

Oregon Nearshore Research TF
December 2-3, 2009
Hallmark Inn, Newport, Oregon

TF Members: Sybil Ackerman, Laura Anderson, Bob Bailey, Caren Braby, Stephen Brandt, Leesa Cobb, Onno Husing, Gil Sylvia, Terry Thompson, Craig Young (only present on Dec 2)

Non-voting members: Nick Furman (alternate for Mike Lane), Roy Lowe (federal), Cathy Tortorici (federal), Frank Warrens (new member, pending final approval)

Absent: Louise Solliday/Jeff Kroft

Other Active Participants: Rep Roblan (initial TF Chair), Rep Boone, Rep Cowan, Ed Bowles

Staff: Jenna Borberg and Carol Cole

Summary of Issues Decided/Position Taken

An expanded summary of issues can be found below under the detailed summary of the meeting.

1. The Nearshore Research TF (NRTF) elected Stephen Brandt as Chair and Sybil Ackerman as Vice Chair in a consensus vote.
2. The Task Force (TF) designated an “Operations Team” to be involved in TF planning. The team includes Stephen Brandt, Sybil Ackerman, Gil Sylvia, Caren Braby, and will be assisted by staff.
3. The NRTF voted unanimously to make changes to the draft *Overview* and *Guiding Principles* to better align them with the language in HB3106.
4. The TF assigned a committee to create a general funding proposal to submit to the Packard Foundation that includes an institutional design proposal and an economic proposal. The committee includes: Gil Sylvia, Stephen Brandt, Caren Braby, and Sybil Ackerman.
5. The TF decided by consensus to hold public comment periods during each meeting, wherein three minutes of comment will be allowed per person (but to the discretion of the Chair based on how many people want to comment). During public comment period, a sideboard will request that comments be issue driven and that the TF will not allow personal attacks on any members (at the discretion of the chair). Comments will also be accepted through notecards at meetings, through the NRTF website, and through email to individual TF members or to the group email address.
6. The TF assigned a committee to research and summarize the current institutional design of Oregon’s current nearshore management structure, as well as the work of other similar task forces. The committee includes: Bob Bailey (chair), Gil Sylvia, Laura Anderson, and Sybil Ackerman. Steve Brandt and Caren Braby will serve as consultants to this committee.

7. The TF agreed upon dates for future meetings (see below), and decided that the next two meetings will be held in Newport. Meeting locations thereafter are to be determined. Further, the idea of holding separate community meetings throughout the State about collaborative research will be explored by Terry Thompson and others.

Summary of Action Items (Person/People responsible)

1. DLCD will host a NRTF website and will video tape each meeting (video will be available upon request) (Bob, Andy).
2. DLCD will create a TF email address for public comment. Comments received will be collected and brought to the following meeting (Bob, Andy).
3. The Operations Team will write a grant proposal and submit the application to the Packard Foundation (Steve, Sybil, Gil, and Caren).
4. A committee will research and summarize Oregon's institutional framework and review other models for the January meeting (Bob, Gil, Laura, and Sybil).
5. The Operations Team will draft the Agenda for the January meeting (Steve, Sybil, Gil, and Caren).
6. Explore the idea of holding separate community meetings about collaborative research (Terry).
7. Provide a copy of the *Rocky Shores Strategy* to the TF (Bob).

Presentations

Caren Braby, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife – *The Oregon Nearshore Marine Resource Management Strategy*

Jessica Keys, Governor Kulongoski's Office – *The West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health*

Bob Bailey, Department of Land Conservation and Development – *The Territorial Sea Plan*

Stephen Brandt, Oregon Sea Grant – *The West Coast Regional Marine Research and Information Plan*

Future Meetings

Dates for future meetings:

Jan 21-22, Newport

Feb 18, Newport

Mar 29, TBD

May 3, TBD

Jun 10-11, TBD

Jul 22-23 (tentative, with the understanding that the TF requests an extension on the bill)

Jan 21-22 Meeting

1. Discuss institutional design and funding
 - a. Oregon's Current Model: Provide a full disclosure of the Oregon model including strengths and weaknesses. What are the existing coordinating structures in place? What is the funding process? Are there any education linkages involved? This could help get at a gap analysis.
 - b. Other Institutional Models: Are there other models that this group should look to? Possibly bring in some people to talk about other models. This may help the group come up with focused committees to address these issues further.
2. Discuss outline for the NRTF Final Report
3. Discuss and decide if meetings will have a facilitator and if so, how to fund.

Possible topics for future meetings:

- Discuss and possibly define terms such as EBM, adaptive management, resilience.
- EBM – discuss the natural link to Goal 19, Francis et al.'s *Ten Commandments* article
- Gap Analysis/Baseline Data
- Emerging issues that are not well represented in the four background documents, such as, ocean acidification, invasive species, energy development (wave energy), marine reserve implementation, offshore aquaculture, ocean zoning/MSP
- Think about what research and monitoring in the four background documents will support ecological, economic, and social issues.
- Monitoring versus research

Detailed Summary of Meeting

Overview of HB3106 and TF Charges

- Rep Roblan and others wrote HB3106 because organized, coordinated research was lacking in the Oregon nearshore. The purpose of the Bill is to decide what Oregon wants for Oregon's ocean. Science should be without politics – so anyone can look at data and make their own conclusions.
- Roblan hopes this TF discusses and determines:
 - a. how to use data and science to inform Oregon in moving forward
 - b. protocols for collecting data that can be trusted and has safeguards to know how decisions were made; and
 - c. how do we keep the process and data transparent so people can come up with their own conclusion.
 - d. how to collaborate and use existing sources (e.g., coast guard, research institutes, etc); and
 - e. develop a long term nearshore organization if this TF decides that is necessary.
- Roblan – would love to have an organization to review and determine if things are or are not working. As part of implementation – have a science branch that has

this oversight (he sees the TF a bit like the National Academy of Science, a beacon of really good research).

Overview Discussion

There was general discussion by people who were key in developing the Bill about the purpose and goals of the TF, including:

- The TF is not designed to be a long-standing group, nor is it intended to determine nearshore research priorities for the state. The TF is here to make recommendations to the legislature and the governor on how to move forward from a State perspective with the best information to make the best decision.
- Nearshore work needs to be done collectively and responsibly, particularly given so many competing interests offshore – can't talk about things in vacuum.
- If we don't have a plan, the Oregon nearshore will be chipped away at. Need to step back and think about what is best for all of us. Don't want to lose future potential of what could be there. Plans can keep opportunities available for when we figure it all out.
- Information needs to be *transparent and credible*, and policy decisions need to be in a coordinated fashion in terms of management, financing research, and getting information.
- Public/community involvement is essential.
- Identify a long term funding strategy with a diverse funding portfolio to address all nearshore issues; and think about how to bring in money in a transparent way with no strings attached so that the states priorities can be addressed.
- Identify how to share data cohesively as a state.

General Discussion from the TF:

- Facilitator: Should the group hire a facilitator to help the group stay focused and on task, and talked about potential ways to fund that facilitator?
- Final Report: Whose responsibility is it to write the report? Does it need independent peer review before it is finalized - would that add to the credibility of the document, or is public comment adequate?
- Research Priorities: Some TF members feel it is difficult to think about a funding plan without having priorities set. A number of TF members noted that determining a funding strategy is different than identifying funding sources – and that the former can be done without research priorities. It was also noted that the four guiding documents are a great place for the TF to start because each identifies priorities and had significant public involvement in determining those priorities. One TF member doesn't believe fishing industry and local people were engaged, but another member noted that that could lead to one of the recommendations of the group – *how to involve the public to get their priorities incorporated*.

Presentations: HB3106 Guiding Documents

Presentations were given on the four background guiding documents identified in HB 3106 (presentations will be made available on the NRTF website):

1. *The Oregon Nearshore Marine Resource Management Strategy* (Nearshore Strategy)
2. *The West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health* (WCGA)
3. *The Territorial Sea Plan* (TSP)
4. *The West Coast Regional Marine Research and Information Plan* (Regional Plan)

Presenters highlighted how their respective document addresses:

1. Research and Monitoring – identification of needs and priorities
2. Management and Policy
3. Education and Outreach
4. Funding – assessment of funding needs and processes identified for obtaining funds
5. Data Sharing - models, goals, etc.
6. Collaboration and Coordination – among stakeholders, institutions, etc.

Common Features of Guiding Documents – Round Table Discussion

1. Research and Monitoring

- Research and monitoring are included in the Sea Grant document, the Nearshore Strategy, in Greg McMurray's wave energy research, and in the Territorial Sea Plan Amendment 5.
- The Sea Grant document speaks to more global modeling, and it could be good to step down from that and interlink with the Nearshore Strategy.
- The Sea Grant searchable database could be a good source to identify Oregon's research needs and priorities.
- West Coast Governor's Agreement provided a good overview statement, Action Item 2.1 – describe and map marine and estuarine....; and this overlaps well with the Nearshore Strategy items 11-16, and the Territorial Sea Plan also links to this overall statement.
- General themes that all of the documents talk about: Invasive species, forage fish, biogenetic habitat – bottom habitat, air pollution, education, ecosystem services, oil and gas development, runoff, estuaries, land/sea, fisheries impacts, climate change (pg 34-38 of SG doc).
- Sea Grant identified perceived threat while the WCGA provided a policy perspective.

Missing Items

- Water quality is talked about in the WCGA, but not as much in the other documents. There is a big emphasis on this in PEW and National Ocean Policy Action Plan. The question was asked – *is the TF coordinating with DEQ?*
- Need baseline data in order to monitor change
- There was a comment regarding a disconnect between research and monitoring – there needs to be a means of collecting data to help with management decisions, rather than the current ad-hoc ways. It would ultimately be good to build in a more formalized research capacity for any given year or on any given project.

- A Question for this TF is how to strike a balance between what people see as biggest issues and how science can help address those questions
- One TF member noted that they fund research proposals based on scientific excellence and societal relevance. When you have a set of priorities – that determines the scientific questions. And then a separate question to determine how to answer those questions. Keep separate so policy doesn't influence science.

Some Comments on Monitoring v Research

- Skepticism was raised about pouring money into monitoring unless there is someone to actually review and analyze the data, because just monitoring the data doesn't tell you much about causes. ODFW's report is more monitoring while Sea Grant's has more to do with asking questions and ecosystem functions that leads to more experimental design. Important to discuss what is enough – just having data, or figuring out how our ocean works.
- It was noted that indicators are key for this
- It was also noted that we don't need to know everything specific to Oregon because broader issues such as ocean acidification – could utilize other research (outside of Oregon) for this large of an issue

2. *Management and Policy*

The group discussed the management and policy structure in Oregon and agreed that Goal 19 is the main policy driver and needs to be followed. The TSP is in service of Goal 19, and mirrors it, and it was noted that the ODFW Nearshore Strategy is not inconsistent with Goal 19.

3. *Education and Outreach*

- Public education is a huge piece of infrastructure that the state needs to have. Sea Grant does this a lot and the West Coast Governors' Agreement (WCGA) also highlights education. Sea Grant includes ocean education and environmental literacy as a cross-cutting theme, and this may be a good way to think about it.
- It was suggested that all of the documents have a bit of a lag in terms of education, and that it might be good to look outside of Oregon for successful education strategies.
- It was noted that this group should focus on the "how" in terms of education rather than discussing content (though others noted that educators need guidance and that the message should include benefits to society).

Some specific comments:

- The WCGA Sustainable Communities Team is addressing education and linking different interpretive centers in Oregon.
- It was noted that the *Rocky Shores Strategy* thought about a network of interpretive centers, and Bob said he will provide a copy of this to the group.
- The marketplace should be considered by the Education and Outreach subcommittee

4. Funding

- Not about sources, but how we handle funds, and how it is allocated, in a way that everyone is comfortable w/.
- The WCGA has a strategy for seeking funds, and they are being recognized by their regional partnership. Seems could be good for this group to follow this strategy and expand on that.
- There will still be a lot of research outside of the NRTF. What is the responsibility of the state of Oregon to provide infill funding to support other projects that help w/ the long-term research priorities?
- The plan that this group comes up with could help drive funding from other entities, e.g., NSF and NGOs (rather than funding driving the plan). Groups like this are starting to support policy and management, and are necessary to utilize as long as funding is handled in an objective, transparent, and non-political arena.
- This plan need to relate to Goal 19, and it needs to undertake a gap analysis
- This TF needs to think about how funds will be distributed, not just how to get money.
- Some important questions to ask in order to come up with a structure for funding:
 1. can we leverage other funds?
 2. duplicating efforts?
 3. breaking new ground
 4. understanding key systems?
 5. model for the nation? Could attract more fed funds
 6. will it still happen if we don't fund it
 7. firewall – making sure there are systems in place that support the NRTF report

5. Data Sharing

- The TF should develop a long-term data sharing structure to aggregate, house, and control access to existing data (this was well outlined in the Sea Grant report as a cross-cutting theme).
- Important to use existing databases, and follow existing protocols
- Think about how to best make data/information available to scientists, managers, legislature, and to the public (may require different formats for different users).
- Metadata must have reliability and trust

6. Collaboration and Coordination

- Oregon has no one marine management agency. But there is a collaborative framework. How to promote and maintain this could be strengthened.
- Should Oregon consider identifying one single ocean management agency?
- Collaborative process needs to be transparent and give everyone an opportunity to be involved
- There is more opportunity for connecting the fishing fleet with scientists
 - Possible model to consider: Banfield Marine Science Center in BC
- The Great Lakes Research Information Network (searchable database) is a good example of collaborating on research

Selecting a Chair and Vice Chair

After a roundtable discussion, the TF decided by consensus to elect Stephen Brandt as the TF Chair, and Sybil Ackerman as the Vice Chair. The group also said that they would like Caren and Gil to continue being involved in meeting planning.

Decisions

- The TF selected Steve as Chair, and Sybil as Vice Chair
- The TF designated an “Operations Team” to be involved in meeting planning. The Operations Team includes: Caren, Gil, Steve, and Sybil and will be assisted by staff.

Overview and Guiding Principles

The TF discussed that the Overview and Guiding principles could be modified to better align with the language in HB3106. The TF voted unanimously to make the following changes to the *Overview and Guiding Principles*:

Decisions:

1. Separate the Operating Philosophy and the Guiding Principles from the Overview Document.
2. Overview - Gave the Chair and Vice Chair the authority to make modifications to the Overview to include more of the language of HB3106.
3. Guiding Principles – add the following text for the TF to encourage:
 - a. *Protection and utilization of Oregon’s nearshore resources* (HB3106, Section 1(3))
 - b. *Consideration of ecological, economic and social benefit/impact*
 - c. *Thinking on multi-time scales – short term and long term*
 - d.

Funding

It was discussed that Packard Foundation is willing to provide more funding to the TF because they want the group to really take the bill seriously – flesh it out and do background homework; comprehensive process – *inviting expert researchers, writing white papers (e.g., looking at alternative models)*.

Decision:

The TF voted unanimously to assign a committee the responsibility to apply for more Packard funds to help support in the development of an institutional framework, and in conducting an economic assessment of a nearshore strategy. The committee includes: Steve, Sybil, Gil, and Caren.

Public Involvement

The TF briefly discussed Oregon Public Meeting Law. They also talked about how to notify the public of meetings. DLCD announced that they will be hosting a website and a listserv for the NRTF.

Decisions

Notifying the Public about Meetings:

Meeting announcements will be posted on the DLCD NRTF website, and individual TF members will be responsible for notifying their constituents of upcoming meetings.

Receiving Public Comment at Meetings:

The TF decided by consensus that there will be a public comment period at each TF meeting. The public comment period will allow three minutes per person (but to the discretion of the Chair based on how many people want to comment), and will include a sideboard that requests comments be issue driven and that the TF will not allow personal attacks on any members (at the discretion of the chair). At meetings, the public can also comment via notecards, and if relevant, the Chair will read them at the meeting.

Receive Public Comment in General:

The TF decided by consensus that members can receive individual email from constituents. The TF as a group can receive public comment through an email address that DLCD will set up for the TF. Emails sent to the group address will be compiled and brought to the following meeting.

Working Documents

In order to follow Oregon Public Meeting Law and in the interest of transparency, the TF decided that working documents can circulate within a subcommittee (as long as it is not a quorum), but that these documents are okay to distribute as needed. Further, documents will be posted on the web once ready for distribution [to the remainder of the TF].

Topics List & Approach to Future Meetings

A roundtable discussion by the TF highlighted the need to understand Oregon's nearshore research and funding model, and to compare this to other models. This was expanded on to include the importance of understanding the following questions:

1. What is the history of Oregon's model?
2. Who is doing research (including the roles and interactions)?
3. Where is research being done (where along the coast, and what is the geographic scope – land/sea, estuaries, etc.)?

It was discussed that this should occur early in the process. The importance was noted of collaborative work and understanding the existing groups involved and how to

collaborate with them in a cost-effective way. It was also noted that working with fishermen could really set this model apart from existing ones

Decision:

The TF charged a committee to think about institutional design for the next meeting. The committee will first describe the current institutional framework in Oregon, and will also look at a couple of other models (e.g., Rhode Island and Massachusetts).

The Committee includes: Bob (chair), Laura, Sybil, Gil, and Steve and Caren can be consulted.

The TF also decided to discuss topics and the report structure at the following meeting.

Schedule for Future Meetings

Several people brought up concern that the tentative meeting locations don't represent coastal communities enough – particularly, there is a lack of representation on the South Coast. However, it was also brought up that the TF is meant to represent the entire State, and that in the short time the group will meet, it would be impossible to hold meetings in enough locations to adequately represent everyone. The group talked about the possibility of holding all meetings in Newport.

Due to the importance of collaborative research and involving communities and exiting research efforts, the TF decided to explore the idea of holding separate community meetings about collaborative research, and these community meeting could be held in various locations throughout the State. It was noted that these community meetings should fall between the end of February and early April.

Decision:

- The TF will hold the next two meetings in Newport, and will then decide on locations for meetings thereafter.
- The idea of holding separate community meetings about collaborative research will be explored (led by Terry).

Public comment –

- Surfrider/Kaiser – is the process how to structure milestones, tasks, marked incremental process. Offered to help on that.
- Watershed council – will they be consulted?
Roblan – they were included in another version of the bill. Agrees – we need to get past the separation at some point.