

# 2006 CONFERENCE WORKSHOP RESPONSES

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

## Issue: NATIONAL SANCTUARY

How would you advise the Governor on his proposal for an Oregon Coast National Marine Sanctuary?

### Table 1:

- The governor should expedite OPAC process by virtue of his authority—he needs to provide money, staff, and resources to facilitate results.
- Lack of governor’s leadership is an obstacle to progress.
- Coordinate sanctuaries with Washington and California Governors to ensure an Oregon NMS would provide support to Channel Islands and Olympic NMS/planning.
- Regard the sanctuary as a regional ocean system with coordination, objectives and goals.

### Table 2:

- He must do the public scoping process—make presentations about the sanctuary concept; get ideas about how it should be sized (not just “love it” vs. “hate it”).
- Hold scoping meetings *inland* and along coast; it’s the state’s coast, the state’s potential sanctuary.
- We need to produce maps of habitat area, and human use areas. *And* must get the coastal habitat mapping initiative off the ground.
- The ecosystem-based approach is the right one.
- The coast-wide approach (the *entire* coast of Oregon) creates too many problems; it is too big. But there are many options that could be considered that are oriented around important ecological areas in Oregon.
- Find the compelling ecological stories and evaluate a possible sanctuary over each of them, not the whole coast.

### Table 3:

- A National Marine Sanctuary will provide access to federal funds but also federal authority.
- A question is: Under a NMS would Oregon have autonomy and flexibility to incorporate: fisheries; marine reserves (OPAC), local communities and goals.

### Table 4:

- Start with a marine reserves from Pt Gregory to Cape Arago with maybe five reserves.
- Create a sanctuary, with a system of reserves within, but these not publicly accepted just reserves where you get more bang for buck.
- Start with reserves then later build a sanctuary around them though there could be conflict between state and federal.
- Prior to making or defining a marine protective area ensure public buy-in through extensive educational program using scientific studies on pros and cons of establishing MPAs.
- It’s important to provide general public input, not just stakeholders.
- They should not be based on total consensus but based on science to address needs weighed against issues.

## **Table 5:**

### Pros:

- Brings federal funding and national recognition.
- Promotes EBM and ocean stewardship.
- Needs much more stakeholder input included.
- Has clear goals and management plan.
- Good for prohibiting oil drilling and ocean mining.

### Cons:

- Proposed size is too big and unrealistic.
- No clear goals for it yet
- The differences between NMS and marine reserves (MRs) unclear and confuse public; need to clearly integrate NMS and MRs with clear goals and objectives for both.
- Listen to natural and social scientists regarding goals and objectives.

## **Table 6:**

- A Marine Sanctuary for the whole coast is a 'non-starter.'
- Criteria should be equitable in respect to other uses such as fishing interests.
- If concerned about oil/gas then focus on those areas specifically.
- There is concern over state participation in decisions.

## **Table 7:**

- How far upstream would a NMS designation protect water quality? Jurisdictions must be clarified.
- Build on existing research sites.
- Our discussion group is still unclear ON MANAGEMENT... WHO IS IN REAL CONTROL?
- We support more funding for research.

## **Table 8:**

- Local input is necessary for a coast-wide NMS, especially on the South Coast where we don't have OPEC representation.
- We don't need a strengthened NOAA with another set of regulatory hurdles to overcome in order to get anything accomplished.
- A sanctuary may be necessary to protect ocean environment from intrusive activities like sea-mining, oil/gas exploitation, etc. but should preserve/encourage activities like fishing.

## **Table 9:**

- A border to border (CA –WA) sanctuary would essentially cede OR coastal waters to Federal Government; therefore shrink proposal or drop proposal.
- Major concern is loss of local control.
- If NMS ... then Governor K should demand strong OR leadership over sanctuary Governing Board.
- Pursue NMS only if does not cede local control to Fed Govt.
- Large NMS—requires plan to have more activities. A smaller NMS can be more restrictive.
- Provide for accommodations for fiber-optic cable landings.

### **Table 10:**

- Let the public see the options and experiences of other sanctuaries.
- Keep on talking about it.
- Try to take away fears and myths.
- Continue to work out federal/state relationship on management.
- Highlight the educational opportunities that can happen with NMS.
- Find best example of a NMS and use it to develop Oregon's option(s).
- IDEAS: Thankyouocean.org campaign in CA. Work with youth to get the idea going.

### **Table 11:**

- A sanctuary has to fit Oregon—must match local needs but it is a viable idea.
- Governor wants autonomy and Federal money—can it be negotiated?
- Yes, we should have one.
- Must be a state thing, not a county thing; Governor should seek funding.
- State should look at reserves first then maybe a sanctuary offshore but just a portion.
- Current structure of sanctuary program does not meet governor's desire for local control.
- Perhaps a smaller scale would work.
- Need to make a stronger case than CA and WA one.
- Is there a special place?
- Dead Zones? Can a sanctuary help them?
- Scientists and users could look at biology and seamounts/banks and connectivity and pick a representative assemblage.

### **Table 12:**

- (All participants at this table) are in favor of a sanctuary.
- Possible Federal money is good.
- There are concerns about the manager being able to overrule an advisory committee.

### **Table 13:**

- Control/Size/Location?
- Clarify Marine Sanctuary from governor.
- Clarify/define State, Local federal roles.
- Guarantee State control?
- Another layer of bureaucracy.
- Fisheries expand beyond territorial sea.
- Guarantee minimal impact on fisheries.
- Define Oregon model.
- Need more resources/capacity to educate/outreach.
- Input from those affected.

### **Table 14:**

- A sanctuary is a good idea.
- The governor must, however, back up to where he should have started—work with scientists, local governments and stakeholders to scope out a new plan that has local and inland support (the oceans belong to everyone in the state) and is of appropriate scale.

**Table 15:**

- Start smaller to work kinks out.
- It should be non-political-not managed by governor—policies should be consistent and laid down effectively so that they don't change with each governor.
- Start bigger with different management areas on the whole coast—too difficult to go back to the public many times.
- More education of public on marine sanctuary is needed.

**Table 16:**

- Get whatever we can get—a reserve or sanctuary.
- Need to get fishermen at the table.
- Can learn from reserve experience in a limited area.
- Whole coast is unrealistic; but, some type of sanctuary would be appropriate near pointing (?) reserves.
- Not whole coast but representative reserve and offshore areas.
- Can have areas with fishing gear restrictions.
- Should pursue if it helps get federal funding.
- Prevent offshore drilling.
- Encompassing whole coast avoids pandering or picking on a certain part of coast.
- Scientists can help identify biological hot spots that should receive sanctuary designation with especially sensitive areas designated as reserves.