

# Rocky Habitat Proposal Working Group Evaluation

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 materials 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 packet of materials to OPAC for review. The following summary is an aggregate of the rocky habitat proposal evaluations conducted by the Working Group in winter, 2021.

## Site Information

Proposed site location: [Coquille Point](#)

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: [Bill Stenberg](#)

Affiliated organization(s): [Shoreline Education for Awareness](#)

Date of proposal submission: [December 30, 2020](#)

## Evaluation Criteria Matrix

The following rubric is a simplified way to objectively evaluate key aspects of rocky habitat site designation proposals that can be assessed categorically. The criteria listed below largely correspond with each section of the proposal questionnaire form. This rubric should be used 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 across reviewers, and across proposals over time. While this matrix can aid in making final recommendations, as this is a merit-based process, 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 iterations of the evaluation process.

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
<b>Goals, objectives, or other criteria for site success</b> should be clearly stated and reasonably achievable.			X – Reasonable and practical; good goals (raise visitor awareness that it is a special place requiring special behavior); Kept goals/objectives narrow, simple, straightforward.
<b>Measurable results and outcomes</b> should be reasonably measurable and achievable.		X – Measures likely need additional clarity other than level of effort for enforcement; the proposer acknowledges limitations of measurable outcomes	
<b>Site Uses</b> should be characterized appropriately, with reasonable expectations for potential impacts.			X – High visitation/use with good volunteer program to sustain it. Stairs need to be repaired.

<p><b>Key Natural Resources</b>, should be characterized appropriately, including features, values, and anticipated impacts.</p>			<p>X – Summary is good, referenced good sources</p>
<p><b>Regulations &amp; Enforcement</b> should be clearly stated with reasonable expectations.</p>			<p>X – Established volunteer program with capacity and good track record; should clarify invertebrate harvest regs, subtidal application</p>
<p><b>Non-Regulatory Management Mechanisms</b> should be clearly stated with reasonable expectations.</p>			<p>X – Signage updates at access points, Elephant Rock; volunteers experienced and ready</p>
<p><b>Stakeholder Engagement</b> should be characterized appropriately, and include clear and actionable outreach.</p>			<p>X – Very well done, exemplary. The utility bill outreach strategy, engagement of Tribes, City of Bandon (simple, effective outreach), were appreciated</p>
<p><b>Additional Information</b> should provide relevant context.</p>			<p>X – Existing group, support and volunteers with proven track record like this should be the standard for all proposals to meet feasibility and completeness for their proposals; good acknowledgement of Tribal role in interpretation</p>

<p><b>Goals, objectives, management principles, and policies within TSP3</b> should be adequately addressed and/or advanced.</p>			<p>X – Proposal consistent with maintaining long-term sustainability and existing use</p>
<p><b>Designation and associated changes to regulatory standards or and management practices</b> should be appropriate for the site and reasonably effective to achieve the stated goals.</p>			<p>X – Site well-suited for Marine Garden designation</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.

## Working Group Evaluation Questions

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

### Marine Garden (Marine Education Area):

- a. What are the primary educational, recreational, or resource awareness priorities or needs at this site? **Goals:** to protect the ecological resources and biodiversity of Coquille Pt by encouraging lawful, appropriate human activities through education and outreach. raise awareness and convey the message to all users that this is a special place. It is a place where visitors can witness from a reasonable distance the miracle of marine life; where visitors can see close up the beauty of the diverse and abundant life in the area’s tide pools. It is a place that draws tens of thousands of visitors and provides them with memories and photos to thrill them forever **Needs** visitors can trample hundreds of tide pool creatures, chase birds from their nests, and cause female seals to abandon their pups on a regular basis.
- b. In what ways would the proposed site designation provide, protect, or enhance public education, enjoyment, access, and/or resource awareness? Help visitors learn about marine life and the wonders of nature. It will then also be clearly distinguished from being a “recreation area.” As such, with proper signage and increased visualization of the rules of conduct, coupled with more volunteers and greater local buy-in to help

protect the area, we can stop the activities that gradually destroy this marvelous rocky habitat. Recommends volunteer interpreters and signage for enhanced public awareness.

- c. Where feasible, in what ways does the proposal aim for or demonstrate equitable access, either visually or physically? No change to access to the site but active volunteers will assist visitor experiences. There is active management by USFWS for accessibility and the educational program and goals of the site articulate continued stewardship, protection and education for continued enjoyment, access and learning experiences.
2. Regarding the site map(s) provided:
  - a. Is the polygon appropriate for the location (e.g. size, shape, placement, etc.)? Yes. Very tight boundaries. Some questions about which rocks/sea stacks were intended to be included (rocks along western and northern boundaries, sea stacks on SW side). Science review and management logic may suggest that some minor boundary adjustments may be sensible.
  - b. Does it reflect the goals or intentions of the proposal? Yes
  - c. What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of this particular shape and placement? It's a high profile and use area - presents education/recreation/awareness opportunity and a conservation need. City of Bandon presents volunteer and financial capacity opportunity. USFWS wildlife overlap aligns with existing formal partnership and program. Great outreach to community and community buy-in. Good knowledge of site and site needs, good recognition where greatest impacts are occurring.
3. Are the goals and objectives of the proposal clearly stated, and what are their strengths and/or weaknesses? Goals and objectives were well-stated and clear. Some of the objectives may not have clearly measurable outcomes.
4. Will the proposed criteria to evaluate site goals, objectives, or success, be reasonably measurable or achievable? How effective will they be? The proposer acknowledges that measurements of success created by this designation as a Marine Garden are not easily determined by specific species criteria, however they present effort of outreach as efficacy and a measure of success. Based on the track record of the existing program and partnerships in this specific area and opportunity for capacity, new efforts under this designation are likely to be effective.
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? New rules limiting harvest of certain invertebrates. Likely minimal impact to existing users given opportunities for rocky habitat harvest to the north and the south. Invertebrate harvest should not extend to subtidal.

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? **Yes**
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.) **No**
8. Is there any relevant historical or institutional context to this proposed site designation that should be taken into consideration? **Surrounding USFWS Wildlife Refuge designations, Coquille Indian Tribe cultural uses**
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? **Protect ecological resources and biodiversity, encourage human activities through education and outreach; continued coordination and cooperation between the assorted local, state, federal, and Tribal governing bodies by getting them to focus on the entirety of this area.**
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? **USFWS National Wildlife Refuge islands overlap, well-linked – existing partnership presents support opportunity and leveraged capacity.**
  - b. What are the potential links, considerations, or conflicts between them? **See above, generally an opportunity.**
  - c. In what ways does this proposed site designation differ from other proposals that overlap or interact with it? **USFWS Refuge as a federal designation carries different rules and regulations however they are complimentary and goals consistent with that of proposed Marine Garden.**
11. How might this site designation interact or fit in with the broader coastwide regulatory and management context of all habitats, resources, and designations? **Fits well within broader coastal context. Fills a gap of protection north of Cape Blanco and south of Cape Perpetua – and important ecological zone.**
12. What, if any, practical feasibility concerns might you have about implementing the proposed site designation? **None. If any it is capacity and while there is minor concern for measurable criteria for site success, this is not a standard we hold current sites to. May at some time desire to be linked more closely to city of Bandon.**

13. What are the organizational partnerships involved in this proposal? In what ways have those partnerships contributed to development of this proposal? [Collaboration in developing this proposal included Portland Audubon, the Pew Charitable Trust, the South Coast Rocky Habitats Team, the Rocky Habitats Partners group, and the Coquille Indian Tribe.](#)
14. Are there any additional materials or documents provided? If so, what are they and what is their purpose? [No](#)
15. Are there any additional site considerations that should be noted? [No](#)

## 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. [Appropriate area focused on the intertidal extent of rocky habitat adjacent the USFWS National Wildlife Refuge Islands, discrete area allows for focused education, enforcement and general site monitoring.](#)

### 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. [This is an outstanding area of islands and varied wash rock and rocky intertidal area adjacent a sandy beach. Adjacent beach and general accessibility highly appropriate for site goals for education and site visitation.](#)
18. In what ways does the proposal appropriately address, reflect, or account for the risks associated with potential future sea level rise scenarios? [None stated](#)

### Biological

19. How well represented by the proposed polygon sketch are the species and/or habitats of interest that are mentioned in the proposal? [These were well represented based on available data in SeaSketch and provided within the proposal.](#)
20. How appropriate is the selected designation category and stated goals for the protection of the species and/or habitats of interest? [Highly appropriate – the site links continued use and education to supporting existing wildlife disturbance measures, efforts to protect the biodiversity of the intertidal area, reduce trampling, etc.](#)
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? [No](#)

### 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? Education and visitor intercept/awareness. Harvest of a limited number of invertebrate species, however these opportunities exist a short distance to the north and the south. The proposer demonstrates knowledge of existing uses and likely impacts.
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? Intertidal areas and connection to existing island refuges highly appropriate for stated goals of education and protection. Some of the western and northwestern boundary may not be necessary for stated goals, however increasing and evolving water-based activities (stand-up paddle, kayak, etc.) are making these intertidal and wash rocks more accessible.
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? No. The proposer addresses outreach and engagement with Tribal Nations, however consultation may be necessary to ensure designation is coordinated with the rights and cultural interests of tribal nations.

### Evaluator Comments and Feedback

In the space below, please provide a (brief) summary of the merits of the proposal, and rationale for recommendation. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

This was a very straightforward and thoughtful proposal. Its simplicity made for an easy review, especially as it both aligned with the existing designation management framework *and* overall designation goal. This proposal does a decent job of defining a site with the appropriate designation and has a ready volunteer workforce to do the work proposed already. The site fits the category well, and will benefit from the designation too. A lot about this proposal makes good sense for a Marine Garden, the goals are achievable, the local community has a well-established track record of existing site-specific programs and formal site-specific partnerships with USFWS. Simple, but effective outreach strategies. The designation and proposal recommendation works within the existing management and administrative rule framework which makes it highly implementable and achievable. While there could be better metrics stated for the measuring the outcomes from designation, I think that with some agency guidance the proposers and the site will be successful as the rocky habitat program is intended. To meet the education, NRMM, enforcement, volunteer and financial support goals, we must use this group as the standard that needs to already be in place to accurately be able to assess the feasibility and completeness of other proposals. Strongly recommend for Working Group recommendation to OPAC and formal designation as a Marine Garden.