

Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting

Online Zoom meeting

August 29, 2019

9:00 AM-12:00 PM

STAC members attending: Shelby Walker, Veronica Dujon, Elise Granek, Selina Heppell, Jan Hodder, Gil Sylvia, Craig Young

STAC members absent: Jack Barth, William Jaeger

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

Information from previous meetings:

STAC meeting notes: [April 2017](#), [October 2017](#), [March 2018](#), [June 2018](#), [November 2018](#), [March 2019](#)

General information: [Oregon Ocean Information - STAC](#)

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

AGENDA

9:00 AM

- Welcome and introductions
 - STAC member and ODFW introductions
 - Agenda overview
- Finalize [criteria document](#)
 - Introduction of criteria organization and addition of subheadings since last version
 - Intent is to organize, streamline, avoid duplication
 - Not looking to change the substance a great deal
 - Recap changes to the Criteria over the last two meetings (11/9/18 and 3/22/19):
 - Taken out of matrix and put under seven broad headings to group related criteria
 - Two Planning Principles and Guidelines (from OPAC 2008 Policy Recommendations) were incorporated into the criteria per ODFW comments
 - Program Evaluation versus Site Evaluation subheadings were added per ODFW comments
 - Glossary definitions – where not defined previously, STAC needs to discuss and determine final wording
 - STAC discussion of Criteria based on STAC member suggestions in comments
 - **Ecological Factors Q4** - An additional sub-question is considered. Discussion of size and spacing to increase biodiversity, but increasing biodiversity is not a MR goal or objective (conserving biodiversity is a goal; enhancing resilience is an objective). Concerns that the size might not be large enough to cover certain taxonomic groups. Sub-question b. is expansive, so perhaps it's better to keep it at the broader level. Decision to return to original question 4a, just adding "and spacing."

- Resilience is covered in 3, so decide to leave as is (no need to combine Qs 3 and 4)
- **Socioeconomic characteristics** - slight wording change accepted
- **Level of Community Engagement** - suggestion of tense changes opens up a discussion regarding exact time frame that should be evaluated. Any planning process criteria should stay past tense, but implementation issues should not be past tense. Pointed out that you can only evaluate the past; but it is important to differentiate that some activities were clearly in the past while others are ongoing. The level of engagement over time is an important aspect.
 - Suggestion to change language to “Has _____ been _____”
 - Shelby Walker will make some wording suggestions during the break and STAC can touch base again briefly after the break
 - Dates of the evaluation should be clearly defined in the RFP
- **Governance Q2** - slight wording change. Integrate changed to consider
- **Governance Q6** - can it be streamlined/should it be? 6a and 6b are different in focus, so decision made to keep them as is, with minor word deletions to streamline
- STAC moves into Glossary definitions
 - Reminder that at this point, the Glossary uses OPAC’s definitions where possible, but some terms were not identified.
 - **Adaptive management** - was initially defined by OPAC in 2008 Policy Recommendations. There is a desire to incorporate *scientific* because adaptive management is often used incorrectly. Want it to align with the current scientific literature as much as possible. There is a difference between an adaptive approach and adaptive management. OPAC’s intent is likely reflected in the reference that they chose; so a footnote will be added to point back to OPAC Policy Recommendations. The wording “and scientific information” was added to the end of the definition.
 - **Beach access** - STAC members agree that the Beach Bill should be referenced here – the specific language (regarding high tide) will be added in.
 - **Mass transit** - Recommendation: see if Coast Guard has a definition. Because the Coast Guard has jurisdiction over the Territorial Sea, it would be useful to look in to this. Otherwise, STAC members generally ok with this definition as is.
 - **Resilience** - was initially defined by OPAC, but agreement that some changes would be useful. Original definition referred to *amount*; suggestion was made to change to the *ability* to absorb because resilience is extremely difficult to quantify. Resilience can also be applied at levels other than ecosystem level (species, community, population, etc.). Pointed out that resilience can also be applied to human communities. Human community resilience was not part of the OPAC guidelines (the term was used in reference to nearshore ecosystems), so need to make sure it’s clear that this definition refers to ecological resilience. The original source wording (Walker & Salt 2006) is actually *capacity*, not *amount*; all agree to change to this more accurate terminology. Also changed wording from *ecosystem* to *system* to conform to the original terminology.
 - **Safe harbor** – does it mean that vessels can anchor? Fishermen raised concerns during the planning process, and wanted to ensure that they would be able to safely shelter during a storm – so yes, anchoring was included in OPAC’s intent. Discussion

about whether the term is a verb or a noun in helping to determine definition. Slight wording changes accepted.

- **Significant** (refers to social/economic impacts and NOT statistical significance) - Question regarding whether the term should be *significant adverse effects*. Many instances in the document do refer to adverse, but there are also references to positive social and economic effects. Detectable is not necessarily significant, neither is something that's outside of expected levels. People can have different expectations, so that wording is not very objective. What is significant to society? Some states have environmental planning definitions of significance, but Oregon does not. Discussion of perceptions versus what the data show (so general agreement that expected is not relevant). Should it be left undefined since the state hasn't defined it? Leave it to the reviewers? Generally ok with leaving a shortened definition that removes mention of effects being outside of expected/anticipated language.

10:30 AM

- Break

10:40 AM

- Discuss [first draft of RFP preamble](#)
 - At prior meeting, STAC members agreed that some context-setting should precede the Criteria in the RFP.
 - One thing that needs to be included that's currently not in Preamble – explanation of why some headings in the Criteria include the subheadings “Planning and Site Evaluation” and “Program Evaluation.”
 - Question regarding meaning of *limited information* – could be confusing to the reviewers. They can obtain additional information, but needs to align with the Criteria outlined by STAC, so should sideboards be added?
 - Many activities (e.g., economic development, education) have happened during MR implementation that are outside of ODFW's mandates and reviewers will address these activities. University reviewers may need to go outside of Synthesis Report for relevant information, but ODFW will provide supplemental information regarding actions that have occurred beyond ODFW mandates, which could provide a starting place for the reviewers.
 - Question regarding whether ODFW feels that the Synthesis Report will contain most of the information needed by the reviewers to address majority of criteria, or whether reviewers will have to do additional research. ODFW feels the Synthesis Report will provide the majority of the information reviewers would need to make a determination.
 - Suggestion to move some of the language that's in the first paragraph below the objectives
 - Will go back and attempt to reconcile these concerns in the next draft of the preamble – don't want to spend too much time on it right now, and this can be discussed at the fall meeting. Agreement to move on at this point.
- ODFW presents [draft outline of Synthesis Report](#)
 - Cristen Don, Marine Reserves Program Leader, introduces Synthesis Report organization, and requests STAC feedback on 1) any key info that's missing; 2) is organization logical and is

- it structured clearly so that needed information can be easily accessed; 3) the idea of giving a kick-off presentation to the selected university to provide an opportunity for reviewers to ask questions in person; 4) any other ways that ODFW should be providing information to the university beyond this report and potential presentation.
- ODFW wants it to be digestible, not overwhelming
 - Primary Purpose of Synthesis: ODFW sees this as the main source of info for the university to develop their final report. The university report needs to address:
 - The planning/design/placement of MRs;
 - Implementation of MRs and the ODFW MR Program (Did they meet mandates); and
 - Any recommendations for adaptive management (e.g. recommendations on sites or system as a whole, recommendations regarding needed resources, and/or recommendations for adaptive management)
 - Secondary purpose of the Synthesis:
 - Public documentation of MR planning process;
 - Public documentation of what it takes to create and spin-up a long term conservation and monitoring program;
 - Public documentation of MR implementation to date, and contributions of the MR Program to date.
 - C. Don discusses Synthesis Report Organization
 - Executive Summary
 - Digestible synthesis report (~7 chapters totaling <100 pages). To accommodate this brevity, appendices will provide more detailed information. There will also be links, etc. in Supplemental Information pointing to products of other organizations, journal articles or reports from collaborators, etc.
 - Suggestion from STAC as finalizing the outline: Look back at the criteria and think: If I was a reviewer, where would I go in the Synthesis to find the info needed to answer this question?
 - Chs. 1-4 provide the context
 - What are MRs and how did we get here? (planning)
 - What do we have and what are expected ecological and conservation outcomes based on state of knowledge?
 - What resources were available and how were they leveraged?
 - What can we say given the timeframe (likely too short to see ecological changes)?
 - Chs. 5-6
 - Implementation, lessons learned, and contributions of MR program and collaborative efforts to date
 - What was done, how it was done, takeaways
 - Contributions to science
 - Contributions to management and policy
 - Other contributions
 - Ch. 7 – Moving Forward
 - Opens up for STAC questions regarding the broad organization discussed above
 - **Q:** What is meant by program contributions? **A:** Could cover many areas – some examples include: developed a new method that’s being used by others; journal

publication; offered education opportunities for students to do applied research; highlight if data has been used in other management decisions (e.g. stock assessments)

- C. Don provides additional information about individual chapters
 - Ch. 1 - general overview
 - Ch. 2 - documentation of planning and designation history
 - Phases of planning and implementation (public process, mandates, etc.)
 - Ch. 3 - Snapshot of each reserve
 - Site stats and maps (habitat, size, depth ranges, fisheries prior to closure, relative level of fishing pressure, what communities of place likely to be most impacted)
 - State of knowledge at designation (most sites didn't meet all planning guidelines and criteria) and acknowledge expectations regarding potential for ecological change (ecological change may not be detected over the short time frame this assessment covers; and at some sites detectable ecological change is not expected even over longer time scales)
 - Section on the overall MR system
 - **STAC questions:**
 - **Q:** where does baseline data fit in to this? **A:** A summary of scientific knowledge to date would be provided here. Details regarding baseline data would be in additional chapters (4-6)
 - **Q:** How far will ODFW Synthesis Report go in analyzing the MR system that resulted from the initial planning process (2008-2012), which included scientific input, planning goals and guidelines (e.g., regarding size and spacing; sideboards that should be large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits but small enough to avoid significant economic or social impacts), and the public process. **A:** Trade-offs were involved; that discussion will mainly be in Ch. 2. Will follow agency analyses they compiled during the process to examine strengths and weaknesses, compromises made, etc. There was a balancing act to design and placement, and some areas had greater support than others.
 - Ch. 4 - Overview of ODFW Marine Reserves Program
 - Structure
 - Highlight collaborators and other partners
 - Overview of resources available (staff and funding)
 - Ch. 5 - Implementation
 - Will be the longest chapter, will focus on different program areas of the Marine Reserves Program (Management, Ecological Monitoring, Human Dimensions Research, Communication & Outreach, Community Engagement, Compliance and Enforcement)
 - Each program area will use a consistent structure including: intro and mandates; methods overview; results and conclusions; contributions and lessons learned; moving forward; and appendices.
 - Appendices would have greater detail
 - **STAC questions:**
 - **Q:** Does 100 page limit include appendices? **A:** No.

- **Q:** Distinction between “key findings and takeaways” and “results and conclusions?” **A:** Key findings would be more than the analytical results. Could include information about how to develop and implement a program (bigger picture items). STAC suggestion: Clarify this difference.
 - **Q:** Appendices will be online? **A:** Yes.
 - **Q:** On ecological monitoring, has ODFW considered ways to combine all the individual project information into the Synthesis? **A:** Yes, have started to think about that for both ecological and human dimensions research (because they are NOT going to discuss each project individually). STAC suggestion: add a summary table with studies that includes information like duration, objectives, etc.
- Final feedback on ODFW Synthesis Outline:
 - C. Don asks for feedback on the following:
 - the idea for an obligatory kick-off presentation for the selected university (nutshell presentation to provide proper context)
 - Are there any areas of missing key information?
 - Additional thoughts on organization?
 - Other ways that ODFW should provide information?
 - STAC comments:
 - Will be a balancing act to carefully/clearly craft the report.
 - General support for a kick-off program – would want to include that as an obligation for the selected university in the RFP.
 - What about guidelines for the university to contact ODFW with questions? STAC will need to discuss this matter. The primary point of contact likely should be STAC, and that would need to be clear in the RFP.
 - May want additional information regarding expected length of appendices so that it can be reflected in the RFP.
 - Agree that chapter layout is appropriate and logical.
 - ODFW reiterates it’s a work in progress, open to feedback at the next meeting as well.
- Return to [criteria document](#) to revisit the verb tense discussion that occurred earlier
 - Shelby Walker attempted to change wording to reflect group thoughts. For criteria that are ongoing (present and past) – does the wording change seem appropriate?
 - Generally, “Has ___ been _____” instead of using “was” or “is.”
 - Agreement that wording makes sense, and STAC can provide additional guidelines about evaluation timeframe in other portions of RFP (e.g., Preamble).
 - Examination of the document here raises a question about what “key species” are and how they were chosen (justification). Also, key habitats. Suggested that perhaps a definition needs to be provided for these terms. ODFW did have some guidelines here, C. Don will share this information so that STAC can consider it in definition formulation.
- Topics for next meeting; tentatively schedule
 - Discuss revised Preamble
 - Discuss full draft of RFP
 - Including process questions that STAC should address (e.g. selection process)

- ODFW check-in on outline/provide additional information if available
- Final items
 - Update on funding for the assessment process: OPAC Executive Committee has been working to figure out possible funding avenues. At the recent Oregon Coastal Caucus Economic Summit, OPAC's Executive Committee and Rep. Caddy McKeown discussed raising this issue with the full Coastal Caucus, which will meet in September 2019 at Legislative Days (9/16-9/18).
 - Funding level requested is a relatively minor ask – may be appropriate for E board or the upcoming short session. OPAC Chair, OPAC Vice Chair, and the STAC chair hope to put forward the request at Legislative Days.
 - Reception from Rep. McKeown was relatively supportive, as were prior discussions with Sen. Roblan. The Governor's office is supportive of the assessment, but needs a legislative champion to move it forward.
 - Options for where the money would go (Department of Land Conservation & Development (DLCD) and the Oregon Ocean Science Trust (OOST) mentioned as viable options for fiscal admin). Regardless of where the funding lives, STAC manages the process. Some external groups have also expressed interested in providing support for the process - C. Don and S. Walker will discuss next week.
 - **Q:** Does OOST have a mechanism to manage funds. **A:** 2019 legislation does now allow them to accept external funding, so may be possible.
 - Funding updates will be provided as they become available.
- Scheduling next meeting – November timeframe
 - Weeks of Nov. 4 and Nov. 18
 - STAC members have more conflicts week of Nov. 4, so will move forward with scheduling poll for week of Nov. 18.

12:00 PM

- Adjourn