

## OPAC TERRITORIAL SEA PLAN WORKING GROUP

April 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 the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy text and prepare for the next steps in the Territorial Sea Plan amendment process.

### 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.

- 1:00 pm**      **Welcome and Introductions**
- 1:05 pm**      **Meeting Goals & Process Overview**
- 1:15 pm**      **Public Comment**
- 1:30 pm**      **Tribal Nations Comment**
- 1:45 pm**      **30-day public comment period overview**
- 2:15 pm**      **Rocky Habitat Management Strategy updates**  
**(Break as needed)**
- 2:45 pm**      **Proposal recommendation process discussion**
- 4:30 pm**      **Public Comment**
- 4:45 pm**      **Tribal Nations Comment**
- 5:00 pm**      **Adjourn**

### MEETING LOGISTICS

**Date & Time:** April 26, 2021, 1:00 – 5:00 PM Pacific Time

**Location:** Meeting was conducted via web meeting.

**Meeting Recording:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LzIFUZEG6NY>

**Meeting Materials:** <https://www.oregonocean.info/index.php/opac-documents/workinggroups/tspwg-p3/2021-april-26>

#### **Participants:**

**Working Group Members** – Andy Lanier, Kerry Morgan, Tom Calvanese, Laurel Hillmann, Walter Chuck, Shawn Stephenson, Dave Fox, Dave Lacey, Dick Vander Schaaf, Charlie Plybon, Andrea Celentano

**Other Panelists** – Michael Moses, Patty Snow

**Public Participants** – Larry Basch, Joe Liebezeit, Dawn Villaescusa, Jason Miner, Bob Main, Jim Carlson, Susan Chambers, David Yamamoto, Cherie Eichbaum, Jamie Fereday, Elizabeth Ruther, Nora Sherwood, Tara Brock, Joseph Youren, Shelby Walker, Steve Griffiths

### SUMMARY

The meeting opened with an overview of the Territorial Sea Plan amendment and proposal evaluation processes, led by DLCD staff. An overview of the results of the 30-day public comment period was then provided, which included breakdowns of support by proposal, organization, and location. Next, the Working

Group reviewed and discussed the most recent track-changes draft of the [Rocky Habitat Management Strategy \(Strategy\)](#). The Working Group flagged several items in the text and requested changes DLCD staff make changes to descriptive text in the Regulatory Standards and Management Practices table (Section D). DLCD staff recommended forwarding the Strategy text for OPAC review, while also recommending delaying revisions to the proposal process and questionnaire form (Section E, Appendix C) until the fall 2021 OPAC meeting, to allow sufficient time for review and engagement with proposers and the public. DLCD staff also recommended delaying the planned October 1, 2021 start date of the Maintenance Proposal Process. Following deliberation, the Working Group reached consensus on forwarding the Strategy Draft, the process revision delay, and recommended setting a new tentative start date for the Maintenance Proposal Process of October 1, 2022.

Next, DLCD staff provided a walk-through of consensus and voting procedures proposed for use in crafting the Working Group's final rocky habitat proposal recommendations. The procedures were derived from the standard OPAC consensus and voting protocols. DLCD staff then proposed the Working Group add a second consensus and vote-taking step to potentially remand proposals that did not receive a recommendation for "continuing consultation". A continued consultation process would engage proposers, agency representatives, and Working Group members (based upon willingness and OPAC support) for additional consultation to address considerations identified in site proposals reviews, with the potential for proposal resubmission in the spring 2022 OPAC meeting. Proposals that do not receive recommendation and are not remanded for continuing consultation, would then be assigned a status of "*not recommended*". Consensus on the DLCD recommendation to utilize the continuing consultation pathway for proposals was objected to, and a motion to vote was carried by the majority of the Working Group. In doing so, the Working Group committed to providing OPAC with a 3-tiered system for the site proposal recommendation that was either: 1) Recommended; 2) Does not recommend, but supports continuing consultation, or; 3) Not Recommended.

The meeting 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 identified in the process such as support for statewide coordination of interpretive programs, site monitoring, and site proposal development.