

Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting

Children's Farm Home Historic Old School

Highway 20, Corvallis

March 17, 2020

1:00-5:00 PM

STAC members attending: Shelby Walker, Selina Heppell, Elise Granek, Craig Young, Jan Hodder Gil Sylvia, Jack Barth, Bill Jaeger

STAC members absent:

Other invited participants: Cristen Don (ODFW), Tommy Swearingen (ODFW), Dave Fox (ODFW), Lindsay Aylesworth (ODFW), Haley Epperly (ODFW), Andy Lanier (DLCD), Dick Vanderschaaf (TNC), Chris Wolsko (OSU), Beth Marino (OSU)

Information from previous meetings:

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

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

- Welcome and introductions
 - STAC member and ODFW introductions
 - Agenda overview

- Update on assessment funding
 - Funding to support the marine reserves assessment has not progressed in the Oregon State Legislature short session. Like many bills that were left on the table following the GOP walk-out. It is unlikely that the funding will be included in a special session, should one be called.
 - It is likely we will not have anything definitive until June/July of 2021, which would require a timeline update (current timeline: Oct draft, March final).
 - Are there any other ways to get this done?
 - Shelby will be raising this topic at the upcoming OPAC meeting. It would be nice to put something forward from OPAC too and not just STAC.
 - Right now, the OPAC meeting is scheduled for May 6, which puts it at the peak COVID 19 infection rates as predicted by the CDC.
 - Would OPAC go to a virtual meeting? It's unclear at this time.
 - The University of Oregon has several bills that are in the same boat as the marine reserves funding bill. Craig indicated that UO laid out 4-5 alternate routes forward to continue seeking funding.
 - Does OPAC communicate between meetings? Yes, the Executive Committee meets in between. Shelby and Andy will talk about potentially including it on their next agenda.
 - Jack Barth encouraged STAC to explore plans B and C.
 - Other paths forward could include pursuing foundation funding.
 - An updated timeline may be necessary. The original timeline has the draft set for next October.

- The RFP will need to reflect any constraints specific to the fiscal agent. Therefore, we cannot release an RFP until we know who the fiscal agent is.
- Pursue the interests of the foundations. Bring this up with OPAC, and update the timeline.
- Shelby will keep the group updated as things develop.

- Conflict of interest review/revisit in [*full draft of RFP*](#)
 - Members made minor edits to the Conflict of Interest section of the RFP.
 - Concerns were raised that if there are too many listed potential conflicts we may inadvertently eliminate the pool of qualified respondents.
 - One of the bullets under what “MAY” qualify as a conflict includes involvement on one of the community teams.
 - What was the degree of involvement from the community teams’ members?
 - How would we decide what constitutes a conflict from someone on one of these community teams?
 - Shelby is comfortable leaving the language around this alone and relying on vetting of the final team to help determine whether a conflict of interest is present or not.

- External reviewers for proposal process
 - Since we don’t know who will be applying it may be difficult for us to assemble a final list of reviewers, but we can start assembling a list of potential reviewers.
 - Reviewers will likely not be from Oregon. Are there suggestions on the federal level that we should consider?
 - The institution that manages this does need to be an Oregon institution, however they are able to add non-Oregon members. Therefore, at this early stage it is even harder for us to propose people as reviewers since we don’t know who will be included as applicant team members.
 - This list will not be set in stone, it is just a starting point.
 - This should wait until we know who the applicant teams are and after we know more about potential collaborators.
 - Suggestions:
 - Kelly Biedenwieg (from Selina), Anna Spaulding,
 - Social-Economic side: Jim Sankiriko (US Davis), Jim Weiland, Martin Smith (Bill Jager)
 - Dan Holland from NOAA
 - Mark Carr
 - Steven Morgan, US Davis
 - Sarah Lester (US Santa Barbara)
 - Steven Gaines – Santa Barbara
 - Dave Egleston – NC State
 - Fiona McKelly – Stanford Marine Science Station
 - Jim Estes – Santa Cruz, but may work for NOAA
 - John Whitman – Brown University
 - Tim Essington – UW
 - Rodrigo Bustamante – (Elise)
 - Sergio Novarete – Chile (Elise)
 - Heather Leslie – Maine, Director Darling Reserve Center
 - Would it be possible to start a Google Doc sheet to add to this list? Yes

- OAH Council - Academic Representative
 - Jack, co-chair of the council, provided an overview of the OAH Council.
 - It was set-up to help advise the state on how to take action on OAH. It includes representatives from agencies, watershed councils, academia, etc.
 - The council needs a new academic representative. They also aim to have good geographical balance, and would like someone from the southern part of the state.
 - Alan Shanks – retired but still teaching at UO
 - Are their restraints on retired vs.non-retired? Bill will check.
 - Jessica Miller – That would be another rep from OSU
 - Dave Sutherland - (hypoxia in coos bay)

- ODFW Update – Cristen Don and Lindsay Aylesworth
 - Oregon Marine Reserves Staffing Updates:
 - Ecological Monitoring Staff: Lindsay Aylesworth (Lead), Stephanie Fields (Assistant Lead) and new employee, Ryan Fields (Research Assistant)
 - Human Dimensions Research: Tommy Swearingen
 - Outreach and Engagement position is currently vacant, attempting to reclassify this position to a public affairs position (which does not require a biological degree like the current position) to help widen the pool of applicants and to have their skills be more in line with outreach and engagement needs
 - Fellows: Dori Kane (OSU-MSI/ODFW), and Haley Epperly (Oregon Sea Grant Fellow)
 - Cristen highlighted some 2019 actions of the Oregon Marine Reserves team
 - 2019 Ecological Monitoring – Lindsay Aylesworth
 - 2020 Core Tools Monitoring
 - Very recently received their first oceanographic data from Cape Falcon, it included a winter deployment and a summer deployment.
 - One mooring out of the three that had the monitoring equipment survived the winter storms.
 - This year they have been able to get their first data representations from across all five reserves to compare (May – Sept).
 - They are still working to understand what the full message is coming out of this data.
 - Diver data indicates that there are some urchin increases at Redfish Rocks
 - Plans for 2020 Monitoring
 - Spring surveys are postponed for now due to COVID 19
 - Cape Falcon: Diver and lander efforts
 - Cascade Head: All four at Cascade head
 - Cape Perpetua: Hook and line
 - 2020 Collaborative Fieldwork – Plans to survey in the spring and in the fall. Spring plans are currently postponed for due to COVID 19
 - What allowed for the expansive oceanographic monitoring at all of the sites?
 - It was due to the persistence of the collaborators. There were a lot of different factors that helped to increase their capacity around these efforts.
 - For the Core Tools, data is gathered at the marine reserve sites along with the comparison sites. For the Collaborative Field work, it varies.
 - What have you learned from the temperature patterns collected? We’re starting to see that there are different regimes that are associated with the different capes. The temperatures in the Redfish area are different from the central coast and Cape

Falcon appears to be its own distinct location. There is a lot to get at in the oceanographic detail and we've just scratched the surface.

- We are getting useful information inside and outside of the reserves regarding temperature and we are able to track the warm blob.
- 2019 Human Dimensions Report – Tommy Swearingen
 - Developed 5 reports
 - Two in their final version: *Commercial Fishing Effort Shift*, and *Commercial and Recreational Fishing Economic Impacts Coastwide and Near Reserves*
 - Three others in progress: *Coastal Residents Spatial Preference for Marine Reserves*, *PPGIS Spatial Attribution of Coastal Values and Management Preferences*, and *Qualitative Study of Reserve Impacts on Fishing Occupational Communities*.
 - 2021 Human Dimension Projects:
 - Spatial Model and Economic impacts
 - Economic and Social Welfare Time Series Analysis
 - Survey of I5 and Coastal Resident awareness and support
 - Visitor intercept survey of awareness and trip motives
 - Coastal Business Survey
 - Qualitative Study of Reserve Impacts on Individual Fishers

Break

- Guest Presenters - Drs. Chris Wolsko and Beth Marino-human dimensions research program
 - Time spanning 2009 – present
 - They are summarizing, evaluating and analyzing the human dimensions findings from ODFW's various Human Dimensions studies.
 - They are not doing a peer review of the existing HD research reports. They are also not retroactively validating the findings.
 - Key questions:
 - Are people knowledgeable about Marine Reserves?
 - General public has little knowledge (high confidence)
 - Coastal residents are significantly more aware than I5 corridor residents (high confidence)
 - The awareness of MR among residents and visitors is increasing (low confidence)
 - How do people feel about Marine Reserves?
 - Both coastal and I5 corridor residents feel somewhat positive about the existence and impacts of the marine reserves
 - What are the economic impacts of Marine Reserves on fishermen?
 - It's complicated.
 - Cascade Head and Redfish – vulnerable to economic impacts
 - MR constitute only a minimal amount of economic value (2.9-3.6% of total economic value, spatial measurement)
 - Interviews suggest fisherman are not experiencing negative economic impact
 - Fisherman are concerned about the larger context of the MR regulations
 - What are other significant economic impacts on communities of place?

- It appears that the current MR are NOT significantly impacting business (Medium confidence)
 - What are the social impacts of Marine Reserves?
 - MR, like other forms of regulatory action, may act as a flash or conflict point between key groups (fisherman, conservationists, etc.) (High confidence)
 - Observations and Recommendations:
 - MR are providing a natural laboratory for social research that mimics the natural laboratory for ecological research
 - We recommend projects that promote collaboration between Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) holders and scientists.
 - There was a robust discussion regarding trust and influence of coastal residents related to MR management and in general, other management and natural resources issues.
- Size and spacing workshop overview and STAC member reflections - Dick Vanderschaaf (TNC)
 - Workshop basics: 38 participants from CA, OR, and WA. 12 observers. 14 presentations, 5 sessions.
 - Workshop goals:
 - Review CA and OR networks, design guidelines
 - Assess state of knowledge from findings
 - Consider emerging issues, climate change
 - What roles social and cultural factors play
 - Facilitate discussion
 - Science Findings:
 - Size Factor: 5-10 KM along shore. Based on larval and adult movement, habitats. Got this about right.
 - Spacing Factor: 50-100KM. More nuanced than distance. Should include habitat diversity, connectivity, key nursery areas, representation and replication, population dynamics.
 - Place Factor: recognizes the specialness of places and importance of sitting areas, OAH concerns.
 - Shape and Configuration
 - Emerging Issues Findings
 - OAH: Placing marine reserves to include refuges and hotspots
 - Marine Disease: placing marine reserves as refugia that can repopulate the coast
 - Climate resilience: can marine reserves act as resilient refugia and support mitigation through carbon sequestration in kelp?
 - Monitoring: long term sites for research and monitoring
 - Networks: for resilience
 - Social and Cultural Findings: the workshop generated interest in these topics
 - Social-ecological systems: combine dimensions
 - Enabling conditions: use more effectively in the placement process. Communities, stakeholders.
 - Include more factors than just fishing: ecosystem services, compliance, cultural significance, coastal resiliency
 - More inclusive process
 - Other considerations:
 - Linkages to federal waters: habitat diversity, connectivity
 - Monitoring needs and values

- Fisheries management, spatial planning
 - Restoration
 - Global networks and messaging
 - Next steps
 - Developing a workshop summary to share with all participants
 - Webinar planned for May/June to seek consensus on a few workshop findings
 - Targeted discussions on issues - climate change, social/cultural factors, networks?
 - There were several STAC members who attended the workshop: Jan, Jack, Selina, Elise, and Shelby
 - Jan: California has estuaries covered, Oregon does not at this time
 - It was good to hear the CA and BC processes and to hear about OR fits in with their efforts.
- Next meeting - topics and schedule
 - In the past there has been a summer meeting. Is there a need for a summer meeting at this point?
 - We can pass on the summer meeting and stay in touch via email updates for now.
 - There will be a regular fall meeting. Are there suggestions for topics to discuss or to hear about during that meeting?
 - The first two bullet points that were on Tommy's list; especially the time series analysis, it would be very useful to have some quantitative information (even work in progress) on what those measures are and what they are expecting to have. It is still quite vague.
- Adjourn