NEMIA: Review of Draft Actions

Presentation Outline

• Overview of Case Studies
• Integrated Assessment Ideas for Prioritized Themes:
  – Sense of Place and Community Character
  – Natural/Cultural/Maritime Heritage & Resources Tourism
  – Incorporating Modern Technologies
Overview of Case Studies

1. Blackstone Valley, MA/RI
2. Olympic Peninsula
3. Queensland, Australia
4. Coastal Ohio

Common Themes

• Ecosystem approach to tourism
• Geotourism
• Sense of place
• Visitor experience
What do we call it?

- Cultural Tourism
- Heritage Tourism
- Geo-tourism

...an “ecosystem approach” to tourism??

Contributions by Sandra Clark, Michigan Dept. of History, Arts, and Libraries

Geo-Tourism

“tourism that focuses on, sustains and enhances the geographical character of a place, including its:

- Environment,
- Culture,
- Aesthetics,
- Heritage,
- Quality of Life for Residents”

Citing National Geographic Society’s Web Site for and research on “Geo-tourism”
How does geo-tourism work?

- Identify **ALL** the possible resources
- Protect the resources
- Enhance the experience
  - Design audits
  - Web and other information sources
  - Programs and festivals
- Figure out the stories
- Market your region as a destination through these stories

Contributions by Sandra Clark, Michigan Dept. of History, Arts, and Libraries and

1. Blackstone Valley, MA/RI
Blackstone Valley

Similar Context

Socio-Economic:
• Ex-Industrial area
• “Poor corner of a poor house” (1990s)
• Region is reinventing self as geo-tourism center
• Rural character

Geographic:
• Natural resources
• Cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Falls City</td>
<td>16,995</td>
<td>17,586</td>
<td>18,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Town</td>
<td>27,069</td>
<td>29,434</td>
<td>31,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Smithfield Town</td>
<td>9,972</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>10,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blackstone Valley

Differences

• Near urban location
• East coast megalopolis
• Bi-state region
• Smaller in geographic scope
• Larger population base
Tourism Industry

- Geo-tourism focused
- Relatively limited resources
- Challenges coordinating efforts across state lines
- Blackstone Valley Tourism Council “visionary”
- Building from nothing, “long haul” approach
- Annual visits

Summary of Blackstone Valley Regional Travel and Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Person-Trips (Millions)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenditures ($ Millions)</td>
<td>$474.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel-Generated Employment</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel-Generated Payroll ($Millions)</td>
<td>$124.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel-Generated Tax Revenue for State and Local Governments ($ Millions)</td>
<td>$39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar Context

Geographic:
• One road in and out
• Small communities
• National Marine Sanctuary, National Park
• Rural character and natural resources

Socio-Economic:
• Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>34,770</td>
<td>51,648</td>
<td>56,464</td>
<td>64,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>10,661</td>
<td>15,965</td>
<td>20,146</td>
<td>25,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>59,553</td>
<td>66,314</td>
<td>64,175</td>
<td>67,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences

• National Park
• West coast chic (?)
Tourism Industry

• Geo-tourism focus nature/culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocean Tourism &amp; Recreation Participation</th>
<th>People (millions)</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Visiting A Beach</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visiting Other Waterside (Beside Beach)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motor Boating</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Saltwater Fishing</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water Skiing</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jet Skiing</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Canoeing</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Snorkeling</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sailing</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rowing</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tourism Industry

Olympic NP Visits and Spending by Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment/Lodging Type</th>
<th>Recreation Visits (000's)</th>
<th>Party-nights (000's)</th>
<th>Avg Spending ($) per party per night</th>
<th>Total Spending ($Millions)</th>
<th>Pct of Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Day Use</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local Day Trips</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge-Inside Park</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>244.13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp-Inside Park</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.66</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacker Campers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel-Outside Park</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>197.41</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp-Outside Park</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76.31</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stynes, Daniel, "Economic Impacts of Visitors to Olympic National Park, 2000."
3. Queensland, Australia
**Queensland**

**Similar Context**

- **Socioeconomic:**
  - Daintree Village: 100 residents
  - Port Douglas: 1287 residents
  - Cairns: 100,000 - 130,594 residents [nearest major city center, a distance to Cairns to Port Douglas = 70kms (approx. 43 miles)]

- **Geographic:**
  - Undeveloped, unspoiled resources
  - Little built infrastructure outside of city center
  - Somewhat Peninsular -- Difficult location to get to; you have to go out of your way to get there
  - Gas prices ($3.70-$4.00/gal) are ALSO expensive in Australia!
  - Have major attractions (Great Barrier Reef), but majority are “mom & pop” or smaller entrepreneurial businesses
Queensland

Differences

- Climate – Year around “warm weather” tourism

- Continent and Country – slightly different types of government, programs, and management “rules” and culture

- Worldwide travelers make up tourism market

Queensland

What are they doing right?

- Focused on their own unique assets – natural & cultural

- Promote each other

- Created an experience – worked for quality, not quantity

- Regional planning process, similar to NEMIA
Coastal Ohio

**Similar Context**

- 293 miles of Lake Erie Shoreline (eight hours of travel without stops)

- Draw from same types of tourism markets (within region and country)

- Similar Great Lakes regional context, including climate/seasons, history, culture, and natural assets...

- …similar challenges
Differences

- Higher population density, more city centers
- More built, developed assets
- Not as peninsular – Can often just be “traveling through” Lake Erie (by water) or Ohio (by land) to get somewhere

Challenges

- What to do with “Lake Erie Circle Tour”?
- Challenges of connecting multiple disparate, disconnected, and competing efforts along coastline
- Frustration with local “Chambers and tourism bureaus beating each other up”
Coastal Ohio

What are they doing right?

• Focus on their collective and unique coastal assets

• Focusing on:
  (1) Regionally Coordinated Asset Inventory
  (2) Resource protection and interpretation
  (3) Providing support tools for industry
  (4) Marketing to “improve experiences for visitors”