

**Oregon Nearshore Research Task Force**  
**January 21-22, 2010**  
**Hallmark Inn, Newport, Oregon**

TF Members: Sybil Ackerman, Laura Anderson, Bob Bailey, Caren Braby, Stephen Brandt, Leesa Cobb, Gus Gates, Onno Husing, Jeff Kroft, Mike Lane, Gil Sylvia, Terry Thompson, Frank Warrens, Craig Young

*Non-voting members:* Roy Lowe (federal), Cathy Tortorici (federal; by phone)

Other Active Participants: Rep Roblan

Staff: Jenna Borberg, Julie Risien, Carol Cole, and Andy Lanier

*An expanded summary of issues decided and action items can be found below under the detailed summary of the meeting.*

**Summary of Issues Decided/Positions Taken**

1. The Task Force (TF) approved the December Meeting minutes.
2. Three Committees were established:
  - a. Funding Committee - Members: Laura (chair), Sybil, and Gil.
  - b. Data Committee - Members: Caren, Craig, Steve, and they will be assisted by Andy.
  - c. Community Outreach Committee - Members: Terry, Gus, Gil, Leesa, and they will be assisted by Julie.

**Summary of Action Items (Person/People Responsible)**

1. Committee Work: Evaluate the scope of the topic; provide background information and detailed proposal for work needed, for full task force consideration at the February meeting (Funding, Data, and Community Outreach Committee).
2. As appropriate, Committees can consider the following models in their evaluations:
  - a. Data Committee - VISA and Paypal
  - b. Community Committee – POORT and Watershed Councils
  - c. Peer Review Committee (if established) - National Academy of Science
3. Go back through the *Key Questions for Assessing and Comparing Ocean Programs*, and write a narrative of what TF questions have been answered so far, and what still needs to be answered. Prepare a handout for the February meeting (Bob with the assistance of Jenna).
4. Investigate elements of the Massachusetts' model in more depth to determine how it really works on the ground (Sybil and Terry).
5. Draft a proposed institutional framework model for discussion at the February meeting (Sybil, Craig, Bob, and any other interested TF members).

6. Further consider Oregon's current research programs and gaps - explore the possibility of an inventory survey (Operations Team).
7. Create a draft RFP for contracts – keeping it general so the TF can add specifics later (Operations Team).
8. Draft the February Agenda (Operations Team).
9. Create a set of definitions that this group uses consistently (e.g., data, research) for the February meeting (Operations Team).

### **Future Meetings**

Recurring topics for possible discussion at future meetings:

1. Consistency between Goal 19 and the Federal Approach (e.g., Goal 19 list the Precautionary Approach and Feds often use Best Available Science).
2. Discuss/Diagram how the various State and Regional models inter-relate, and think about how they could coordinate.
3. Geographic scope the TF will consider.
4. Possible presenters: Amber Mace of California, Dearin Babb-Brot of Massachusetts, Rocco and Paul from Fiscal and Revenue, COMPASS, POORT, NAS
5. Decide on contracts to fund.
6. Think about what credible science is, and need to consider the audience (not just the legislature).

### **Detailed Summary of Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 10:04am by Chair, Stephen Brandt

#### ***Approval of December Meeting Minutes***

##### **Decision:**

The Task Force (TF) voted to approve the draft December meeting minutes, pending the addition of Gus Gates as an attending TF member on the second day of the meeting.

#### ***General Business Items***

Andy Lanier, Department of Land Conservation and Development, provided a brief overview of the NRTF listserv and website.

#### ***Oregon's Current Nearshore Structure***

Bob Bailey gave a presentation on the history of Oregon's management structure, and the current institutional design of Oregon's nearshore management. Oregon's Ocean Resources Management Plan is part of Oregon's Ocean Resources Management Program, and it has been approved by NOAA under CZMA. This gives power to the State to work with federal agencies. Goal 19 is a driving principle by which other elements of the structure are based, and this Goal makes Oregon's plan unique in comparison to other states. Goal 19 is information driven, but it does not specifically require science or research, nor does it get at how to enter the decision making field. Also, it does not

specifically address local areas, but it does break out certain habitat types, such as rocky areas.

There was some general TF discussion about the *precautionary approach* (noted in Goal 19) and using *best available science* (as noted in Magnusson Stevens) and whether these principles are compatible or conflict.

The question of if/how Goal 19 balances conservation and economics came up, and it was noted that the new amendment to Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan, Part 5, includes habitats and fisheries as priorities in attempt to balance conservation and economic cost, but the balance hasn't been tested yet. Wave Energy will be the first big test of this.

The issue of funding was also discussed, and the fact that coastal management and Oregon state agencies are all federally funded (rather than receiving State funds), and foundations are now having interest in Oregon. It was noted, however, that Oregon is ill prepared in terms of structure to utilize that potential stream of foundation funds – and this is something that the TF needs to address.

The roles of OPAC, STAC, and the NRTF were brought up and briefly discussed. Rep Roblan said that from the legislative perspective, they need to make decisions on ocean policy and didn't feel there was an independent scientific body to guide them. Their first thought was that they should go through STAC, but others wanted a task force to discuss and determine this. He wants the TF to look at the big picture.

#### ***Presentations: Statewide and Regional Science Models***

Presentations were given on statewide and regional research institutions that have legislative authority, to briefly introduce:

1. Geographic area the program covers
2. Program history (authority and dates created)
3. Funding sources/level
4. Key program elements
5. Coordination functions
6. Linkage of science and management
7. Data collection/sharing/infrastructure
8. Criteria for setting priorities
9. Assessment of strengths and weaknesses

Presenters:

#### **Statewide Programs**

1. Oregon Sea Grant – Stephen Brandt
2. Coastal Ocean and Marine Experiment Station (COMES) – Gil Sylvia
3. Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW) – Dave Fox

#### **Regionally Active Programs**

4. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) – Rick Brown
5. Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI) – Jack Barth

6. Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing Systems (NANOOS)– Jonathan Allan
7. Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO) – Bruce Menge

### ***Task Force Roundtable Discussion about Oregon's Current Nearshore Research and Funding Structure***

The TF discussed the various presentations and highlighted items that they may want to consider for the Nearshore Research Strategy. Notable items:

- Proposal Review Process - Sea Grant's
- Research/Stakeholder Priorities – Sea Grant and NANOOS
- Equipment, experience, expertise, institutional capacity, and field presence - ODFW
- Long-term monitoring – OOI - they have an NSF commitment for the next 25-30 years
- Open-access data - OOI
- Regional scope – NANOOS, OOI, Sea Grant, PISCO
- Framework for housing data – NANOOS was mentioned, however it only includes physical data. Oregon Coastal Atlas was also mentioned as a potential for housing data.

### ***Define the Geographic Scope that the Task Force will include in the "Nearshore" Strategy***

The TF decided to postpone the topic of geographic scope for future discussion.

### ***Presentation of Other State/Country Models***

Gil led the TF through a discussion of the key questions that had been drafted for the group to consider in evaluating the institutional models of other states and countries. Some additions were made to questions, and additions are noted in *italics*.

**Action Item:** In the discussion of questions, it was decided that someone should come to the table with some definitions that this group uses consistently, e.g., data and information.

### **1. Overall institutional framework for each state**

- A. Characterize the framework or model:
  - highly centralized or distributed?
  - overarching strategic plan?
  - strong regional or multistate approach?
  - How will different regions be treated?
- B. What policy/management issues is program designed to address?
- C. What type of strategies and incentives encourage collaboration?
  - explicit coordination across agencies and sectors? Success?
  - explicit incentives to encourage/reward coordination and cooperation?

- explicit process to encourage collaboration with communities and NGO's?
- D. Is this process responsive and adaptive?*

## **2. Determining priorities for policy, management, research/monitoring, and education/outreach**

- A. What is the process for determining territorial sea priorities for:
- policy, management, research/monitoring, and education/outreach of each state/nation?
  - Is it a central process, recurring process or ad hoc approach?
  - Is it considered successful? If not why not?
- B. Is there a process to implement priorities?  
How well does it work?
- C. Is there an assessment that is done on a periodic basis to make sure that the institution is serving the key people who want/need the information?*

## **3. Funding process for the institutional framework.**

- A. How does the funding process work in supporting
- policy development, management, research/monitoring, and education/outreach of each state/nation?
- B. For each of the four priority areas:
- Who funds?
  - Approximate total funding?
- C. What financial tools/mechanisms are used to fund the four priority areas?
- Is a non-governmental entity involved in the funding process?
  - Are state funds from the general fund or other sources?
  - Are there explicit requirements for funding from marine user groups?
  - If so, how do these financial tools work?
- D. Financial incentives  
Do they encourage coordination/alignment of the four priority areas?

## **4. Generating, collecting, and sharing data and information.**

- A. Is there a well-defined and centrally integrated marine research and data monitoring program?
- Are programs relatively distributed and diffused?
  - Are policy/management needs integrated with research and monitoring?
  - What data and information are systematically collected? Major gaps?
  - Is data and information available and shared with agencies, universities, and the public?
  - Are there major lags and gaps in timing?
  - *Are research findings presented in a way that are understandable and useable to non-scientists and managers? Is there a mechanism for making data useable?*
- B. Roles in data and information system  
(e.g. funding, collection, quality control, storage, sharing, research, analysis, communication)
- federal agencies, state agencies, universities, communities, industry, NGOs

**5. Is there a trusted neutral body to review research?**

- Review research approach
- Does the research adequately addressing the question/hypothesis and the intended use of the information?
- Does the analysis adequately represent risk and uncertainty?

After discussion of the questions, Bob presented on institutional frameworks of California, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington, and New Zealand.

***Compare and Contrast Oregon to Other State Models***

In comparing other State models with Oregon's, the TF identified questions and areas where they were interested in more information on other state models.

1. Funding Entities - Non-profit (501(c)(3)):
  - a. CA Ocean Science Trust
  - b. MA Ocean Partnership
  - c. WA NW Straight Commission.

*Questions in addition to the identified Key Questions:*

  - How do they receive and distribute funds?
  - What are their true costs?
  - What are the advantages?
  - What are they really like behind the scenes? (Sybil and Terry are looking into this for MA)
2. Community-based Projects.
  - a. Investigate WA County-based Community Groups and how they involve the public
  - b. Look at the process of MA
3. Data Network Design – MA MORIS
4. Science Advisory Teams

Do they advise in an unbiased way?

  - a. CA – learn more about OPC and the Science Advisory Team and their interactions
  - b. WA – learn more about the Science Team that helps inform the Puget Sound Partnership
  - c. MA - Science Advisory Council – is it a standing body, or was it just established for a one-time effort?

It was noted that the TF could invite Amber Mace of California and Deerin Babb-Brot of Massachusetts to address some of these questions.

Some concern regarding receiving funds from foundations was brought up, and the fact that this is not well accepted by the general public at this point. But it was also noted that the State of Oregon does not have the money to fund all of Oregon's research needs so this needs to be addressed and resolved. That is part of the role of this TF. One way to address this is to ensure that the process is transparent. This is something the TF will need to discuss further.

Geographic scope was briefly discussed, and various TF members brought up that it would be good to consider what is going on at the regional level.

In discussion of outreach, it was noted the USFW already has a great outreach tool and this could be expanded on through their volunteer efforts.

**Action Items resulting from discussion:**

- Go back through the *Key Questions for Assessing and Comparing Ocean Programs*, and write a narrative of what TF questions have been answered so far, and what still needs to be answered. Prepare a handout for the February meeting (Bob with the assistance of Jenna).
- Some additional models were noted that the group could consider at a future meeting: National Academy of Science for their peer-review process, VISA and PayPal as data platforms, and POORT and Watershed Councils for their public involvement.
- Sybil and Terry volunteered to investigate elements of the Massachusetts' model in more depth to determine how it really works on the ground.
- Various TF members offered to draft proposed institutional framework models to bring for discussion at the February meeting (Sybil, Craig, Bob, and any other interested TF members).

***Approach to February and Future Meetings***

Potential subcontracting needs were discussed.

One TF member noted that there are certain things we need research on:

- Non-profit examples that are a funding entity – CA OST, MA Partnership, and WA NW Straight Commission. What are their true costs. What are the advantages? Could bring Amber Mace to present on CA. *Note – do not want it to turn into a critique of the CA process.*
- Community-based Projects. WA, MA has a process.

**Decision Points:**

Three Committees were established to evaluate the scope of the topic; provide background information and detailed proposal for work needed, for full task force consideration at the February meeting:

1. Funding Committee - Members: Laura (chair), Sybil, and Gil.
2. Data Committee - Members: Caren, Craig, Steve, and they will be assisted by Andy.
3. Community Outreach Committee - Members: Terry, Gus, Gil, Leesa, and they will be assisted by Julie.

Additionally, it was decided that the Operations Team would further consider Oregon's current research programs and gaps - explore the possibility of an inventory survey.

### **Action Items**

- Due to the tight timeline of completing the TF charge, it was decided that the Operation Team would create a draft RFP for contracts – keeping it general so the TF can add specifics later.
- It was agreed that the Operations Team would draft the February Agenda.

### **Public Comment**

Rep Roblan – hope that efforts are coordinated – such as PISCO with new OOI/NANOOS work. He agrees with some TF members that funders will be more likely to fund work once people believe that money will be spent in a good way – making data available and useful for *all Oregonians*. A goal is getting this out of the political realm, so there is trust and belief there. Then, he believes, there will be money there. An example of a success is Watershed Councils.

David Allen, resident of Newport - Although a member of OPAC and TSPAC, he is here speaking for himself. In 2003 there were legislative changes about OPAC (HB 3534), which took OPAC out of the office of the Governor. This halted the process for awhile and they didn't have meetings for a couple of years. And then from 2005-2007 they were still re-establishing. Then, the Governor gave EO 0708 in 2008 on marine reserves. This gave some clarity about the interaction between OPAC and STAC. OPAC has been asked to make some difficult policy decisions, and they repeatedly said – they need better science. But he offered a couple of caveats: the focus should be how to get good science in the form of policy and decision making. This is very different from setting policy. He sees OPAC as serving that role. And sees the TF as a coordinating body for this. This TF should come up with the ideas and framework for research and funding. Thinks OPAC and NRTF can work well together – each has a different mission that can help support each other.

Cyndi Karp, Watershed Council – Commended the TF for including shareholders in the process. Would like to see the TF involve watershed councils more. Would like the group to bring in watersheds, estuaries and how policy has worked. She recommends Wayne Hoffman or someone to present from a Watershed council. Also – include education through all stages of life.

Greg Krutzikowsky, ODFW – likes the regional approach. Would like to see the group stick to the nearshore, but make note of the watershed connection. He also noted that doing research in the nearshore poses unique challenges and that needs to be considered.

**The meeting was adjourned at 2:58pm**