

**Oregon Nearshore Research Task Force  
Meeting Minutes  
February 18, 2010  
Best Western Agate Beach, Newport, Oregon**

TF Members: Sybil Ackerman, Laura Anderson, Bob Bailey, Caren Braby, Stephen Brandt, Leesa Cobb, Gus Gates, Onno Husing, Jeff Kroft, Gil Sylvia, Terry Thompson, Frank Warrens, Craig Young, Mike Lane (absent)

*Non-voting members:* Roy Lowe (federal), Cathy Tortorici (federal, absent)

Facilitator: Jane Barth

Staff: Jenna Borberg, Julie Risien, Carol Cole, and Andy Lanier

*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 January Meeting minutes.
2. Committees - The TF established a Scientific Review Committee in addition to already existing committees. Committees that will convene between the February and March NRTF meetings are as follows:
  - a. Funding Committee - Members: Laura (chair), Sybil, and Gil.
  - b. Data Committee - Members: Caren, Steve, and they will be assisted by Andy.
  - c. Community Outreach Committee - Members: Terry, Gus, Gil, Leesa, and they will be assisted by Julie.
  - d. Scientific Review Committee - Members: Steve, Craig, and Sybil.
  - e. Institutional Framework Committee – Members: Bob, Craig, Sybil, Gil, and Laura
3. Future Meetings: The next TF meeting will be a two-day meeting, March 29-30<sup>th</sup> at OIMB in Coos Bay. And the following meeting was changed from May 3<sup>rd</sup> to May 4<sup>th</sup> and will be in Astoria.

**Summary of Action Items**

1. The *Funding, Data, and Scientific Review Committees* will present to the TF at the next meeting on March 29 - 30<sup>th</sup> based on the following two charges:
  - a. Review the discussion from this February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, and create 1-2 page write-ups on core elements and ways to move forward; and
  - b. Identify contracts/work needed.
2. In addition to charges listed above, for the next meeting:
  - a. the *Scientific Review Committee* will invite/organize a presentation on the National Academy of Sciences, and

- b. the *Data Committee* will invite/organize a presentation on the Oregon Geographic Information Council.
3. The *Institutional Framework Committee* will draft further institutional frameworks based on those presented at today's meeting (other TF members are encouraged to send their straw man to this Committee). At the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting, this Committee will present example frameworks, and the TF will walk through them with some core examples.
4. The *Community Outreach Committee* is going to discuss their plan to move forward and will run this by the Operations Team (comprised of Steve, Sybil, Caren, and Gil).
5. Work with the Operations Team to create a general NRTF 101 presentation that all TF members can use (Julie).
6. Invite presenters from California, Massachusetts, and Washington to present to the TF at the next meeting (*Bob*).
7. The Operations Team will draft an agenda for the March 29-30<sup>th</sup> NRTF Meeting.

### **Detailed Summary of Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 8:30am by Chair, Stephen Brandt

#### ***Approval of January Meeting Minutes***

The Task Force (TF) voted to approve the draft January meeting minutes, pending a correction to the public comment by Greg Krutzikowsky per his request.

#### ***Core Elements of a Nearshore Research Funding and Coordination Strategy Task Force Roundtable Discussion***

*Discussion facilitated by Jane Barth (summary below provided Jane Barth)*

The Task Force brainstormed on the core elements (purpose, principles and practices) inherent to a successful institutional framework for nearshore research and funding. The following components were discussed: funding process; research priorities; peer-review and trusted science; data generation, collection, and sharing; collaboration/community involvement; and the overall institutional framework.

##### **1. Funding Process**

The TF discussed the core elements of a strategy for funding current and anticipated nearshore needs and programs, and how to best determine transparent procedures and oversight mechanisms for pursuing, securing and administering public and private funds.

#### ***Agreement Heard:***

Open, Neutral, Trusted

Flexibility

Transparent - mechanisms and procedures to create this

Not limiting individual researchers

Wide spectrum of research funded

Results in “good” science

Study results available beyond intended target, publicly available annual reports

Long-term commitment/investment from state

Value-added to system that exists now

Helps to leverage additional funds

No conflict of interest on resource allocation

Open competitive process (example of neutral and trusted)

Firewall between provider of funds and the public

Low administrative overhead

#### *Issues Brought Forth, But Not Necessarily Resolved*

NRTF focus is state agency decision-making process versus broader – no agreement on this

Related Comment: Implementing state policy; not influenced by outside policy

How to deal with different types of funds? “dedicated”, “federal”

Related comments:

- Distinction between public and private sources of funds?
- Critical to keep dedicated funds separated from general fund.
- Funding system protected from the legislature

– lack of agreement seemed centered upon feasibility of accomplishing this

Multi-source desired (industry, fed, non-profit, state, etc.) – not sure agreement on private foundations as a source unless firewall is effectively established; lack of trust exists

#### *Other Points Raised*

Predetermined objective or plan for use of the funds

Link between funds and outcome objectives

Use existing mechanism

Peer-review process to vet

Fair representation on advisory councils

Tied to the diversity of “benefits”

Measurability of benefits tied to funding sources

## 2. Research Priorities

The TF discussed the core elements of a process to review, consolidate, and anticipate nearshore research priorities.

#### *Agreement Heard:*

Long + short term view of setting list

Linked to important issues of the day (current to 3 years)

Take into account broader issues; fundamental questions (10yr time frame)

List needs to be dynamic, flexible, responsive to needs, scalable, adaptable  
List needs to be based on needs identified by group with knowledge of what is and isn't known

Core priority needs identified (ex/ "strawman" list offered perhaps)

Research needs include a broad range social, biological, economic issues

Use the list as a basis of funding

Inclusive table of folks creating list; inclusive process

Involve community-based organizations

Coordinating with people on the ground with working knowledge

Bottom-up collection of input to expand sharing of good ideas (binary process)

Established criteria for setting research priorities

Criteria and process for setting priorities

Group responsible for driving process "accountable"

Brings multiple values

#### *Issues Brought Forth, But Not Necessarily Resolved*

Serve the needs of agencies and communities implementing management and stewardship of nearshore resources. Other comment was: Agency focus of outcomes or multiple audiences? Another related comment was: Meaningful input to federal policies, not in conflict with federal policy -- As with the funding topic, not agreement on this.

Research Priorities List acknowledges the limited funds available. – not agreement on this. Others felt should focus on opportunity to leverage funds.

Work needs to be done before research priorities are identified

Structure: Ongoing science advisory committee linked to executive process (ex/ MA, CA) (high level, visible players) maintaining the list

### 3. Peer-Review and Trusted Science

The TF discussed the core elements in a robust process to review information, traditional research and other, and providing scientific information that can be trusted by all.

[Note: The goal is trusted science; peer review is a way to achieve the goal.]

#### *Agreement Heard:*

Composed of Oregon and not Oregon based; dependent upon topic, not geographic affiliation

People of expertise

People who can provide balance

No conflict of interest (as defined in scientific review process)

Independent evaluation by someone(s) with no conflict of interest

Scientific method  
Rigorous; repeatable  
Results in published science

*Issues Brought Forth, But Not Necessarily Resolved*

Question raised about the different points that “peer review” would be done and whether the peer review process would pull in data that are on the “periphery” and don’t currently go via peer review (e.g. mapping efforts, local knowledge). Clarification that review done by different methods; scientific peer review typically only on #5 below.

1. Funding
2. Review of established articles
3. Data gathering
4. Establishing Priorities
5. Review of science that gets commissioned

Cost comments: As costly as it needs to be to achieve the objectives. Appropriately funded process.

Who? Permanent entity with staff as the mechanism to review

Who can invoke this group to do work? How to put limits on demands on their time.

Not all people agree on what science is “trusted.” Hence suggestion of review of established articles (#2 above).

4. Data Generation, Collection, and Sharing

The TF discussed the core elements of an effective mechanism for data sharing to coordinate, collaborate, and reevaluate priorities and programs among state agencies, universities, and other stakeholders with an interest in nearshore resources.

*Agreement Heard:*

Build information products from the data

Brings high value to multiple users

Communicated in terms of relevance to public legislature; put into context of what results mean

Clearly articulated data sharing policy

Data is public and shared quickly/ “real time”

Transparent so all know what information is going through the system, who has access

Time frame for availability is articulated

Expectation that products coming out of funded research are shared

Available in the public domain with recognition of privacy issues

Feds and tribes incorporated into sharing

Able to mesh with/interface with West Coast states’ systems

Generated from multiple sources but agreed upon standards and protocols  
(ex/certification process)

Standardized metadata forms (where, how, methods)

Basic framework of data routinely in system and available

Strategic process to prioritize data needs

*Issues Brought Forth, But Not Necessarily Resolved*

Make this a way to leverage funds.

State needs a monitoring plan, system to collect, review on continual basis. Need data management capacity in system. Need way to review and update quality of data collected and methodology.

#### 5. Collaboration/Community Involvement

The TF discussed core elements for effective ways to best involve communities and other interested parties in the nearshore research strategy.

Purpose Articulated:

- Forum for information exchange and feedback

- Build ocean literacy

- Create economic opportunities

- Better science when local knowledge included

- Inform state's management policies as to local impact

*Agreement Heard:*

- Open and two-way

- Build community teams into statewide research and monitoring work strategy – see teams as part of the infrastructure

- Work with existing groups

Legitimacy/buy-in at local level is done through engagement process

Broader experience base involved

Flexible enough to fit different readiness/engagement levels of communities

Training provided so community data collection, etc. done to standard (“barefoot scientists”)

*Issues Brought Forth, But Not Necessarily Resolved*

“Compensate” collaborators. Not necessarily monetary, but in way that is relevant to them.

Create opportunities for community folks, agency people, etc. to be listened to. Need financial and structural capacity to make this happen.

When go for breadth of representation, depth of information/knowledge then can be a challenge

All affected ocean users included – issue of how to involved non-coastal folks

#### 6. Overall Institutional Framework

The TF discussed the core elements of a nearshore research framework that pulls together the core elements of a research and funding strategy (items 1-5) for coherent and coordinated management and effectively linking to policy.

#### *Agreement Heard:*

Trusted

Relevant, people ask it for help and information

Flexible; changing with the times

Be forward thinking (not limiting thinking to current timeframe and constraints)

Uniquely Oregon

Includes all affected users

Capitalize on existing resources (funds, vessels, groups, agencies, institutions, etc.)

Value added – avoid replication; empower current structure and build upon it.

#### *Comments on Structure (linked to model presentations made later in agenda)*

Structural/framework elements

- Governance/executive element... maintains state policy

- Broad based funding element

- Science/policy coordination element

- Management and implementation element

- Science element

- Educational element

Both stakeholder and scientist advise the state, should be separate groups (joined at a higher level)

Oregon Academy of Marine Science like National Academies of Marine Science (include people in Oregon who seek advice of those outside of Oregon)

#### ***Proposed Institutional Frameworks***

Several TF members gave brief presentations on institutional framework models that they had drafted. There were areas of similarity and difference among the models, and all elicited discussion. It was noted that in coming up with the final model to recommend to the legislature, the TF should ask if the model violates any of the core principles that the group decides on.

The first model included: governance - governor, legislature, a new executive level coordinating body that oversees OPAC and STAC (science advisory body); science coordination which would include a foundation; science; management/application – would involve community groups and marine spatial mapping; funding; and education.

The second model had a high level advisory board for each of the following key considerations: funding, research priorities (legislation should include that we need to determine top research priorities), trusted science – policy forum (e.g., OPAC, Governor’s Marine Cabinet, workshop, etc.) and a science body, data generation, and collaboration – communities can offer to input to the policy forums.

The third model included an independent science board (NAS type of body) that doesn’t deal with other issues. And then there would also be a separate marine stakeholder advisory board. Information goes into both of those bodies. Data would have it’s own bubble because it can come from anywhere – and it will be turned into data products. Then those data products, along with the science advisory and stakeholder boards as well as research and regulatory agencies would provide input into an overarching Ocean Policy Committee. That body then gives advice to the Governor and Legislature.

Some general comments about the models from TF members:

- Need a mechanism to get funds, such as a 501c3
- There should be less separation between science and stakeholders – how do ideas from the public rise to a level to be addressed?
- It was noted that Sea Grant has a science advisory board that evaluates science and then there is a citizen review group that evaluates societal relevance
- Models should consider existing programs, and draw from their strengths – good to think about if existing groups can function in the role that this group is foreseeing.

Decision: The *Institutional Framework Committee* will draft further institutional frameworks based on those presented at today’s meeting. At the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting, this Committee will present example frameworks, and the TF will walk through them with some core examples.

### ***Committee Presentations***

The Funding, Data and Community Outreach Committees each provided a brief update on their work. They had been directed during the prior NRTF meeting to (1) evaluate the scope of the topic, (2) provide background information, and (3) present a draft proposal for work needed.

Funding Committee – Laura, Sybil, and Gil

#### ***Principles***

- Transparency
- Create an annual report



- Clear priorities, based on a peer-review process, and priorities should precede funding
- Flexible, responsive and adaptive with the ability to scale up to regional efforts and scale down to support and infuse local processes and projects
- Trusted, neutral – representation based on an open and competitive process
- Firewall to make sure it is peer reviewed and that we set the strategies, standards and principles

#### *Practices -*

The Committee is thinking about this as an investment strategy (knowledge-based), because you can't think about funding in a passive way. [Oregon] needs marketing strategies to attract funding from a diverse range of sources. The TF should consider other models for incentives, e.g., tax incentives to fishery that contributes data. Or consider Ecosystem Services – e.g., cap and trade and if there are any venues to tap into. Oregon must have diversification of funding sources:

- federal funds – do you need to be tied into big efforts in order to attract funds (e.g., energy initiatives, job creation)?
- State funds – opportunities include ecoliteracy
- Private sources – seafood, energy, recreational, pharmaceutical
- Foundations
- Private donors – individuals

#### *Proposal for Work Needed*

Starting to think about a contract – the Committee would develop a scope of work to bring to the NRTF Operations Team that would meet with these principles to determine an investment strategy. Also think about strategies to attract funding.

#### *TF Discussion*

- One TF member suggested an “Ocean Stewardship Foundation” because he sees a stand alone entity as being proactive, not just a receptacle for funds. They could do education and outreach.
- Whether or not the body will apply for outside funds is to be determined.
- The question arose of what criteria funding will be based on (e.g., based on a list of priorities from the science community, the four guiding documents for the TF).
- It would be good to learn about funding entities that help get science into management outside of the marine environment - look at structures, mechanism, and safeguards.
- It was pointed out that this committee is not working in a vacuum – it is just one piece of the whole puzzle.

#### Data Collection Committee - Caren, Craig, and Steve (assisted by Andy)

This Committee investigated how you share and process data, and found that Oregon is limited and poorly coordinated.

What might make sense in the near future –

1. Conduct an inventory of systems and databases used in Oregon that provide data related to nearshore research (gap analysis). Possibly do a white paper on this.

2. Develop data sharing standards and formats – very important, but also challenging to get people to talk about. Oregon Geospatial Enterprise Office has accepted standards for metadata. Should take advantage of those existing standards. Learn how the framework model could be used in Oregon’s marine system. Documents for people to review:
  - a. MA Ocean Partnership Data Network Report
  - b. West Coast Coastal Atlas Workshop
  - c. IOOS Data Management and Communications Plan

Some principles identified include: use existing structures such as national databases and having data standards

#### TF Discussion:

- May want to think of this broader - as information system, not just data. Monitoring seems to be lacking from this system so we don’t have to rely on consultants.
- The advent of MSP that will be operated by WCGA will likely drive a lot of the discussion about accessibility of data. This encourages us to discuss data standards because that will in turn drive discussion on the West Coast.
- The TF might recommend that Oregon’s marine communities get together to discuss data standards.
- The issue of prioritizing data and research needs arose as some TF members think that it is necessary to determine this, while other don’t believe this is part of the TF charge. One TF member commented that they need to at least determine what core elements are vital. It was noted that Oregon doesn’t have a process to prioritize data, and it could be good to learn about how they did this terrestrially - how it was done before, how long it took them, and the cost.

#### Decision:

After discussion, it was decided that it would be good to have more information on the *Oregon Geographic Information Council*, so the Data Committee will invite someone to present or organize a presentation on this topic.

#### Community Outreach Committee - Terry, Gus, Gil, and Leesa (assisted by Julie)

The scope of the Community Outreach Committee is to: inform the public about the existence, charge, and progress of the NRTF; solicit public opinion on how individuals, communities, and groups want to be engaged in nearshore research, education, policy and management in the future and what they see as the information and data needs; and contribute findings to the final recommendation created by the full NRTF. Their initial strategy is to invite a broad range of stakeholders through press releases and other mechanisms to community meetings in 5 target coastal communities.

#### TF Discussion

- A number of TF members commented on the fact that there were no identified inland meetings, and they think without that, the TF will get pushback.

- The Committee commented that this had been decided due to budget constraints and a tight timeline.
- It was suggested that the TF could do some web-based surveys and outreach
- A TF member commented from experience that many of these types of community meetings don't elicit large turn-outs inland, so unless someone is willing to bring out the troops, it is not worth the time of the TF.
  - It was noted that it could be good to consider already existing events, such as the Port Orford Water Festival in April

### ***Approach to March and Future Meetings***

The TF discussed how to move forward in light of discussions during today's meeting.

#### **Suggestions:**

- Give materials from today's meeting back to the Committees (Funding, Data, Community Outreach, and Institutional Framework) to have them see how they can further enhance their discussion and come up with draft one-two pagers to present to the full TF at the next meeting.
- A second charge of Committees was to come up with contracts/work needed, and four potential contracts that were identified are as follows:
  1. Funding Committee – pluses and minuses of entities
  2. Data Inventory – inventory of data producing entities
  3. Research Inventory in a broad way – look at current research enterprise – who is doing it, and in general, what are they funding in Oregon. Get a rough total dollar amount.
  4. Governance structure models – look at how these complex systems work and ferret out some and come up with recommendations
- Consider a fourth committee that deals with scientific review and advice (that addresses Research Priorities and Trusted Science from today's Agenda), and they can provide a presentation for the TF at the next meeting.
- Need more information about the Oregon Geographic Information Council and the National Academy of Sciences.

#### **Decisions:**

A Scientific Review Committee was established to consider trusted science/peer review, and requested to invite/organize a presentation on the National Academy of Sciences.

The Funding, Data, Community Outreach, and Scientific Review Committees were charged with:

- a. Reviewing the discussion from this February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, and creating 1-2 page write-ups on core elements and ways to move forward; and
  - b. Identifying contracts/work needed.
- It was suggested that the TF invite someone from Massachusetts, California, and Washington to present case studies (could be good to have MA talk about MSP in their

presentation). Additionally, the TF may consider contracting someone who can review other case studies that are out there – not just marine - about how to bring science into policy.

Decision:

Invite presenters from California, Massachusetts, and Washington to present to the TF at the next meeting.

- It was asked how data inventory fits into the TF mandate and the response was that the intention is to provide background for the recommendations, and that this is something the TF said they would do when they applied for Packard Funds. It was also pointed out that when any legislation comes out, they are required to do a fiscal analysis on it, so the TF will want to have this done beforehand. However, it was noted that the TF has not decided that they are writing legislation – they are providing a report to the legislature that may include recommendations. Therefore, the TF needs to talk to the Coastal Caucus at some point if they want to make this legislation.
- The Funding Committee noted that they are currently looking at the funding institute. To implement and maintain that will come at a cost – so that will come once the TF has a structure for them to analyze.
- The Community Outreach Committee introduced an alternative approach in response to concerns raised by the TF during prior meeting discussion. They talked about doing a phased approach where they would notify people and allow for phone-in and write-in comments. And from this process, they would determine if there is a demand for public meetings, and if so, where that demand is. They suggested also having a paper survey at various locations. It was also noted that there are other strategies for getting the word out, such as individual TF members presenting to their constituents. It was noted that if that is the route the TF goes, the Committee should create a bulleted list (NRTF 101).
  - It was suggested that the TF could hold their meetings in strategically held locations around the state.
  - Important to think about how to draw the public in – such as asking them how they want to be involved in nearshore research.

Decision:

The *Community Outreach Committee* is going to discuss their plan to move forward and will run this by the Operations Team. They will also create a NRTF 101 for other TF members to use in communicating with their constituents.

- A TF member noted that it is important to fill the fisherman gap on this TF if Mike Lane and Nick Furman aren't able to make future meetings.
- The timeline that the TF is working on was brought up: It was agreed that they need to get a report to the legislature in August. But they need to find out when they would need to put a bill together if they decide to do that.

- It was discussed that since the TF is inviting presenters for the next meeting, that they should make it a two-day meeting. Also, several TF members are not able to make the May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Decision:

The next two NRTF meetings were discussed and it was decided that the next TF meeting will be a two-day meeting, March 29-30 at OIMB in Coos Bay. And the following meeting was changed from May 3<sup>rd</sup> to May 4<sup>th</sup> and will be in Astoria.

***Public Comment***

Gordon Robertson, American Sport Fishing Association - Been involved in a ton of fishery resource and water quality issues. They've done their share of conservation work over the years. Anglers pay license fees. Their members pay an excise tax every quarter – resulting in millions over the years. A good bit of money for fisheries conservation. Anglers are also doing a lot of volunteer work and provide survey info to agencies.

Funding:

- important for the State to set it's own objective goals so that it is clear to grantors why they exist
- insulate grantor from decisions and policy making
- good clear process with understandable rules
- keep it solid and not sexy

Research priorities – think holistically – land uses and impacts. Create a baseline data system that is forward looking. Press for objectivity on biological, economic, and social issues. Remember existing authorities of state agencies to not duplicate efforts.

Peer Review – use common sense and balance. Listen to and consider local knowledge as well.

Organizations and other states – keep it simple, transparent, and balanced. Understand and coordinate with existing groups and utilize their institutional insight. Have a good overarching framework.

Susan Allan, Our Ocean, a group that represents 70,000 members statewide. She is very interested in models and intrigued to see where that goes. Worrisome piece – not just the fundraising piece, but the distribution of funds. Seems that the more firewalls that you can create, the better and more comfortable for stakeholders. Might think about the role that the treasurer's office can have in this. May be good to establish a trust that may be harder to raid. And a fiduciary set up that gives more normalized funds over time. This is based on another coalition she worked with in 2001 and she's happy to share more on that.

Regarding outreach – sees an oversight. Should consider Cannon Beach, Lincoln

City, Yahats – not just port cities. Important for all stakeholders to be briefed on this. Could help for the marketing. Include Corvallis, Portland/Beaverton, Jackson/Josephine County. Many folks pay dues into the system and would like to provide recommendations. Additionally, feel free to task leaders in stakeholder groups such as herself to take on issues.

Cyndi Karp, Watershed Council –should hold meetings all over the State because important for everyone to feel ownership. She had several other questions/comments:

1. Is there older scientific data not digitized that needs funding for data entry? Good to digitize as much info as possible that we have. Find some kind of system to process that data to make it available to all stakeholders.
2. Wants to understand what the NRTF is doing during the month in between meetings.
3. Wants a better understanding of when to provide public comments to the different agencies.
4. Challenge for fishermen to participate in public meetings because they are out there fishing. How do we coordinate efforts?
5. Recommends this group meets at least twice a week.