

Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting
Linn County Extension office, 33630 McFarland Road, Tangent, OR
March 22, 2019
10:00 AM-2:00 PM

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

STAC members absent:

Other invited participants: Cristen Don (ODFW), Tommy Swearingen (ODFW), Dave Fox (ODFW), Lindsay Aylesworth (ODFW), Andy Lanier (DLCD)

Information from previous meetings:

STAC meeting notes – [April 2017](#)

STAC meeting notes – [October 2017](#)

STAC meeting notes – [March 2018](#)

STAC meeting notes – [June 2018](#)

STAC meeting notes – [November 2018](#)

[Oregon Ocean Information - STAC](#)

Link to the audio recording of the meeting [here](#).

AGENDA

NOTE: Yellow highlighted items represent action items. STAC fellow Anne Hayden-Lesmeister will work on these items in preparation for future meeting discussions.

Green highlighted items represent areas where further STAC discussion and decisions are needed.

10:00 AM

- **Welcome and introductions**
 - Overview of agenda
 - Introductions
- **Finalize criteria for the marine reserves evaluation**
 - Reminder that STAC previously agreed to use OPAC recommendations (Objectives and Implementation P&Gs) for assessment process, and STAC is finalizing that process now
 - There was no specific definition for measureable questions – STAC is taking recommendations and translating them into effective criteria that university can use for the assessment
 - **C. Young leads discussion on P&G #7**
 - Review **Implementation Principal and Guideline #7 – Adequate baseline data will be collected at each site prior to excluding extractive activities. The types and adequacy of baseline data, and the timing and methods of data collection will be driven by the research and monitoring objectives and sampling designs employed at each site.**
 - P&G 7 clearly worded, so C. Young came up with five questions as a place to start:
 1. Were baseline data obtained at each site prior to closure?
 2. What baseline data were obtained at each site? Were the data adequate to provide a statistically useful baseline for subsequent sampling?

3. Did the nature of the baseline data differ among sites, and were these differences reflected in the subsequent monitoring decisions?
 4. Was the timing of sampling driven by the objectives and sampling designs planned for each site?
 5. Were the methods of data collection appropriate for each site, and driven by the planned objectives and sampling designs?
 - Potential challenge with this guideline – question of what should be measured, and how should it be measured at each site (given that sampling methods might evolve over time)
 - Conversation with ODFW – would new methods produce new data where you can't do before and after comparison? Even the first several years post closure, probably don't see radical changes given slow change in temperate systems (e.g. CA uses data completely post-closure for their baseline data)
 - ODFW can point out in their report what they could/couldn't do and what the reasons are for that (e.g. funding constraints, etc.)
 - For initial Q#5 – add in the following, “given information available at the start of the MR process.”
 - For Q#2 – inclusion of statistical significance language discussed
 - Interpretation of adequacy – what does it mean for statistical analyses and comparisons (discussion of power, etc.).
 - Did modifications to sampling design consider the need to continue comparisons and use previously collected data? Yes, so can acknowledge adaptations and still compare to baseline
 - How to accommodate if ecological response is undetectable at this point (given the time period)?
 - So change #2 to: What baseline data were obtained at each site? Were methods designed and carried out so that change could be detected?
 - Discussions regarding overarching questions/preamble to RFP
 - Question about resources – Need university reviewers to reflect on and understand the trade-offs made between monitoring decision versus resources available.
 - Would a very strong preamble help with this?
 - These will be placed into the larger criteria document
- **Summary of changes to initially-presented measurable questions:**
 - **Q1 – no change**
 - **Q2 – second sentence wording changed to “Were methods designed and carried out so that change could be detected?”**
 - **Q3 – no change**
 - **Q4 and Q5 – added the phrase, “given information available at the start of the MR process.”**
 - **Discuss, amend, and agree on [final criteria document](#)**
 - Moving on to the complete review document – don't really want to reword at this point but can streamline in areas where there are duplications
 - Need to incorporate PG #7
 - Brief discussion on how the new criteria document was derived

- Pulled measurable questions out of the matrix that STAC has been working off for several meetings and rearranged (organized) them under different headings (from a literature review of factors that contribute to MR/MPA success)
 - This re-grouping of questions may allow for streamlining of the document in areas where there is duplication
 - The document, once finalized, will go into the RFP
 - Don't want to wordsmith at this point, but if really big issues STAC can address them
 - Major issue raised: In "Marine reserve design" Question 3 – a concern raised that STAC may need to define community interests and needs because it's very broad. Questions regarding inclusion of word "needs." These were needs related to socioeconomic concerns and are captured in other areas. Also question regarding "design," so wording slightly changed to **"Did the design of the MR system incorporate community interest?"**
 - Next, discussion of where the newly developed P&G questions would best be placed
 - STAC could add a new category like "baseline information" or "evaluation." The P&G 7 questions are cross-cutting. STAC members believe it could possibly go under heading 1 "Marine reserve design" – but currently placed under new category "Marine reserved baseline assessment." Can be changed later if needed.
 - Don't want to restrict these questions just to ecological data, that's the problem with putting it under "Ecological factors"
 - Organizational notes regarding the remainder of the document
 - Take Objectives and Principles & Guidelines; place them as an appendix instead of on the end
 - Definitions that are currently blank – AHL will work on initial definitions for STAC consideration at next meeting
 - STAC did not address areas where it might be able to reduce duplication - so may need to revisit this at summer meeting
- STAC discussed ODFW comments on the criteria document
 - Need to look at impact of MRs and management
 - STAC will possibly defer some of the specifics to the next meeting due to time constraints
 - ODFW raised planning guidelines questions – STAC had decided NOT to look at the Marine Reserve Planning Principles and Guidelines
 - Question raised as to why they were left out, and do they need to be included.
 - ODFW has developed their outreach and engagement on Planning P&Gs 1 and 2 (which STAC previously agreed NOT to adopt for development of measurable questions) – but worried that they now won't be evaluated on it.
 - P&G 1 and 2 may be a mis-organization by OPAC (both involve planning **and** implementation). Would need to go through the process (of measurable question development) with these two Planning P&Gs.
 - Agreement that outreach and engagement should be assessed by the university because it has been a large part of ODFW program.
 - Propose to develop measureable questions and then figure out where to place them within the criteria document.

- Does the university have information to actually gauge this O&E activity? Would need access to data – is there info that would allow university to assess it?
 - Reworded PGs 1 and 2 to three new questions:
 1. PG1: Was the public (including ocean users, coastal communities, and other stakeholders) involved in the proposal, selection, regulation, monitoring, compliance and enforcement of marine reserves?
 2. PG2: Was outreach and public engagement an ongoing part of the MR planning and implementation process?
 3. PG2: Was scientific and other information made available to the public through outreach and websites?
 - The above three new questions were added to the “Level of Community Engagement” section of the criteria document
 - ODFW personnel feel it would be useful to have planning separated out from execution/implementation (because ODFW didn’t have control over certain factors)
 - Proposal for moving forward: This would result in rebinning – not fundamentally changing the questions, so the group could come back with suggestions at the summer meeting. One possibility is to differentiate within each of the categories?
 - Another proposal: Could a good preamble to the RFP take care of this issue? Many STAC members prefer this option
 - Question – what is the scope of the RFP? It’s not all about ODFW mandate – some of it is about whether or not MRs are working and/or doing what’s intended.
 - STAC will work to make this concern very clear (context is important) for differentiating planning from implementation
 - STAC also wants to handle ODFW #3 comment in the preamble to RFP – ODFW shouldn’t be held responsible for things outside of their purview, but the university process is an evaluation of ALL aspects – not just ODFW’s role
 - The group will move forward with binning, context setting (preamble to RFP) at the summer meeting. AHL will provide an updated draft for STAC comment prior to the next meeting.
- **View and discuss [draft timeline](#) prepared in response to OPAC’s request**
 - Review of draft timeline; discussion of potential changes
 - Questions about university review and check-ins. May want to do an earlier check-in to address any questions the university may have regarding scope of work
 - University could have access to lots of materials before completion of Synthesis Report (but a constraint is that ODFW won’t likely be done with the Synthesis Report until end of 2021)
 - The selection process could be moved forward or back. The university could do planning, organization, and background research
 - Timeline updated to reflect changes discussed above
 - Content-based engagement – it should be with STAC and in a public meeting (STAC agreement on this point)
- **Discussion/clarification of [STAC’s role in the upcoming RFP Process](#)**
 - **Scope of work**
 - Discussion regarding whether university will do analyses or not. Initially, not considered feasible if no resources at all for the RFP process. However, there is

some level of discomfort among STAC members with not allowing the university to do any data analyses

- STAC members agree that there is lot of non-ODFW materials that a university would want to familiarize themselves with
 - Will the university have access to ODFW's raw data if they want it (even if not doing additional analyses)?
 - STAC members agree that it should be available.
 - Data re-evaluation: is it mandated or is it optional? Not an expectation that university will do additional analyses – but they can re-analyze parts that seem problematic. The university team would have to determine what would be within the specified budget constraints.
 - The RFP should make it clear that it's a contract to review a paper (time and dollar limited). It should be clear that there are only X dollars, and if the university does anything beyond that, there would be no additional money available.
 - There will be some uncertainty in responding to the RFP, but the university needs to have sufficient information to determine what the scope of work is. Framing is important.
 - RFP should have a table/outline that indicates what will be in synthesis report and what the data availability will be.
 - Need outline, data description, and possibly a table of other resources from ODFW to be quite detailed.
 - There is large range of variability in work levels that could be involved, particularly for the socioeconomic side of things (some of that the economics data would already be online, so economists could potentially get a good idea of work).
 - Also, how long is the synthesis report going to be (Is STAC putting boundary conditions on it?)
 - Emphasis is on looking at the synthesis report, but can go back to original data if needed. All agree it needs to be available to the university.
 - If time/resource constraints, the university could say – this needs to be redone (even if they don't redo it) if they have concerns/reservations about the analyses
 - Scope of work – university needs to let STAC know if it's going to change dramatically
- **Report preparation and review**
- STAC check-ins with the university and what STAC needs to see
 - There should be an earlier check-in (2022) in case some questions come up – January would let them review and then meet with STAC
 - STAC members agree there should be a midcourse check-in in April
 - June draft review will be STAC's chance to look over it
 - Regarding point 3 on the framework STAC discussions – what will STAC do/provide once receiving final report and before sending to the Legislative Assembly?
 - May be easier to determine STAC action once the recommendations are available.
 - Scope is probably did they complete the contract (do what was requested in the RFP) – STAC will comment on that but likely not their analyses.

- Brings up the question of the “recommendations for administrative actions and legislative proposals”
 - Should the RFP state that legislative proposals/administrative recommendations need to be based on the data in the report?
 - To avoid pulling in outside data if someone wants to put personal stamp on it.
 - But could pull in all the planning documents, etc.
 - Section 4(2)(b)(C) – the university may provide any other scientifically based information related to reserves – opens the door to other information coming in to the process.
- STAC’s role may be to determine if evaluation was of sufficient quality, etc.
- STAC could probably comment on their recommendations (were recommendations defensible).
- What was the legislative intent for STAC in this process? Unclear based on review of hearings around SB 1510. STAC could put recommendation in context if needed – would be aligned with STAC’s advisory role.
- As a technical group, STAC should be able to comment on recommendations that are related to scientific topics. There is a potential “gray area” - STAC needs to consider where they are going to draw the line.
 - Feel like possibly need to see the recommendations before they can determine what is appropriate scientific guidance versus policy guidance
- **STAC members agree they should revisit this topic throughout process**
- **University selection (time permitting – this was not discussed at the 3/22 meeting)**
- **Discussion/clarification of [STAC’s role in the ODFW synthesis process](#)**
 - Already agreed that raw data will be available
 - STAC agrees that nothing additional needs to be submitted to STAC from ODFW after outline and before final draft (per Q#3 on framework document)
 - #1 – feedback on ODFW outline. Some reluctance to provide too much info regarding content – STAC doesn’t want to veer into chosen university’s territory
 - Main thing – STAC should assess if measurable questions can be addressed
 - ODFW asks if STAC will provide guidance regarding core of the report versus supplemental material.
 - A point of confusion: STAC has provided guidance to ODFW throughout the process as part of their role – why can’t this continue? There is an assumption that a separate entity (the chosen university) will do the assessment – STAC shouldn’t provide substantive comment.
 - Some disagreement on this point, where is the line? E.g. – could STAC provide comments on the types of analyses that could be done? ODFW will contact outside experts – but need to be cognizant of conflicts.
 - The process is unusual, but STAC needs to abide by the process that was laid out by legislation. STAC wants to avoid a perception of unduly influencing the synthesis document. But part of STAC’s mandate is to provide advice to ODFW. Some STAC members think the role toward ODFW changes after the criteria are finalized; others think it may be when the RFP goes out. Likely makes sense to err on side of caution.

- So, is STAC (as a body) done with providing feedback regarding how to analyze data, etc.? When evaluation criteria are done? When RFP goes out?
- STAC members wear two hats. STAC member and/or scientist. That is different than the STAC process. So can likely individually advise on questions.

12:05 PM

- Break

12:20 PM

- **ODFW updates regarding modified monitoring plan for 2021**
 - Lindsay Aylesworth discusses ODFW ecological monitoring 2021 (the year that the Synthesis is going to be written).
 - MR core tools and sampling plan – staggered cycle every 2-3 years depending on the site and the tool.
 - Three different budget cycles are involved in the 2021 decision – don't anticipate major changes to budget, but each 2-year financial cycle influences the next
 - 2019-2023: 30 core sampling surveys planned (10 hook and line, 8 scuba, 8 lander, 4 ROV)
 - General planning issues for 2021: A funding issue that ODFW didn't anticipate (ROV surveys – have relied on a combination of ODFW and federal funding – federal funding no longer available).
 - 4 were planned, so there's now no money to do 3 of 4. An additional \$150k would provide enough money to conduct the ROV surveys.
 - ROV surveys appropriate at 3 sites only: Redfish Rocks, Cape Perpetua, Cascade Head (because deeper subtidal rocky habitat).
 - All sites have already been surveyed multiple times (all at least twice, some 4-5 times to date. Shortfall affects vessel time mainly (\$110k of vessel time).
 - Small staff capacity issue for hook and line surveys and only in 2021 – because of writing the synthesis report (Cape Falcon and Redfish Rocks).
 - Funding wouldn't help as much because of the training required to do those surveys.
 - Hook and line 2019 and 2023 at those sites (so will miss one year of staggered sampling interval). This is the tool with the greatest number surveys for all the sites.
 - All SCUBA and lander will occur (Otter Rock – 2021 and Cape Perpetua ROV – 2021)
 - Now opened up to discussion with STAC
 - Recap – no money could resolve hook and line issue easily – but ROV surveys could be done if \$150k (this amount based on current vessel rates) – this problem would happen regardless of the Synthesis Report writing
 - Cape Falcon and Redfish Rocks are the ones that will be affected for hook and line. As an ecological team of 3 – don't have the capacity to do it. Focus of 2021 has to be the writing.

- It takes about 1 year to train a person on the sampling protocols (so, need a full time person for at least 2 years. Also, lose out on different local knowledge and captains – site specific).
 - Oceanographic sampling is not one of 4 core tools, so not sure what would happen 2021. Should continue if collaborator partnerships continue. SMURF program has been the best way to collect oceanographic data so far (although ODFW has contributed staff time to these efforts in the past).
 - Collaborators could cover some things and may need more money. Discussions are just starting to happen now for 2021, so not a straightforward answer.
 - Recap - Not stopping monitoring in 2021 – still staggered approach and still will do some core tools in 2021. Bigger issue = ROV surveys (loss) in 2019, 2020, 2022. Under current funding – 2019 and 2020 ROV surveys that would have been in synthesis – won't.
 - ROV series spaced every 4-5 years as it is (not a yearly time series due to expense). But it collects lots of valuable data – loss of 2019 and 2020 could result in an 8 year gap.
 - If a ship was available, is there salary help available (ODFW would need an additional 40k beyond 110k of ship costs).
 - How important is the ROV work long term – how to deal with the loss if funding not put in place? ODFW will need to evaluate the impact on long-term monitoring.
- **Discuss [OPAC request for information on scenarios and likely outcomes document](#) (the document linked here is the final document submitted to OPAC)**
 - At December 2018 OPAC meeting – issue regarding lack of resources for assessment and ODFW was raised
 - OPAC wrote a letter requesting three analyses, asked for a report to be submitted by Nov. STAC wants to present to OPAC at their 4/3 meeting in Salem if any real ability to obtain additional resources. STAC also needs to send a draft letter by next Tuesday. ODFW will provide more info in by next Monday
 - **For ODFW (lack of capacity)**
 - How can the OPAC scenarios discussion be helpful to ODFW moving forward? Challenge for hook and line – but loss of ROV data may be able to be addressed in the scenario discussions.
 - STAC wants ODFW to write the oceanography part into the Scenarios document. ODFW doesn't have all information needed to fully present scenarios (collaborative projects), but a “best faith effort” should be reflected in the document.
 - Does anything else need to be considered here with regard to scenarios as currently presented?
 - STAC members agree that loss of data is very problematic; there should be no gaps in the time series. The bottom line is that ODFW will be missing critical pieces of information. ROV data is a huge issue for the synthesis, but from a long-term standpoint all data loss is problematic.

- Given uncertainty around hook and line – ODFW priority is the ROV survey. ODFW feels like it's a greater loss of data and easier to communicate about. It affects multiple sites and years, and contributes more than just fish data (hook and line only provides fish data).
- But hook and line is the best chance of detecting a change in species – so if that's a priority – it shouldn't be left out. Cape Falcon wasn't heavily fished so maybe not a change there.
- If missing oceanography data – you could miss out on important information if there's an anomalous year.
- STAC suggests a 3rd scenario – a full package that incorporates the true need – ROV, hook and line surveys, and oceanographic – because it speaks to impact on synthesis and impact to the long-term dataset
 - ODFW has been attempting to get oceanographic sampling up to speed and need to ensure discussed in the document. Oceanographic – 2019, 2020, 2021 (unclear), 2022, 2023. Might be curtailed after that.
 - STAC thinks ODFW is underselling the impact of the loss of information with gap in time series. Earlier years are less important than later years being missing when looking for effect of closures; STAC wants ODFW to be clear about the negative impacts of this data loss.
 - ODFW needs to provide the core information so that the draft letter for OPAC can be sufficient. Need to highlight the major issues and what it means. Strong STAC agreement here.
 - For OPAC scenarios – ODFW should make clear what is most pertinent for synthesis and what is most pertinent for long-term monitoring when presenting the scenarios.
 - STAC asks ODFW if they can pull together S3 with cost estimate by Monday – needs to include: full funding (best case scenario – 3 ROV, 2 hook and line to complete core sampling, also oceanography)
 - Also, STAC requests that ODFW more clearly articulate impacts of first two scenarios.
- **For RFP process (current lack of funding)**
 - Three scenarios examined/discussed
 - If \$0 – IF get a review – likely to be the most biased kind of review, agenda-driven. Driven by agenda probably true for S2 to some degree as well.
 - STAC discusses leaving out S2. Just S1 and S3. Discussion - is not putting 2 (an in-between amount) flexing muscle and forcing an issue?
 - Issue with quality. Scenarios need to include a very strong statement regarding concern for low quality and potential for bias - so STAC needs to strongly endorse S3.
 - STAC wants to use the 150-200k range if the university might do additional analyses.

- Possibility of a university institute performing the review is raised (e.g. INR is legislatively mandated and performs reviews of this nature)
 - Could bypass the RFP selection process – because legislation does not mandate a competitive review process. Some STAC members don't think this should be considered at this point because it wouldn't save any money
- Regarding source of money for RFP process - donations would open up avenue for bias or perception of bias.
- Moving forward for RFP –
 - Delete Scenario 2
 - Increase dollar amount
 - Incorporate bias concern in S1
 - Don't present university institutes as alternate
 - STAC will receive an updated draft on Monday (3/25) to make any final recommendations/ edits – documents need to be submitted on Tuesday 3/26.
- Topics for next meeting and tentatively schedule
 - Will need to do a remote summer call – so will send out a doodle poll
 - Request for a presentation at the next meeting from ODFW regarding preliminary results/analyses
 - ODFW may present human dimensions work

2:00 PM

- Adjourn