds - NM users not be reached or use resources - Cost benefit - If voluntary not all will participate - If mandatory bureaucracy - Will NM user actually gain knowledge - Integrate all users and unify into a "known" group - boaters - Consistent messaging among all users - (Lack of interest - Waste of resources - Miscommunication - May not improve compliance - Overwhelming resources - Casual masses will always be the casual masses - Changes in participation - Do nothing - Casual users may not take advantage of information and opportunities - "Voluntary" information may have little impact on improving safety - Not accepted by the NM user group - Funding not available - Needs legislation] - Providing information that users want - Maintain changes/updates - Cost - Conflict between jurisdiction on who should provide information - (Restricting use, motorized days, non-motorized days) - [Access closures due to environmental impacts - Funding - Conflicts between user groups, environment organizations] - New technology is threatening to some users - Conflict - Turf battles - [Do nothing - Reaches technology savvy clubs, but misses individuals] - To be served well, it will take resources - Need for more resources - Be resource for the variety of NM users - Create bureaucracy - [Boaters don't want us - No government involvement - Lack of participation] - Lack of rural representation due to technology lag - Providing information that users want - Maintain changes/updates - cost - conflict between jurisdiction on who should provide information - [Maintain on-going funding - No clear path to identifying resources - Pay-to-Play - If the system is not user friendly, no one will use it - People without internet do not have same opportunity - No funding for expansion] - Don't understand navigation rules and operation needs between users - Public use rights and landowners understanding - [Changes or increased restrictions to ownership and public access laws as they relate to navigability - Many competing interests involved in this issue] - [Reduced funding, Livery no longer a priority - Reduced LE to monitor from field - Some are more interested in making money than spending time educating]</p>	<p>Move to green and move forward with paddling education - What do people need to know to be able to go out? And put that information out - PI - OSMB becomes the resource of education, website (no cost, already doing), Working with water trails, PI - Establish and Identify what is out there (i.e. outdoor schools, other education programs, YMCA, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire, etc.) Get involved with kids programs - Reach out to paddling clubs, retailers, liveries, shuttle operations regarding education, PI - Use the poster for outreach (after changes) - (possible program for retailers of a "certified store, keeping their customers safe on the water") - Billboards - PI - Establish a pilot project on chosen public rivers, class II or below areas...Deschutes (downtown Bend), Rogue (Baker Park &/or Shady Cove), & Clackamas (Barton to Carver area) surveying/educating people on life jackets, SPD & know before you go at access/launch points (different method at each site; retailers outreach, launch ramps education, surveys) - compare historical citations/warnings, what method worked, did citations decrease with what method) - Mandatory PFD wear?, begin the process - research bicycle rule in multinaal county.</p>
NM storage -Secure place for recurrent use.	High demand, potential for increased revenue - Can encourage boaters to take advantage of other things a town can offer/economic stimulus	Cost - Space - NEPA process (federal) - Lack of facilities - (Currently not available)	Continued awareness of youth diabetes/obesity - Links between water sports and environmental awareness - Can help disperse users - Look at/identify existing facilities for future development - Create additional user days - Convenience	Continuing loss of waterfront property to higher \$ uses - Can encourage boaters to take advantage of other things a town can offer/economic stimulus - Cost - Best use of space conflicts - (Expensive - Localized)	Half green and half yellow - step child to seize the opportunities - maybe attach to "user fee, user benefit -
Integrate water trails into a statewide plan	OPRD through 2014 - Consistent voice of the information	Overuse of an area - how should a water trail be defined - Inconsistency of the different water trails - [Can be improved - Lack of funding - Lack of staffing - Localized]	Needs to be updated/more distribution - One-stop website for users	Driving people to certain facilities will impact them and create potential for more enforcement - Users have more information than skill - More users on water with limited skill and understanding - (Potential for localized fees)	Step child to Education piece & seize opportunities - PI - State Parks has a water trails plan, partner with and bring a meeting together OR primary water trail associations - have discussions regarding the role of the Marine Board, who is the best to coordinate the water trails program, (funding is through the lottery money)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Promote partnerships with OPRD, local cities, water trails, existing resources (this applies to all Goals) > Federal & state working relationships > Support organizations - establish relationships with existing clubs/organizations 	Some partnerships exist for established projects (i.e.-Deschutes Mgmt Group, Willamette and Rogue River Watertrails, OR Parks Association, Outdoor Recreation Council, OR Public Ports Assoc., OSSA...) - Remove polarity and create collaboration - Potential to streamline functions/areas of overlap to become more efficient - Include NGOs - Transparency with partners - Organizations are established and have a desire to work with OSMB	Partnerships take work, expertise, and resources - Not enough NGOs - Diversity of NGOs mission/beliefs (promotion of PFD may not be something that they support) - Communication between jurisdictions - How do organizations get support from OSMB? - How do they get involved in various programs as partners - [Can be improved - lack of funding - lack of staffing - localized]	Stewardship - common goals - consistency - improved services and amenities - better communication - broader vision and representation - increase participation of non-governmental organizations (NGO) - Transparency with partners - Willingness for other organizations to work with OSMB - Continue to work together and seek partnership opportunities	Partners can sometimes be more work - NGOs mission/belief conflict - Status quo, or we'll figure it out ourselves - (Potential for localized fees)	PI - Establish an advisory committee strictly non-motorized, LE, NGOs...keep as only non-motorized until more established.
Law enforcement training and equipment on non-motorized crafts	Interest on the part of LE - Already providing this service - OSMB provides training	Lack of funds/training time - Always playing catch-up - Shunting, communication, officer safety - Can't always use a NM craft for enforcement because of efficiency depending on area of operation - Priorities change on a lot of variables - OSMB doesn't have control over who works marine - [Are we utilizing equipment where needed - Perception of lack of patrols - Lack of contacts - Shuttles - Two man patrols - Logistics]	Grants - Partnering with Feds and other counties for training - Can share resources for training - Whitewater training facility in Bend - See if there are ways to partner - Consistency of LE enforcement and knowledge - Educate LE on NM use & craft needs	Some areas need more trained enforcement or equipment based on area of operation - Waterbody can limit areas of operation/patrol - Patrols spread too thin or focusing on motorized activities - Funding support - Time to become proficient so LE does not endanger themselves or others - [Officer safety - funding for equipment and LE time - Increased training - Limited rescue capability and maneuverability - Limited radio communication - Increase response time]	PI - bring awareness and continuing education to LE Maine Patrol regarding NM boating, all aspects - PI - discuss equipment needs for NM awareness/patrols.

Increase outreach to and communication with all boaters user groups					
Signage at locations Varying types of signs (regulatory, safety, interpretive.)	Education/safety messaging, last point of contact - Boradly supported - Provide info on funding, ownership	Lack of funding - Remote locations = vandalism - Maintenance and the time it takes to inventory, replace, etc - Can become outdated quickly - Inconsistent messaging - [Signs needing updating/replacement - Standardize - Funding - Consistency with placement and messaging]	Schools or Scouts are always looking for projects - Non-profits, grant opportunities - Unified messaging between all waterway managers - Organized, consistent messaging - QR codes to a website	Sign pollution - People don't read the signs - Imply safety when changes happen - [Decrease in funding - No \$ for signs - Sign pollution - Maintenance - Variety of sites make placement challenging]	PI - Using NMAC for designing localized signage standard for NM - PI - assess current signs on launch ramps and determine the needs (dups., standards) - PI - Establishing hazard signs localized

Explore equitable and appropriate fees for non-motorized boaters					
Non-motorized boating education card - other states? (What if mandatory and no fee for card)	Reduce accidents, (?) Increase safety - Reduced user conflict - Mandatory Ed for motorized model - Lots of options for education (class/internet/hands-on/equivalency) - Phased-in enforcement (warn/educate for a period of time) before citations	Difficult to enforce - how do you address team boats, clubs and or race events - Voluntary - Law enforcement workload increases - Increased costs for data infrastructure - Implementation of NM education compliance would need to be streamlined so its more efficient for LE...can't efficiently look for compliance like motorized (a tyvek tag? Something easy to see) - [More staff time, but not overwhelming]	Increase LE presence - Create enforcement efficiencies - Learn about other boating uses and specific issues relating to non-motorized safety/operation - Partner for teaching/hosting a class - Capture user demographics and have an ability to communicate with them - Incentive for getting education (insurance, reduced fees?) - Voluntary (?) using a similar model to the BEC phase-in (& Homestay option) - Use partnerships	Reduced participation - Barrier for new users - Wouldn't pay for itself - How do you enforce when you have thousands of users on a waterway on a hot weekend? Non-residents? - Splash & Giggle crowd (need to be included-how?) - How do you present the concept to Legislators and how to implement - to broad of user base - not wanted - no mandatory - low priority when approaching a new relationship with NM - [Likely huge pushback, difficult to enforce, minimal compliance]	Goes to green and take out the word 'mandatory' - PI - Establish incentive based education card - PI - Seek legislation of NM education - PI - Determine what is required to be in the education program by NMAC
> Fees for specific uses - (i.e. amenity fees, based on impact?) Restrooms, parking, launching, etc. > Commercial/recreational fee - same or different? (charge differently depending on livery/guide/club/non-profit, etc.) Proposed fees should be different > AIS fees already apply - Will additional fees be detrimental? > Understand negative impacts of fees	Many are already in place, users expect it - Facility development through grants - It's not a registration - use it, pay for it at the site - Fees are variable from site to site - AIS model or other fee models in place in other states that OSMB could use - Commercial already paying through outfitter/guide & livery - Tyvek tag options already in place	Risk of making activity too expensive - OSMB doesn't own any facilities -the waterway managers' do - Some of the fees (Corps example), do not go back into the facility - Limited on the number of fees you can charge - Overhead costs for facility staff who do charge (and the enforcement component) - Don't want to run anyone out of business (fee structure is important) - Commercial already paying - Paddlers are notorious tightwads - users need to see that they are getting something for their \$ - Legislative aspect - Economy - Enforcement impacts - Fee burden (overlapping amenity fees) - Resources needed to execute - [Only pays funding where usage is - users not using amenities - creates more usage not intended for access environmental issues]	Access fees go into maintenance - Greater ability to collect data on use from how the fee is captured (type of user) - Fair & equitable depending on the entity - Fee for the person, not the boat - Begin charging to register liveries - Follow AIS sliding scale on rate - AIS tag could morph into NMB tag including AIS - Users need to know the benefits for the fee - Where the \$\$\$ goes - "Taxation with representation" - Educate about where fees go and how it benefits the users - Positive PR campaign	Fees are variable from site to site...may drive overflow to non-fee areas - Liveries - Reduced number of liveries/financial impact - Depends upon structure per person, per use day, per boat it could become burdensome to commercial - Fair to little and big business - In short term push back - Long term OK - Decrease recreational activity - I've always done it why pay - Low environmental impact - Not like a motorboat - Privacy concerns - Not different fees based on length - Don't penalize for multiple boats - Less use of the site - Non-compliance - Push back from users - [Regionalized dispersed funding - environmental issues - enforcement issues - users not using amenities (go around) - Capacity issues]	Fees based on boat - PI - More exploration of fees for OR boaters - Spring of next year needs to have a determination
> Explore equitable and appropriate fees for non-motorized boaters - Grants (in lieu of fees) > Casual boater fees > Equal fees for masses - groups fees, boy scouts, church groups, etc.	Broad array of sources - Federal, non-profit grants - Less controversial, feel-good and promotable - Like AIS Program transferable to multiple boats - Administratively simple - Day use fee or year around fee - Increase safety on the water - Improved response	Most are under-funded - Competitive and can't depend on these funds - Huge workload to apply and meet grant reporting requirements - One-time grants - Match requirements can be limiting - Can only apply for government, eligible grants - Rec. paddlers are cheap - Enforcement, staff - Pool toys not paying - Hard to reach "pool toy" crowd - The once-a-year user etc. - Non-profit groups (universities, churches) - More safety issues/not required to carry PED, etc. - Difficult to achieve an excise tax and actually get the fee back to OSMB - [Increase time involved & administration - Strings attached - Staff time]	Offset potential fees (?) Leveraging other resources and partnering with other entities - Opportunities for non-profits - Inventory non-profits working in boating-related grants and see where OSMB can partner/leverage - OSMB as an intermediary - between Fed/non-profits and create more partnerships (facilities for non-motorized) - Collect information about who the NM users are - Create structure through a funding mechanism - Create equity by having NM pay for what they use - Wait fee to benefit NM needs - Programs like sto-park to model - Already have distribution network (AIS) - Establish structure for all groups - Excise tax at point of sale (at manufacturer level, similar to angling tackle tax) - Education opportunity about the waterway and boating - Be able to provide more LE services to NM	Unreliable source of income/sustainable lot of variables depending on the economy - Change - Push back - Principal, regardless of amount - Already getting stuff now - Discouragement - Low income - [Competition - Inconsistency of funding - Undependable funding - Need for matching funds - Timing restrictions - Usage restrictions - Staffing]	

Balance the needs of motorized and non-motorized boaters					
Get law enforcement on water in non-motorized appropriate craft	Recent program successful - Improves credibility.	Funding - Time - Putting LE in watercraft that limits their effectiveness and response	LE who've at least tried NM have a better understanding of safety and needs - Use PWC or smaller craft to approach NM	Trying to coordinate shuttle - time inefficiencies, etc. - Use appropriate watercraft for purpose (rescue, inspection, meet-greet, etc.)	PI - Assess the need for non-motorized boats for Marine Patrol and if it is a value in the county or leave as is.
Determine high use areas, trends, issues, target outreach for proactive management and facilities ID	N/A	Not enough LE to go around! Portland area LE bases are in bad locations for quick response - [This changes depending upon waterflows, weather, events - Moving target]	Potential for new LE base at "Staff Jennings" - Balance and identify needs the same way OSMB does with motorized - Make sure resources are stacked appropriately based on the need - Be responsive to issues as they arise - Identify conflicts NM, Motor	Cost - [Balance between perceived capacity, environment damage, and encouraging use at other locations]	PI - Baseline for public meeting and regional (Urban vs. Rural) data collection for facilities, LE, more education and how do we deal with each one. PI - Build an easy access web survey for the general public to give opinions regarding facilities, improvements, signs, conflicts, etc.

Address facility issues to accommodate the needs of all boaters

<p>Adequate facilities for law enforcement to respond to incidents and waterway conditions</p>	<p>Existing facilities have access points or land available</p>	<p>Funding - Waterfront access sites being developed w/o water related uses - Lack of public land</p>	<p>Staff Jennings site in Portland - Creative access points (pole slides, bridge right-of-way, etc.)</p>	<p>Wild scenic areas, permit limitations - Cost to limited use emergency access - Do not limit to LE use only - Public has right</p>	
<p>Establishing public non-motorized boathouses (instead of boathouses change it non-traditional docks, storage, infrastructure, etc.)</p>	<p>Portland wants to be #1 livable city...</p>	<p>Funding - Waterfront access sites being developed w/o water related uses - no incentive to developers - Rowing/paddling clubs are often classified as "health club" in zoning and don't qualify as water-related uses - (Lack of land or competitive use - Need funding to carry this out)</p>	<p>Youth obesity/diabetes awareness, interest in more ways to get active - Sites can generate \$ as meeting/wedding/etc - Facilities - Planning incentives</p>	<p>[Funding, local liability - Perception of specialized structures for NM but we currently don't fund marinas - If resources are not identified, will not sit well with motorized boaters]</p>	<p>Combine all facilities boxes together - All types of facilities for urban vs. rural non-motorized boaters</p>
<p>> Public/private right-a-ways/access > Road access to water access</p>		<p>Lack of public understanding - Seasonal restrictions due to road closures - [Funding - We have not historically done this type of work]</p>		<p>Loss of access - Being trapped if unaware - [Could increase congestion on roadways and create parking problems alongside the road]</p>	<p>PI - Start the dialogue to managing agencies regarding facility needs and wants PI - have a dedicated non-motorized coordinator at OSMB - PI - Engage with public services (PGE, Utilities, etc.) - PI - Create a checklist (tool list) for NGOs for possible projects (consideration list) of how to and with whom to communicate and what to think about (HOW TO list)</p>
<p>Safe parking - security - garbage cans, restrooms, staging areas, ramps</p>	<p>Existing infrastructure that could be modified to access</p>	<p>Funding - Overnight parking - [Funding]</p>	<p>Growth of remote monitoring abilities - Volunteer patrols, etc. - Better communication to locate and design access for NM users</p>	<p>Over development - Lack of operating funds - Lack of construction funds</p>	
<p>> Increase urban area water access - new construction sites/master planning > Create whitewater parks - streambed modifications</p>	<p>Being done all over country - Economic development</p>	<p>Need changes to zoning laws - Need developer incentives - Funding - Permitting challenges, fisheries - (Property cost and availability - Requires a consultant and funding - Funding - Location)</p>	<p>Public/private partnerships - Utilize opportunities - Look at boater activities to utilize planning to reduce conflict - Economic development - New user groups - Educational and connect to youth</p>	<p>Resource agencies target "low hanging fruit" in belief that docks are harmful to fish, while overlooking sewage treatment, pollution and other bigger issues - Bureaucracy - Nimby - Funding - Liability - Permitting - [SSSS - Conflict that land is "best-use" - Environmental, rulemaking, push back from other NM users to have specialized - Question of whether this is only benefiting a few because it may not be "public" - Location - Funding]</p>	