

## **OPAC Marine Reserves Process**

**DRAFT 5/16/2008** *OPAC Coarse Review Criteria for Review*

This document was prepared by the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC). Until final approval is given by OPAC, this document is a working draft only.

### **OPAC COARSE REVIEW CRITERIA**

Proposed sites for further evaluation need to try to meet a select set of criteria (i.e., OPAC's "coarse review" process per Executive Order No. 08-07) in order to be considered for further evaluation in the marine reserves process (i.e., selected as an evaluation site). The proposal form specifically addresses these criteria to demonstrate how a proposal meets the coarse review criteria and establishes justification for a proposal being selected as an evaluation site. The coarse review is based upon the goals and objectives, developed by OPAC, of the Oregon marine reserve system. The coarse review is also influenced by the governor's Executive Order, the Governor's previous sideboards to the process, and what is realistically achievable.

#### **1. DRAFT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES OF THE OREGON MARINE RESERVE SYSTEM (Developed by OPAC)**

##### **1.1 Goal:**

Protect and sustain a limited system of ecologically-special places in Oregon's Territorial Sea to conserve marine habitats and biodiversity; provide a framework for scientific research and effectiveness monitoring; and avoid, to the extent practicable, potential adverse social and economic effects on ocean users and ocean-dependent communities. A limited system is a collection of individual sites that are representative of marine habitats and that are ecologically significant when taken as a whole.

##### **1.2 Objectives:**

- 1) Protect areas within each biogeographic region of Oregon's Territorial Sea that are important to the natural diversity and abundance of marine organisms, including areas of high biodiversity and special natural features.
- 2) Protect key types of marine habitat in multiple locations along the coast to enhance resilience of nearshore ecosystems to natural and human-caused effects.
- 3) Site marine reserves and design the limited system of reserves in ways that are compatible with the needs of coastal communities by avoiding, to the extent practicable, potential adverse social and economic effects.
- 4) Use the marine reserves as ecological reference areas by conducting ongoing research and monitoring of reserve condition, effectiveness, and the effects of natural and human-induced stressors. Use the research and monitoring information in support of adaptive management.

#### **2. GOVERNOR'S SIDEBORDS TO THE MARINE RESERVES GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PROCESS (From Executive Order and Governor's Statements/ Correspondences)**

- 1) No more than nine sites can be selected
- 2) Process to propose sites for further evaluation begin by July 1, 2008.
- 3) The proposal form shall address site location characteristics, potential biological, social and economic impacts, potential economic development opportunities, and any research opportunities.
- 4) By December 1, 2008 use coarse review criteria as a filter to review proposals resulting in recommendation of sites that warrant further evaluation.
- 5) Give priority consideration to collaborative community-based (coastal community members, ocean users and other interested parties) proposals for sites for further evaluation.
- 6) Sites are large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, but small enough to avoid significant economic or social impacts.

## OPAC Marine Reserves Process

**DRAFT 5/16/2008** *OPAC Coarse Review Criteria* for Review

This document was prepared by the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC). Until final approval is given by OPAC, this document is a working draft only.

- 7) Develop additional criteria by January 1, 2009, to more fully evaluate biological, social, and economic impacts of sites following legislative funding.
- 8) Submit a budget package to the Governor's office by November 1, 2008 for financing, budgeting and implementing OPAC's marine reserve recommendation process in the 2009-11 biennium.

### 3. CRITERIA FOR COARSE REVIEW OF PROPOSED SITES FOR FURTHER EVALUTION

Proposals will be reviewed based on how well they meet the coarse review criteria. Proposals meeting more criteria will have a better chance of being recommended for further evaluation. The coarse review consists of **site-specific criteria** (criteria addressed in the proposal form for each individual site) and **system-wide criteria** (criteria used to collectively review proposals for a state-wide perspective).

#### 3.1 Site-specific criteria:

- 1) Habitat representation (**Objectives 1, 2, and 4**)
  - a) Proposed site includes a variety of key habitat types; or
  - b) In regions of homogenous habitat, the proposed site includes a valued contiguous single key habitat type; or
  - c) Proposed site includes special natural features.
- 2) Proposed site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, but small enough to avoid significant economic or social impacts on ocean users and ocean-dependent communities. (**EO, Objectives 3 - 4**)
- 3) There is, in reasonably close proximity to the proposed site, an area that can be used as a non-reserve comparison area. (**EO, Objective 4**)
- 4) Proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure such as a submarine cable, dredge spoil disposal site, wave energy project, port bar or access point. (**Objective 3**)
- 5) Proposal describes adjacent protected areas in the terrestrial or marine environment, if present, and/or describes adjacent marine, land or watershed uses that may affect the site. (**Objectives 1 and 3**)
- 6) Proposed site will avoid significant adverse social and economic effects on ocean users and ocean-dependent communities. The proposal includes information on existing and potential future uses/users of the proposed study area, and an estimation of the degree to which uses/users will be positively or negatively affected. (**EO, Objective 3**)
- 7) Proposal was developed by collaborative community-based teams comprised of coastal community members, ocean users and other interested parties. (**EO**)
- 8) Enforcement of proposed site (if it was later designated as a marine reserve) is realistic.

#### 3.2 System-wide criteria:

- 1) Includes nine or fewer evaluation sites. (**EO**)
- 2) Includes evaluation sites dispersed along the coast. (**Objectives 1, 2 and 4**)
- 3) Collectively, evaluation sites represent key habitat types in replicate. (**Objective 2**)
- 4) Collectively, evaluation sites are large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, but small enough to avoid significant economic or social impacts. (**EO**)