

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting NOTES
Children's Farm Home Old School, Corvallis, OR
March 12, 2018
1:00 – 4:30 PM

STAC Members attending: Jack Barth, Selina Heppell, Bill Jaeger, Gil Sylvia, Shelby Walker, Craig Young, Elise Granek, Jan Hodder, Veronica Dujon (virtual)

Other invited participants: Cristen Don (ODFW), Tommy Swearingen (ODFW), Lindsay Aylesworth (ODFW), Beth Marino (virtual – OSU-Cascades)

Other attendees: not captured

Ecological Monitoring Update – Lindsay Aylesworth (ODFW)

- Questions on Table 20 – Focal species, how were they determined?
 - Some are the same species that partners in CA are using.
 - Some are recommendations from Bruce Menge(?)
 - Plan to also reach out for recommendations in consultation from Gail Hansen (has not happened yet, plan to)

- Do we actually have numbers on the species?
 - Yes, but where we are now is looking at how well the previous data holds up and allows us to see trends and changes over time.

- Questions about the lists of invertebrates
 - The report broadly lumps invertebrates, using common names instead of specie. This allows room for a lot of confusion. For example, what anemone are you tracking, all anemones in general?
 - Craig Young would be happy to help determine specific species under these broader categories to focus on.
 - Throughout the report, instead of talking about the diversity of invertebrates, be descriptive and refer to them as megafauna instead, all of these examples are megafauna

ACTION: Craig to work with Lindsay on determining specific species

- Be clearer about the timeline for each of these data sets. Be explicit about how far back the (usable) ROV data goes, etc.

- ROV expense- What makes the ROV use so expensive? Ship time and data processing.
 - Graduate students may be used to help process the ROV data

- If ODFW had the money, would you do all of the 2020 monitoring with ROV?
 - It's possible, but weather windows would cause some limitations
 - Also, would increase the need for data processing

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting NOTES

- This question was raised to explore the idea of saving money along the way, hold and do all of the data collection via ROV in one year instead.
- Do you monitor trash and derelict fishing gear?
 - No, that is something to consider, and could be something that could cause policy change more quickly
- Benthic extraction surveys, are they still being done?
 - No, they are not currently being done.
- We understand the focus on rocky habitat, but there have been large MPA that have been initiated on non-rocky areas. What about monitoring on those sites?
- Suggestion: Have the report appendices organized by the questions being asked.

Human Dimensions - Tommy Swearingen, ODFW

- In replicating the data, what question are you trying to answer?
 - Tracking the knowledge, support, and attitude of stakeholders
 - Yes, but a lot of these surveys were conducted post-implementation
 - Many of the respondents were unaware of the implementation, therefore it had no effect on their responses.
 - When questions are replicated respondents will be asked if they are aware of the implementation now or not.
- Timeline: Two years to collect the data (2019, 2020), then one year to analyze data and draft report (2021).
- When is the summary report due?
 - It depends on which replication and how. There is some work that could be done on it now.
 - We need to define the plan for replication and the tools for secondary implementation, then a secure timeline for draft completion can be determined.
- Will STAC see a draft/interim report (like Lindsay's Ecological Draft)?
 - A collection of executive summaries is possible
 - Several STAC members agreed that seeing this information in a draft form would be very helpful
- Clarity on which questions will be covered in this report:
 - The handout has "Research Questions", "Research Hypothesis", and equity questions...
 - Decided to focus on the Research Hypothesis

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting NOTES

- It would be helpful to have a look at a draft report, four chapters covering each of the questions being addressed
 - Part one, with existing baseline data
 - Part two, with newly acquired data
- To be clear, this is not a replicate study, it is a repeat of some questions previously asked.
- Reports present the information; they do not make a value judgment or comment on whether the work is making progress toward goals, nor do they make any policy recommendations.
- Hypothesis 3, has an assumption of attribution.
 - Tommy will revisit this wording, he's sensitive to attribution
- What about people that don't live on the coast?
 - These populations are being captured through visitor surveys
- Research hypothesis focuses on adverse impacts, a note of caution about this practice. Make sure that positive impacts are also considered
 - Make sure the approach isn't too narrow (focused only on negative)
 - Consider rewording the hypothesis or add another hypothesis
 - Also note that use of the term "impact" implies causality and not correlation, there are more neutral

ACTION: Subset of STAC (Gil, Bill, Veronica, others?) to work with Tommy on continuing to focus the human dimensions work. Will need to ensure compliance with public notification if quorum of STAC members are present.

Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia

- Council of 13 members selected, some through open nomination in communities.
 - Membership includes:
 - Academia
 - Agencies
 - Stakeholder groups
 - The council is meeting monthly right now
- They have two goals:
 - Draft a short report in 2018
 - Asked by Governor to write Ocean Action Plan (due April/June 2019), joining an international effort
- They are forming four working groups:
 - Advance scientific understanding and data gaps
 - Look at sources of stress and reduce causes of OAG

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting NOTES

- Look at building adaptation and resilience
- Advance understanding broadly through outreach and engagement
- Aaron Galloway (OIMB) was nominated by STAC to participate
 - Shelby and Jack are also participating in the group

Criteria for MR Evaluation

- Table of review criteria shared with group
 - This evaluation will not be done by STAC, the task will go to a university group
- Is this list of objectives, principles and guidelines too prescriptive?
 - Will the RFP include the list of questions, and state that these questions must be asked? Or will it be used as starting suggestions?
 - Confused on what this university group will do- are they doing the analysis?
 - No, they are establishing what the measureable questions actually should be, which ODFW will then be answering/addressing
 - The questions on the table (a lot of them) would be pulled directly out of the CA plan, some of these may not be relevant to OR
 - Look at this to see if this is a good structure, not necessarily the details.
 - Recommend that this group be broken into teams do address the details, then report back to this larger group.
- Where do questions about enforcement go?
 - For example; How many citations were issued? Did people actually stay out of the area?
 - Yes, this is included in the criteria.
- What is “adequate” and who defines that?
 - The review team will help define that for these objectives, STAC will also weigh in on them
- Adaptive management, has this been done?
 - ODFW is not supposed to change anything about implementation until after the review is done
- Can we eliminate an objective if we find it problematic?
 - No, these were lifted directly out of the objectives, we can't get rid of one even if STAC finds it problematic.
- To university group taking on this project.
 - Here are the questions
 - Here's what's been done so far

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting NOTES

- What are the other questions we should be asking and answering now?
- There is a lot of repetition between some of these categories, keep an eye for that while reviewing, may need to develop another matrix to make it easier for ODFW to pull this information together
- Looking for STAC members to volunteer to review the draft questions and possibility coming up with indicators
 - Re: indicators – would it be helpful to ODFW to have this committee come up with those?
 - ODFW – some indicators would be useful, but on the other hand, not having it too prescribed is also appealing
 - A list of suggested indicators would be helpful, but what if this process leads to a list of additional work that we don't have the resources to support?

ACTION: STAC members to take the lead on refining the “measurable questions” to ensure assessment criteria are clear and useful for assessment.

- What's the timeline for this?
 - STAC may need to meet again mid-year to see how these questions are developing so that STAC can get these questions to ODFW by the fall.
 - Having this done this year (2018) helps ODFW plan for 2019/2020 monitoring needs and related to that, funding identification to support the needed work
 - STAC will be planning a mid-year meeting, perhaps virtual, and a fall in-person meeting
 - **Need to make sure what the rules are around STAC members meeting virtually considering this is a public committee**

ACTION: Determine next meeting date, likely end of school year (June)

Presentation - [Beth Marino, OSU Cascades](#)

Next STAC meeting: dates between the 11th and 16th of June.

- Topics for next meeting;
 - Review criteria
 - Hear from another external researcher working with ODFW on Marine Reserves