

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, June 24, 2021 11:08:57 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, June 24, 2021 1:05:38 PM
Time Spent: 01:56:40
IP Address: 24.22.77.179

Page 1

Q1

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you spent on the following tasks?

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal development stage (Jun-Dec 2020)? | 30 hours |
| Reading/evaluating proposals? | 40 hours |
| Reading/evaluating supporting materials submitted with the proposals? | 30 hours |
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal evaluation stage (Jan-Apr 2021)? | 20 hours |

Q2

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value most when considering your recommendation decision? Why?

The actual written proposal including the rationale for site nomination and designation, plus the recommended management actions where most valuable to me. Of course the map was critical and some of the site description from the perspective of the nominators was good to see. I really wanted to understand why a site was considered important for designation and what management would be recommended for the site to protect and enhance the site values. I also felt that seeing the stakeholders that were engaged with the site nomination and the stakeholders that were contacted about the proposal was important information to insure that there was awareness and buy-in for the proposal when possible.

Q3

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value least when considering your recommendation decisions? Why?

I was least concerned with the number of additional site supporters when a particular nomination may have collected numerous letters and such. The fact that they supporters, and detractors, may represent diverse stakeholder groups was important though. I also felt that the nomination form on SeaSketch was quite redundant in places and that made for less value for these redundancies. As far as making recommendation decisions, I was less swayed by site beauty or site interest particularly if there was no additional recommended management for the new designation.

Q4

What were the most challenging elements of the proposals to evaluate? Why? Should these elements be revised or removed from future iterations of the process? Why?

The overall redundancy of the nomination form made it difficult to distill the essence of any given proposal. Also, it was difficult to compare and contrast proposals in a simple spreadsheet, not that we were to rank them, but just to judge what was good and bad about different proposals. I also felt that questions in the form may not have gotten at the basic issue of what a designation would bring to any particular site, in other words, what might be different and lead to better protection of rocky habitats and/or their appreciation by the public with such a proposal.

Another aspect of the evaluation was that the agency review didn't seem to always reveal what agencies felt about specific sites, especially relative to other proposals. I would have valued more programmatic reflection from agencies.

Q5

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

The nomination form should be tightened up to reduce redundant questions. There should be more of a fine point be put on what designation may actually do for a site above and beyond what is already in regulations and what agencies should already be doing for rocky habitat conservation. Nominations and nominators would greatly benefit from workshops with the agencies (DLCD, ODFW and Parks at least) to better determine what sites may need and how best to address it in terms of designations. Overall, the process was constrained by time, by the inability to have in person meetings, by use of an online form, and by constraints that led to the public at times misunderstanding what designations mean for sites and how current conditions including agency budgets and priorities may be a bigger issue than lack of designations. The fact that the process was changing during the nomination process (building the airplane while in the air) was very difficult for everyone too.

Q6

What elements of the proposal materials surprised you the most?

I was surprised how much materials groups amassed for every proposal. I was also impressed by how much effort some groups put into outreach to stakeholders. I think on the evaluation and reviewer side of the effort, I was dismayed how unprepared we were to compare and contrast proposals until the day before any particular meeting. We didn't have the process thought out very well in advance.

Q7

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

The entire process should be drafted, tested and previewed and made public before the process begins. This means all the way through the process (nomination, consultation, evaluation, decision making). There should be scheduled work sessions for public and agency and any working group to interact about sites. And finally, an overall review or assessment of the OR rocky habitats done at the level of the pre-1984 work would be very beneficial for all parties involved.

Q8

What were the most important elements of the evaluation process that helped you make your recommendation decisions? Why?

I really focused on whether a case was made for a particular site designation in terms of would it lead to better protection/conservation and awareness of rocky habitats there. Sometimes these elements were spelled out in the proposal but more often than not there were not directly addressed. I wanted to understand the "need" for designation at any given site, not just that the site was cool or iconic.

Q9

What, if any, elements of the proposals were largely or completely absent that would have made your recommendation decisions easier?

I was dismayed that proposals did not revisit existing designations to address boundaries or management. I was dismayed that so many proposals were focused on marine conservation area designations when they were ID as either primarily a research area (had great research interest or values) or was more of a community education site and would thus be a logical marine garden designation. Again, I think more back and forth working meetings with proposers may have adjusted some of these designation issues.

Q10

In what ways did the findings of the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis aid your recommendation decisions?

The agency feasibility analysis was helpful for sure and it sort of backed up what I knew and thought about most sites. There was a lot of reliance on current status at sites whether it pertained to education work or research of what have you, and there was much less looking forward by agencies toward future needs. I felt that the agency analysis really dropped the ball on sites when there was very little reflection on what agencies were doing or not doing to manage sites under the current management prescriptions. These issues came up for nearly all nominations (wildlife harassment for instance) and agencies should have recognized these deficiencies in their feasibility analysis for sites. If an overriding finding in the agency feasibility analysis was that agencies weren't currently funded or focused on management, then that would be a strong statement for what rocky habitats may need well beyond just new designations.

Q11

What were the most influential aspects of the Working Group discussions on your recommendation decisions?

There were so many discussions over the course of the evaluation period but I think the discussions that reflected on greater need for agencies to enforce regulations, the need for a "whole coast" interpretative program, and the very noticeable lack of any cultural-focused nominations beyond just lip-service to tribally important areas were some of the most important. Discussions that looked at broader support for some sites certainly shaped my recommendations. I think the recognition that the current loss of kelp at a number of sites and the whole coast nomination focused on kelp restoration was also a key discussion point that brought home who individual sites were not going to address broader issues that deserved our attention.

Q12

3

Overall, how confident were you in your final recommendation decisions?

Q13

What, if anything, could have increased your confidence in your final recommendations?

I think the 2 sites that were advanced as recommended for designation were solid proposals. The numerous sites that were put in the continuing consultation category which came about virtually at the last meeting of the process (not ideal planning or process management) is where my confidence is lessened. I know this won't be the last opportunity to examine new sites or to modify sites so I take heart that we learned a lot and that the public that bore a heavy load in all this, also learned a lot.

Q14

Given a revised process with a longer timeline for evaluation, what would be a reasonable number of proposals for future evaluators to evaluate in each proposal cycle? Why?

I don't have a good number in mind but I doubt that there will be a formal working group, more likely a subcommittee of OPAC, so likely no more than 5 sites will be max they can evaluate effectively. Also there needs to be more time for interaction with proposers to get the designations right and to provide timely responses from agencies.

Q15

Consultation with the agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. In what ways would inclusion of initial consultation have potentially influenced your evaluations? Why?

Initial consultation would hopefully had a positive effect on addressing the actual need and primary interest in any particular site designation. I think we would have had better proposals if we had up front working meetings with proposers.

Q16

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified from the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues, etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues are addressed?

These are clearly agency issues that OPAC should be calling for more agency focus and funding to address. Agencies should also recognize that should not need to be told that they are responsible for managing sites, natural values and existing regulations such that they should be including more resources in the budgets and workplans to address these elements.

Q17

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

This is hard work. 25 years is too long a time to fine tune the TSP. Coastal habitats deserve more closer attention in the future as climate change and shifting population demographics of our state will put more strain on these critical areas. and finally, mere designation is not sufficient to insure that we can begin to meet conservation needs.

Q18

Is there anything else you would like to share?

I really appreciate the hard work that everyone on the working group put into this effort. And I especially appreciate all that agency staff contributed plus the super extra effort that Charlie put in as head of the process. Finally I want to recognize the interest and effort of the public in this process. We made a lot of demands on the public under very challenging circumstances and they showed great drive working towards the common goal of protection our rocky habitats in Oregon. The public deserves our appreciation for their work.

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:23:46 PM
Last Modified: Monday, June 28, 2021 8:32:31 AM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 174.204.214.115

Page 1

Q1

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you spent on the following tasks?

| | |
|--|----|
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal development stage (Jun-Dec 2020)? | 10 |
| Reading/evaluating proposals? | 30 |
| Reading/evaluating supporting materials submitted with the proposals? | 20 |
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal evaluation stage (Jan-Apr 2021)? | 4 |

Q2

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value most when considering your recommendation decision? Why?

The application itself as it was the most relevant. Next was the agency analysis.

Q3

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value least when considering your recommendation decisions? Why?

The support letters that were form letters were not as valuable.

Q4

What were the most challenging elements of the proposals to evaluate? Why? Should these elements be revised or removed from future iterations of the process? Why?

The scientific criteria were hard to evaluate as I am not a scientist so I relied on the agencies. Don't remove, it is important.

Q5

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

Continue to consider the science of course.

Q6

What elements of the proposal materials surprised you the most?

The ranking process was not well done. The way we voted and recommended or did not recommend could use some serious rethinking.

Q7

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

There was too much uncertainty in how the ranking was developed. Let the working group come up with how we would rank proposals.

Q8

What were the most important elements of the evaluation process that helped you make your recommendation decisions? Why?

The well done applications and agency evaluations we the most helpful.

Q9

What, if any, elements of the proposals were largely or completely absent that would have made your recommendation decisions easier?

Not enough recreational use data. I think there are holes in that information.

Q10

In what ways did the findings of the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis aid your recommendation decisions?

It helped me understand the agency viewpoints, but sometimes I was not clear in whether they just did not want to do more work or whether they actually thought these sites would not be successful. Too much agency dependence on there being volunteer groups to do the work.

Q11

What were the most influential aspects of the Working Group discussions on your recommendation decisions?

The discussions before voting.

Q12

4

Overall, how confident were you in your final recommendation decisions?

Q13

What, if anything, could have increased your confidence in your final recommendations?

The voting process could have been better.

Q14

Given a revised process with a longer timeline for evaluation, what would be a reasonable number of proposals for future evaluators to evaluate in each proposal cycle? Why?

8 seems reasonable

Q15

Consultation with the agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. In what ways would inclusion of initial consultation have potentially influenced your evaluations? Why?

I believe there was some consultation. Make it more clear though. Have proposers go through an agency process before work group members get them.

Q16

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified from the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues, etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues are addressed?

The agencies like State Parks absolutely need more rangers in the field talking with visitors. They also need the power to do citations if they don't. Also, state money could be combined with with tourism monies to do messaging.

Q17

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Clear guidelines for decision making is important. Strong facilitation is important. Ample public input is crucial.

Q18

Is there anything else you would like to share?

Not right now.

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, June 28, 2021 2:09:14 PM
Last Modified: Monday, June 28, 2021 3:45:58 PM
Time Spent: 01:36:43
IP Address: 159.121.202.137

Page 1

Q1

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you spent on the following tasks?

| | |
|--|------------|
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal development stage (Jun-Dec 2020)? | 10 |
| Reading/evaluating proposals? | 160 |
| Reading/evaluating supporting materials submitted with the proposals? | 5 |
| Interacting with proposers during the proposal evaluation stage (Jan-Apr 2021)? | 10 |

Q2

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value most when considering your recommendation decision? Why?

I valued most the following sections:

- 1) regulatory management measures
- 2) non-regulatory management measures
- 3) explanation of stakeholder engagement

The management measures are the most important part of the proposals and the primary elements that are implemented after the site is designated. Stakeholder engagement is a key component of the process, and there needs to be robust engagement to understand public acceptance and/or concerns about the proposal.

Q3

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value least when considering your recommendation decisions? Why?

Long descriptions of the resources at the site. Long and repetitive descriptions of the goals and objectives. In general, there was a great deal of repetition in the proposals.

Q4

What were the most challenging elements of the proposals to evaluate? Why? Should these elements be revised or removed from future iterations of the process? Why?

Many proposals were unclear when describing proposed regulations, often leaving it open to alternative interpretations. The regulatory aspects of the proposals are extremely important, yet that section of the proposals is buried down as item 3.a. of the regulations and enforcement section. It needs to be a separate section on par with the non-regulatory management section with instructions that ensure clear descriptions.

On-going support descriptions for education/stewardship programs - We need to decide if proof of on-going support is needed for a proposal to be viable. This was always vague and working group members had different opinions about this.

Q5

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

The response to the previous question answers this.

Q6

What elements of the proposal materials surprised you the most?

The length and level of detail of the proposals surprised me the most. I was also surprised by the number of regulatory ideas that were not really implementable as proposed.

Q7

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

For future iterations, we need to change the content questions to eliminate repetition, and set an overall page limit on the proposals. The issue of non-implementable regulations could be addressed by having proposers work with agencies during the proposal process.

Q8

What were the most important elements of the evaluation process that helped you make your recommendation decisions? Why?

Drawing on knowledge of working group members concerning the site's needs, condition, uses, etc. helped confirm (or discredit) and add to the descriptions in the proposal. This was an important part of my decision making process. In addition, examining the site in the larger landscape of rocky habitat and existing protections helped me make decisions because this was important in determining the need for a designation within the site's regional context. This is something that is not addressed in the proposals and perhaps surprised some of the proposers when we brought that element into the decision process.

Q9

What, if any, elements of the proposals were largely or completely absent that would have made your recommendation decisions easier?

- 1) Description of the need for regulatory measures, including how the proposed measure solves the natural resource issue.
 - 2) Analysis of the site in a landscape context, including the landscape of habitat, landscape of uses, and landscape of existing management.
-

Q10

In what ways did the findings of the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis aid your recommendation decisions?

Hearing the other agencies' perspectives and concerns was an essential part of my decision making.

Q11

What were the most influential aspects of the Working Group discussions on your recommendation decisions?

Other agencies concerns and perspectives.

Q12

4

Overall, how confident were you in your final recommendation decisions?

Q13

What, if anything, could have increased your confidence in your final recommendations?

More clarity on the consensus and voting process. The first process during the draft recommendations was very confusing and evolved/changed during the process. The second process for the final recommendations was better but still lacked clarity and seemed to change subtly during the process.

Q14

Given a revised process with a longer timeline for evaluation, what would be a reasonable number of proposals for future evaluators to evaluate in each proposal cycle? Why?

It should be limited to about 4 proposals. Perhaps more than 4 start the process, but the agency-proposer interaction makes it clear that some are not viable sites.

Q15

Consultation with the agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. In what ways would inclusion of initial consultation have potentially influenced your evaluations? Why?

I think we wouldn't have needed to have a recommendation about the 6 sites for further evaluation. The agency consultation process (assuming it works) would have made some of those proposals suitable for immediate recommendation and make it clear that others were not viable.

Q16

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified from the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues, etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues are addressed?

Capacity needs to be addressed with increased agency funding. Wildlife disturbance issues are complex and would required a multifaceted approach. On-site interpreters and education programs would help alleviate some of the disturbance. The more sites with on-site staff, the better. In areas where a general education-oriented program doesn't reduce disturbance to acceptable levels, the details of the disturbance and impacts need to be documented and site-specific solutions developed.

Q17

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

People are passionate about protection of the coast. We need to develop a process that directs that passion toward real world solutions.

Q18

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 07, 2021 9:24:59 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 07, 2021 10:18:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:53:04
IP Address: 159.121.119.8

Page 1

Q1

Approximately how many hours would you estimate you spent on the following tasks?

Interacting with proposers during the proposal development stage (Jun-Dec 2020)?

0 - I believe some proposers spoke with other staff members so many a few hours from the agency.

Reading/evaluating proposals?

30 - 50 hours plus working group meetings (this is a guess - I didn't track my time and had some help from other staff in the initial review to support the feasibility analysis. There was also time spent discussing sites at meetings within the agency.)

Reading/evaluating supporting materials submitted with the proposals?

5-10 hours (guess)

Interacting with proposers during the proposal evaluation stage (Jan-Apr 2021)?

Just at meetings - plus one short phone call (15 mins) with a proposer

Q2

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value most when considering your recommendation decision? Why?

Materials that supported the agency feasibility analysis. As an agency there were certain aspect that I needed to consider in terms of implementation.

Q3

Which elements of the proposal materials did you value least when considering your recommendation decisions? Why?

Materials that were outside of my agency's scope of expertise.

Q4

What were the most challenging elements of the proposals to evaluate? Why? Should these elements be revised or removed from future iterations of the process? Why?

Elements about the groups ability to achieve the goals of the site. It is outside of my agency's scope and expertise to determine the merit of a proposer.

Q5

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

These elements may be important to others in the review process. A streamlined agency feasibility review should be established that focuses on relevant information to each managing agency. It may be advisable to allow each agency to craft questions that they believe need to be answered in order to support their independent review. Agencies should also have an avenue to ask clarifying questions of the proposers during the review process.

Q6

What elements of the proposal materials surprised you the most?

The quantity of materials that were submitted. Robust proposals were very interesting to read, however, little of the submitted information was actually necessary in terms of conducting my agency feasibility analysis. Again, this information may be valuable to others but was not necessary to determine if site implementation was feasible.

Q7

How should future iterations of the process treat these elements you listed in the previous question? Why?

This information could be used to support long term coast-wide planning which may be advisable. OPAC may find value in additional planning in the future to prioritize sites that may warrant additional protections. This planning exercise may support a streamlined approach to rocky shores management, to avoid designating every rock on the coast or to prevent continued review of the same sites/resubmittal of the site proposals.

Q8

What were the most important elements of the evaluation process that helped you make your recommendation decisions? Why?

Elements that discussed management tools, regulatory and non-regulatory. These were the elements that allowed for the completion of the feasibility analysis.

Q9

What, if any, elements of the proposals were largely or completely absent that would have made your recommendation decisions easier?

Not from the proposals themselves but from the process. Open communication and the ability to ask clarifying questions.

Q10

In what ways did the findings of the Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis aid your recommendation decisions?

Key feasibility findings helped to demonstrate what was not legal or within the ability of an agency.

Q11

What were the most influential aspects of the Working Group discussions on your recommendation decisions?

My recommendation was based on the feasibility analysis or to reach "consensus" in the process.

Q12

Respondent skipped this question

Overall, how confident were you in your final recommendation decisions?

Q13

What, if anything, could have increased your confidence in your final recommendations?

Clearer buckets and a clear understanding of what recommendations meant.

Q14

Given a revised process with a longer timeline for evaluation, what would be a reasonable number of proposals for future evaluators to evaluate in each proposal cycle? Why?

I am not sure how we would limit the number of public submissions unless we are soliciting for specific sites or had a plan for prioritizing certain areas. I assume all proposals that did not move forward will be resubmitted during the maintenance period. Given a longer evaluation period and streamlined process all site could be reviewed. Instead of limiting submissions, I would suggest engaging in additional planning. This will be helpful to avoid rereviewing the same proposals / sites.

Q15

Consultation with the agency representatives and Working Group members has been proposed as a necessary element to include in future iterations of the process, prior to full proposal development. In what ways would inclusion of initial consultation have potentially influenced your evaluations? Why?

I think it would have been helpful and added clarity to the intent of a proposal. There likely would have been less elements that were not feasible and avoided long public meets where we speculated about intent.

Q16

Several cross-cutting or coastwide issues were identified from the proposals (e.g. wildlife disturbances, lack of public education/awareness, capacity issues, etc.) that are ubiquitous in many rocky habitat regions of the coast, and are likely to persist to some extent indefinitely as populations, coastal tourism, and recreation grow. How would you recommend these issues are addressed?

I think there should be conversations about a coast-wide approach to address specific issues. I think that consistency would help the public and streamline the process to avoid rulemaking for individual sites.

Q17

What would you say are the most important lessons learned through your participation in this process?

Adaptive management is critical to the creation of a workable process. Adaptive management will also need to continue into the future to improve the process.

Q18

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything else you would like to share?
