



PROPOSAL EVALUATION GUIDE

Rocky Habitat Site Designation Proposal Process

Summary

This is a guide to assist reviewers with evaluating rocky habitat site designation proposals during the Initial Proposal Period of the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy update. This guide includes review and evaluation guidance for the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis and the Working Group Review & Recommendation steps of the Initial Proposal Process.

Oregon Coastal Management Program

TSP.Comments@state.or.us

November, 2020

Rocky Habitat Site Designation Proposal Evaluation Guide

The Rocky Habitat Management Strategy Initial Proposal Period (June – December, 2020)

DISCLAIMER: This guide has been made available to evaluators in digital form on the Rocky Habitat Web Mapping Tool in order to streamline the evaluation process (Oregon.SeaSketch.org). This document is for reference purposes only, and should not be utilized for official proposal evaluations except in the case of special accommodations. If you require assistance with proposal evaluation, please contact the Rocky Shores Coordinator, Michael Moses, at Michael.Moses@state.or.us.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to expedite and standardize the rocky habitat site management designation evaluation process for agency and Rocky Habitat Working Group proposal review. This process was developed in response to public request for more direct involvement in the management of coastal rocky sites in Oregon during the amendment to Part Three of the Territorial Sea Plan, the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy. The text of the Strategy outlines the purpose, rationale, goals, objectives, and management of rocky habitat sites in Oregon’s territorial sea. Any rocky habitat site management designation proposal must align with the goals and objectives of the Strategy, as well as the Territorial Sea Plan writ large. The Rocky Habitat Working Group is tasked with conducting preliminary proposal evaluations, and compiling them into a packet of recommendations and supporting information to be reviewed by the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC). For ease of evaluator reference, the relevant text from the Territorial Sea Plan are provided below.

As stated in Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 19, the overall ocean resources management goal of the State of Oregon is to:

Conserve the long-term values, benefits, and natural resources of the nearshore ocean and the continental shelf.

To achieve this goal, the State of Oregon will:

- 1. Give higher priority to the protection of renewable marine resources than to the development of non-renewable ocean resources;*
- 2. Support development of ocean resources that is environmentally sound and economically beneficial to coastal communities and the state;*
- 3. Protect the diversity of marine life, the functions of the marine ecosystem, the diversity of marine and estuarine habitats, and the overall health of the marine environment; and*
- 4. Seek the conservation of ocean resources within the larger marine region that is of ecologic and economic interest to the State of Oregon.*

Part Three of the Territorial Sea Plan, the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy, acts as a framework to support the following objectives:

- a. To maintain, protect, or restore rocky habitats and biological communities;*

- b. To implement a holistic management program through site designations and management recommendations that allows for enjoyment and use of Oregon's rocky habitats while protecting them from degradation and loss;*
- c. To enhance appreciation and foster personal stewardship of Oregon's rocky habitats through education, interpretation, and outreach;*
- d. To improve our knowledge and understanding of rocky habitat ecosystems by fostering research and monitoring efforts;*
- e. To facilitate cooperation and coordination among local, state, and federal resource management agencies, and tribal governments, to ensure that marine resources and habitats are holistically managed.*

The rocky habitat site designation proposal process follows an adaptive, holistic management approach, allowing for greater management flexibility. The original rocky habitat site management designations from the 1994 TSP have been reworked and consolidated into new site-based designations in the amended Strategy. These are 1) Marine Research Area, 2) Marine Garden/Marine Education Area, and 3) Marine Conservation Area. Proposals will be considered for site additions, deletions, or modifications, and must meet the goals of their stated designation category. Additionally, proposers must state their own site-specific goals and objectives, and demonstrate how they will be met. For ease of evaluator reference, the goals for each designation are outlined below, and the table of associated standards and management practices is on the following pages.

Marine Research Area

Goal - *Maintain the natural system to support scientific research and monitoring while maintaining ecological integrity.*

Characterization - *Relatively intact system that has, or may benefit from, scientific study and monitoring.*

Marine Garden (Marine Education Area)

Goal - *Protect rocky habitat resources to support public enjoyment, learning opportunities and maintain ecological integrity. These sites should be prioritized for providing enhanced education, enjoyment, public access, and resource awareness.*

Characterization - *High public visitation and educational potential.*

Marine Conservation Area

Goal - *Conserve the natural system to the highest degree possible by limiting adverse impacts to habitat and wildlife.*

Characterization - *Relatively intact system with high ecological value.*

Variable management based on site needs - *This designation allows for different types of management prescriptions based on site conservation goals and needs.*



Summary of Review and Evaluation Steps

Proposal review for the Initial Proposal Process will be conducted in four phases: 1) Agency review 2) Rocky Habitat Working Group evaluation 3) OPAC recommendation 4) LCDC adoption.

Agency Feasibility & Completeness Analysis: OCMP staff and agency representatives will review submitted proposals for completeness, making a determination of *'accepted'* or *'rejected'*. Accepted proposals will be forwarded to coastal Tribal Nations. OCMP staff will notify proposing entities of proposal status changes throughout the review and evaluation process, and if a proposal is rejected during review, the proposing entity will be provided a rationale. Agency review information will be summarized in a brief report and forwarded to the Working Group.

Working Group Review & Recommendation: The Working Group will evaluate each proposal on its own merit, sorting them as *'recommended'*, *'not recommended'*, and draft a brief summary report for each proposal. They will then forward their recommendations to agency commissions and conduct a 30-day public comment period on *recommended* proposals. The proposals and evaluation summaries will then be compiled into a proposal packet for OPAC review.

OPAC Review & Recommendation: OPAC will review the proposal packet and determine which proposals to recommend to the Land Conservation & Development Commission (LCDC) for potential adoption, along with any recommended text amendment changes to the TSP.

LCDC Review & Possible Adoption: LCDC will either approve of the OPAC recommendations, or make findings that will be communicated back to OPAC with recommended modifications. Once OPAC and LCDC reconcile the recommendations, LCDC will adopt the changes to Part Three and the site designations. LCDC will make a final determination on which site proposals will be incorporated into the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy.

Table 1 REGULATORY STANDARDS & MANAGEMENT PRACTICES


	Marine Research Area	Marine Garden (Marine Education Area)	Marine Conservation Area
Fish Harvest	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No additional site-based fish harvest regulations. Coastwide Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations apply.</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No additional site-based fish harvest regulations. Coastwide Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations apply.</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – Requires a permit from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife or Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, which may be issued if the research does not impede the management goals of the Marine Research Area.</p>	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No additional site-based fish harvest regulations. Coastwide Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations apply.</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No additional site-based fish harvest regulations. Coastwide Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations apply.</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – Requires a permit from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife or Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, which may be issued if the research aligns to further the management goals of the Marine Garden.</p>	<p>Marine Conservation Areas with broad conservation goals may be proposed with regulations closing harvest in all categories. Specific fish harvest regulations will be established based on the proposed management goals of the site. Individual site management must include a clear justification for all proposed regulations for <u>commercial</u>, <u>recreational</u>, <u>scientific</u> and <u>educational</u> fish harvest.</p>
Invertebrate Harvest	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No take except at a subset of sites which allow species-specific harvest of clams, Dungeness crab, red rock crab, mussels, piddocks, scallops, and shrimp.</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – Requires a permit from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife or Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, which may be issued if the research does not impede the management goals of the Marine Research Area.</p>	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No take except for single mussels for bait</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – Requires a permit from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife or Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, which may be issued if the research aligns to further the management goals of the Marine Garden.</p>	<p>Marine Conservation Areas with broad conservation goals may be proposed with regulations closing harvest in all categories. Specific invertebrate harvest regulations will be established based on the proposed management goals of the site. Individual site management must include a clear justification for all proposed regulations for <u>commercial</u>, <u>recreational</u>, <u>scientific</u> and <u>educational</u> invertebrate harvest.</p>
Algae Harvest	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – Requires scientific or education permit issued by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department or the Department of State Lands, which may be issued if the research does not impede the management goals of the Marine Research Area.</p>	<p><u>Commercial</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Recreational</u> – No take</p> <p><u>Scientific & Educational</u> – No take except by scientific or education permit issued by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department or the Department of State Lands.</p>	<p>Marine Conservation Areas with broad conservation goals may be proposed with regulations closing harvest in all categories. Specific algae harvest regulations will be established based on the proposed management goals of the site. Individual site management must include a clear justification for all proposed regulations for <u>recreational</u>, <u>scientific</u> and <u>educational</u> algae harvest.</p>

Users should refer to individual site designation for a complete understanding of site regulations

NON-REGULATORY STANDARDS & MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Marine Research Area	Marine Garden (Marine Education Area)	Marine Conservation Area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In regards to physical public access to areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Avoid enhancement of <u>future</u> physical public access on public lands to rocky habitats except in instances of safety concerns. ○ Maintain but avoid enhancing capacity of <u>current</u> physical access. ○ Enhance visual access to these sites. ○ Prioritize access to these sites for low impact research. • When possible, researchers in these areas should report project outcomes and metadata to the permitting agency for incorporation into a publically accessible repository. • Other actions and practices that aid in reaching site goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase, enhance, and maintain visual and physical access on public lands to rocky habitats to be inclusive of diverse uses while prioritizing the protection of ecological and cultural resources. • Encourage educational and interpretive programming that increases informed visitation to the site and minimizes impacts to site resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educational programs should aim to reduce the impacts of trampling and wildlife disturbance, as well as monitor impacts of visitor use. • Increase and enhance messaging around rules and regulations, and highlight general rocky habitat etiquette and stewardship. • Other actions and practices that aid in reaching site goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable non-regulatory management practices are applicable in Marine Conservation Areas. • Individual site management must outline clear non-regulatory management mechanisms that aid in reaching the site goals.

DRAFT



Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis

This initial review is intended to assess the completeness and practical feasibility of each rocky habitat site designation proposal. State agency representatives (e.g. ODFW, OPRD, DSL, DLCDC, or others based on the details of individual proposals) and OCMP project staff will evaluate completeness of proposals to determine if all necessary information has been included in the proposal, as well as if the proposer has taken all necessary steps to create a complete proposal. A (brief) report will be created presenting an analysis of the proposal's alignment with the goals and policies of the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy and of implementation feasibility. Incomplete proposals will be rejected and not move forward in the review process. Proposers will be contacted with necessary information for completing and resubmitting the proposals. Rejected proposals may be revised and resubmitted as a new proposal. The completed proposal packet is submitted to the Rocky Habitat Working Group, and will include the public proposal and agency analysis report. OCMP staff will also provide notification of the proposals to the five federally recognized Oregon coastal Tribal Nations with lands in the coastal zone, and engage in consultation as necessary.

Questions

Please fill in information and answer the questions below for *each* rocky habitat site designation proposal, and provide a brief summary report at the end. Please provide additional information, interpretation, concerns, or context where necessary. Some of the information and questions below are also asked in the Working Group evaluation to ensure consistent interpretation, transparency, accountability, and historic preservation.

Evaluator Information

Evaluator name:

Evaluator role/position(s):

Evaluator affiliation(s):

Date of evaluation:

Site Information

Proposed site location:

Designation category:

Marine Research Area

Marine Garden/Education Area

Marine Conservation Area

Is this a proposal to *add, delete, or modify* a rocky habitat site designation?

New Site Designation (addition)

Existing Site Removal (deletion)

Alteration to Existing Site

Name of principal contact:

Affiliated organization(s):

Date of proposal submission:

Agency Feasibility Analysis Questions

1. Please answer the following based on the proposed site designation category:

Marine Research Area:

- a. What are the primary scientific research and/or monitoring interests or concerns at this site?
- b. What is the history or precedent for conducting or protecting scientific research and/or monitoring at this site?
- c. How might this site benefit from scientific research and monitoring protections?

- d. How will ecological integrity be maintained at the site?
- e. How might the proposed site designation address knowledge gaps in areas of understanding that currently lack adequate data and/or monitoring efforts?

Marine Garden (Marine Education Area):

- a. What are the primary educational, recreational, or resource awareness interests or concerns at this site?
- b. In what ways would the proposed site designation provide, protect, or enhance public education, enjoyment, access, and/or resource awareness?
- c. Where feasible, in what ways does the proposal aim for or demonstrate equitable access, either visually or physically?

Marine Conservation Area:

- a. What are the primary conservation concerns at this site (i.e. species, habitats, public use, etc.)?
- b. What are the specific management objectives relating to the concerns above?
- c. What are the proposed management measures to help reach these objectives, what is the provided rationale for these measures, and is it appropriate?
- d. In what ways would the proposed site management measures limit adverse impacts to habitat and/or wildlife?

2. Regarding the site map(s) provided:

- a. Is the polygon appropriate for the location (e.g. size, shape, placement, etc.)?
- b. Does it reflect the goals or intentions of the proposal?


- c. What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of this particular shape and placement?
3. Is the proposal complete?
 - a. Have sufficient responses been provided for all questions, including indications or explanations for those questions which are not relevant or applicable? If not, please indicate which question(s) are of concern.
 - b. Is a rationale provided for any incomplete or missing information?
4. Does the proposal consist of one place-based submission?
5. Does it overlap with or is it directly adjacent to any Marine Protected Areas, Marine Reserves, or Seabird Protection Areas?
6. Are the goals and objectives of the proposal clearly stated, and what are their strengths and/or weaknesses?
7. Will the proposed criteria to evaluate site goals, objectives, or success, be reasonably measurable or achievable? How effective will they be?
8. How does the proposal change the status quo of management protections at this site? What are the implications of this change as you see it?
9. Does the proposal indicate whether any of the desired outcome(s) cannot be met with a site designation proposal? (If so, proposers are encouraged to outline their concern or desired regulatory change in a formal letter to OPAC.)
10. Is there any relevant historical or institutional context to this proposed site designation that should be taken into consideration?
11. How would designating this site fit into the broader context of the currently designated rocky habitat sites, and coastwide rocky habitat management?

- a. Are there other site designations proposals at or near this site that may overlap, interact with, or support this one? If so, what and where are they?
 - b. What are the potential links, considerations, or conflicts between them?
 - c. In what ways does this proposed site designation differ from other proposals that overlap or interact with it?
12. If the proposal includes subtidal habitat, are there possible consequences (intended or otherwise) for the Oregon Marine Reserves Program?
13. How might this site designation interact or fit in with the broader coastwide regulatory and management context of all habitats, resources, and designations?
14. What, if any, practical feasibility concerns might you have about implementing this proposed site designation?
15. Are there any additional site considerations that should be noted?

Reviewer Comments and Feedback

In the space below, please provide a (brief) summary of your thoughts on the feasibility of this proposal, and your rationale for your personal recommendation selected at the bottom. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

Evaluator recommendation: *Accepted* *Rejected*



Working Group Evaluation

Evaluation by the Rocky Habitat Working Group is intended to be a merit-based process, the final product of which is a packet of recommended proposals and other evaluation information that is forwarded to OPAC. Following the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis, rocky habitat site designations proposals are forwarded to the Working Group which will review them and sort them as **“recommended”** or **“not recommended”**. Recommended proposals will be made available for a formal 30-day public comment period, after which the Working Group will modify the recommendation as needed and then submit the full proposal packet to OPAC for review.

Evaluation Criteria Matrix

The following rubric is a simplified way to evaluate key aspects of rocky habitat site designation proposals that can be assessed categorically. The criteria listed below correspond with the proposal questions, and use of the rubric should be approached holistically to evaluate how well the components of the proposal come together, rather than evaluating answers to individual questions in isolation. The rubric can also be used to compare reviewer evaluations and ensure consistency among reviewers. While this matrix can aid in making final recommendations, it should not be the *only* criteria by which a final determination is made. As part of the Initial Proposal Process, this is a pilot effort and therefore subject to change for future rounds of evaluation.

Criteria	Does not meet criteria (1)	Has merit, needs work (2)	Meets criteria (3)	Score
Goals, objectives, or other criteria for site success.	Goals, objectives, or other criteria are not clearly stated, and/or are not reasonably achievable.	Goals, objectives, or other criteria are stated, but remain unclear, incomplete, or of questionable achievability.	Goals, objectives, or other criteria for success are clearly stated and reasonably achievable.	
Measurable results and outcomes.	Does not state measurable results or outcomes, or results and outcomes stated are not measurable.	States measurable results and outcomes, but they are unclear, incomplete, or difficult to measure.	Measurable results and outcomes are clearly stated and reasonably achievable.	

<p>Site Uses</p>	<p>Site uses and/or impacts of proposed management designation characterized inappropriately or are unreasonable.</p>	<p>Characterization of site uses and/or impacts of proposed management designation not fully described.</p>	<p>Appropriately characterizes present and future site use. Describes clear and reasonable expectations (pos. & neg.) for impacts of proposed management designation on site uses.</p>	
<p>Key Natural Resources</p>	<p>Key resources, features, values, or impacts on the above omitted or inappropriately described.</p>	<p>Key resources, features, values, or impacts not fully described.</p>	<p>Key resources, features, values, and anticipated impacts of management designation clear, complete, and reasonable.</p>	
<p>Regulations & Enforcement</p>	<p>Enforcement changes, needed regulations, and management improvements inappropriate or are unreasonable.</p>	<p>Enforcement changes, needed regulations, and management improvements not fully described.</p>	<p>Enforcement changes, needed regulations, and management improvements clear, complete, and reasonable.</p>	
<p>Non-Regulatory Management Mechanisms</p>	<p>Non-regulatory management mechanisms or methods of support inappropriate, or unreasonable.</p>	<p>Non-regulatory management mechanisms or methods of support not fully described.</p>	<p>Non-regulatory management mechanisms and methods of support clear, complete, and reasonable.</p>	
<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p>	<p>Level of stakeholder engagement or public outreach is insufficient.</p>	<p>Level of stakeholder engagement, public outreach efforts, or stakeholder feedback not fully described.</p>	<p>Clear and actionable steps have been taken to engage appropriate stakeholders and other members of the public and their feedback is captured appropriately.</p>	

Additional Information	Additional information is irrelevant or not provided.	Additional information is not fully described.	Clear effort has been made to include relevant information or context for the proposed designation.	
Goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3.	Does not address and/or further the goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3.	Partially or inadequately addresses and/or furthers some of the goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3.	Clearly addresses and/or furthers the goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3.	
Designation	The proposed designation or changes to regulatory standards and management practices are inappropriate, or unlikely to achieve the stated goals.	A different designation or alternative changes to regulatory standards and management practices could more effectively address the goals as stated.	The selected designation and proposed changes to regulatory standards and management practices are appropriate and will reasonably achieve the stated goals.	
Total Score:				/30

Questions

Please fill in information and answer the questions below for *each* rocky habitat site designation proposal, and provide a brief summary of your thoughts at the end. Please provide additional information, interpretation, concerns, or context where necessary. Some of the information and questions below are also asked in the Agency Feasibility Analysis to ensure consistent interpretation, transparency, accountability, and historic preservation. Questions that are duplicated in the Agency Feasibility Analysis are marked with an *.

Evaluator Information*

Evaluator name:

Evaluator role/position(s):

Evaluator affiliation(s):

Date of evaluation:

Site Information*

Proposed site location:

Designation category:

Marine Research Area

Marine Garden/Education Area

Marine Conservation Area

Is this a proposal to *add*, *delete*, or *modify* a rocky habitat site designation?

New Site Designation (addition)

Existing Site Removal (deletion)

Alteration to Existing Site

Name of principle contact:

Affiliated organization(s):

Date of proposal submission:

Working Group Evaluation Questions

1. Please answer the following based on the proposed site designation category:*

Marine Research Area:

- a. What are the primary scientific research and/or monitoring interests or concerns at this site?

- b. What is the history or precedent for conducting or protecting scientific research and/or monitoring at this site?
- c. How might this site benefit from scientific research and monitoring protections?
- d. How will ecological integrity be maintained at the site?
- e. How might the proposed site designation address knowledge gaps in areas of understanding that currently lack adequate data and/or monitoring efforts?

Marine Garden (Marine Education Area):

- a. What are the primary educational, recreational, or resource awareness interests or concerns at this site?
- b. In what ways would the proposed site designation provide, protect, or enhance public education, enjoyment, access, and/or resource awareness?
- c. Where feasible, in what ways does the proposal aim for or demonstrate equitable access, either visually or physically?

Marine Conservation Area:

- a. What are the primary conservation concerns at this site (i.e. species, habitats, public use, etc.)?
- b. What are the specific management objectives relating to the concerns above?
- c. What are the proposed management measures to help reach these goals, what is the provided rationale for these measures, and is it appropriate?
- d. In what ways would the proposed site management prescriptions limit adverse impacts to habitat and/or wildlife?

2. Regarding the site map(s) provided:
 - a. Is the polygon appropriate for the location (e.g. size, shape, placement, etc.)?
 - b. Does it reflect the goals or intentions of the proposal?
 - c. What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of this particular shape and placement?
3. Are the goals and objectives of the proposal clearly stated, and what are their strengths and/or weaknesses?*
4. Will the proposed criteria to evaluate site goals, objectives, or success, be reasonably measurable or achievable? How effective will they be?*
5. How does the proposal change the status quo of management protections at this site? What are the implications of this change as you see it?*
6. The rocky habitat site proposal process focuses on allowing for adaptable and holistic management at the site level and is not intended to manage on a species-specific level. With this in mind, are the proposed regulatory goals, objectives, outcomes, or changes appropriate for this process?
7. Does the proposal indicate whether any of the desired outcome(s) cannot be met with a site designation proposal? (If so, proposers are encouraged to outline their concern or desired regulatory change in a formal letter to OPAC.)*
8. In what ways does the proposal demonstrate that it incorporates appropriate information from relevant sources such as local knowledge or the best available scientific information?
9. Is there any relevant historical or institutional context to this proposed site designation that should be taken into consideration?*

10. In what ways does this proposal address and/or further the goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy and/or the TSP writ large?

11. How would designating this site fit into the broader context of the currently designated rocky habitat sites, and coastwide rocky habitat management?*
 - a. Are there other site designations proposals at or near this site that may overlap, interact with, or support this one? If so, what and where are they?

 - b. What are the potential links, considerations, or conflicts between them?

 - c. In what ways does this proposed site designation differ from other proposals that overlap or interact with it?

12. How might this site designation interact or fit in with the broader coastwide regulatory and management context of all habitats, resources, and designations?*

13. What, if any, practical feasibility concerns might you have about implementing this proposed site designation?*

14. What are the organizational partnerships involved in this proposal? What, if any, considerations or concerns should be documented regarding partner organization intentions, goals, missions, and/or program areas in order to avoid negative impacts?

15. Are there any additional materials or documents provided? If so, what are they and what is their purpose?

16. Are there any additional site considerations that should be noted?*

Site Attributes and Reports

Geography

17. Briefly describe how appropriate the area and length of shoreline in the proposed polygon sketch are for the selected designation category and the stated goals.

Physical

18. Briefly describe how appropriate the distribution of habitat features (such as offshore islands & rocks, substrate types, etc.) in the proposed polygon sketch is for the selected designation category and the stated goals.

19. In what ways does the proposal appropriately address, reflect, or account for the risks associated with potential future sea level rise scenarios?

Biological

20. How well represented by the proposed polygon sketch are the species and/or habitats of interest that are mentioned in the proposal?

21. How appropriate is the selected designation category and stated goals for the protection of the species and/or habitats of interest?

22. Are there other species, habitats, or natural resources of relevant management concern that were overlooked by this proposal, or could be negatively impacted by the proposed designation?

Human Uses

23. What are the most likely human use activities to impact, or be impacted by, the selected designation category and the stated goals?

24. In what ways are the selected designation category and stated goals appropriate for the kinds of human use activities known to occur within the proposed polygon sketch?

25. Are there other human use activities not mentioned in the proposal or site report(s) that could be of relevant management concern for the proposed polygon sketch?

Evaluator Comments and Feedback

In the space below, please provide a (brief) summary of your thoughts on the merits of the proposal, and your rationale for your personal recommendation selected at the bottom. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

DRAFT

Evaluator recommendation: *Recommended* *NOT Recommended*