Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting Meeting Summary August 9, 2022

STAC members: Jack Barth, Elise Granek, Selina Heppell, Jan Hodder, Bill Jaeger, Karina Nielsen (Chair), Gil Sylvia, Craig Young

STAC members not present: Veronica Dujon

Other invited participants: Will White (OSU)

Information from previous meetings: STAC meeting notes: July 2022, April 2022, September 2021, January 2021, October 2020, March 2020, November 2019, August 2019, March 2019, November 2018, June 2018, March 2018, October 2017, April 2017

Background information: Oregon Ocean Information - STAC

Meeting recording: <u>https://media.oregonstate.edu/media/t/1_z5f7vhjb</u>

- Welcome and introductions Karina Nielsen
 - o Overview of the timeline
 - July 15 Draft report delivered to STAC
 - July 19 Presentation of draft report at STAC meeting by University team
 - August 9 STAC meeting to discuss and finalize review comments for University team
 - August 15 University team receives written comments from STAC
 - September 12 University team deadline to submit revised report to STAC
 - September 19 STAC meeting to discuss revised report, vote to approve transmission of draft report to interim committees on environment and natural resources of the Legislative Assembly
 - October 1 Draft Marine Reserves Assessment Report due to interim committees on environment and natural resources of the Legislative Assembly
 - March 1, 2023 Final Marine Reserves Assessment Report due to the Legislative Assembly
- Marine Reserves Assessment report
 - o Discussion of draft STAC review and feedback for the University team
 - How will STAC be using the ODFW comments that were supplied?

- STAC members approved the following language to be included in the review to the University team.
 - "Lastly, we note that ODFW has provided a response to the university team's report with valuable information (in a separate document). We recommend that the university team consider the points raised and evidence provided by ODFW in addition to the comments provided here by the STAC."
- o Discussion regarding estuaries, ecological connectivity, legislative intent, OPAC guidance regarding estuaries.
 - 2008 OPAC recommendations <u>https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qU3xhojk1BYZMjZHEVJk0pTI3AhpBG3r/view</u>
 - STAC recommendation to University Team: Consider expanding the understanding of ecological connectivity between estuaries and marine reserves
- o Discussion regarding the definition of "significance" and the University Teams' approach to avoid it since it wasn't defined in statute.
 - Without better definitions, best not to address the concept of significance here
 - Recommended legislative recommendation: better definitions of terms like "significant"
 - Not just whether the change was significant/of importance, there's also an issue of attributability. Can we say that MR caused any of the detected changes?
 - Up to legislators to decide if the findings were significant assuming the intended meaning is of importance, instead of a statistical interpretation
- Discussion of the ODFW finding of no significant change as a result of the Marine Reserves. Does STAC and the University Team have confidence in the ODFW studies/analyses supporting that claim?
 - It's one thing to list what ODFW found, but what did the review team find?
 - Review team took the report at face value and did not re-analyze data. Review team did comment on/evaluate the methodologies of the ODFW studies.
 - Would like the University Team to address concepts like this more directly in the executive summary, so that the legislators that receive this report have more context as to the findings and the review.

- The point is not to be hypercritical of ODFW and the resources they did or did not have available. The point is to address our confidence level in the robustness of the results, whether they are up, down or no change.
 - o Is that feasible for the university team in the given time?
 - Yes, Dr. White believed it would be possible to include this in the final report.
- STAC recommendation to University Team: Address your confidence level in the robustness of the results, whether they are up, down or no change.
- o Discussion regarding University team recommendations to ODFW about their review process, and why there were no recommendations for the legislative side of things.
 - STAC encouraged the University Team to make clearer legislative recommendations in the executive summary.
 - In the university team's eyes, they did provide some legislative recommendations, mostly regarding resources to support this work.
 - While this information may be peppered throughout the document, it would be stronger to have the recommendations more clearly highlighted and in a cohesive place in the document.
 - Put the goals in context, "In order to meet the goals of BILL XX, we recommend...."
 - o Not just recommendations about money, but also size and spacing....
 - Size and spacing are not goals of this, so these recommendations may not be applicable.
 - But from an ecological perspective, more connectivity between reserves would be relevant.
 - STAC Recommendation better understand how our reserves are connected, resilient, including with the MR system in CA.
- STAC discussion regarding important questions: Real question is what do we need to do differently...here's how things are working, and here's how they're not. It would be helpful for the University Team to frame the document this way.
 People reading should know what was actionable and what was not.
- o STAC discussion regarding insufficiency of ODFW's methods for estimating species diversity or species richness. Since their methods were flawed, some information in their report is misrepresented.
 - Would like this stated somewhere in the review
 - Could recommend other approaches to ecological review methods

- STAC recommends more standard, clear language on the recommendations throughout the report and executive summary.
- o STAC discussion regarding the importance of going back to the research itself before making extrapolations. For example where "I don't know" was a possible answer to surveys, but the results were presented in a more binary way.
- o Dr. White welcomed guidance on how language to use to make the recommendations in the report read better to those in the legislature.
- o STAC Chair summarized the major updates to the review feedback for the University Team from the discussion today
 - Transmit the ODFW response for Will and his team to consider
 - In particular pointing out the tribal knowledge
 - Comments regarding estuaries and connectivity to MR and goals there
 - Comments around significance, it would be a good to recommend the legislature to define that in a policy framework.
 - Ask team to summarize recommendations under headings for legislative proposals, administrative actions, and those for ODFW assessment
 - Make the executive summary more user-friendly for legislators; focus on what questions are the legislators going to ask about MR and what kinds of information would be more useful to them?
- o STAC Chair asked for approval from the committee to revise the STAC review per the summarized points and discussion today, and transmit the final STAC review to the University Team
 - STAC approved
- Adjourn