

Rocky Habitat Site Designation Proposal Evaluation Guide

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



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 designation 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 may modify the recommendation prior to submitting 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 largely correspond with the different sections of the proposal form. Use of this 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 of interpretation among reviewers currently, and over time. 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.

For each of the criteria below, indicate your selection and add notes as you see fit.

Criteria	Does not meet criteria	Has merit, needs work	Meets criteria
Goals, objectives, or other criteria for site success should be clearly stated and reasonably achievable.			

<p>Measurable results and outcomes should be reasonably measurable and achievable.</p>			
<p>Site Uses should be characterized appropriately, with reasonable expectations for potential impacts.</p>			
<p>Key Natural Resources, should be characterized appropriately, including features, values, and anticipated impacts.</p>			
<p>Regulations & Enforcement should be clearly stated with reasonable expectations.</p>			
<p>Non-Regulatory Management Mechanisms should be clearly stated with reasonable expectations.</p>			

<p>Stakeholder Engagement should be characterized appropriately, and include clear and actionable outreach.</p>			
<p>Additional Information should provide relevant context.</p>			
<p>Goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3 should be adequately addressed and/or advanced.</p>			
<p>Designation and associated changes to regulatory standards or and management practices should be appropriate for the site and reasonably effective to achieve the stated goals.</p>			

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.

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 supporting 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 priorities or needs 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 priorities or 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 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. Is there any relevant historical or institutional context to this proposed site designation that should be taken into consideration?
9. 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?
10. 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?
11. How might this site designation interact or fit in with the broader coastwide regulatory and management context of all habitats, resources, and designations?
12. What, if any, practical feasibility concerns might you have about implementing the proposed site designation?
13. What are the organizational partnerships involved in this proposal? In what ways have those partnerships contributed to development of this proposal?
14. Are there any additional materials or documents provided? If so, what are they and what is their purpose?
15. Are there any additional site considerations that should be noted?

Site Attributes and Reports

Geography

16. 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

17. 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.
18. In what ways does the proposal appropriately address, reflect, or account for the risks associated with potential future sea level rise scenarios?

Biological

19. How well represented by the proposed polygon sketch are the species and/or habitats of interest that are mentioned in the proposal?
20. How appropriate is the selected designation category and stated goals for the protection of the species and/or habitats of interest?
21. 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

22. What are the most likely human use activities to impact, or be impacted by, the selected designation category and the stated goals? Has the proposer demonstrated how they expect these uses to change in the future?
23. 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?
24. 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 recommendation. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

DRAFT