

KEY TO DECISION POINT TIERS:

Tier One - Large-scale Priority decisions that deal with, major structural or conceptual changes. Opposing opinions were expressed, and these decisions must be made before other decision points in that same section can be addressed.

Tier Two -Decisions dependent on Tier one and/or still significant conceptual changes, may become irrelevant depending on answers to Tier one.

Tier Three - Smaller scale changes, insertions, or systemic wording changes, may be difficult to answer until the first two tiers are addressed, or the entire document is considered.

Recommended Long-Term Funding and Coordination Strategy for Implementing Nearshore Priorities of Oregon

Submitted by the Oregon Task Force on Nearshore Research

Introduction for TFNR Recommendations Report
June 21, 2010

Sources of information:

1. April 2010 draft of Institutional Framework document
2. TFNR Overview/Process document (1-pager)
3. TFNR 101 presentation
4. guiding documents and Goal 19

Outline:

1. Why/how the TFNR became a reality
2. Need for research – state’s capacity unable to meet needs
3. Need for a coordinated plan – multiple agencies have authority; many community/stakeholder groups are interested
4. Strong desire for Oregon to drive its own agenda in MSP/Nearshore work, rather than have outside interests/funders drive an agenda
5. Use of existing state policy (TSP, Goal 19, Executive Order 08-07, etc.) and research plans (Nearshore strategy, WCGA, Sea Grant Research document).

Text from Laura: Rationale: “Investment in a knowledge-based Oregon nearshore economy”. In a nutshell we should recommend an investment strategy for performing nearshore research that will allow us to make better management decisions about utilizing/protecting nearshore resources, expecting this will create better long-term economic and ecological stability for citizens of Oregon.

Introduction and Rationale

The Oregon Task Force on Nearshore Research (TFNR) TFNR was developed by the state legislature with the passage of House Bill 3106 in June, 2009. The Task Force is charged with recommending “a long-term funding and coordination strategy for implementing the nearshore priorities of the state.” The overall purpose of this strategy is to “ensure the protection and utilization of Oregon’s nearshore resources.” HB 3106 instructs the Task Force to consider key documents that outline existing nearshore priorities in the development of a funding and coordination strategy. The strategy recommended by the Task Force must:

1. *Review, consolidate and anticipate nearshore priorities for purposes relating to:*
 - (A) *Researching and monitoring nearshore resources;*

(B) Management of nearshore resources and policy formation; and

(C) Education and outreach.

(b) Identify the funding needs of current and anticipated nearshore programs.

(c) Determine transparent procedures and oversight mechanisms for pursuing, securing and administering public and private funds.

(d) Identify mechanisms for data sharing to coordinate, collaborate and reevaluate priorities and programs among state agencies, universities and other stakeholders with an interest in nearshore resources.

The suggested guiding documents for this work were: 1) Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan, 2) Oregon Nearshore Marine Resources Management Strategy, 3) West Coast Regional Marine Research and Information Plan developed by Sea Grant and 4) the West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health Action Plan. In addition, the TFNR has contracted a study to assess the major, ongoing, research activities in the state.

- The Task force believed that it is important to differentiate the policy and management decision-making authority of various state entities (Governors Office, State legislature, and state agencies) through statutory authority and the scientific underpinnings and research, monitoring, education, outreach and data availability that provide an unbiased, science-informed decision-making process. Much of the management and policy decision-making outlined in the documents above are being undertaken at the state, regional and local community level (as communities become more involved with local management). However, the Task Force and HB3106 recognize the need for more research targeted at key priority questions. **The Scientific approach needs to be prioritized, coordinated, targeted at key issues and be funded at higher levels through unbiased processes that ensure that the science is trusted and free of conflict of interest.** This is a key, overarching recommendation of the Task Force. Currently there is insufficient state funding to meet the information needs demanded by current use conflict over the Territorial Sea. In addition, there is no coordinated approach to identify specific research or monitoring needed to acquire data and information needed to support critical management decisions and there are fundamental needs for better coordination and collaboration among institutions and between institutions and stakeholder communities. In the short term, key issues such as continued community engagement in ocean stewardship, sustainable management of nearshore

fisheries, development of ocean alternative energy resources, implementation of marine reserves, human health and ecological effects of nearshore ocean water quality, invasive non-native species, effects of hypoxia on nearshore ecosystems and resources, ocean disposal of dredged materials from coastal ports, effects of climate change, land-sea interactions and the overall vitality of the ocean ecosystem will continually challenge our scientific understanding but will also provide significant opportunities to develop and implement agency coordination, stakeholder involvement in process, and critical research and monitoring efforts.. TFNR recommendations address how to meet the needs that are not already being met by existing funding for agencies and institutions, as well as, how to improve the coordination and stakeholder engagement processes to leverage efforts across the state to attract funding for these additional needs without compromising Oregon's agenda for how to manage its nearshore territorial sea.

•

The Task Force recognizes that investment in a knowledge-based Oregon nearshore economy is vital. Put simply, an investment strategy for performing nearshore research will allow us to make better informed management decisions about utilizing/ protecting nearshore resources and therefore create better long-term economic and ecological stability for citizens of Oregon.

Task Force on Nearshore Research Process

The TFNR has been meeting since December 2009 (Table 1), exploring strategy components to meet the directive from HB3106. The Task Force has largely worked through consensus. At the first Meeting the task Force elected a Chairperson (Brandt) as required by the legislation and also elected a Vice-Chairperson (Ackerman) and an Operations Team (Brandt, Ackerman, Silvia, Braby) that provided the continuity between full Task Force Meetings. The Task Force also created a number of working subcommittees (Appendix __), and bought in expert speakers and panelist as well as consultant services through a competitive process to evaluate institutional frameworks used in other states and countries. With a team of committee members from multiple stakeholder groups and management institutions (Table 2), we have developed recommendations using guiding principles including:

- Authentic collaboration (HB3106, SECTION 1. (5)(d))
- Sharing of data and information (HB 3106, SECTION 1. (5)(d))

- Transparency of funding process (HB3106, SECTION 1. (5)(c))
- Scientific rigor and peer-review (social and natural sciences)
- Innovation and creativity in problem-solving
- Community engagement

Table 1. TFNR meeting schedule

Date	Meeting location
December 2-3, 2009	Newport
January 21-22, 2010	Newport
February 18, 2010	Newport
March 29, 2010	Charleston
May 4, 2010	Astoria
June 3-4, 2010	Corvallis
June 28-29, 2010	Newport
July 22-23, 2010	Portland

Table 2. Membership of the Nearshore Research Task Force.

Seat	Name	Institution/Representing
A	Gil Sylvia Operations Team	Superintendent, Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station, Oregon State University
B	Craig Young	Director, Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, University of Oregon
C	Stephen Brandt <i>Chairperson</i>	Director, Oregon Sea Grant
D	Caren Braby Operations Team	Manager, Marine Resources Program, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
E	Bob Bailey	Manager, Ocean Coastal Services Division, Department of Land Conservation and Development
F	Onno Husing	Executive Director, Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association
G	Jeff Kroft	Director (designee), Department of State Lands
H(i)	Terry Thompson	Local government: Commissioner, Lincoln County
H(ii)	Sybil Ackerman <i>Vice-chairperson</i>	Conservation: Lazar Foundation
H(iii)	Mike Lane	Commercial fishing: Dungeness crab
H(iv)	Frank Warrens	Sport fishing: Charter
H(v)	Leesa Cobb	Community-based fishing: Port Orford Ocean Resource Team
H(vi)	Laura Anderson	Nearshore industry (non-fishing): Local Ocean Restaurateur
H(vii)	Gus Gates	Nearshore recreation (non-fishing): Surfrider

b	Cathy Tortorici	Federal (non-voting): NOAA
b	Roy Lowe	Federal (non-voting): USFWS

Recommendations Summary

One of the key criteria that we adopted early on was to recommend using existing bodies where available to expedite the process for the short term and for enhanced efficiency and fiscal conservatisms. The recommendations that we are making for the Oregon Marine Cabinet, The Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) and the Science and Technology Advisory Committee (STAC) are not intended to affect the current responsibilities of these bodies. Rather our recommendations are to use these bodies to provide mechanism for enhancing the research and monitoring coordination and the effective use of science to inform the decision-making process.

The core element of our recommendations is the development of a Research and Monitoring Action Plan, which clearly uses Oregon's agenda (generally derived from policy directives from the legislature, Governor, and agency commissions) for prioritizing and coordinating nearshore research, monitoring, education, outreach and data management and sharing. By developing a PLAN with state agencies, academic institutions and stakeholder groups, we will not only have a transparent process; we will have a process that defines our collective agenda first, and seeks funding sources that match Oregon's research agenda.

In addition to institutionalizing a state PLAN, TFNR other recommendations are largely focused on developing standing mechanisms to infuse trusted science to inform decision-making and to implement the plan. The development and implementation of the Plan will require significant time and financial resources, so we have followed our guiding principle of using existing institutional resources and bodies to bring together stakeholder, scientific, and agency expertise to join in the process. The brunt of the workload would fall on state agencies, which have the statutory authority and capacity to provide the staff time needed to produce this document. The currently unfunded stakeholder and scientific experts would be involved in an advisory capacity and provide minimal resources to the increased workload.

The Strategic Vision

Tier One:

- 1.1 Do we want to deemphasize management and focus on research for the entire document? Including the NAP? (at least 4 people)

NOTE: Current version of the text has been made much clearer to do so

Tier Two:

- 1.2 Does the document need to be restructured to put less controversial sections up front (data, funding) and more controversial sections at the end (MC, OPAC, STAC)?

Tier Three:

- 1.3 Should data management be included as a 6th action element?
1.4 Should we update the title of the entire document to "Recommended Investment Strategy to Enhance..."? (Strategy is a passive term)

NOTE: Title has been changed to reflect language in HB3106

The Task Force offers a "long-term funding and coordination strategy for implementing the nearshore priorities of the state." The strategy builds upon Oregon's existing ocean management and research programs and adds new or modified mechanisms to strengthen the state's ability to obtain scientific advice and set research, monitoring, education, outreach and data coordination and input mechanisms to ensure unbiased science informed decision-making carry out long-term, sustainable management of ocean resources. The proposed strategy has five interrelated action elements:

- An executive level coordinating body;
- A broadly representative stakeholder advisory body;
- An independent science advisory entity;
- An independent, transparent funding mechanism;
- Community engagement mechanisms to involve Oregon community-based marine stewardship groups and citizenry in nearshore research. (Note: There was not a clear decision

on whether this should be a discussion of its own, or incorporated into the stakeholder discussion)

Central to the successful cooperation and coordination of these four elements would be a multi-year Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Plan (Nearshore Action Plan – NAP) that includes relevant education, outreach and data coordination prepared every five years through a transparent and open process by an executive-level body with significant input and engagement from the stakeholder advisory body and the scientific advisory body. The NAP would identify priorities for research which would be required to guide ocean management program activities and funding priorities for research. In addition, the NAP would address data management, sharing, and infrastructure needs and help direct resources to community-based marine stewardship groups.

DRAFT

1. Executive-level Marine Cabinet

Tier One:

- 2.1 Should the MC exist, if so what exactly is the marine cabinet coordinating? (At least 5 people)

The Task Force agreed to the existence of this body in previous meetings. Indeed the body already exists. The question is how this body can provide a useful function for a 'long-term funding and coordination strategy'. The concerns raised seem to question the broader authorities and exact responsibilities of this body. Key questions are: Should this body have responsibilities largely restricted to coordination and funding of research and monitoring (including outreach, education and data management) relative to the nearshore...or also have broader management responsibilities. I have redrafted the text to reflect the scientific coordination aspects of this body and also softened some of the language on membership.

Tier Two:

- 2.2 What specific responsibilities should the marine cabinet have?
- Should it be responsible to create and approve the NAP, or should it just be responsible to initiate the creation of the NAP? If so, who approves the final version?
 - Should it have the ability to appoint STAC members at the recommendation of? If not who is responsible for appointing STAC members?
 - Should the MC be the gatekeeper for STAC services? If not who should perform this function?
- 2.3 What specific mechanism will stakeholders have to be involved or provide a check on the MC? Do we need to list these or just state that a transparent process with full engagement be used.
- 2.4 Should we identify MC membership? (Or let it evolve in the legislative process)

If yes

- Who are the members?
- Who votes?

The state has statutory responsibilities to oversee and coordinate nearshore ocean affairs or to set policies for nearshore management and research. At present, state agencies serve as ex-officio members of the Ocean Policy Advisory Council and, from time-to-time, are convened by the Office of the Governor as an informal Marine Cabinet. Neither of these mechanisms assures continued coordination of the research and monitoring enterprise for the state or provides a single body or point of contact for stakeholder, community, academic, private or federal collaboration on nearshore research, monitoring, data management, outreach or education.

Successful, efficient management of nearshore ocean resources and uses to meet state priorities requires a formalized way for the state to receive scientific input and to set state research priority needs. We propose that the Marine Cabinet be given specific responsibilities to:

- Initiate and complete an Oregon Research and Monitoring Action Plan
- Develop a long-term funding strategy for research and monitoring
- Provide continual coordination of statewide efforts in nearshore research, monitoring, outreach, education and data management
- provide stakeholders and communities with a clear mechanism to participate in setting priorities for management and research,
- ensure that the best possible and trusted scientific advice and information is available to marine managers and the public, and
- Provide guidance to funding entities including the Ocean Science Trust (described below) to ensure that funding decisions for research and monitoring are aligned with the state's strategic nearshore management priorities.

The Task Force recommends that a formal Marine Cabinet be created, either through legislative action or Executive Order. The Marine Cabinet would be directly advised by a formal Scientific Advisory Body (STAC), and Ocean Policy Advisory Body (OPAC) and Communities, stakeholders and the public and would work through an open, transparent process (as described

below). We recommend that the Departmental membership to this Cabinet include a broad representation of agencies that have direct responsibility in nearshore issues. These might include the following:

- Director or designee of key state agencies including:
 - State Lands
 - Land Conservation and Development
 - Fish and Wildlife
 - Parks and Recreation
 - Environmental Quality
 - Geology and Mineral Industries
 - State Marine Board
 - State Police

Representative of the Governor

We also recommend that other key members of the Cabinet are:

- A member of the state legislative
- Chair of OPAC
- Chair of STAC

The Marine Cabinet would:

- have no independent authority to manage ocean resources or uses; it would focus on research and monitoring funding, priorities and coordination. It would not replace any existing individual agency programs, authorities or funding mechanisms;
- facilitate research, monitoring, education, data management and outreach relative to the Oregon nearshore among all parties with interests in Oregon's nearshore marine management (e.g. state agencies, the Governor's office, legislators, academic research institutions, stakeholders, and the public);

- periodically prepare a Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Plan (described below) through a public process that would include advice from OPAC, STAC, and formal mechanisms for citizen input. The NAP would outline funding priorities for needs beyond existing state agency or academic research capacity;
- provide research priorities of the NAP to the Ocean Science Trust to provide a basis for funding decisions;
- prepare a biennial report to the governor and the legislature regarding marine research and activities being conducted under the oversight of the Cabinet, including progress on the NAP;
- .
- review and approve work of the STAC and review requests from other entities to enlist scientific advisory services from STAC.
- approve all changes to the membership of STAC.

Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Plan

Tier One:

3.1 What are the core elements of the NAP? (At least 6 people commented)

- The basic question is whether this plan is a Nearshore action plan with a focus on research and monitoring or whether it is a strategic plan that discusses all of the management/policy issues. If the latter, how does one deal with the other strategic plans like those listed in the bill
-
- *Text has been redrafted to reflect the Research and Monitoring (including data, outreach, and education) Action Plan.*
- Does it include funding?

3.2 Who initiates and has final approval on the NAP? (At least 3 people commented)

- What is the role of the marine cabinet
- How should the science community be involved?
- How should OPAC be involved?
- How should others in the stakeholder community be involved?

Tier Two:

- 3.3 Should the NAP be prepared every 10 years with an evaluation every 2? Or should we leave this to the legislature to decide?
- 3.4 Should we identify when the NAP should be completed relative to enactment of a Bill?
- If yes, how many months from enactment should we recommend?

Tier Three:

- 3.5 What do we call the plan? (Suggestions were made)
- Nearshore Strategic Plan? (NAP)
 - Oregon Research and Monitoring Action Plan? (ORMAP)
 - **NOTE: this is the one selected for this version**
 - Oregon Nearshore Action Plan? (ONAP)
 - Oregon Nearshore Research Action Plan? (ONRAP)
 - Oregon Nearshore Research and Management Plan? (ONRAMP)
 - Oregon Research and Coordination Nearshore Action Plan? (ORCNAP)

The Marine Cabinet would periodically (every five years) prepare and adopt a Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Strategic Plan (NAP). This plan would guide the state's Nearshore research, monitoring, outreach, education and data management activities, set priorities for direct funding by the Ocean Science Trust and by the state and provide an overarching structure for coordination.. The Action Plan would use established state, and regional priorities as an overarching guide. The NAP would cover both short term needs (i.e. less than three years) requiring more immediate attention and long term issues (i.e. more than ten years) that require sustained efforts to address. Overall this Action Plan will provide direct guidance to the funding entity (described below) in acquiring and allocating funds for research, monitoring, and other activities to meet the state's science information needs relative to nearshore policy and management objectives. The NAP must be completed not more than X number of months from when the bill is implemented.

- The plan would be prepared through a vigorous public process with advice from the STAC and comments from stakeholders via multiple pathways including the OPAC, community-based marine stewardship groups, the public, and state and federal agencies. The plan would identify nearshore priority research and information needs and financial support needed to address those needs by;
- review current nearshore issues and activities;
- review current nearshore research, monitoring, outreach, education and data management activities relative to those issues
- assess of all relevant overarching policy directives, identifying within those directives the policy, management, and information needs;
- do a gap analysis to asses information gaps

2. Stakeholder Advice

Tier One:

- 4.1 Should OPAC be the formal Stakeholder Advisory Body? (i.e. other stakeholders and community groups would have a separate mechanism to access the MC) (At least 6 people commented)
- There seems to be concern that if OPAC advises this body that it will somehow diminish its authority. The Task Force did agree that OPAC would be a formal stakeholder advisory body. The Task also has not suggested ANY changes to the current OPAC structure, roles or responsibilities. This role would be considered an added responsibility to advise state agencies on research and monitoring.
 - *This has been made clearer in the text*
 - If no, what entities should the stakeholder advisory body include?
 - Community Groups?
 - All other ocean users?

NOTE: there is a new recommendation that the STAC Chair remain on OPAC to enhance communications in that the STAC chair will hear concerns about stakeholder needs and can report on STAC activities.

Tier Two:

- 4.2 Should OPAC still be directly responsible to advise the Governor? (i.e. advising the MC is therefore an additional task)
- 4.3 Should OPAC membership be expanded?

Tier Three:

- 4.4 Should we delete second paragraph "At present OPAC..." under OPAC? (note: majority said yes)

NOTE: Paragraph has been kept but slighted edited

The Marine Cabinet will use a number of transparent mechanisms to engage the stakeholder community on a regular and continuous basis, particularly with the development of the Action Plan and strategic priorities. The OPAC will serve a formal role to advise the Cabinet.

The Ocean Policy Advisory Council

Experience in Oregon and elsewhere has shown that successful ocean planning and management requires robust stakeholder involvement throughout the process. The Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC), created by Oregon state law, is the state's current mechanism for providing stakeholder advice on ocean issues to the Governor and state agencies. Members of the OPAC (see ORS 196.438) include coastal counties, commercial and recreational fisheries, coastal cities, a coastal local government association, coastal ports, non-fishing recreation, coastal and statewide conservation groups, coastal tribes, and the public. State agencies, the Office of the Governor, Oregon Sea Grant, and a federal liaison are non-voting *ex-officio* members. The Task Force did agree that OPAC would be the formal stakeholder advisory body to the Marine Cabinet regarding nearshore research and monitoring needs (including education, outreach and data management). The Task Force is not recommending any changes to the current OPAC structure, roles or responsibilities. Rather, we recommend an added responsibility to advise state agencies on research and monitoring. *The STAC Chair remain on OPAC to enhance communications in that the STAC chair will hear concerns about stakeholder needs and can report on STAC activities.*

At present the OPAC is not involved in identifying broad-scale, comprehensive research needs or setting priorities for management-related research or monitoring. The OPAC is advised by a Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee when needed. The Task Force agrees that a stakeholder advisory body is a necessary contributor to the development and implementation of the state's Nearshore Research and Monitoring Plan. The Task Force also agrees that the current OPAC is fundamentally suited to initially fulfill the function of a formal stakeholder advisory body, particularly in providing advice to the Marine Cabinet in developing and implementing the NAP. In addition to OPAC's role as a stakeholder advisory body, the Task Force recommends additional means to provide opportunities for public participation (see the Community Engagement section).

The Task Force recommends that the Legislature add this responsibility to OPAC to advise the Cabinet on, priorities and needs for nearshore research and monitoring, education, outreach and data management from the stakeholder perspective.

3. Marine Science Advice

Tier One:

5.1 There seems to be consensus that the STAC membership and disciplinary breadth needs to be expanded to account for the broader range of research issues. STAC has already requested that its' membership be expand from 7 to 10 just to cover its current commitments.

Do we want to recommend specific number or guidelines? If yes, which future changes or guidelines do we want to recommend if any?

- If no, what guidelines do we want to recommend?
 - Who recommends disciplines or individuals? (STAC OR MC)
 - Who approves disciplines or individuals STAC OR MC)
 - Should there be a mechanism for public input on membership? (If yes - Should we recommend a specific mechanism, or just that a mechanism be developed?)

Tier Two:

5.2

5.3 Should we delete point C. under STAC tasks? (Is it beyond the scope of STAC, is it feasible)

5.4

Tier Three:

5.5 Can we delete "including social sciences" or change to "natural and social sciences"?

Do we need to add more specificity to the final bullet in this section "use peer-review whenever appropriate"?

At present, Oregon has no formal independent and trusted scientific advisory body to directly advise the Executive branch, including state agencies, or Legislature on scientific issues related to nearshore ocean management and policy or on priorities for scientific data, research, and monitoring, outreach or educational needs. The Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) required in ORS 196.451 currently advises the Ocean Policy Advisory Council "in the performance of its functions" The 2009 Legislature directed the STAC to advise the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) on implementation of marine reserves during the 2009-2011 biennium pursuant to HB 3013. This expanded role has proven valuable in the scientific review of the marine reserves designation and monitoring processes. Neither responsibility covers the scientific advice needed for the much broader nearshore issues. The Task Force agrees that an independent scientific advisory body is necessary for the development of the state's Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Plan and to provide scientific evaluation and review of scientific issues relative to state priorities. Such a body is needed to ensure that the state's goals and objectives are science informed. The current STAC has neither mission nor capacity to serve this purpose.

The Task Force recommends that the Legislature establish the STAC, with its current membership, as the science advisory body to the Marine Cabinet. The Task Force further suggests that a formal mechanism be put in place to allow STAC membership to be expanded to include a wider range of scientific disciplines to better serve the more comprehensive needs of the state. The Task Force proposes that changes in the STAC membership process proceed as follows: STAC recommend new disciplines that need to be represented and members to serve those roles, and these disciplines and members would need to be approved by the Marine Cabinet

Recommendations would be based on disciplinary needs and individual expertise, lack of conflict of interest and availability of time to serve.

(Note: it was agreed that operating funds will be required for STAC – but should this be stated here, or in your budget section?)

In a similar manner to OPAC, the Task Force recommends that a primary function of the STAC would be to advise the Marine Cabinet in preparing the NAP. It is further recommended that the use of STAC for other purposes such as providing direct advice to an individual state agency or OPAC be approved on a case-by-case basis by the Marine Cabinet.

The STAC would serve three primary functions:

- A. Advise the Marine Cabinet and state agencies on scientific issues and needs for research, monitoring, education, outreach and data management relative to the state's nearshore management policies, goals, and objectives. In this role the STAC could convene or sponsor symposia, panels of experts, technical reports, or commission special studies as needed to address emerging scientific and data needs. STAC would take the lead on the scientific input to the NAP.
- B. Advise the funding entity (the Trust), by developing standards or procedures to help ensure that the results of scientific research or monitoring are high-quality science and consistent with the action plan.
- C. Provide a coordination and communication mechanism for scientific research and monitoring in the nearshore and across the larger California Current Marine Ecoregion by academic institutions, state and federal agencies, and the private sector to ensure communication and collaboration among research or monitoring efforts.

DECISION: is 'c' a valid thing to do or should it advise on just coordination mechanisms???

The Task Force recommends that the following principles frame the STAC composition and mission:

- seek and utilize expertise based upon topic, without regard to the geographic location of the expertise;
- provide balance and breadth among disciplines to cover strategic needs avoid conflicts of interest in the scientific review process;
- ensure the integrity of the scientific process (i.e. rigorous; repeatable); and
- Use peer-review processes whenever appropriate.

4. Funding Mechanism/Entity: Oregon Marine Science Trust

Tier Two:

- 6.1 Are we going to recommend how many board members there should be?
If yes
- How many?
- 6.2 How should board members be selected?
- Who selects?
 - Who approves?
 - Is there a public process component?
- 6.3 Who creates the funding mechanism/entity? (Legislature, governor, another party or action)
- 6.4 Do we need to clarify when competitive process, peer-review, or direct allocation are appropriate?

Tier Three:

- 6.5
- 6.6 What do we call the Trust or C3?

NOTE: We agreed that legally this would be a 501c3. We can call it a Trust or Foundation. OWET has just created a Trust for similar purposes.

- Oregon Ocean Science Trust? (OST)
- Oregon Nearshore Science Trust? (ONST)
- Oregon Ocean Stewardship Foundation? (OSF)

In its first meeting, the Task Force clarified some of the underlying reasons that a funding strategy was needed. First, the demand for nearshore research, monitoring, data management, education and outreach outstrip available funding. Second, the state does not or cannot take advantage of all potential funding sources, especially from non-governmental sources. Third, coordinated use of available funds could stretch scarce resources and leverage projects that otherwise could not be completed. Thus the legislature directed the Task Force to recommend a “long-term funding and coordination strategy.”

Along with the Marine Cabinet, Ocean Policy Advisory Council, and the STAC, a fourth key component of the Task Force’s proposed strategy is a mechanism to pursue, receive and allocate funding from a wide range of sources. At present, no such funding mechanism for nearshore research and monitoring (including outreach, education and data management) exists. The Task Force recommends that an Ocean Science Trust be created as a stand-alone non-profit 501c3 entity with an Executive Director and a very small Board of Directors of diverse membership (including the Chair of OPAC, Chair of STAC and one member of the Marine Cabinet) to oversee its functions and set general policies. This Trust would be safeguarded with clear, strong procedures and standards to seek and receive funds only from institutions that are interested in funding priorities as described in Oregon’s Action Plan. The overall mission of the Trust would be to receive and provide funds to support the implementation of the state’s Nearshore Action Plan. Such a non-profit body is the mechanism used most frequently in analogous situations in such states as Washington and California to enable diverse private and public sources to contribute to an entity whose objectives and purposes are coincident with those of the state while retaining high standards for accountability and a transparent process of decision-making.

The Task Force suggests that the Trust could be chartered (i.e. incorporated) in one of several ways: by another party at the specific direction of the legislature, by the legislature itself, or by action of the Governor. **Question: Do we need to specify this??** The purposes, objectives, and operations of the Trust would be clearly stated to support the mission and function of the other elements of Oregon’s nearshore institutional framework (e.g. the Marine Cabinet, the OPAC, STAC). Regardless of the actual method of chartering, it would be beneficial for the Oregon Legislature to confer official approval of the formation of such an entity and provide guidance on the purpose, objectives, membership, and other factors.

The Task Force recommends two basic functions for the Trust:

- 1) Pursue, receive, and hold funds from many sources including state, federal, and other public funds, private foundations, businesses, individuals, and other organizations. The Trust would accept funds only for purposes consistent with the Trust's mission to support the nearshore Action Plan.
- 2) Allocate funds according to priorities set within the Nearshore Action Plan pursuant to by-laws and procedural guidance documents adopted by the Board. The Marine Cabinet, STAC and OPAC would interpret the funding priorities, as well as in preparing funding strategies.

Funds allocated by the Trust would likely fall into 2 categories: 1) funds directed to state agencies for specific purposes, such as for unfunded state mandates under the NAP (e.g. data management, monitoring, convening Expert Panels, scientific symposia or workshops, or specific projects sponsored by community-based stewardship groups) that are best implemented by a state agency or are within the authority of a particular state agency;

2) Funds distributed through a competitive proposal-driven process to support the priorities of the NAP such as research, monitoring, data management, outreach and engagement.

Decision Point: We need to decide who should actually run the competitive process - 1) the Trust (this will require staff and administrative costs), 2) an existing body such as Sea Grant being done in California or 3) the STAC.

Decision Point: For the competitive process, proposals will likely be evaluated with respect to scientific merit, societal relevance, cost, and alignment with the strategic plan. Who ultimately makes the decision on which proposals will be funded?

For proposal-driven processes, the Trust, in collaboration with the STAC, would develop standards and procedures based on the following principles to ensure the scientific integrity of the use of these funds using existing processes when available.

- Scientific integrity: provide a firewall between funder and research methods and results;
- Transparency: be open, neutral, transparent through a trusted process;
- Consistent with state goals: support a spectrum of research and activities pursuant to its charter of meeting the objectives of the NAP;
- Responsive to changing needs: be flexible to meet rapidly moving needs ;
- Value-added: augment research systems that currently exist and leverage funding success such as through matching funds;
- Fiscal conservatism: be administered with low overhead; and
- Accountability: make annual reports to public/legislature on research results.

Additional Notes

- Need to address the operating cost for all the recommended actions, entities, etc.

This needs redrafting and should be put into an appendix...Summary numbers can go into the introduction

Summary of White Paper

*Imagine packaging the current stream of funds into a coherent map that directly links to strong overarching research and monitoring priorities for Oregon. That is what our Task Force is all about, finding ways to leverage existing funds for more financial support that enhances our understanding of the Nearshore. Right now such a clear map with distinct priorities does not exist. The Nearshore Task Force undertook a fact-finding mission to understand more fully what Oregon is doing now to fund Nearshore research and monitoring. We hired Heather Reiff to investigate the myriad of state, federal and private institutions and discovered that total funding attributed to research and monitoring relevant to the Nearshore was \$38,640,245 (Table 2 and Figure 2). Of this total, 78%, or \$30,368,895, of total funding reported is attributed to Federal sources (Table 5 and Figure 4), 14%, or \$5,341,879 to State sources (Table 3 and Figure 3) and the remainder to Private, 6% or \$2,191,971 (Table 6 and Figure 5), and Other, 2% or \$712,000 (Table 7), sources. The map (Figure X) of the general flow for Nearshore funding illustrates the complexity of these funding streams. Ms. Reiff was careful to explain that this data had many limitations, which means that the financial numbers should not be quoted as final or absolute. **The financial numbers are not definitive and represent only a small snapshot in time.** The information is meant only as a baseline for intelligent discussion about the matter. Her research justified the Task Force desire to offer a recommendation that will further coordinate our work and leverage Oregon as a strategic powerhouse for research and monitoring.*

Note: this section is not yet complete.

Community-based Stewardship Groups

The active engagement of communities in the protection and utilization of Oregon's nearshore resources and, in particular, in providing input and dialogue in the processes to set the states priorities for nearshore research, monitoring, education, outreach and data management is a key component to every recommendation that the Nearshore Research Task Force has put forward. Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal #1, which is a foundation of all state programs, established the charge **"To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process."** Communities, as well as individual community members possess a wealth of knowledge and expertise on specific issues as they relate to research, monitoring, management, policy, education, and outreach. Communities in this context can be defined by their connection to a specific location, their interest in a specific issue, or both. The knowledge held by communities is extremely valuable to help inform decision making, yet this information is often hard to capture without formal mechanisms for communities to provide input into various processes.

The Task Force recognizes that enhancing community capacity will strengthen the knowledge base of our citizenry and enhance our state's ability to address nearshore needs in the long-term. A robust public process is transparent, includes broad and balanced representation of stakeholders and multiple pathways for engagement. Such a process would engage community groups and individuals in and collaboration in designing and implementing nearshore research and monitoring programs.

The Task Force additionally recognizes many existing groups actively participate and collaborate with the state adding much needed capacity through their contribution of both experiential and technical knowledge. These groups can be referred to collectively as community-based stewardship groups and include: a broad array of non-profit mission-based organizations; academic and community-based collaborative research groups; and community teams established around specific issues. Existing community-based stewardship groups employ a variety of mechanisms to participate and collaborate in state efforts. Each has a unique breadth of expertise

specific to their own interest, the issues they focus on, and often reflective of the size and characteristics of their community.

New community-based stewardship groups are developing all the time. They form either through a bottom-up process or they are aided by state agencies or non-governmental organizations.

These groups generally start when a new nearshore issue poses challenges that can best be addressed by a local community or a specific interest group. Some community-based groups only last until the issue they formed around is resolved or becomes irrelevant. Others will adapt and expand their own expertise in order to make a valuable contribution on emerging issues.

Recommendations:

Community-based stewardship groups present an opportunity to strengthen Oregon's nearshore research and monitoring efforts. In addition, creating formal mechanisms for community-based stewardship groups to be involved in priority-setting for reach, monitoring, education, outreach and data management can enhance implementation and outcomes. The NAP can formalize their role of active groups in collaborative research and monitoring, education and outreach. The NAP should additionally identify guidelines for new groups to become involved in the process.

The Task Force recommends that community groups:

- Have a formalized and active role in developing the NAP
- Have access to formal mechanisms to participate in nearshore research and monitoring development and planning and to provide advice and perspectives to the Marine Cabinet
- Are invited as collaborators (and compensated for their contribution) on state research and monitoring and education and outreach efforts when their expertise and capacity will enhance outcomes
- Be provided technical support from agencies and universities to build their capacity and succeed over time
- Be invited to compete for funding through the Oregon Science Trust (or other funding mechanism).

Community Education and Outreach

An important factor in securing the success of the ideas put forth by the Task Force on Nearshore Research is ensuring public support to science initiatives. In order to effectively manage our marine resources, we need a citizenry who understands the value of our nearshore environment and the underlying scientific processes... The Task force believes that this can be achieved through education and outreach (engagement). The Task force also recommends that education and outreach should be a component of the NAP. The NAP can serve as an important tool to identifying areas for educational and outreach improvement. Oregon Statewide Planning Goal #19 states that public involvement, particularly through “public awareness, education, and interpretive programs,” should be incorporated into Oregon’s marine management plan. Based upon prior recommendations outlined by Task Force on Nearshore Research guiding documents, the Task Force proposes that five areas to improve community education and outreach be incorporated to the NAP:

- K-12 education
- Informal public learning
- Professional development
- Educating through media
- Coordinating educational material

The first step towards creating an educated Oregon citizenry begins with teaching in the classroom. Producing ocean literate children of today will foster ocean literacy in Oregon’s future adults. The Task force recognizes the following actions to increase marine education in formal K-12 settings:

- Implement state standards to incorporate ocean science curricula in K-12 learning
- Design textbooks with age appropriate and up to date information relevant to Oregon’s nearshore environment
- Increase provisions to encourage out of classroom hands-on experience through informal venues (science centers, museums, etc.)

Informal education experiences are not only important for children, but for adults as well.

Currently, there are approximately 20 coastal interpretative centers throughout Oregon, as well as dozens of instructional whale watch sites. These centers provide visitors with opportunities to

engage in hands-on learning experiences about their marine environment. Touch tanks, data collection, beach clean ups, and interactive exhibits are just a few examples of these experiences. Hands-on learning reinforces a personal connection between visitors and the nearshore environment. The Task force recognizes that an emphasis should be placed on continuing funding to current informal education and outreach centers, as well as developing more informal opportunities for Oregon residents.

Continuing ocean education for professionals is also another important piece to increasing ocean literacy in Oregon. Prior recommendations have emphasized providing marine education workshops for teachers during the summer. Professionals in ocean and coastal related fields also need continued training to receive up to date information and technical expertise on emerging issues. Decision makers who influence marine policy should also be provided educational opportunities to learn science and social science related to our nearshore environment. In order to successfully implement the education strategies previously mentioned, educating entities should coordinate their learning material and utilize 21st century media to inform citizens. The Task force suggests that this can be achieved through

- Pairing with news outlets to present scientifically sound information
- Utilizing blogs, podcasts, and other electronic sources to inform citizens about the nearshore environment
- Incorporating electronic media into informal learning centers (interactive computer programs, 3-D imaging, etc.)
- Encouraging collaboration to provide consistent information about the marine environment between education centers and classrooms.

5. Data Management Structure and Processes (place holder)

6. Conclusion - including a statement about near-term and longer term