



You are here.

## Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis

This guide is intended to facilitate the agency review of rocky habitat site management designation proposals during the Initial Proposal Period of the Territorial Sea Plan – Part Three amendment process. Proposals will be assessed for completeness to determine if all necessary information has been included in the proposal, and that it is sufficient in nature to conduct agency review. Agency representatives (e.g. ODFW, OPRD, DSL, DLCD, or others based on the details of individual proposals) will then provide analyses of the practical feasibility of implementing the proposal under relevant agency authority and jurisdiction, including alignment with the goals and policies of the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy.<sup>1</sup>

Following agency analyses, proposals will be ruled as **accepted** or **rejected**. Accepted proposals will advance to the Rocky Habitat Working Group for merit-based evaluation. Rejected proposals will not move forward in the review process, but may be revised and resubmitted as a new proposal. OCMP staff will also forward proposals to federally-recognized Oregon Tribal Nations with interests in the coastal zone<sup>2</sup>, and may 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 may be duplicative with 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:

<sup>1</sup> TSP3 Sections E. 3. & 4. Step 2 – Agency Feasibility & Completeness Analysis

<sup>2</sup> Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, Coquille Indian Tribe, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, and Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians



## 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:

## Proposal Completeness

Please answer each of the following questions as it relates to the completeness of the proposal.

1. Is the proposal complete? 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.
2. Have sufficient data, information, and/or other relevant materials been provided in order to facilitate proper review and evaluation of the proposed designation?
3. Is a rationale provided for any incomplete or missing information?

4. Does the proposal consist of one place-based submission? (A small network of designated sites is acceptable, provided they are all the same designation category.)

## Feasibility Analyses

Please provide a brief analysis of the feasibility of proposal implementation as it relates to each of the following areas within the scope of your agency's mission.

**Agency Jurisdiction.** Consider broadly how the proposal fits in with factors such as your agency goals, strategic plan, management/regulatory authority, etc.

**Implementation.** What are the practical and logistical implications or limitations of your agency implementing the proposed site management?

**Programmatic and Budgetary Impacts.** How will implementing this proposal affect your agency's programmatic work? What are the estimated costs or budgetary impacts as you see them (approximately)?

**Landscape Management.** How would designating this site fit into the broader context of coastwide management, such as the currently designated rocky habitat sites or the Marine Reserves Program?

**Administrative Rule and Enforcement.** What are the implications as you see them for any requisite changes to rules and regulations, and the ability of your agency to enforce them at the proposed site?

**Territorial Sea Plan.** In what ways does the proposal align with the goals and policies of the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy?

**Other Considerations.** Are there additional site considerations that should be noted? (e.g. size, shape, placement, or designation category of the proposed site; historical or institutional context; established relationships with communities, organizations, the public at large, or Tribal Nations; etc.)



### 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 recommendation. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

DRAFT