**Oregon Nearshore Research Task Force**
**May 4, 2010**
**Columbia River Maritime Museum, Astoria, Oregon**

<u>TF Members</u>:  Sybil Ackerman, Laura Anderson, Bob Bailey, Caren Braby, Stephen Brandt, Leesa Cobb (absent), Gus Gates, Onno Husing (absent), Jeff Kroft (absent), Mike Lane, Gil Sylvia, Terry Thompson (absent), Frank Warrens, Craig Young.
        *Federal non-voting members*: Roy Lowe (absent), Cathy Tortorici (federal, by phone)
<u>Staff</u>: Jenna Borberg, Julie Risien, and Andy Lanier
<u>Contractor</u>: Heather Reiff
<u>Other Participants</u>: Representative Boone, John Weber

*An expanded summary of issues decided and action items can be found below under the detailed summary of the meeting.*

**Summary of Issues Decided/Positions Taken**
1.  The Task Force (TF) approved the March Meeting minutes, pending a correction in the summary of the Peer Review Process presentation.
2.  Contracting Plan:
    a.  The Operations Team along with the Finance and Institutional Framework Committees (Steve, Sybil, Caren, Gil, Laura, Bob, Craig, and Frank) sent out two RFPs and hired a contractor to research institutional framework models, as was decided during the March 29-30 NRTF meeting.  They decided not to hire a consultant to work on the finance research at this time.
3.  The Community Engagement Committee (Leesa, Terry, Gil, Gus, and Julie) is reviewing other models of community engagement within and outside of Oregon, and they requested assistance from relevant TF members.
4.  Future Meetings:
    a.  June 3-4, Salbasgeon Suites, Corvallis.  The meeting that was schedule on June 10-11 was rescheduled for June 3-4.
    b.  June 28-29, Newport.  The TF decided to hold an additional meeting in late June, and the meeting date has since been confirmed.
    c.  July 22-23, Portland.

**Summary of Action Items**
1.  Final Report Drafting
    a.  Bob will redraft the Institutional Framework based on discussion from this May 4 meeting.  This draft will be reviewed by the Institutional Framework Committee and the Operations Team before being distributed to the TF.  At the June 3-4 meeting, the TF will continue discussing specific example(s) of an institutional arrangement.

b. The Community Engagement Committee will provide Bob the outline that they have drafted that could contribute to the *Community Engagement and Education* section in the Institutional Framework draft.

c. Jenna will provide Bob a summary of notes from the institutional framework discussion during this May 4th meeting.

2. Draft Agenda for June 3-4: It was proposed that at the next meeting, the TF will continue to discuss the institutional framework. For the funding mechanism, the TF will think about and discuss (1) what problem are they trying to solve with the funding entity, (2) what is achievable in the short-term with the existing framework, and (3) what might be the bigger "Cadillac" version (such as, a 5-year plan).

## Detailed Summary of Meeting
The meeting was called to order at 8:25 am by Chair, Stephen Brandt

### *Approval of March Meeting Minutes*
The Task Force (TF) voted to approve the draft March meeting minutes pending the following correction: Under the summary of the Peer Review presentation, the text should be changed to say that the process has been around for "decades", not "centuries".

### Evaluation of the Institutional Framework Concepts
*Discussion accompanied by handouts that can be located on the NRTF website.*

Bob led a discussion of an institutional framework that he and members of the Institutional Framework Committee and the Operations Team had drafted, per a decision made at the March NRTF meeting. This draft was presented in order to initiate detailed discussion by the TF, and it was noted that it is not a consensus document, just a collection of ideas. The draft attempted to incorporate key principles of an institutional framework that had been agreed upon at prior meetings. The draft included descriptions of, and identified issues that the TF may want to discuss, on the following eight components/bodies of an institutional framework:
1. Science and Technical Advisory Body
2. Funding Mechanism
3. Advisory Board
4. Community Engagement and Education
5. Stakeholder Advisory Body
6. Scientific Research and Monitoring
7. State Agency Programs
8. Marine Data Network

1. Stakeholder Advisory Body
The Stakeholder Advisory Body was proposed to be some version of the current Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC). General Consensus: The TF does not need to decide on details such as the make-up of OPAC right now. However, there was general agreement that it probably will eventually need to be modified to have representatives from education and energy because both of those groups are likely to have a stake in Oregon's nearshore. There was general agreement

that OPAC would have a role in shaping the research and monitoring plan, it shouldn't be decided by scientists alone.

 2. Science and Technical Advisory Body
This body was proposed to help ensure that new funding is distributed in a way that serves the management needs to achieve the state's priorities.  After discussion, the TF was trending towards some type of expanded Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) that will do the following: (1) strategic research thinking and planning, and (2) provide short-term information, such as, white papers.  There was also a suggestion that this group could serve a role in coordinating research and identifying immediate state research needs.  It was suggested that this group should be titled the "Scientific and Advisory Council", rather than the "Academy".

3. Executive-level Policy Oversight and Coordination
It was proposed that the executive level policy body would determine policy through input from the stakeholder and scientific bodies, and that some version of the current Oregon Marine Cabinet could serve this role.  Again, general consensus was similar to the decision made regarding OPAC – the TF does not need to decide on a revised make-up of the Marine Cabinet. However, it was suggested that the Marine Cabinet have liaisons from OPAC, STAC, and the Governor's Office.  The TF discussed that the state needs an immediate short-term and longer term (e.g., 5-year) strategic plan, and that this body could create this plan with input from the stakeholder and scientific advisory bodies.

4. Funding Mechanism/Entity
A funding mechanism was proposed as part of the Institutional Framework because Oregon needs to be able to receive and allocate funds from a variety of sources (state, federal, and private) in order to target management needs.  The funds could be received and distributed based on the strategic research plan that the executive level body would develop.  It was noted that if a 501(c)(3) is established, a board would be required.

There was general discussion by the TF about the exact structure and function of this funding mechanism.  Would they merely exist to funnel money, or would they serve a larger strategic role of marketing, etc.?  Also, will money be distributed based on RFPs, or could the entity also house money for targeted projects?  Again, the need for a strategic plan came up.  A driving home point was that there is money that Oregon isn't capitalizing on because we don't have the mechanism.

Rep Boone cautioned the TF that one of the reasons this got through the legislature was for the need of research.  The TF needs to be careful to not have this look like a backdoor for funding items that the legislature didn't want to fund.

The TF discussed the issue of trust.  Various ideas were discussed on how trust is gained, including through a strategic plan, trusted science, a strong vision, and/or a process in which stakeholders are heard.  It was noted that it should be explicitly stated that funding supports utilization and economic benefits as well as protection.

The TF ran out of time to go through the remaining components of the institutional framework. It was proposed that at the next meeting, the TF would continue this discussion. And for the funding mechanism, they should think about and discuss (1) what problem they are trying to solve with the funding entity, (2) what is achievable in the short-term with the existing framework, and (3) what might be the bigger "Cadillac" version (5-year plan). It was noted that the consultants will help frame some of the funding mechanisms.

### *Massachusetts Ocean Plan Presentation*
*PowerPoint presentation can be located on the NRTF website.*

John Weber, Ocean Program Manager for Coastal Zone Management in Massachusetts, presented on data management activities and work with the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership (MOP), a grant funded entity with whom he has been working closely. The program was mandated by the Oceans ACT of 2008 to develop an ocean plan in a year for public review. The plan was to be data/science based, contain goals, site priorities, and standards. The plan also had to be spatial in nature, protect special sensitive or unique life/habitats, and had to be enforceable.

Their approach was to develop goals and strategies, conduct a compatibility assessment, create screening criteria (use of spatial data), and develop the plan based on synthesis of spatial management elements. They used best available science on human uses and natural resources, and this data was put into GIS format to enable analysis of different spatial scenarios. They used an already existing data management tool (MORIS) to provide an online mapping tool for the public to view and create maps. The system can be used very quickly to look at different scenarios, and allowed them to use spatial data more effectively. MORIS needs adjustment and expanded capabilities, which is being addressed through partnerships. In addition they are looking to do this on a regional basis in light of national developments in spatial planning.

The MOP is privately funded and has over 60 public and private members, a 15 member governing board, advisory bodies and councils to assist them, and includes public involvement. The MOP provided funds for third party consultants to address priorities identified in the Ocean Management Plan "Science Framework", which can include work such as: processing data, addressing very specific questions, and conducting research on social and economic issues related to fisheries.

The MOP is not currently incorporated as a 501(c)(3), but there are concerns related to the amount of overhead at the university so this is something they are considering.

*Task Force Questions*
Q: Was the partnership a funding mechanism as well as providing a science advisory mechanism?
A: The partnership already existed and had a science program. In this implementation phase, the science program has shifted gears to serve the Ocean Management Plan needs. Their function has changed.

Q: Was the ocean science advisory council spawned by the oceans act?

A: Yes. They served two functions: 1) acquiring and analyzing existing data provided by a series and specialized working groups; and 2) the helped develop the science framework by identifying the knowledge gaps and what needs to be addressed to better achieve the goals in the ocean management plan.

Q: Will they continue to advise the state through the next iteration?
A: Yes, but the structure might change. There were 9 scientists with specific areas of expertise (fisheries, geology, etc.). Moving ahead they will have sub-groups with 4-5 folks to look into a specific area like habitat or commercial fisheries. These will be more narrowly focused.
The science advisory council doesn't get any funding. They are appointed by the Governor.

Q: Is there a separate stakeholder advisory process that will continue?
A: Yes, the ocean advisory council which includes state agencies and representatives of different sectors. There will be a named stakeholder outreach cabinet for them. They are appointed by the Governor, but some are confirmed by legislature, some were selected by the sector them approved by the governor. This group advises the state agencies that are responsible to develop and implement the ocean plan.

Q: Was there a formal agreement between MOP and the agency?
A: Yes, there is an existing MOU that is somewhat general. The MOU set the tone and started on the right foot, but they haven't had to use it, the relationship has developed in an ad hoc way.

Q: What happens when the Moore money disappears?
A: The existing grant runs out end of 2011; that is why the partnership is shifting over to be housed in a different place with a demonstrated track record for getting funding. There are pending grant applications submitted in partnership with the state that could provide significant funds. The next 9 months the partnership will focus on funding based on how the board sees the MOP role. The Ocean Management Plan is a framework and a prioritization. We have a start for the regulatory portion of the plan in place. There is no way that the state can make a significant contribution into the program. They are watching what's happening on the federal level and keeping an eye on opportunities related to regional and spatial planning to leverage what the state would like to do. At the private level, the state is actively looking for opportunities to implement the framework in the plan.

**Presentation on the TF Guiding Documents**
A contractor of the NRTF, Heather Reiff, presented on her work of characterizing the research efforts in Oregon's nearshore, and determining how much money is spent on this research. The approach she took was to go through the four guiding documents listed in HB3106, and from these, she identified 18 research categories. She then asked state and federal agencies, and other groups participating in nearshore research and monitoring to provide one year of budget information (for 2009) – requesting information on overall nearshore research and monitoring, funding sources and amounts, and how it fits into the 18 categories. For the education and outreach category, spending information was requested from state and federal agencies, but not from private organizations.

*Data Limitations*

She noted that there were some major limitations to her assessment of money spent on Oregon's nearshore. The data was limited to agencies and groups that responded - some of which had a nearshore budget, some could not break funds into the 18 categories, and some could not distinguish funds between nearshore and offshore. Additionally, the fact that only one year of data was requested limits the interpretation of results.

*Summary of Results*
The rough estimate of the total funding going to Oregon's nearshore research for 2009 was $38M. This does not include double counting as far as she could tell. A complex map was presented that identifies where money originates and where it is spent. The overall breakdown of where nearshore funds come from was as follows: 78% federal, 14% state (which includes New Carissa funds), and 6% private. Of the funds received from federal agencies, the groups receiving the largest amounts included NOAA (43%), OSU (16%, largely for seafloor mapping), and Sea Grant (9%). The largest receivers of state funds (approximately $5M) in 2009 were ODFW (32%), Sea Grant (21%), and DSL (21% from New Carissa). The largest receivers of private funds ($2M) were PISCO (51%), Sea Grant (21%), and Surfrider (7%).

When broken down by category, seafloor mapping received the largest amount of money in 2009. The Final report by the contractor will include more details on the breakdown of funds.

*Preliminary Conclusion*
Some preliminary conclusions are as follows: there is a heavy dependency on federal funds, it is difficult to categorize funds (particularly for some fed agencies that work across many areas), the transfer of funding is not straightforward (double counting is difficult to avoid), seafloor mapping was the most funded research area for 2009, and the short project timeline resulted in limited responses.

*Task Force Questions and Discussion*
The TF was interested to know if there may have been any major chunks of money missing and/or if the $38M may be an overstatement of money spent on Oregon's nearshore. The contractor did not think major chunks were missing, but did acknowledge that it may be an overstatement – there were some large chunks of money that were included in the analysis that agencies could not specify what portion of that money was spent in Oregon's nearshore. It was also noted that the categorization does not reflect all nearshore research, e.g., some agencies left out issues that did not fall under research and monitoring, and studying animals at organismal levels was not a category.

The TF discussed the results in light of their earlier discussion on a funding entity as part of the institutional framework. The funding entity could allow for more private funds to come into the state through a trusted process, but based on these results, the TF may not want to create an entity with a lot of overhead because it may not be handling many funds. The TF may want to estimate overhead that would be required for the trust to handle X number of dollars.

The TF had some general suggestions for the report. They thought it could be interesting to look at a comparison of how much money is spent on land. They also noted that it is critical to make sure all of the qualifications are clearly spelled out in the final report.

*Committee Updates*
The Community Engagement Committee presented an update on their work. They noted that they have an expanded outline on Community Engagement and Education that could be incorporated into the draft Institutional Framework. The Committee is looking at various existing community engagement models – history, governance structure, how they are dealing with emerging roles, and strengths and weaknesses of the different models. They are thinking about reviewing the following models, and would like assistance from some TF members on this: POORT Model, local government partnerships (e.g., FACT, FINE, etc.), Blue Water TF – section of Surfrider's Oregon Chapter, Project CROOS, Marine Reserve Community Teams, Watershed Councils, and OPAC. They are also considering some out of state groups including: locally managed marine models (international group), and Washington community teams.

*TF Discussion*
It was suggested that the Committee also look at the Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries in Monterey and the Haystack Rock Awareness Group in Cannon Beach. The Committee is looking to complete their work by the late June or July meeting, and they see their summary fitting into the overall TF report.

**Additional Business**
*Contract update*
The Operations Team, Institutional Framework Committee, and Funding Committee put together two calls for proposals for institutional framework and funding contractors. Both calls were extended an extra week due to lack of applicants. An Institutional Framework contractor has been decided on, T.C. Hoffmann and Associates, LCC. However, the OT and Committees decided not to hire for the funding contract at this point. The original RFP had requested a full initial briefing to the TF at the June meeting, but since the contractors were hired later than planned and the June meeting has been moved earlier in the month, this is now unlikely.

**Future Meetings**
The next NRTF meeting, June 3-4, was to be largely devoted to contract presentations and continuing the institutional framework discussion. It was discussed that the TF may need another meeting between the currently scheduled June and July meetings, in part, because the contractors are unlikely to be ready to present at the early June meeting due to reason noted in the contract update. All TF members who were present were available to meet June 28-29, and it was decided that this meeting would be held in Newport. This date will be confirmed once TF members not present are contacted.

**Public Comments**
There were no public comments at this meeting of the NRTF.