

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, June 14, 2021 6:40:02 PM
Last Modified: Monday, June 14, 2021 6:58:57 PM
Time Spent: 00:18:55
IP Address: 94.140.8.181

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

None this time around, was on the committee during the first time apparently, many years ago with state parks.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

N/A

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

If I had known about it, then I would have contributed. If I had, my motivation would be to protect biodiversity.

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7 Respondent skipped this question

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

Q8 Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Q9 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Q10 Other (please specify):
Not knowing about it!

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q11 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q12 Respondent skipped this question

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Protection of Biodiversity and giving more attention to wildlife than extractive activities.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity.

Q15

Respondent skipped this question

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Probably . . . because I would have understood their perspective, and could have framed or presented information more effectively to advocate for my position/proposal.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Scientists for sure. Do NOT do it during the summertime or after Nov 15th during the holidays, if you really want to be inclusive and get participants actively involved. The scope, the entire proposal, the focus should be figuring out what actions really need to be taken and how they will accomplished, the outcomes are a better proposal in terms of being realistic . . . and envisioning the idealistic as well!

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Wow, that's honestly a hell of a question! If I could answer that one, then I'd win the \$6 million question!

People are obviously the problem (see the BBC documentary, "The Year Earth Changed" and you'll see what I mean. Essentially, we need to limit access to rocky habitat regions of the coast. Perhaps a permit system? That's what they do at Olympic National Park in the coastal strip section for backpackers, also Parks Canada on Vancouver Island's West Coast Trail. Parks Canada also charges a fee, plus used to make you watch a video before they'd let you go hike. If we are to get serious about the coast, about this habitat, and wildlife and biodiversity, then we need to take some serious actions, and that's it . . . period!

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Well, although I did not participate . . . this survey was informative, in terms of what whoever wrote it learned are potential issues with the process . . . and like I said, that last question . . . WOW! What a question!

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

It's become very clear that human presence in all its forms, soundscapes (aka noisescapes), lightscapes (light pollution), in the landscape . . . has apparently caused, and is causing problems for wildlife globally. So, let's get with the show for the Oregon coast rocky habitat areas, as well as beaches and offshore, too. The balance now needs to lean heavily for wildlife, and NOT humans.

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, June 14, 2021 7:29:19 PM
Last Modified: Monday, June 14, 2021 8:39:29 PM
Time Spent: 01:10:10
IP Address: 76.115.21.248

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

Citizen principal author of one of the 12 rocky proposals, i.e. the coast-wide kelp preservation proposal.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

zero. We divers only learned of the Rocky strategy/documents/deadline a short time prior to the 12/31/20 deadline.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

The existential threat to kelp forests was the primary motivating factor (NorCal has lost 95% of their habitat and certain reefs in Oregon have already lost miles of kelp - turned into permanent urchin barrens such as large parts of Orford reef and Cape Lookout as just two examples).

If the redwood forests were being chopped down at a rapid rate by alien-beavers there would be aggressive action in days, not years. Since we SEE the extensive destruction, we Oregon divers put together an affirmative plan of regulatory improvements and cited many scientific references to support the proposal. This was also submitted as a Formal Letter to OPAC since it wasn't compliant with a 'single site'.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	0-10 Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	10-20 Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	2
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	rejected due to being coast-wide
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	10
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	rejected due to being coast-wide, couldn't argue that vs site

Q6

1

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

visual, graphic, great resource

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Writing,

Researching/gathering information.,

Other (please specify):

how to communicate a sense of urgency regarding the kelp forest catastrophe to non-divers.

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

urchin culling-in-place by divers as a solution to kelp forest restoration needed to be backed up with scientific references and reaching out to kelp scientists from USA to New Zealand. That took a lot of time in comms and scouring journal articles worldwide.

It's so hard to overcome the inertia of 'go-slow' attitudes on kelp preservation via urchin culling when people don't see the catastrophe that's hidden beneath the waves (mostly). Worldwide evidence for urchin-culling method of kelp restoration is quite strong but slow, cautious, studious steps are seen as wise, instead of furthering the destruction. How to overcome the inertia? That's hard.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Other (please specify):

Knowing that the scope of our coast-wide proposal was doomed from the beginning, since the scope was a priori limited to sites only. Seeing little or no formal response to our Formal Letter - seems that the Strategy's 'Formal Letter invitation for non-site ideas' kind of fell through the procedural cracks? it was disappointing to see so few/no site proposals approved while the 'house on fire' kelp forest situation didn't fit the process. The 'house is on fire' still.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

explained in 'other' above

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

fairly clear, but scope for coast-wide 'house on fire' lacking.

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Ecological rating of habitat destruction! weighting should have been VERY HIGH! instead of one modest factor of many.

Eg existential destruction of keystone marine habitat like kelp forests should have overwhelmed other criteria and the entire main effort should have pivoted to solving the massive keystone habitat destruction. vs massive effort devoted to site proposals - where NONE of them cleared the bar... while the "house is still on fire."

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

The severity and scope of keystone habitat destruction should have overwhelmed other criteria.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

nothing really.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

no. too coast-wide, not narrow enough.
a good idea though to get formative feedback.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Don't leave out a Formal Letter process completely. As far as I can tell, it just got dropped out of sight, even though Formal Letters were explicitly invited in the Strategy document. There should be a formal response to Formal Letters.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Yikes, the coastwide issues examples cited in this question didn't even mention the coast-wide kelp forest crisis. As a starting point there should have been two TYPES of proposals allowed. (1. site-specific (2. coast-wide.

or at least honor the invited Formal Letters invitation with a thoughtful formal response to our Formal Letter for kelp forest preservation.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Too narrow a scope (site-specific only allowed) mandated a tragic MISS on one of the most important keystone habitat destructions in our state's history.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

We divers will enthusiastically volunteer millions of dollars worth of time and personal travel and equipment costs over the coming decades to prevent complete devastation of Oregon's keystone kelp forest habitat (as already happened in Norcal). But we request that urgent policy changes be supported/mandated at ODFW primarily, not in years, but a few months.

The kelp restoration scientific permit recently issued by ODFW was a positive step and we're very thankful, but duplicating scientific urchin/kelp studies already done in California, New Zealand, Italy and many other places is insufficient to the scope and urgency of the ecological threat. The procedural rules of the permit make it extremely difficult to organize dives and scale up especially when Oregon sea conditions for diving are so fickle, changing and often difficult. Our proposal lays out the ODFW coast-wide regulatory changes needed to save or restore our kelp forests. With general rules for allowing (subtidal only!) urchin culling especially, we can deploy FAR more divers to save kelp forest.

Apologies if not diplomatic enough answers above. It's hard not to passionate about it when we witness the destruction first-hand.

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 9:10:53 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 9:36:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:36
IP Address: 24.22.77.179

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I was on the working group that re-wrote the rocky habitat strategy and evaluated the publicly proposed sites.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

I had a pretty solid knowledge of the Strategy and TSP but did not know all of the aspects of the strategy that we determined could be strengthened by re-drafting the enforceable policies sections.

I also had good experience in site designations on state and federal levels and realized the shortcomings of many of the existing designated and recommended sites in the rocky habitat strategy.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Rocky habitats are critical ecosystems in Oregon's nearshore environment and they have historically been undervalued as well as misunderstood in terms of the impacts they are and will continue to suffer in climate changing conditions. The Strategy needed updating and I felt I could add both a conservation perspective as well as an ecological perspective to what was needed for the habitats now and into the future. The re-drafted Strategy goes a long ways towards better protecting these habitats and the ability to add new designated sites will continue to benefit the coast and local communities in the future.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	20-50 Hours
E. Proposal writing	0-10 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	80 hours
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	40 hours
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	40 hours
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	0

Q6

2

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

I'm fairly familiar with these sorts of tools so they are not difficult for me to use. I do feel like the tool was needlessly redundant and may not have been the optimal means to draft a proposal. The tool was good for eliciting thinking on proposals though.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

- Researching/gathering information.,**
- Outreach & engagement.,**
- Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...,**
- Developing management recommendations.**

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

It appeared to me (a working group member) that proposers struggled most with making management recommendations and with understanding the existing rules and regulations that governed rocky habitats.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,
Understanding Working Group decision-making,
Other (please specify):
Changing process during the process.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

The fact that the process was changing as we were all in the middle of it was difficult to track for all participants.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

none

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

It would be helpful if an overall evaluation of the Oregon's rocky habitats from an ecological perspective was conducted to update the information that led to the initial Strategy. This would allow agency staff to reflect on how new proposals fit into the existing pattern of habitats and what the new proposals might contribute to the state's breadth of protected rocky habitats. Basically a GAP analysis would be a very useful agency report to have in the future.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

I think if the evaluation criteria matrix was not embedded in each section but rather was set up as a complete matrix in one spot it would be easier to use and to compare responses between sites.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Not much really except that no proposers chose to modify existing sites.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

I think this would have made for a stronger process and might have resulted in stronger proposals too.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

I would like to see these further consultation proposals address the parts of proposals that were problematic and this being done in a small group setting.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

These might be well addressed by a sub-committee in OPAC with outside help from agencies and the public/stakeholders. I would also like to see tribal interests much better represented in this effort as well as in future rocky habitat proposals. Funding for involvement would be necessary for a more comprehensive effort.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Having a defined process well thought out ahead of time is critical. Having tribal involvement throughout the process is needed. Having a broad GAP analysis that updates the ecological (and social) perspectives of rocky habitats in Oregon would greatly assist the proposal making.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

no

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 11:12:42 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 12:20:25 PM
Time Spent: 01:07:43
IP Address: 47.5.238.10

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I was the lead proposal author and volunteer coordinator for North Coast Rocky Habitat Coalition, which submitted proposals for Marine Conservation Areas at Ecola Point and Chapman Point.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

None

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

I was hired to do this work on a contract basis.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	20-50 Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	10-20 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC. | 25 |
| B. Writing initial recommendation responses. | 30 |
| C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement. | 20 |
| D. Preparing your proposal presentation. | 16 |
-

Q6

2

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

My main issues with the mapping tool were:

- Bad data provided - particularly the invertebrate harvest data
 - Drafts in SeaSketch should be saved under name of proposal, not just a date and time stamp.
-

Q8

Researching/gathering information.,

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Historical documents and helpful reports from OPRD and other agencies had to be sought out, both in terms of knowing they exist and finding them online or elsewhere. The State should provide these in an organized manner to proposal writers.

Q10

Understanding the evaluation process.,

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding Working Group decision-making,

Other (please specify):

Being expected to be available all day for meetings at fairly short notice.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

There was not a consistent evaluation process that was applied to each proposal. Working Group decisions were not consistent with the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy as updated by the Working Group.

On the proposal form, many questions were unclear in what they were looking for. When DLCDC staff told us what was expected, it wasn't what was asked in the question. Very confusing and we would not have known if we didn't ask.

Many questions were also redundant.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

I don't understand what the continuing consultation process will consist of, because it hasn't been announced yet.

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Ecological merit and need

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

The matrix was not used by the working group.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The lack of organized scientific and regulatory information from the State provided to site proposers.

That the working group expected proposers to be experts in regulations and downgraded proposals for lack of that expertise.

That agency representatives at the working group were not able to make decisions based on conversations and shifting proposals in working group meetings, but could only agree to what had been authorized by their superiors.

That budget and staffing limitations were used as a reason to not implement designations.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes. Consultation would have enabled us to avoid presenting some management recommendations that were not workable.

Q17

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Statewide rocky habitat outreach, education, interpretation, and enforcement program.

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 1:12:50 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 1:32:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:19:26
IP Address: 65.36.53.52

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I worked with locals in observing, documenting and reviewing the plans for Ecola Point and Chapman Point.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

I know it through my work as a Haystack Rock Awareness Program volunteer and Friends of Haystack Rock board member. In those roles I learned through my peers.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Spending time seeing visitors using these spaces as their own personal dog park and allowing them to chase birds off nests and seeing what even just a little protection can do for these places and animals that make our coast special. Considering the number of visitors we see in Cannon Beach and the declines in creatures due to our human disturbances (not only in Oregon but worldwide) and the fact it has been 20+ years since the last review I honestly don't think we can wait to protect these animals and these spaces for people to enjoy for many years to come. Someone years ago stuck their neck out for the protected spaces we enjoy today, this is just one of many small steps that can be done for ensuring our future.

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

Q6 Respondent skipped this question

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7 Respondent skipped this question

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

Q8 Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Q9 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Q10 Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q11 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q12 Respondent skipped this question

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

Q13 Respondent skipped this question

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Q14

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Q15

Respondent skipped this question

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Q16

Respondent skipped this question

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Q17

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Yes, these are literally the reasons we are here. It needs to be an ongoing review process with uniformity and education being the keys. Signage and clear standard approaches to issues (i.e. wildlife disturbance/harassment) will go further than any one person could do, although people at these locations would help to further engage the public.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

I'm working on my patience while watching another generation of black oystercatcher get harassed by people and their dogs and drones.

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 3:23:20 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 4:10:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:46:47
IP Address: 24.20.186.166

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

We did not directly prepare any proposals but were involved in the evaluation process

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

My knowledge and previous experience with the TSP is high, although Part 3 has been quiet for many years prior to the initiation of this process.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Updating the GIS, science, policies and designations. All of this was needed to reflect 20+ years of improved technology and science.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	20-50 Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	0-10 Hours
E. Proposal writing	0-10 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC. | 40+ hours |
| B. Writing initial recommendation responses. | 0 |
| C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement. | 10 |
| D. Preparing your proposal presentation. | 0 |
-

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

Q8

Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Q9

Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Q10

**Understanding the evaluation process.,
Communication with agency staff, Working Group members.,
Understanding Working Group decision-making**

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

The process continued to evolve, often in real time, during meetings and many times without any clear leader, plan or outcome. If you missed a meeting, it was hard to catch up or understand what happened.

In rare circumstances, closed door meetings may be warranted but I am unclear if that was truly necessary in this case, particularly when those meetings also excluded OPAC members.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

Is the agency going to implement objective evaluation metrics?

Who/how will the work be done moving forward without a Work Group and designated agency staff/fellow?

For adaptive management purposes, I hope the process will be updated and clarified to reflect lessons learned and comments that will be learned through this evaluation phase.

Q13

Respondent skipped this question

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Q14

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The fishing communities' claim to have been left out of the process at the 12th hour despite several years of outreach and requests for them to come to the table to participate.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes, very few processes in Oregon put the bulk of the outreach, science and GIS work on citizens

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

During the evaluation process, some pushed that only locations with established volunteer programs should proceed to designation. Having a volunteer program should not be a threshold or requirement in order to designate a site.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

These common issues are topics where the state agencies and/or OPAC can and should set a vision and articulate needs for the future. The Governor's Office and the Legislature are never going to provide more resources if we don't create the case.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Deanna created beautiful communication tools that brought positive visuals to the process and coalesced energy to get folks participating in the process early on.

Outreach should be conducted with the tribes to ascertain their perspectives of this process.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

All of the comments received by the agency should be shared publicly and in their entirety. We will not improve the process or learn from it if agency staff "clean up" the responses

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 4:01:41 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 4:41:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:40:17
IP Address: 159.121.202.137

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I was a member of the rocky habitat working group representing ODFW.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

Extensive experience. I was involved in the development of the original rocky shores strategy in 1994.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

I was involved as a agency staff member with expertise in rocky habitat ecology and management.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	20-50 Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	20-50 Hours
E. Proposal writing	0-10 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC. | Over 100 hours |
| B. Writing initial recommendation responses. | N/A, I wasn't a proposer |
| C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement. | N/A, I wasn't a proposer |
| D. Preparing your proposal presentation. | N/z, I wasn't a proposer |
-

Q6

2

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

The tool is fairly easy to use. Not all of the layers would always be available. I think that was a problem with service connections and not due to difficulty in use.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Other (please specify):
N/A, I wasn't a proposer

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

N/A, I wasn't a proposer

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

The evaluation process timeline.,
Preparing initial recommendation responses.,
Understanding Working Group decision-making,
Other (please specify):
Proposals were much longer than they needed to be, greatly increasing the time for review.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

- 1) The evaluation timeframe was much too short for 12 lengthy proposals.
 - 2) The group decision making process was not well defined and changed during the review process.
 - 3) The nature of the evaluation was not well-communicated with proposers. I think many proposers thought that the working group was evaluating the quality of the proposals (i.e., how well the proposals met requirements), rather than the merits of the site and management solutions. There seemed to be a general feeling among proposers that as long as their proposal was thorough and met requirements, then approval of the site would be automatic.
-

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

none

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

The criteria seem to be about right, nothing to add. In future proposal reviews where a working group will not be in place, some of the working group review criteria will need to be added to the agency criteria.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

I don't think criteria should be added. The questions and criteria need to be streamlined. I believe that it is not a good idea to attempt to make the criteria more quantitative (i.e., numeric scores with a pass/fail threshold).

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The compressed timeframe for evaluation.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

I believe some of the proposals would have been more successful with consultation prior to submittal. Some proposals probably wouldn't have been submitted, or substantially changed, with pre-submittal consultation.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

The review should focus on the aspects of the proposal that the working group identified as needing further work.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Agency capacity needs to be built to address these issues, either directly or through the use of volunteers.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Allow adequate time for evaluation of proposals. Allow for early and thorough interaction among proposers and agency staff.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

nothing else to add.

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 7:26:26 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 7:49:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:22:48
IP Address: 216.110.223.64

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

help write a proposal

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

zero

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

felt site designation was important

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	20-50 Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	20-50 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	20-50 Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	20-50 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC. | 20 hrs |
| B. Writing initial recommendation responses. | 5 hrs |
| C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement. | 10 hrs |
| D. Preparing your proposal presentation. | 10 hrs |
-

Q6

3

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

I actually did not use the web mapping tool much as that work was done by another person.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

**Writing,
Researching/gathering information.**

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

they were what I was assigned to do.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

because this was the first time I was involved in getting something through the government.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

none

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

none.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

none

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

how thorough the vetting process is.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

no

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

consultation with participants regarding scope and focus of areas.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

addressing the benefits of a declining human population growth rate and developing and a human population growth policy/plan.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

good things can come about through the government, but it takes a lot of patience and time and effort

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

I was impressed by the dedication, knowledge, and efforts of the working group. they were very helpful.

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 11:21:55 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 12:06:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:44:45
IP Address: 47.39.29.137

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

Commented on the southern Oregon proposals.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan’s Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

Relatively good. I have lived on the Oregon coast for 40 years and am familiar with the Territorial Sea management.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

I did not develop a proposal but I read the proposals for the southern Oregon sites and commented on them.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	0-10 Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	0-10 Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	
E. Proposal writing	
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

Q6 3

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7
What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

Maps were relatively easy to understand

Q8 Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Q9 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Q10 Respondent skipped this question

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q11 Respondent skipped this question

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Q12
What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

How the designations will be implemented and supported by on the ground activities. How will State Parks respond to the designations and what will they do to implement them.
What sort of enforcement will be put in place.
How will educational sites be supported.

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Impacts to adjacent upland areas and offshore pinniped haul out sites of increasing visitation.
Access issues to sites including safety.
View shed concerns for additional signage that might be implemented due to designation.

Q14

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Apparent lack of coordination with USFWS at the Mack Arch site for upland issues. Apparent lack of involvement with OR State Parks for access issues.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

As mentioned in Q15. I think involvement with those that manage the adjacent uplands or have responsibility for offshore islands would be beneficial early in the process of designation.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Suggest using the term evaluation rather than consultation.
There should be some concrete reasons set out for why each of the proposals needs further evaluation. This should guide the participants who should be involved. The group should be larger than the small number of people who wrote the proposal and should include people familiar with the sites, and agency reps who manage the sites. The outcome of the evaluation for sites in the education category should include a realistic assessment of whether a volunteer education group is likely to be practical at the site on a regular basis.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Encouraging the use of certain easy accessible sites and improving programming, funding and access at these sites that to become the "go to places" for tide pooling. Branding them as special in the same way that Depoe Bay has become the gray whale watching place to go. For sites that are still relatively inaccessible don't increase access.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Bottom-up citizen involvement in management decisions is important but the process was complex so it was only a few people with good computer skills that seemed to develop proposals. The Covid restrictions prevented in-person meetings and it probably would have been better to suspend the process as I think it would have benefited from more involvement of agencies and locals.

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:05:42 AM
Last Modified: Monday, June 21, 2021 10:39:45 AM
Time Spent: 02:34:03
IP Address: 96.41.187.124

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

Starting in 2019, I provided outreach to Oregon coast residents, tribes, conservation groups, businesses, research groups, state groups (like the Oregon Dungeness Crab Coalition) and community, city and county leaders about the opportunity for the public to update the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. When individuals and groups came forward with ideas for site proposals, I coordinated communications and connected individuals to each other, to state agency employees and to the Rocky Habitat Working Group. In 2020, I hosted three Q&A webinars, available to the general public, with a panel of state staff and working group members. I supported proposal writers by coordinating small meetings with them and members of the public and larger town hall type meetings, created mailing lists and newsletters, and responded to individual requests from the public and the media. I visited proposed sites with scientists and researchers, created media from photographs I took and kept the public notified throughout the entire process, particularly during the time when comments were sought from the public about the process. I also read proposals, and provided insight and editing.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

I have known about Oregon's unique TSP for years (was introduced while in college), but only learned about the RHMS in 2018.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Educating members and volunteers about rocky habitat ecology on the Oregon coast is part of my job with Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition, so supporting the site designation proposals was a natural fit.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	0-10 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	8 hours
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	10 hours
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	40 hours

Q6

1

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

I only used the tool in the very beginning of the process to experience it, but because I didn't actually write the proposal, I didn't utilize it very much. I do wish I would have participated more in the forum provided by the tool.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Outreach & engagement.,

Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...,

Developing management recommendations.,

Other (please specify):

Politics. While proposal writers and their supporters did an excellent job of working with and considering the public and private sectors when drafting the proposals - in most cases not even adding fishing restrictions but instead drafting creative non-regulatory management measures, very unfortunately there were bad actors (who were decision makers) who refused to listen to the facts and instead spread misinformation based on unfounded concerns.

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

1. Outreach and engagement in 2020 and 2021 was most certainly affected by the pandemic. A complex process during a complex time likely contributed to a lack of engagement and response from more members of the public across the board - businesses, tribes and community leaders were focused on pandemic fallout.
2. Some rules and regulations, site by site, were often unclear and state staff sometimes were baffled themselves about certain site history and current regulations. Eventually, with careful reading of many documents, the answers were found by me, but it took time.
3. Not knowing what the evaluation criteria would be made developing the management recommendations extremely difficult.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,

Understanding Working Group decision-making

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

As far as I understood, the evaluation criteria was not yet fully developed until 2021 and even then, not until after the first evaluation! It appeared during one meeting that the working group was creating the criteria in real time publicly - and not coming to an agreement about it. It was incredibly hard to watch and experience this, knowing how hard the proposers worked on the proposals.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

Respondent skipped this question

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Additional criteria should include:

1. history of conservation proposals at the site
 2. public use of the site over time (and projected future)
 3. willingness of the public to voluntarily steward the site.
-

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Additional criteria should include

1. history of conservation proposals at the site
 2. public use of the site over time (and projected future)
 3. willingness of the public to voluntarily steward the site.
-

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

1. The failure of some working group members and OPAC members to grasp the difference between MCAs and Marine Reserves.
 2. The failure and perhaps unwillingness of some working group members and OPAC members to reach out to proposals writers for clarifications before they spoke publicly of their understanding of a particular proposal.
 3. In at least one case, the spreading of misinformation by some working group members and OPAC members.
 4. That the evaluation criteria had not been established prior to December 31, 2020, the deadline of submitting proposals.
-

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Communications (consultations) with agency reps and working group members DID occur. Proposal writers took it upon themselves to do this so that their proposals would be as good as they could be.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

I have read the proposals and think that each should move forward with the recommended designation. Consultation should be swift and organized, focusing on the elements of the proposal that need refining. Consultation should include one agency staff assigned to each proposal who communicates with the representative of that proposal (some proposal writers have moved on so there may be new participants). Because so much time has already been spent, only 10 - 20 hours in total should be sufficient, between now and October. One more public comment period should be allowed for each proposal after revisions by proposers.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

This process provided an opportunity for coastal conservation groups to consider and evaluate together the issues of increased visitation to the coast. I witnessed a continuing cooperation and coordination among proposers to write solutions intended to help the state agencies manage the public at these sites. I recommend state staff read the solutions outlined in these proposals, as there are some excellent plans for addressing these issues. Some of these proposals are models for how Oregon can save our rocky habitats and should be taken seriously. The public has spoken, let's use these pilot proposals as blueprints for how to move forward.

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?

Q21

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:18:22 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:02:00 AM
Time Spent: 00:43:37
IP Address: 24.21.163.125

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

Provided public comment throughout all phases of the process
Helped some of the proposers develop site proposals and assisted with other aspects of proposer support

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

Relatively familiar with the TSP in advance of getting involved in this process in 2017. After the years spent on Chapter 3 update, I feel pretty intimately familiar with the current draft

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

We desire a TSP Ch. 3 that is a much improved version from the original, fairly balances ecological protection with human use, and includes a public site proposal and evaluation process that is fair and minimizes confusion and politicization of the process

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	20-50 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	20-50 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	30
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	20
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	20
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	8

Q6 **4**

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

- Formatting limitations
- Single author limitation
- Proposal naming protocol is non-descriptive and confusing when more than one proposal
- Difficult for the public to utilize (not user friendly)
- Lack of compatibility with other GIS tools such as Oregon Explorer

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Outreach & engagement.,
Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...,
Communication with agency staff, and Working Group members.
,
Using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool. ,
Developing management recommendations.,
Other (please specify):
pretty much all of the above had particular challenges

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Stakeholder outreach during covid
Stakeholder outreach during the short 30day period between the initial and final working group evaluation. Not really any time to ask community members their opinion regarding the working group considerations.
No formal back and forth with the agencies during the feasibility analysis so that confusion during the evaluation could be avoided.
No mechanism during the April 29th presentation of the proposers to the WG to resolve the WG "considerations"
The evaluation criteria questions weren't in synch with the rocky habitat strategy objectives and principles.
The evaluation process having no formal rubric (scoring system).
Closed door working group meetings
Proposal voting process that was decided on the fly (leaving public and working group unprepared)

Many other issues that will take more than 20 minutes for this survey. We will be providing DLCD a detailed recommendation document outlining potential pathways/solutions to improve the evaluation (Section E, Appendix C) process.

We request meetings beyond the 1 July workshop that DLCD is organizing (thank you for that) as we expect it will take much more public interaction than one 6-hour workshop to help develop and provide feedback to create a proposal and evaluation process that will be adequate moving forward

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Other (please specify):
See responses above. I would say a major issue was the process being a moving target so the public often had to adapt on the fly as the working group changed the way they said they were going to do things.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

To much to list here.

We will provide more info in a detailed formal evaluation recommendation letter to DLCD in advance of the July workshop

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

A big one is how "continuing consultation" and resolving section E will interface. I would say, its probably best to get Section E and Appendix C totally straightened out (with a lot of public input). Get that approved by OPAC at the fall 2021 meeting. Then, use the new and finalized evaluation process to evaluate the 6 remaining continuing consultation pproposals in time for OPAC to vote on them in spring 2022. I think that is what I recall OPAC approving during the May meeting but it wasn't totally clear

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

We will provide detailed recommendations on this in advance of the July workshop

In general, a formal readiness assessment should be considered for fully developed proposals (Examples: ACOE 401 permit; ODFW R&E grants)

In advance of the agency feasibility and completeness analysis DLCD should consider inviting the public to submit a Pre-application readiness review for initial screening and feedback. Those given the green light would then develop full proposals, conduct stakeholder outreach, etc.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

We will provide a detailed recommendation to DLCD in advance of the July workshop.

A couple quick things:

Ensure that criteria questions are based on management need (not whether proposers included certain info)

There are criteria in the Oregon Rocky Shores Natural Resources Inventory that are still relevant (e.g. intertidal overuse, marine wildlife conflicts) that could be referred to develop new evaluation criteria questions.

Recommend considering evaluation criteria question(s) specific to climate change concerns.

Break down each RHMS principle and policy into an evaluation question (they are currently lumped into 1 criteria question for goals/policies/principles - see pgs. 1-3 in the Draft IPP).

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Too many to count ;-)

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes, it would have reduced confusion

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

Evaluate them after Section E and Appendix C are finalized (with full public input) and approved by OPAC

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

coastwide management plan discussed by the working group is a good idea but should be targeted on the sites that are designated and with the most issues of wildlife disturbance and lack of public education.

Need to get more funds to agencies to implement this but with close coordination and agency support of stewardship groups

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

try not to get frustrated

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

look forward to DLCD really listening to the public and taking recommendations seriously so we can work together to develop a great evaluation and proposal process for the long term

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, June 24, 2021 8:22:54 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, June 24, 2021 9:10:35 AM
Time Spent: 00:47:41
IP Address: 24.181.141.205

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I'm with the Audubon Society of Lincoln City and have been involved with our Rocky Habitat Campaign from the beginning. I helped craft a job description and hire a part-time temporary staff person to coordinate our Campaign. My other activities included: 1) helping decide which rocky habitat sites in Lincoln and Tillamook counties to select for designation; 2) helping develop our campaign strategy and forming our Rocky Habitat Campaign team; 3) attending DLCD and OPAC meetings and workshops; 4) conducting stakeholder outreach; 5) drafting OP-EDs and helping write and edit video narratives, outreach materials, and other media content; 6) conducting on-site research at both sites to observe human activity; 7) reviewing and editing our two proposals; and 8) participating in numerous meetings to discuss proposal process and development, stakeholder outreach, and Working Group and OPAC reactions to our proposals.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

Limited knowledge prior to becoming more involved with our decision to participate in the site-designation, proposal submission process.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

After working for a national environmental organization for 30 years, I retired on the Central Oregon Coast in 2009 (where my family has had a home for more than 75 years) and became involved with Lincoln City Audubon. Our board supports Oregon's decision to invite community groups like ours to nominate rocky habitat sites for designation. The Coast is an extraordinary place. As our population grows and environmental stressors increase, we need to protect as much of it as we can while at the same time helping ensure that our local fishing industry remains productive and sustainable.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	0-10 Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	0-10 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	See Kent Doughty's response to this question
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	See Kent Doughty's response to this question
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	See Kent Doughty's response to this question
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	See Kent Doughty's response to this question

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

I did not use the RH Mapping Tool

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Writing,

Researching/gathering information.,

Outreach & engagement.,

Communication with agency staff, and Working Group members.

,

Other (please specify):

Not being given the opportunity to present our proposals directly to the WG and OPAC

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

I drafted one or two sections of our proposals and helped edit them. From my experience doing so, I would say this:

- 1) The proposal requirements were extravagant and time consuming to complete. OPAC seemed to require much more information than was needed to evaluate the merits of a proposal. That said, community groups rose to the occasion and several submitted proposals of exceptional quality.
- 2) The proposal questions invited significant redundancy. This was frustrating to those of us drafting the proposals and surely also to those who read and evaluated them. I suggest DLCD take a very close look at the proposal application and revise it to reduce redundancy and elicit only information OPAC needs to make an informed decision about whether to recommend the proposal or not.
- 3) We were asked to conduct stakeholder outreach to determine what stakeholders supported our proposed designations (and why) and what stakeholders didn't (and why). We reported our findings in our proposals, as required, and responded to stakeholders' concerns. We were not required, however, to win over those who were opposed to the designations, as some WG and OPAC members seemed to imply in their discussions of our proposals.
- 4) If Oregon invites community groups and individuals to submit proposals to nominate rocky habitat sites for designation, then DLCD staff, WG members, and state agency staff must make themselves available to answer questions and provide feedback – all in an effort to ensure that the proposals submitted are complete and well-informed. DLCD and WG concerns over potential conflicts of interest and possible bias got in the way of effective communication, creating a major problem for proposers.
- 5) Unfortunately, proposers were not allowed to present their proposals to the WG or to OPAC. Nor were they given the opportunity before voting occurred to correct any misstatements or misunderstandings of their proposals made by DLCD staff or WG members. Outcomes would have been different if proposers had been given a voice. Not providing proposers a voice at these meetings was a huge failure in the process.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,

Understanding Working Group decision-making,

Other (please specify):

There was a lack of consistency by DLCD, WG, and OPAC in evaluating proposals. For example, some proposers who conducted significant stakeholder outreach were criticized for not doing more while little concern was expressed for a few proposers who conducted little, if any, stakeholder outreach. Focus of discussion should have been on the merits of a proposal and the extent and effectiveness of the proposer's stakeholder outreach. Too much time was spent discussing incomplete proposals. Incomplete proposals should not have been forwarded to the WG for evaluation. Attention should have focused exclusively on completed proposals.

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

The evaluation process was baffling and confusing for WG members as well as proposers. What was needed was an evaluation rubric with a value assigned to each component of the rubric. Each proposal would have received a total score. This process would likely have resulted in greater objectivity and centered discussion on the merits – or demerits -- of a proposal. It would have also served to inhibit discussion of issues not relevant to the rules and requirements of the proposal submission process and the designation criteria.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

No response

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

The results of this analysis should have been captured in graphic form and shared with WG members and proposers at the public meetings. Some of these categories (for example "budgetary impacts") should not have been on the table for discussion by agencies. We were informed potential budget impacts would not be a part of the evaluation process.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

The results of this analysis should have been captured in graphic form and shared with WG members and proposers at the public meetings.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

I was surprised and frustrated by how much the WG's discussions of our proposals veered off course. Much of this could have been avoided if the WG and DLCD had taken measured steps to make the evaluation process more objective and by hiring a facilitator well-steeped in RH Management Strategy issues to facilitate each of the evaluation meetings.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Such consultation should have been a part of the process from the get-go. The WG's discouraging it -- claiming potential bias or conflict of interest -- served to sabotage the process. Every proposal would have been stronger as a result and several more proposals, including our own, would likely have been recommended to OPAC.

Community groups are new to the proposal submission process, lack expertise in the issues, and are unfamiliar with state agency processes. They should have been given every opportunity to have dialogue with, and obtain feedback from, the principal players.

In the future, I suggest that DLCD staff be advocates for the proposers, ensuring that their proposals are complete, that they connect with appropriate agency staff to get their questions answered, point them in the right direction for data they may need, and be at their side when the proposers present their proposals to the Working Group or OPAC. Instead, DLCD staff presented the proposals and we proposers had to sit silently by as DLCD staff, WG members, and OPAC discussed our proposals. We were unable to correct misperceptions or misrepresentations.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

I think you should meet with each of the proposers individually and provide them with frank advice on how to strengthen their proposals to help ensure that OPAC votes to recommend them at its spring 2022 meeting.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

I think this is a good question and that answers to it should be sought, but is now the time to do it? And are we the appropriate players? Our focus should be on the matter at hand – building the inventory of RHMS inventory of rocky habitat sites in need of protections under the strategy.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

I'm proud that we participated in the process and held our heads high throughout. Hopefully OPAC and DLCD can learn from our experience and feedback to improve the second phase of the proposal submission process. Most community groups invested an extraordinary amount of time and resources in the effort. If the proposal submission process isn't streamlined significantly and a more objective evaluation process put in place, community groups may not be willing to nominate rocky habitat sites for designation.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

Yes, it took me much much longer than 20 minutes to complete this questionnaire. Looks like I wrote about 1200 words (which is more than a full day's work for many professional writers).

Your questions on the hours spent on particular tasks does not capture the full extent of the time and resources our team spent on our two proposals. I estimate the time that I spent on the proposals from June 1st to December 31st to be the equivalent of more than eight 40-hour weeks.

Lastly, if another WG is formed to review proposals, I suggest there be no overlap in membership between WG and OPAC with the possible exception of having one ex-officio OPAC member on the WG.

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, June 24, 2021 2:38:26 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:21:09 PM
Time Spent: 00:42:42
IP Address: 67.42.220.189

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I coordinated the development of two proposals submitted by the Audubon Society of Lincoln City. This role included coordinating a team of volunteers, developing and implementing strategies for stakeholder engagement, leading webinars to inform the public and gain public input on proposals, research and information gathering, developing management recommendations, serving as lead author on proposals, creating plan maps on SeaSketch, networking with other groups, preparing responses to Working Group recommendations, tracking evaluation process, attending Working Group and OPAC meetings as well as meetings within ASLC core group working on rocky habitat, onsite monitoring and observations, preparing work plans and schedules, consult with DLCD and other agencies to the extent feasible.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

I was aware of the Phase II process to update the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy Phase II but had limited knowledge. I had a solid working knowledge of Statewide planning goal 19 and the Nearshore Strategy.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Building community and knowing our efforts would help preserve ecologically amazing shoreline habitats in our backyard. The work provides me with a deeper sense of place.

The opportunity to work with a group of passionate and well informed volunteers on rocky habitat management issues and proposals. The ASLC core team of volunteers contributed over 2500 hours to the proposal development and over 1100 combined hours to the proposal evaluation process. In addition to hours by this core team, hundreds of hours were put into the proposals by supportive stakeholders. The level of community engagement was astounding and highly motivating

The hours by category in the next question represent only my personal hours and not the team

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	20-50 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	20-50 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	55 hours
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	80 hours
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	389 hours
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	16 hours

Q6

4

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

While SeaSketch may be used worldwide, the application for proposal development was very problematic. SeaSketch is not a suitable platform for the following reasons:

Formatting limitations

Single author limitation

Proposal naming protocol is non-descriptive and confusing when more than one proposal

Difficult for the public to utilize especially for members of the public not experienced using on-line mapping tools.

Lack of compatibility with other GIS tools such as Oregon Explorer

Technical assistance from DLCD was outstanding. The SeaSketch forums were conceptually a good way of information sharing but I do not believe they had sufficient use to be effective and did not generate interactive dialog among proponents, agency staff, and Working Group members.

The inability to tunnel down to metadata sources with the data layers. The information was static. One could visually see overlaps of layers but there was no analytical capability.

There were errors and inconsistencies in the data. Data layers like the substrates appeared to be in error as the estimated areas were computed on different baselines. The recreational use data were inconsistent with data in OPRD reports. The reported depth ranges would sometimes seem reasonable, then at other times, likely in error (this may be attributable to a drawn polygon appearing to be closed but not completely closed (?). Groundtruthing the depth algorithm is suggested. Without a transparent documentation of data sources, these apparent discrepancies created a low confidence in the data.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Communication with agency staff, and Working Group members.

,

Other (please specify):

Undefined criteria for evaluating proposals, vague and misleading questions on the proposal form, the inability to communicate with the agencies

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Several members of the Working Group said they could not discuss a proposal during the development stage as then they would have to recuse themselves from the evaluation process. Agency staff not directly involved with Part III were not informed about the process. Those agency staff involved in Part III were helpful in answering technical questions but provided no assistance in helping frame issues or express agency considerations in advance of the feasibility assessment. As an example, Dave Fox (ODFW) was exceptionally helpful in providing data sources and I commend him on his contribution to the RHMS.. We had several discussions regarding the Cape Foulweather proposal. He did not mention concerns about it being a comparison area for the marine reserve until I discovered this overlap and directly asked him what concerns our preliminary recommendations posed. Knowing that it was a comparison site at the onset would have been very helpful. The comparison site data layer was not added to SeaSketch until I brought up this concern. This underscores the need for agency involvement early in the scoping process for developing proposals.

Many of the questions on the proposal form were vague and upon asking DLCD for clarification, the information sought was not at all consistent with the question as stated in the proposal template.

There was unnecessary redundancy in the questions. Example: Request to identify key resources including ESA species and indicator species is redundant with the request to list all species present (the latter was of little value and use during the review).

There was no defined location in the proposal form to list management recommendations. Information was requested that was not used in the evaluation process. Example: List infrastructure

The proposal process presented a moving target with substantive changes in the process.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

**Understanding the evaluation process.,
Communication with agency staff, Working Group members.
,
Understanding Working Group decision-making**

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

There was a complete lack of communication between the Working Group members/agencies with the proponents. We were informed by one agency person that they were specifically instructed to not seek clarification or discuss the proposal with proponents. No details on the agency completeness and evaluation were shared with the proponents. If the agencies applied the draft criteria, then those worksheets should be made available to the public. The Working Group held closed door meetings that may have marginally satisfied legal requirements but were not in the spirit of collaboration. This complete disregard for the proponents and lack of communication was highly ineffective and resulted in errors and misperceptions by the Working Group during the evaluation. A lack of dialog between proponents and reviewers wasted everyone's time, alienated the public, and proposals were evaluated on misperceptions.

The Working Group did not have a well defined process for decision making. The decision making was not consistent among proposals. One can not understand the evaluation process when there is no process actually applied.

The criteria for evaluation were not made available in advance of proposal development and were not consistently applied, if at all. Lack of applying criteria resulted in evaluations focused on feasibility of agency implementation and did not consider site merits. Working Group evaluations were subjective without consistently applied criteria.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

The evaluation process (criteria, decision making, and outcomes) is still unclear and poorly defined.

Proponents spent considerable effort in preparing responses to considerations. These responses were not taken into account during subsequent Working Group discussions. In fact, the Working Group chose to vote on proposals as they understood them prior to the request for responses to considerations.

The Working Group's evaluation was not consistent with the policies and terminology of the RHMS. As an example, the Strategy defines the upper extent of rocky habitat as the vegetation line of 16 ft above mean high tide. The Working Group and agency feasibility analysis restricted the definition to the mean high tide

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Site merit: natural resource values and value to users

Does a site designation benefit agency goals and program objectives

The proposal form stated that proposals would not be evaluated on budget yet this was the primary consideration during the agency review

Even though the proposal identified some recommendations as long-term subject to future capacity, all recommendations were treated as mandates for immediate implementation.

Details of the agency evaluation were not made public. While helpful, the DLCD summary of agency analysis was not transparent. Without any dialog between the agencies and the proponents and lack of shared documentation, it is difficult to know how the agency feasibility and completeness analysis was conducted

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

The problem was not in the content of the evaluation criteria. The problem was that the criteria were not used, which resulted in subjective and non-transparent decisions. The Working Group discussion was not tied to each section of the proposal form. As an example, the proposal form specifically stated that proposals would not be evaluated on budget yet this was a focal point for much of the Working Group's discussion.

The criterion does not allow the reviewer to assess or score the proposal's means of addressing or advancing the goals, objectives, management principles and policies. Using individual management principles and policies as the criterion and a scoring rubric provides a means to systematically measure how well the proposal achieves the criterion.

Currently, all the management guidance and policies from Phase 1 work appear in one criterion: "Goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3 should be adequately addressed and/or advanced". This is too broad ranged to be effectively applied. Does this single criterion imply a proposal must address all goals, objectives and management principles? The criterion does not allow the reviewer the ability to assess how well a proposal advanced the goals, objectives and principles of the RHMS. Recommend using individual management principles and policies as the criterion and a scoring rubric to measure how well the proposal achieves the criterion.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The lack of quantifiable criteria being applied in a consistent manner. The Working Group developed draft criteria but never used them. The lack of organization and leadership within the Working Group was capitalized on by those with an agenda. Decisions on proposals seemed arbitrary.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes, communication early in the proposal development process would have benefited defining issues that need to be addressed during the proposal development. For example, perceptions of marine reserves and confusion if proposals can include sub-tidal areas.

Yes, communication for clarifying during the agency completeness and feasibility analysis would have been more efficient for all and avoided errors and misperceptions. Example, the agencies erroneously thought the upper extent of the plan area was the vegetation line.

Yes, it was documented in the Working Group's discussion that at least one member that initially voted to not recommend a proposal subsequently asked to change a vote after a brief post-vote communication clarified concerns. The request to modify the vote was not allowed, therefore the not recommended status was based on erroneous information. An open dialog between the Working Group and the proponents during the evaluation would have easily clarified many concerns and misinformation.

Yes, it is well documented in the literature that effective planning and management for marine areas is dependent on collaboration of agencies and the public. This process ended up alienating the public, especially those who have the strongest interests in the management of rocky habitat.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

As a first step, DLCD should analyze if the responses to considerations satisfactorily address those considerations. This will frame and limit further discussions to unresolved issues that have already been identified. This avoids repeating the considerable effort that has already been invested in evaluation.

A workshop should be held to foster a dialogue between proponents and agencies on how unresolved issues can best be addressed in a manner satisfactory to all parties. The workshop can also document any issues that can not be resolved. An addendum to the proposal can be attached that documents discussions at this workshop.

The proposals should be evaluated on established, quantifiable, transparent and replicable criteria. The criteria should be equitable and science based. These criteria may differ from criteria for evaluation during the maintenance period as the proposal form is likely to be modified.

The decision process regarding recommendations to OPAC should be clearly defined (who, what and how) prior to evaluating the six proposals.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

They need to be addressed within both site-based management and coastwide programs. Agency and public collaboration on stewardship programs with appropriate funding to develop and implement.

This is an important element of the RHMS, but it is not specific to revisions to Section E (the proposal process). Given the time constraints for the initial July workshop, a discussion of coastwide issues should occur during a separate meeting and NOT as part of the proposal revision workshop.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Community based initiatives for managing Oregon's publicly owned natural resources requires collaboration between the public and agencies. Defined processes and expectations need to be well defined at the onset. Dialog needs to occur as part of a formal process (scoping meetings, etc) as well as informal discussions. Community groups have demonstrated ample capability to develop proposals but it is frustrating to do so in a vacuum without meaningful dialog between public and agencies.

Having been a state agency employee myself as well as an active citizen on many initiatives, this experience has underscored my awareness that agencies and the public have a long ways to go to learn how to work collaboratively.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

This survey only mentions stakeholder outreach once in a multiple choice list. I consider stakeholder outreach at the heart of the proposal process, yet it is only minimally noted in this survey. Proposals that had little to no stakeholder outreach were evaluated as comparable to those with extensive outreach. There appears to be disparity among the RHMS, Working Group members, DLCD, OPAC, and proponents as to the role of stakeholder outreach in the proposal process. Clarification is needed so that there is a shared understanding of what is expected for stakeholder outreach and how it factors into the evaluation criteria.

Equitable and science based evaluation criteria are needed

The unimplemented sites listed in the 1994 inventory should be added to this update or provide information on the recommended deletions of 1994 areas to the LCDC as required by ORS 196 and ORS 197.

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 5:01:33 PM
Last Modified: Friday, June 25, 2021 10:45:20 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 71.94.251.226

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

Support of the person developing the proposal.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

None. I was frustrated with behavior I saw happening on the beach, and wanted to see protections put in place.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

I saw people and wildlife being negatively impacted by behavior of visitors to the beach. Over time I have seen an increase in tourists and a decrease in birds and wildlife.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	50 + Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	50 + Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

- A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC. **15**
 - B. Writing initial recommendation responses. **35**
 - C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement. **25**
 - D. Preparing your proposal presentation. **20**
-

Q6

4

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

It is a good program, and even with the training, I had to work with it a while to try to navigate through it.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Writing,
Researching/gathering information.,
Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...,
Communication with agency staff, and Working Group members.
 ,
Developing management recommendations.

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Trying to get up to speed and meet the requirements was time intensive. We met numerous times, spent hours trying to come up with data for the proposal.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,
Communication with agency staff, Working Group members.
 ,
Preparing initial recommendation responses.,
Understanding Working Group decision-making

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

A group of us spent hours meeting, discussing, and trying to figure out what we needed to do to generate a successful proposal.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

I am not familiar with agency elements, and it was difficult to try to come up to speed quickly.

Q13

Respondent skipped this question

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Q14

Respondent skipped this question

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The initial rollout of updates to the rocky habitat plan said the public was being allowed input, but that isn't what happened. This is an agency process rolled onto the public, which is unachievable.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes. We made our best guess, working through the proposal, but we weren't sure if what we were submitting would work.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

I don't expect the proposals we submitted will be progressed.

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

These issues can only be managed by utilizing empowered volunteer educational programs. There is not enough government or state personnel or budget to manage these issues. Putting together some training and expectations and a reporting program would take a little budget, but it would be worthwhile. Provide some vests with a phone number of who the public can contact regarding our performance, positive or negative. Have communication meetings every two weeks during the summer with key volunteers. Don't continue to tell us these issues won't be addressed.

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

That as part of the public, I am powerless to affect change.

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

The proposal process was opened to the public to provide input regarding rocky habitat changes, but it isn't manageable by the public. It may be better that we know that up front. I didn't intend to complete this survey, but I was encouraged by others to provide a perspective of someone who is part of "the public".

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, June 28, 2021 7:30:02 PM
Last Modified: Monday, June 28, 2021 8:40:04 PM
Time Spent: 01:10:02
IP Address: 204.195.46.35

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

I worked with the Lincoln City Audubon Rocky Habitat Core team to develop the proposals for Cape Foulweather and Cape Outlook. In addition to our series of planning meetings, I contacted multiple stakeholders involving meetings and phone conversations with representatives of the fishing community, city councils, local businesses, and homeowners associations. I reviewed some of the background material and rules for application, interacted briefly with SeaScape, and helped review and edit some of the language that became part of these proposals. I communicated with the Friends of Otter Rock group about the development of the proposals and alerted them to webinars and other related events. I attended meetings of the Working Group and OPAC.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

My knowledge and experience prior to involvement was nil. I was excited by the state's invitation and opportunity for community involvement. So I was recruited into coastal stewardship by opportunities such as this.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

Having moved to Oregon's mid-coast 8 years ago, I came to appreciate the beautiful and fragile environment; so much so that I undertook the task of organizing an advocacy group for the Otter Rock Marine Reserve, which was the only Marine Reserve without an active advocacy group, without staff, and without funding. I was motivated by observing the threats to the wildlife and the environment posed by careless visitors.

I was also motivated by the opportunity to create programs of education and interpretation that could inspire visitors to become good stewards of the environment and pass their excitement along to others.

When I became aware of the Oregon's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy, I mistakenly thought that meant that the state was truly interested in extending the protections, community involvement, and interpretive programming to more areas along the coast.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	10-20 Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	10-20 Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	10-20 Hours
E. Proposal writing	0-10 Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	Refer to the survey of our Team Leader, Kent Doughty.
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	Refer to the survey of our Team Leader, Kent Doughty.
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	Refer to the survey of our Team Leader, Kent Doughty.
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	Refer to the survey of our Team Leader, Kent Doughty.

Q6

3

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

I think the tool is a great resource, combining many data sources. We did encounter some difficulties and gaps in the information available.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

**Outreach & engagement.,
Understanding rules, regulations, and policies etc...**

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

Kent Doughty will have a better sense of this for our overall project, but for me personally

Stakeholder outreach was a challenge. Fishing/recreational community representatives were particularly difficult and alerted me to the political nature of this process. The individuals I spoke with had no objection to the specific elements of our proposal. Their reservation or opposition was purely driven by the distrust of state regulatory agencies and the fear of "regulation creep" that might result from further Rocky Habitat designations. Our proposal contained NO change to regulation or harvesting, but was almost completely focused on community/visitor education and interpretation. One operator would have liked to send a letter of support, were it not for the blow-back and difficulties that would ensue from other operators.

Rules, regulations, policies: My frustration here pertains to the rules and policy for carrying out evaluation of the Rocky Habitat proposals. The rules surrounding one of the meetings of the Working Group were such that at least one negative vote was made on the basis of false assumptions and there was no opportunity to correct the misunderstanding. A subsequent effort by the voting individual to reverse the vote was ignored. The Working Group was frequently confused about what a yes or no vote would mean. The application of criteria for approval/denial was inconsistent. One proposal received a Working Group objection to a particular element of their proposal, but that element was on another proposal without objection.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,

Communication with agency staff, Working Group members.

,

The evaluation process timeline.,

Understanding Working Group decision-making

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Evaluation Process: What Process?

Communication with agency and Working Group Staff: non-existent, highly discouraged

Evaluation timeline: It was difficult to carry out some aspects like stakeholder contacts during the COVID restrictions.

Working group decision-making: Chaotic and inconsistent

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

Criteria for approval and disapproval

Working Group meeting rules and criteria applied.

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

Proposal value with respect to community education and recruitment for stewardship of coastal ecology and wildlife health.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

1. See #13: Proposal value with respect to community education and recruitment for stewardship of coastal ecology and wildlife.
 2. Criteria that were present were ignored or inconsistently applied.
-

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

Chaos and inconsistency. I have worked in state government and never seen a public process that was this disorganized and inconsistently applied.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes. Early and ongoing communication is important

Early on conversations would eliminate guesswork for and misperceptions about proposal contents, and would inform proposal writers how best to synchronize with agency rules and strategies.

Interaction with the Working Group during the meetings is also important where misperceptions can result in faulty voting. As stated in question 9 above, there was an instance for our proposals where a negative vote was the result of a misunderstanding that could have been clarified before the vote. The individual attempted to reverse her vote, but that was not allowed. The reversal of that one vote would have put our proposal into the category of the two approved proposals for the final Working Group meeting.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

1. There should be a consultation between the proposers and the agencies to determine alignment with them.
 2. Clear alignment or misalignment with the stated criteria should be established rather than the haphazard application to the various proposals. New criteria should be imposed by mutual agreement only.
 3. The relative importance of criteria should be established, perhaps with a weighting system to establish a final score and a cut-off point for final approval.
 4. Proposal adjustments should be permitted where proposal elements can reasonably be added or subtracted.
 5. Final approval or disapproval should be accomplished by June, 2022.
-

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

1. Community education, interpretation, and recruitment were central to our proposal. Effective interpretation techniques communicate stories and messages to visitors that they will remember, pass on, and become good stewards themselves. This requires boots on the ground, which significantly can be filled by volunteers.
 2. The extent to which proposals address and deliver programming to connect with and inspire visitors, local residents, and volunteers should have been part of the criteria all along.
 3. Rather than additional criteria for the Continuation group, the state would do well to provide an infusion of funds to the current Marine Reserves and any Rocky Habitat area that has a credible advocacy group to carry out a plan of interpretation, carried out by docents and volunteers.
-

Q19

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

1. Mismanagement of processes like this run the risk of discouraging community participation in the future.
 2. Outreach and coordination with stakeholders is critical.
 3. Processes like this are best conducted when they allow and involve collaboration and ongoing communication with state and federal agencies as well as others with whom alignment is possible.
-

Q20

Is there anything else you would like to share?

1. Communication among the agencies seemed to be lacking. It would appear that identification of strategic overlaps or conflicts should be addressed and made public, such that the agencies can deliver consistent and synchronized messages for public consumption and action.
 2. Damage was done by this process to the willingness of community residents to participate in public processes. The state should get its act together and encourage (through funding, in-kind assistance, and other incentives) community groups to be involved in activities that protect and preserve these ecologically fragile areas and the wildlife within.
-
-

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, July 01, 2021 4:13:58 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, July 01, 2021 4:31:49 PM
Time Spent: 00:17:51
IP Address: 47.42.185.194

Page 1

Q1

What role did you play in development of rocky habitat site management designation proposal(s)?

As a local coastal resident and president of our local Audubon chapter in Lincoln City (ASLC), I have a strong interest in preserving our natural habitats for birds and for other wildlife. We learned of the proposed amendment of the 1994 TSP in early 2019 - we began attending events as well as bringing in experts to talk to us about the 1994 plan, the proposed revisions, the Nearshore Strategy, etc. With our Conservation Action Committee chair, I formed a team to develop our strategy for proposing sites in the two counties that make up our service area, Lincoln County and Tillamook County. In early 2020, after conducting months of research and learning, our ASLC team visited sites in both counties. After conversations with local residents, our local membership, and others, we selected one site in each county, Cape Lookout in Tillamook county and Cape Foulweather in Lincoln county. In looking at the process that was being developed, we realized that we would need more resources than our volunteers. We sought grants to enable us, for the first time, to hire a part time person to coordinate our efforts and prepare the proposals.

My role has been to oversee the new coordinator, engage with decision makers, build partnerships, participate with the core team in research and outreach, attend meetings, manage our campaign grants and budget, liaise with our ASLC Board and membership, and make presentations to stakeholders and interested persons about our campaign and proposals, provide testimony to OPAC.

Q2

What was your knowledge of, or experience with, the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan's Rocky Habitat Management Strategy prior to becoming involved with a site designation proposal?

Prior to my becoming president of Lincoln City Audubon (ASLC), our chapter focused primarily on education and community science, with a secondary focus on conservation. Three years ago we formed our Conservation Action Committee and have increased our engagement in issues such as the revision of Chapter 3 of the territorial sea plan. We learned of the proposed amendment of the 1994 TSP in early 2019, at which time we began attending events as well as bringing in experts to talk to us about the 1994 plan, the proposed revisions, the Nearshore Strategy, etc.

Q3

What were the primary motivating factors for spending your personal time and energy developing a site designation proposal?

My primary motivation is the preservation of the habitats along the coast, including the nearshore rocky habitats. I was excited to learn about the plan for a community-driven, site-based process that would further expand the 1994 Rocky Shore Inventory and bring the management plan into the 21st century, addressing climate change, ocean acidification, and other key issues.

Q4

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during proposal development stage (Jun - Dec 2020)?

	Category Selections
A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50 + Hours
B. Research, reviewing literature/background info.	50 + Hours
C. SeaSketch/site design (not including proposal form)	0-10 Hours
D. Community/Stakeholder outreach and engagement.	50 + Hours
E. Proposal writing	50 + Hours
F. Filling out SeaSketch proposal form.	10-20 Hours

Q5

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you/your team spent on the following tasks during the proposal evaluation stage? (Jan-Apr 2021)

A. Communicating/Interacting with agency staff, Working Group, and OPAC.	50
B. Writing initial recommendation responses.	80
C. Community/stakeholder outreach and engagement.	180
D. Preparing your proposal presentation.	80

Q6

5

Using the slider below, please rate the level of difficulty you experienced using the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool.

Q7

What elements of the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool contributed most to your rating in the previous question?

While it was good to have the GIS capability built into the proposal platform, the platform was more geared toward simple answers, not a proposal such as the ones we wrote. There was no formatting for answers, no ability to include diagrams or images in context, and no ability to print out the resulting proposal when completed. We were unable to easily share authorship, forcing us to work outside of the platform and copy the results into the form. The lack of formatting caused hours of additional proofreading as we copied our responses into the form. To overcome the lack of ability to include tables and format, we attached a PDF of our complete proposal as one of the attachments.

The GIS capability was a benefit, however, there was limited, invalid, and contradictory data in the GIS layers. Having two proposals, there was no easy way to tell which of our two proposals we were selecting when trying to access for updates or edits.

The idea for a community forum was good, but the working group did not engage and often staff did not respond timely to posted questions.

Q8

What were the most challenging aspects of developing your proposal(s)?

Communication with agency staff, and Working Group members.

Other (please specify):

Unclear and redundant questions on the proposal form, the inability to have a dialog with the agencies, lack of clear evaluation criteria, community outreach during the pandemic

Q9

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging for developing your proposal?

It is difficult to choose which was the most difficult - scientific research, comprehensive stakeholder outreach (especially during the pandemic), and bringing ourselves up to speed on laws, rules, and regulations were all heavy lifts for our small organization. The proposal questions themselves were duplicative and confusing, a problem which could have been managed had we more interaction with staff to understand the purpose behind the questions and have a dialog about how best to address them. Most of the challenges we faced could have been mitigated with regular, beneficial interaction with agency staff, including DLCD and other key agencies.

- Many of the questions on the proposal form were vague and upon asking DLCD for clarification, the information sought was not at all consistent with the question as stated in the proposal template.

- There was unnecessary redundancy in the questions. Example: Request to identify key resources including ESA species and indicator species is redundant with the request to list all species present (the latter was of little value and use during the review)

- There was no defined location in the proposal form to list management recommendations.

Information was requested that was not used in the evaluation process. Example: List infrastructure

- The proposal process presented a moving target with substantive changes during the process.

Q10

What were the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

Understanding the evaluation process.,

Communication with agency staff, Working Group members.

Understanding Working Group decision-making

Q11

Why were your selections in the previous question the most challenging aspects of the proposal evaluation process?

One of the most frustrating things during the process was the inability to have a dialog. We were told by more than one working group member that they had been instructed not to have a dialog with proposers. One of the most difficult days of my life was listening to the Working Group review our two proposals based on inaccurate proposal summaries (the slides) and asking questions or making inaccurate observations about what our proposal entailed. All of which could have been avoided by:

- 1) having had each proposer make a 20 minute presentation to the Working Group prior to the "evaluation"
- 2) allowing the agencies, as they conducted their initial review, to reach out to the proposers and have a dialog

We saw little to no indication that the evaluation criteria had been used during the review process. For instance, we were told that funding was not going to be scored, but funding was a major concern. In addition, we were told that stakeholder outreach was required, and we did this extensively, but were scored no higher than proposals with little to no stakeholder outreach. During working group discussions, it was made to sound that our stakeholder outreach had been ineffective because we had not brought every group around to our way of thinking.

We were told that the two key elements for a successful proposal were site merit, based on research and science, and community (stakeholder) engagement. However, stakeholder engagement and site merit were barely discussed. Instead, the evaluations focused on feasibility of agency implementation and funding. Working Group evaluations were subjective without consistently applied criteria and a scoring mechanism, which was lacking.

The working group appeared to be arguing as much over the RHMS changes that were adopted in May 2020 as they were with our proposals. The inclusion of sub-tidal, with clear justification, is in the revised plan, but it was continually brought up as an issue. The mean high tide line vs the vegetation line is also in the May 2020 version, but we were advised to change our proposal to mean high tide. We did this prior to submitting, but the proposal summary inaccurately stated that we were attempting to use the vegetation line.

What we saw of the working group's decision-making process was not defined - the first several minutes of each meeting focused on who was a voting member and what entailed a consensus. However, even if those issues had been resolved, the voting was entirely subjective and based on inaccurate information, so even a clear understanding of who was eligible to vote and what constituted consensus would have been moot.

With more interaction and a clear evaluation process, the closed door sessions and subsequent misinterpretations would have been avoided.

Q12

What, if any, elements of the Rocky Habitat Site Management designation proposal process are still unclear to you? Why?

I am not sure that what we observed after submitting our proposal can be considered a process. The lack of clear definition of roles, lack of objectively applied evaluation criteria, inability to present our proposal and answer questions, and shifting targets (e.g., implementability vs merit) to me are clear indicators that the "process" is broken and needs to be reworked. It is critical that those of us who submitted the initial 12 proposals be at the table when this takes place.

Q13

The Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis evaluated proposal based on the completeness of information, agency jurisdiction and authority, implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, landscape-scale management, administrative rule and enforcement, and alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan. What, if any, additional criteria should agency staff consider when analyzing future proposals?

We were told that, in addition to alignment with the TSP, the key elements for a successful proposal were site merit, based on research and science, and community (stakeholder) engagement. However, stakeholder engagement and site merit were barely discussed. Instead, the evaluations focused on feasibility of agency implementation and funding. Working Group evaluations were subjective without consistently applied criteria and a scoring mechanism, which was lacking.

The initial review for completeness should have been conducted by DLCD staff, with proposals lacking completeness rejected or returned to the proposer for completion. Agencies and the working group wasted many hours discussing proposals that were incomplete. These should never have gotten to the agency review step.

The first review by the agencies should have included

- agency jurisdiction and authority,
- administrative rule and enforcement, and
- alignment with the Territorial Sea Plan.

Issues such as implementation feasibility, programmatic and budgetary impacts, and landscape-scale management should be addressed after sites are designated, as part of the implementation feasibility assessment. At this time, public meetings can be held and adjustments made to the management recommendations and even to site boundaries.

Q14

The Working Group Evaluation included evaluation criteria matrix anchored to each section of the proposal questionnaire form, and questions directly derived from criteria stated in the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. What, if any, additional criteria should be used to evaluate future proposals?

We saw little to no indication that any objective evaluation criteria had been used during the review process. The subjective review resulted in proposals being judged not on merit, but on the personal concerns and comfort levels of individuals.

The “considerations” that we were asked to respond to were non-specific and broad, and contained many misconceptions and erroneous conclusions. In spite of this, we spent many hours responding to the many misconceptions and addressing the concerns as we understood them. Unfortunately, the working group completely ignored our presentations and responses, choosing instead to vote on their prior decision without consideration for our responses.

Q15

What elements of the process surprised you the most?

The surprises were constant. Throughout the past year, each time I thought there would be no more surprises, I was mistaken. Some of these are: The inability to have dialogs with agency staff and working group members. The erroneous conclusions that were reached without staff seeking clarifications. The misrepresentations in the slide summaries of our proposals. The lack of consistently applied criteria from proposal to proposal. Lack of a scoring matrix and processes being defined on the fly, with the “rules” changing from one meeting to the next. Being challenged on inclusions that were clearly part of the May 2020 adopted RHMS (e.g., sub-tidal inclusion). Being told that stakeholder outreach (ours was extensive) was not enough because we didn’t “convince” each and every stakeholder to support our proposal.

Q16

Consultation with agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. Do you think your proposal would have received different initial or final recommendations had this element been included during the initial proposal period? Why?

Yes, definitely. It was painful listening to our proposals being discussed and questions asked without our being able to respond. One working group member mentioned that Camp Meriwether was adjacent to our Cape Lookout site and questioned whether we had engaged them, when, in fact, our proposal included a letter of support from them. One agency said they could not vote for our proposals because they were uncertain of the impact, when, in fact, we had conducted conversations with that agency and were told that the impact was minimal and not a concern. If they had been able to get on the phone and check with us prior to or during their review, we could have connected them with the staff we had spoken to.

Q17

The Working Group recommended six of the proposals receive further consultation. What do you think this consultation should look like (e.g. participants, time, scope, focus, outcomes, etc.)?

This is too difficult a question to answer in a survey. There should be meetings between each agency and each proposer. No process will be effective unless there are clear, objective evaluation criteria that are applied consistently from proposal to proposal.

The proposals that were recommended for this consultation process were all Marine Conservation Areas. The Working Group has made it quite clear that none of these proposal fit within what they had in their minds as an MCA - this was because the proposers all took advantage of the built-in flexibility, studying carefully what we could do within that designation. Our choice to use stewardship, education, and interpretation appears to have surprised DLCD and, it appears, the entire working group. No revised process or consultation will work until that dilemma is addressed and solved. Perhaps there needs to be a "Marine Stewardship" designation?

Q18

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified by the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues be addressed?

Again, this is too difficult to answer in a survey. I feel that DLCD and OPAC need to focus on the RHMS revision at this time. It is critical that we:

- Retain the strength and focus of the 1994 Rocky Shores chapter of the TSP
 - Retain the site-based management approach which is core to the RHMS
 - Retain and solidify the community-driven proposal process with clear expectations, refined proposal questions and platform, and objective evaluation criteria with a scoring matrix
-

