

2006 Conference Workshop Responses

“Oregon’s Ocean: Linking the Science to Policy”

Issue: MARINE RESERVES

If Oregon were to establish Marine Reserves in state waters, what criteria would you suggest be used for their design and location?

Table 1:

- Most of the following comments also apply to marine reserves.
- Premise: the ocean is a public good and all citizens’ values and ocean uses/needs must be considered. Fishing industry or any industry (coastal or otherwise) should not be dominant.
- Premise: do no harm, start with inclusion of entire Oregon ocean as valuable and justified for protection. Then nominate areas to exclude from protection for fishing, other industry, and recreational uses. You need to maintain integrity of the whole system with careful consideration of what you remove from the natural system (you can remove one kidney but not both) and still ensure vitality/health.
- Policy convergence of top down (science based, agencies, government policy, guideposts direction with stakeholder bottom-up influence,(All interests represented) Lots to deliberate.
- Compensation for economic losses and sensitivity to families and cultural heritage.
- Compensation of \$40 million to commercial fishing; this is small relative to state’s \$6 billion budget. It’s very important to consider impacts to fishing fleet via compensation and economic transition. But a healthy ocean’s value is in the billions/trillions and should not be sacrificed for a \$40 million interest. (Fishing’s representation is too dominant relative to its own power.)
- How much of the \$40 is from state waters vs. federal waters landings? Is commercial fishing in state waters a significant industry?
- Ocean use/exploitation is not an entitlement.
- Compatible uses and all values/uses must be regarded; increase the integrity of the whole system to ensure ocean health and sustainable uses of many services.

Table 2:

- Protect representative habitats.
- Protect distinct genetic populations.
- Protect/consider local current residues, upwelling jets, etc. Factor recruitment into thinking.
- Evaluate the MLPA science criteria and consider applying them.
- Create a process that clearly involves diverse stakeholders.
- Have a science panel that presents the latest science to stakeholder group and the public.
- Use a process that generates multiple options.
- Find funding.
- Locate then where scientists can actually get to them to monitor their effectiveness.
- Provide measures for enforcement.
- Look for locations that have actively managed watersheds to reduce that impact on the reserves.

Table 3:

- Establish baseline information.

- Flexibility to local conditions.
- Consideration of fisheries.
- Include diversity of habitat.
- Research investment is necessary to evaluate effectiveness.
- Have clear goals and objectives.
- Adaptable to conservation needs and communities needs.
- Include monitoring and evaluation component.

Table 4:

- Essential fish habitat (as established by PMCC).
- Invertebrate protection.
- Criteria that would be conjunctive and supportive to estuary nurseries and areas near estuaries to keep them vibrant and healthy.
- Include non point and point source impacts on key areas considering as reserves.
- Areas that are at risk for pollution or future threats should be protected now.
- Protect key habitats and an array of marine ecosystems. Make some of the rocky intertidal areas into full reserves.

Table 5:

- Economics: reach objectives with least overall cost/trade-off analysis.
- Implement as ecological reference areas protecting representative ecosystems and habitats (shallow and deep).
 - (1) GIS: resources/uses/threats/habitats.
 - (2) Clear goals and objectives – stakeholders and public education.
 - (3) Natural and social science-based alternative designs (e.g. MARXAN program)
 - (4) sufficient time and money for monitoring and adaptive management.
- Include unique areas including “dead zone” reference areas.

Table 6:

- Criteria:
 - (1) Equitable with respect to other uses such as fishing areas.
 - (2) Monitoring of reserves to determine its impact.
 - (3) Incremental implementation and analysis.
 - (4) Devise benchmarks to evaluate over time.
 - (5) Adequate funding for research, monitoring, and enforcement and evaluation.
 - (6) Determine the objective/purpose for a particular marine reserve.

Table 7:

- Local community approval and public endorsement.
- Educational process.
- Needs to protect marine biodiversity—identify key areas to protect including 0 – 25 stewardship area.

Table 8:

- Marine reserves should be small and located in sites where effectiveness can be evaluated.
- Need to show local people, including fishermen, that they would be benefited.

Table 9:

- Consider all ecosystem/habitat types with prior research into habitat types and how they are used by species.
- Identify and focus on areas that are used least now - keep the pristine high energy surf zones warrant particular consideration.
- Prioritize sites sensitive for other reasons e.g. Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge.
- Consider estuaries as part of the MR siting criteria (and then duck).
- Reference to sites as 'set-asides' is counterproductive rhetoric - give them special credit for ecological products/services they produce.

Table 10:

- Places where you can regenerate fisheries (nurseries).
- Most 'broken' places (in ecosystem terms). Look at what could rebound the most if protected.
- Figure out why problem exists and describe why a reserve is needed.
- Base fisheries data.
- Work to retain fisheries; minimize impact on industry.
 - **IDEA: overlap MRA with areas already closed.
 - **Create Oregon coast vision statement.
- Educate on different types of MRAs.
- Foster community dialogs and develop ongoing information stream (Blog).

Table 11:

- Represent habitat across the regions.
- Look at Colombia River Plume (?); look at Rocky Headlands; look at sandy beaches and pick some as a start.
- You need to be selective; sample seafloor habitats and geology.
- Some should be limited take.
- Need to consider other activities like cables that may need to go in.
- There are no unperturbed sites, need to put them in some fishing areas.
- Testing approach: do some then do more, modify, etc.
- Long term: give it time to work.
- Geographical spread—not just one area.
- Select a whole variety of habitat types.
- Start with a handful.
- It needs to be clear why some areas are no-take and others aren't.
- Zoning.
- You need to consider all of the above in a coordinated plan where the State acts first.

Table 12:

- Put it near a Coast Guard Station so it could be patrolled.
- It should generate good scientific research.
- A reserve is preferable to a sanctuary—gives full protection.
- It should start at the shoreline.
- It should include land (watershed) and estuaries.
- It should provide a diversity of marine habitats.

Table 13:

- Control/Size/Location.
- How to reach stakeholders.
- No Federal Reserve Program.
- Alternative to Marine Reserves?
- Expand to more than just fish issues.
- More resources needed.
- Placement/Location.
 - Science based.
 - Stakeholder (specifically fishermen).
 - Goal/Objective (Biodiversity/Fisheries Management.
 - Away from ports and Prime fishing grounds.
 - Sport/Recreation uses.
 - Percentage of Ecosystem designated as reserve?
 - Share Information/Communication.
 - How to have non-polarizing conversations.

Table 14:

- Should be driven by science.
- Must be community based—like Port Orford Process.

Table 15: Criteria

- Must be representative of habitat.
- Less populous coastal areas should be used so as to minimize controversy and lesson economic impacts.
- Use a few areas that can be enforced located in larger areas.
- Use areas that are already in relatively healthy condition so we can see benefits more quickly.
- You need to know financial impact on high value fisheries; measure before and after impacts so you can measure change within and without.
- Consider linkage between land and sea and species that require land/sea resources.
- Don't depend on consensus; move forward. Industry should not dominate; the oceans are for everyone.
- Science should be used as the basis for decision making.
- Consider protection of other species besides fish (and their habitat).

Table 16:

- Need adequate funding.
- Need to protect especially endangered species.
- Need flexibility to adapt to changes in ocean conditions.
- Need to pay attention to complementary or competing oceans uses (e.g. wave energy sites).
- Need monitoring to make science based decisions.
- Need to engage all stakeholders, get fishing community to the table.
- Shouldn't focus only on state areas- need to have federal waters as part of the equation.
- Follow the ecological features.
- Oregonians need to maintain control.
- Reserves can help protect the public interest and trust in offshore areas.