

**Oregon Nearshore Research Task Force**  
**June 28-29, 2010**  
**Hallmark Resort, Newport, Oregon**

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

*Federal non-voting members*: Roy Lowe (absent), Cathy Tortorici (absent)

Staff: Jenna Borberg, Julie Risien, and AnnaRose Adams

Contractor: Tegan Hoffmann, TC Hoffmann & Associates, LCC

Other Participants: Funding Panel - Representative Roblan, Barb Gibbs, Mike Dickerson

*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) decided to focus on research and monitoring, and to not include policy and management for their recommendations to the legislature.
2. The TF decided to delete the section on the stakeholder advisory body/OPAC from their draft recommendations since they are no longer addressing policy and management.
3. There was general consensus that the TF will recommend that a Nearshore Strategic Plan (NSP) and a Nearshore Research and Monitoring Action Plan (NRMAP) be developed. A six person committee - comprised of a representative from DSL, DLCD, ODFW, OPAC, STAC, and at-large public – would be responsible for: running the process of developing the NSP, and aiding in coordination of research. Further, the NSP will be adopted by the three state agencies through their commissions. The NRMAP will be developed by STAC. A cost estimate will be included in the NRMAP, but not the NSP.
4. The TF discussed STAC's membership and role in light of the TF's focus on science and research, and decided on the following:
  - a. Agree that STAC will function as an independent body
  - b. STAC membership will be expanded, and membership will be decided internally based on the National Academies of Science (NAS). New members will be added as required.
  - c. STAC will be responsible for creating and updating the NRMAP.
  - d. STAC will use the NSP and NRMAP as the primary guidance document to make decisions on what it works on.
  - e. The primary responsibility of STAC is to respond to requests by state agencies, OPAC, and the legislature. STAC may also respond to requests from anyone on a case-by-case basis, and may initiate inquiry on its own.
  - f. STAC's described role of providing a coordinating role in the TF draft recommendations should be deleted because it is an unrealistic expectation of STAC.
5. The TF came to agreement on the mission of the Trust as described in the draft recommendations, and decided to include additional responsibilities. Further, the

- trust will employ a competitive, peer-review process for all fund allocation, except for state mandated projects (specific language still being determined).
6. The TF will include some language about inviting community groups as collaborators under the Trust section of their recommendations.

### **Summary of Action Items**

#### *Comments to Hoffmann and Associates*

1. Provide comments to Tegan on the draft Institutional Framework report by July 12<sup>th</sup> (All TF Members).

#### *Revising the Draft Working Document*

2. For the Funding Entity section of the report, the TF decided to add “Responsibilities of the Trust”, and the following need further expanding:
  - a. *Ensure results of funded projects are evaluated by technical experts...* (Bob and Sybil)
  - b. *The trust would employ a competitive, peer-review process for all fund allocation, except for....* (Caren)
3. The Community Engagement Committee will flesh out their draft text for the TF recommendations, and will better define community groups based on this meeting’s discussion.
4. Timeline of Revisions:
  - July 6 – Bob, Sybil, and Caren will send expanded text as described above to Julie and Jenna
  - July 7 –Julie, Jenna, and AnnaRose will edit the working document based on this June 28-29<sup>th</sup> meeting and send to Steve
  - July 9 – Steve will make revisions and send out the working draft to all TF members
  - July 16 – Task Force members will provide comments on the working draft to Julie and Jenna, and these comments will be compiled and the draft will be re-sent to the TF prior to the July 22-23 Meeting.

### **Detailed Summary of Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 9:57 am by Chair, Stephen Brandt

#### ***Approval of June 3-4 Meeting Minutes***

The TF voted to approve the draft June 3-4 meeting minutes.

#### ***Institutional Framework Contract, Hoffmann and Associates, LCC***

Tegan Hoffmann of T.C. Hoffmann & Associates, LLC (TCHA) presented on their evaluation of institutional frameworks that they conducted as a contract position to the TF (*The final report will be available on the NRTF website*). They conducted some initial baseline research and then selected four case studies that would best answer Oregon’s questions about the role of science in decision making. Their presentation included a description of institutional arrangements, as well as an assessment and qualitative discussion of strengths and weaknesses for each of the following case studies:

1. California – selected for its innovation and because it is a West Coast partner
2. Chesapeake Bay (Maryland and Virginia) – selected for the longevity of the program, and for how the states feed information into Chesapeake Bay regional decision making
3. Great Barrier Reef – selected for the relationship with state and federal agencies and unique, robust science integration and funding mechanisms past and present.
4. Gulf of Maine – selected for its richness of science-based decision making

TCHA defined and evaluated criteria for a mechanism overview and objective assessment of the four case studies in order to answer questions posed by the TF. They also tried to assess administrative costs of the various programs. Their methods included (1) interviews, (2) review of published (peer-reviewed) and grey literature, and (3) web-based research. In addition to the four case studies, they provided an overview of Oregon's current institutional arrangements, stakeholder engagement, science integration, and funding of ocean and coastal policy, management, and research. Based on the analysis of the four case studies, 20 high-level recommendations were provided.

### ***Finance Panel***

A three-person panel was organized by the TF Finance Committee to present to the TF on the financial structure of the state and to discuss how to attract and leverage state, federal, nonprofit, and individual funds. Panelists included Representative Arnie Roblan, Barb Gibbs of Meyer Memorial Trust, and Mike Dickerson of Shorebank Enterprise.

Rep Roblan spoke about the intent of the NRTF bill [HB 3106] in terms of financial structure and scope in terms of leveraging state and federal dollars. He is interested in having the best science provided to legislators for decision making, and in having funds for consistent ocean research. He noted that money needs to be separate from other interest groups. The state needs to decide where we are going to go, and then funders can decide if they want to contribute to it. He recognized that the state needs direction and that there has to be some funding from the state for others to think investing in the Oregon nearshore is important.

Barb Gibbs provided some examples of efforts that Meyer has funded, and she provided some advice on what may make Oregon more marketable. She believes that public desires fuel where money goes. She noted several elements that are important to Meyer when considering investing in Oregon: coordinated efforts (rather than separate individual efforts), focus on broad issues, and the move towards a science-based system. She advised the TF to look at the Watershed Councils for their structure and framework. She also noted that you cannot generalize across different foundations – they all operate very differently.

Mike Dickerson presented some insight to the TF on attracting outside funding based on his experience as a non-profit loan funder (largely funding rural communities, including fishing industry) for Shorebank Enterprise. He has been successful in securing and leveraging funds from a variety of sources, and one way he has done this is by staying ahead of funding trends, and by measuring impacts in a tangible way. A challenge for Oregon could be that foundations

often want to be the first to invest in something – and this TF’s efforts don’t really fit that model. He thinks that Oregon needs on-going efforts with multiple sources to get money. A common misconception is that conservation foundations are the only source of funding. How you set up the leverage initially will really set the tone – smaller groups will ignore you if you set it up for only the big foundations. Another important point is that investors need a place where they feel comfortable investing.

#### *General Panel Tips*

- keep it simple
- be nimble
- find the thing that will create political will (tipping point)
- create a strategic plan (showing that Oregon has done the hard work)
- have a longer term vision (where could it go?)
- base it on science (not politics)
- do not target only conservation NGOs
- have a strong process for receiving and distributing funds
  - Who is the trusted intermediary that works to get the funds?
  - Where does the money come from?
  - Who sets the priorities?
  - Who decides who gets the money?
  - Who evaluates the tangible outcomes?
- think about the hidden operation costs of start-up
- have an end product (results are important)
- remind people about the Oregon coast and position it as an attractive investment
- need long-term sustained commitment (including money) by the state to focus on the management of this asset (Oregon’s nearshore) – for health, productivity, and utilization

#### *Summary of Foundations*

Sybil provided a brief summary of the Moore Foundation, Packard Foundation, and Meyer Memorial Trust. The people she spoke with see Oregon as a place for opportunity. Foundations should be seen as short term – meaning short-term projects. We need to make sure we (the state) are going to act on whatever is being funded. It needs to be framed as a model for the nation. None of the foundations have minded that there is a firewall. It matters that there is an identifiable person/people for accountability. It is important to keep the politics out – we’re in danger of having foundations leave because of our name-calling.

#### *Discussion of Draft Recommendations*

A fundamental question was discussed about the overall purpose of the TF – focus on science and research, or should policy and management also be included? Rep Roblan said that he hopes that the science and funding issue is the main priority. He would love other recommendations too, but he believes that should be separate from a bill recommending a funding entity. There was general consensus by the TF to steer away from policy and management in their recommendations. There was also general agreement that the TF could focus on the funding entity, but that they should provide lower-tiered recommendations about data management, engagement, etc.

### *Stakeholder Advisory Bodies*

The TF discussed whether or not OPAC should be included in their draft recommendations in light of the shift away from policy and management.

#### **Decision:**

The TF decided to delete the section on the stakeholder advisory body/OPAC from their draft recommendations since they are no longer addressing policy and management.

### *Executive-level Policy Oversight and Coordination*

In light of the TF shift away from policy and management, the TF discussed if they should eliminate the marine cabinet from their draft recommendations, keep it, or keep it with some significant changes. There was general agreement that the formalized marine cabinet could be removed, but that Oregon needs some body to serve that purpose. The TF discussed the need for a NSP and a NRMAP, and agreed that you need to create a strategic plan before you develop a research priorities and action plan. The TF discussed who would write these two plans.

#### **Decisions:**

It was decided that a six person committee - comprised of a representative from DSL, DLCD, ODFW, OPAC, STAC, and at-large public – would be responsible for: (1) running the process of developing a NSP (and ensure that there is a public process), (2) aiding in coordination of research. Further, the NSP will be adopted by the three state agencies through their commissions. The TF decided not to recommend a lead agency; rather, they will let that be determined by the legislature.

### *Nearshore Strategic Plan and Research and Monitoring Action Plan*

The TF had decided that while the six person committee described above would write the NSP, the Science Advisory Committee (STAC) would write the NRMAP which would include research priorities. The TF agreed that the NSP should cover a six year time period with review every two years, and the NRMAP should be reviewed every two years consistent with changes in the NSP.

There was discussion about whether or not the TF should include cost estimates in their recommendations. It was discussed that the bill is going to have to say what the TF's recommendations will cost and the agencies will also have to do their own fiscal impact statement.

#### **Decision:**

Include a cost estimate on the NRMAP, but not on the NSP.

### *Scientific Advisory Body: STAC*

The TF discussed STAC's membership and role in light of the TF's focus on science and research. The decided on the following:

#### **Decisions:**

1. Agree that STAC will function as an independent body.

2. STAC membership will be expanded, and membership will be decided internally based on the NAS. New members would be added as required.
3. STAC will be responsible for creating and updating the NRMAP.
4. STAC will use the 6 year NSP and NRMAP as the primary guidance document to make decisions on what it works on.
5. The primary responsibility of STAC is to respond to requests by state agencies, OPAC, and the legislature. STAC may also respond to requests from anyone on a case-by-case basis, and may initiate inquiry on its own.
6. It was decided that function c on page 18 of the TF draft recommendations – STAC providing a coordinating role – should be deleted because it is an unrealistic expectation of STAC.

#### *Funding Mechanism/Entity*

The TF previously agreed to have a Trust and that it would be a 501c3. There was general agreement that the Trust's focus needs to be very narrow in scope because this is the most controversial aspect of the plan. The TF agreed on the overall mission of the trust as listed on page 20 of the draft recommendations.

#### **Decisions:**

The TF decided to include additional responsibilities of the Trust in their draft recommendations. These include the following:

Create a funding plan/leverage plan

Employ a competitive process (this may be subcontracted out)

Managing grants

Diligence on grantees

Measuring impacts

Ensure results of funded projects are evaluated by technical experts....

**(ACTION: Bob and Sybil will add more language here, and will make clear how the TF is defining peer review)**

Reporting

The TF discussed whether or not they need to clarify when a competitive process, peer-review, or direct allocation are appropriate. It was decided that in general, there should be a competitive peer-review process, but they should allow for rare acceptations of direct allocation for state mandated issues.

#### **Decision:**

The trust will employ a competitive, peer-review process for all fund allocation, except for.... **(ACTION: Caren will provide language for this)**

The TF discussed board membership of the Trust, but decided to table the discussion until the next meeting. There was general agreement that the board should be made up of people who are experts in raising money, and that members should be independent of STAC and OPAC. It was also discussed that the Trust should be carefully aligned with the NSP and NRMAP.

### ***Community-based Stewardship Groups***

The Community Engagement Committee presented on the work that they had done since the last TF meeting in thinking about how to build in robust pathways for community engagement. They would like capacity-building for these groups from the beginning. They suggested that the TF recommendations could include funding for a liaison who would interact with community groups, and do some surveys that could feed into the strategic planners. They want to ensure that there is a clear streamlined way for communities to provide input. There was general agreement by the TF that everyone should be involved - create a partnership and have a mechanism for including them.

**ACTION:** Community Engagement Committee will flesh some of this out more and will better define community groups based on this meeting's discussion.

#### **Decision:**

Under the Trust section of the TF recommendations, include some language about inviting them as collaborators.

### ***Next Steps***

#### **ACTIONS:**

##### *Draft TF Recommendations*

- Bob, Sybil, and Caren will send expanded text as described above to Julie and Jenna
- Julie, Jenna, and AnnaRose will edit the working document based on this June 28-29<sup>th</sup> meeting and send to Steve. They will add text on Data Management from the May 4<sup>th</sup> TF meeting as a starting point
- Steve will make revisions and send out the working draft to all TF members by July 9
- Task Force members will provide comments on the working draft to Julie and Jenna, and these comments will be compiled and the draft will be re-sent to the TF prior to the July 22-23 Meeting

##### *TCHA Report*

- All TF Members – Look at the TCHA report, particularly the 20 recommendations and think about if they are already included in the document, and if not, should they be. TF members should send comments directly to Tegan and copy Julie and Jenna.

### ***Public Comment***

Paul Engelmeyer, Audubon Society and OPAC – Supportive of a marine committee – must have a strategic plan. Outreach and education - no question about it. Not just state of Oregon, state federal partnership including the community. Not sure if ODFW brought this to the table – but the HAB [harmful algal bloom] work is dead. So what you are working on could make this alive. UO is looking at this budget shortfall ... huge implications – health and others of long term research and monitoring.

David Allen, OPAC – Thinks it would be beneficial for OPAC and STAC to be separated and for STAC to work under some other framework (e.g., the strategic plan), but think OPAC should

still have ability to utilize STAC. Have that connection as needed even if it doesn't fit into the strategic plan. Helps to utilize science as much as possible.

Susan Allan, Our Ocean – Our Ocean appreciates their [the TF's] work. And appreciates comments that are forward thinking and include broader thinking. Provide fair scientific institution that allows access to the public and the rigor for which recommendations come out with. Bring us with you and allow us opportunities to engage in recommendations and see what research is doing. Will provide much more sensible and less explosive marine policy. The more diversity reflected in STAC and the overall process, the better the state will benefit.