

OPAC TERRITORIAL SEA PLAN WORKING GROUP

February 25, 2021 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM & February 26, 2021 1:00 – 5:00 PM Pacific Time

REMOTE MEETING ONLY – See below for remote connection details.

MEETING GOAL(S)

The Rocky Habitat Working Group met to discuss their reviews of the rocky habitat site management designation proposals, and make initial recommendations regarding the submitted proposals. Additional time was needed to complete meeting objectives, and an overflow meeting was held the afternoon of the following day.

AGENDA

All times are general estimates and subject to change based on Working Group progress and discussion. Due to the nature of discussion content, discussion topics may be covered sooner than is listed in the draft agenda.

8:00 am Welcome and Introductions

8:15 am Meeting Goals & Process Overview

9:00 am Coastwide Kelp Forests MRA, Ecola Point MCA, Chapman Point MCA, Cape Lookout MCA, Cape Foulweather MCA

12:00 pm Break for Lunch

12:45 pm Fogarty Creek MCA, Otter Rock North MCA, Seal Rock MCA, Coquille Point MG/EA, Blacklock Point MCA, Cape Blanco MRA, Crook Point-Mack Reef MCA

4:30 pm Recommendation Overview and Next Steps

5:00 pm Adjourn

MEETING LOGISTICS

Date & Time: February 25, 2021 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM, February 26, 2021 1:00 – 5:00 PM PST

Location: Meeting was conducted via web meeting.

Participants:

Working Group Members – Michael Moses, Andy Lanier, Andrea Celentano, Charlie Plybon, Dave Lacey, Dave Fox, Dick Vander Schaaf, Kerry Carlin-Morgan, Laurel Hillmann, Tom Calvanese, Walter Chuck, Shawn Stephensen, Scott McMullen,

Other Participants – Patty Snow, Frank Burris

Public Participants (Feb 25th) – Cynthia Jacobi, Dawn Villaescusa, Joe Leibezeit, Larry Basch, Loren Morris III, Margaret Corvi, Margaret Treadwell, Matthew Goolsby, Robert Wayne, Steve Griffiths, Tara Brock, Casaria Taylor, Kent Doughty, Tamara Mautner, Sybil Ackerman-Munson, Elizabeth Ruther, Jim Carlson, Jena Carter, Jesse Jones, Geoffrey Wilkie, Nora Sherwood, Fran Recht, Joseph Youren, Brittany Poirson

Public Participants (Feb 26th) – Steve Griffiths, Margaret Treadwell, Larry Basch, Kent Doughty, Joe Liebezeit, James Carlson, Elizabeth Ruther, Jesse Jones

SUMMARY

This meeting was led by a meeting facilitator contracted by DLCD through Oregon Sea Grant. The meeting opened with an overview of the rocky habitat proposal process timeline and planning for next steps. The framework for discussion ground rules, themes, and decision making process were outlined by the meeting facilitator. DLCD staff then presented each of the twelve proposals individually, which included a high-level

proposal overview, the findings from the Agency Analyses, and an open discussion to identify Working Group considerations necessary for each proposal to move forward in the recommendation process.

After each proposal was presented, the meeting facilitator then facilitated the voting process on the Working Group's initial recommendation. Initial recommendations were crafted using a ranking system whereby the members of the Working Group entered a vote for each proposal where 1 = *Recommend*, 2 = *Recommend, with considerations*, 3 = *Reservations, even with considerations*, and 4 = *Do not recommend*. Considerations are those components of a proposal, identified through the evaluation process, which must be addressed to facilitate a Working Group recommendation to the Ocean Policy Advisory Council. A vote of modified consensus was agreed upon where no more than 20% of the voting Working Group members could vote *Do not recommend* (4) in order for a proposal to receive a recommendation to move forward for consideration by OPAC.

An overflow meeting was scheduled for the following day (Feb. 26th) as a contingency to accommodate additional discussion time as necessary. This meeting was utilized to complete discussion and recommendation-making for Blacklock Point MCA and Crook Point-Mack Reef MCA. The meeting was then concluded with a discussion focused on understanding the level of support within the Working Group to make statewide recommendations that would complement any site-based recommendations to OPAC to address broader concerns expressed in the proposals such as wildlife disturbance, support for interpretive programs, and site monitoring.