



**WEST  
COAST**  
REGIONAL  
PLANNING  
BODY

# 2016 Annual Meeting **REPORT**



# Executive Summary

The following provides a summary of the 2016 Annual Meeting of the West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB) on October 26-27 in Portland, OR. Included in the summary are the meeting agenda, presentation slides and condensed transcripts of discussion between RPB members as well as public comments received. This report is also available on the RPB's website at [www.westcoastmarineplanning.org](http://www.westcoastmarineplanning.org).

The West Coast RPB's 2016 meeting included representatives from twenty-five member entities, including federally-recognized tribal governments, the states of Washington, Oregon and California, and federal agencies (full list included below). The full meeting attendance was roughly 100 total, with a wide range of public and stakeholders in the audience. The meeting consisted of scheduled updates on RPB activities, designated opportunity for public comment, and open conversation between RPB members and staff.

Highlights of the meeting included focus on defining the regional goals and functions for the RPB, as well as updates on emerging sub-regional dialogs around ocean planning. Data-sharing and coordination was a key theme throughout, with presentations from the West Coast Ocean Data Portal and an update on a nascent regional baseline ocean assessment inventory emphasizing the important role of information-sharing.

Key next steps of the meeting included continued development of the RPB's work plan, emphasizing the importance of effective data-sharing and coordination in the region, initiation and support of sub-regional dialogs for ocean planning that build around existing efforts, and transparent, efficient regional collaboration between tribal, state and federal co-managers along the West Coast.

Themes from public comment received at the meeting emphasized the need for increased outreach in the region to understand the role of the RPB, the importance of including a wide range of stakeholders to identify the best role for the RPB's efforts, recognizing the important link to fisheries issues, and the need for transparency, among others.

The RPB invites additional input on this report or any of its future efforts in the West Coast region. The next full meeting of the West Coast RPB will likely take place in mid-to-late 2017 and will be open to the public, with any interested stakeholders again encouraged to attend.

*For more information, please visit [www.westcoastmarineplanning.org](http://www.westcoastmarineplanning.org).*

## ATTENDEES

### RPB Member Entities

#### Tribal Governments

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians  
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde  
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians  
Makah Tribe  
Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation  
Trinidad Rancheria  
Quileute Tribe  
Quinault Tribe  
Yurok Tribe

#### State Governments

State of California: Resources Agency - Ocean Protection Council; State Lands Commission  
State of Oregon: Dept. of Fish & Wildlife; Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
State of Washington: Dept. of Ecology; Dept. of Natural Resources

#### Federal Agencies

NOAA  
U.S. Coast Guard (Dist. 11, Dist. 13)  
U.S. Dept. of Defense (NAVY)  
U.S. Dept. of Energy  
U.S. Dept. of Interior (BOEM, NPS)  
U.S. EPA (Region 9, Region 10)  
U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff  
Pacific Fishery Management Council

---

### Public Attendee Entities

American Littoral Society	CSU Los Angeles
CA Marine Affairs & Navigation Conference (CMANC)	David Evans and Associates, Inc. Ecology & Environment, Inc.
Center for Ocean Solutions, Stanford University	Ecotrust Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
City of Cannon Beach	Global Ocean Health
Congresswoman Suzanne Bonamici Consultant	Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation Green Fire Productions
Coos Bay Trawlers' Association, Inc.	GreenSpot Travel

Healthy Oceans Coalition  
Historical Research Associates  
Indian Country Today Media Network  
International Law Offices of San Diego  
Kanoloa Water Solution  
Kearns & West  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
Lincoln County, Oregon  
MPA Center  
National Fisheries Conservation Center  
National Ocean Council  
National Ocean Policy Coalition  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Ocean Conservancy  
Oregon Military Dept.  
Oregon Fishermen's Cable Committee  
Oregon Parks and Recreation  
Department, Ocean Shores

Oregon Sea Grant  
Oregon State University  
Oregon Wave Energy Trust  
Pacific Whiting Conservation  
Cooperative  
Port of Garibaldi, Oregon  
SeaPlan  
Sound GIS  
Surfrider Foundation  
The Nature Conservancy  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
Udall Foundation  
UnCruise Adventures  
University of California Santa Barbara  
University of Oregon School of Law  
West Coast Ocean Data Portal  
West Coast Ocean Partnership  
West Coast Seafood Processors  
Association

# West Coast Regional Planning Body 2016 Annual Meeting

## AGENDA

October 26-27, 2016

The Leftbank Annex  
101 N Weidler St  
Portland, Oregon

---

### Day 1- Wednesday October 26

<i>Agenda Item #</i>	<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>Presenter(s)</i>
9:00am (1)	<b>Meeting Opening &amp; Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tribal Blessing</li><li>• RPB Member Welcome</li><li>• Agenda &amp; Logistics Review</li></ul>	
9:30am (2)	<b>RPB Activities 2013-2016: Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recap of RPB Activities 2013 - Present</li></ul>	RPB Staff
9:45am Director	<b>National Ocean Council Update</b> (3)	Deerin Babb-Brott, NOC
10:00am (4)	<b>RPB Draft Work Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RPB Core Functions: Draft Review</li><li>• RPB Member Q&amp;A</li></ul>	RPB Staff & RPB Members

10:30am

**BREAK**

10:45am

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

11:15am

**RPB Draft Work Plan (Cont.)**

RPB Staff & RPB Members

(4)

- RPB Member Open Discussion

11:45am

**LUNCH BREAK**

- RPB Members: Optional Caucusing
- All attendees: Lunch on own (Map of nearby eateries will be provided)

12:40pm

**Optional Viewing: East Coast Ocean Planning Film**

- Film presentation by Green Fire Productions

1:00pm

**West Coast Ocean Data Portal Update**

Andy Lanier, OR DLCD /

WCODP

(5)

- WCODP - RPB 2016 Tasks
- WCODP
- WCODP Needs & Next Steps

Steve Steinberg, SCCWRP /

Allison Bailey, SoundGIS

2:00pm

**West Coast Ocean Assessment Update**

- Open Discussion
- Ocean Assessment Inventory Status for (6)
- Ocean Assessment Next Steps

Lucie Hazen, Stanford Center

Ocean Solutions

- Link to West Coast Ocean Data Portal

2:30pm

**BREAK**

2:45pm

**RPB Communications & Engagement (C&E) Plan**

- RPB C&E: Draft Plan Update
- Kilburg (7)

Eric Poncelet & Annie

- RPB C&E: RPB Member Discussion

Kearns & West

3:45pm **PUBLIC COMMENT**  
4:15pm (Approx.)

**ADJOURN DAY 1**

---

**Day 2 - Thursday October 27**

<i>Agenda Item #</i>	<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>Presenter(s)</i>
8:00am	<b>OPTIONAL: RPB Member Caucusing</b>	
9:00am (8)	<b>Welcome &amp; Meeting Opening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agenda Review</li><li>• RPB Member Comments</li></ul>	RPB Members
9:15am (9)	<b>RPB Sub-regional Approaches</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sub-regional Framework Review</li><li>• Washington Pacific Coast Update</li><li>• Other Sub-regional Updates &amp; Discussion</li></ul>	RPB Staff & RPB Members
10:15am	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	
10:30am	<b>BREAK</b>	
10:45am (10)	<b>RPB Looking Ahead: 2017-18</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regional Context: RPB &amp; West Coast Ocean Partnership</li><li>• Federal Transition</li><li>• Open Discussion</li></ul>	RPB Staff & RPB Members
11:30am (11)	<b>Meeting Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Revisit RPB Work Plan &amp; Core Functions</li></ul>	RPB Staff & RPB Members

- Key Post-Meeting Tasks
- Public Comment Summary

---

12:15pm

***LUNCH BREAK***

- All attendees: Lunch on own

---

1:15pm

**Optional Working Sessions**

- Optional working sessions for RPB members and meeting attendees to meet and discuss any key topics and tasks from meeting.
- Sessions will be self-selecting, with topics and logistics decided on site.
- All attendees are welcome to attend and participate in working sessions.

---

4:00pm (Approx.)

***ADJOURN DAY 2***



# Meeting Summary

*\*Note: Transcripts of meeting dialog edited for length and clarity.*

## Day 1 - Wednesday October 26

### Meeting Opening & Welcome

- Meeting opened by Tribal Blessing from Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Councilmember Jon George.
- West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB) members representing tribal governments, federal agencies, states of Washington, California and Oregon, and Pacific Fishery Management Council introduced themselves.

---

### RPB Activities 2013 - 2016: Review

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen (RPB staff) provided a brief update on the history of RPB activities since their initiation in 2013 through to the present.
- The summary highlighted origin of the RPB on the West Coast, initial federal agency organization, regional tribal assessment and engagement with state agencies. Initial meeting of group took place in January 2015, but RPB not yet officially formed at that time. October 2016 meeting is first time RPB officially meeting in person.
- Early focus of RPB activities focused on organization of government representatives, and focus shifting to how best to engage regional stakeholders moving forward.
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
- Comments
  - John Stein (NOAA / RPB Federal Co-Lead): "We've been discussing how to effectively engage on the West Coast since 2011. We have a very large region and have thought a lot about how to tackle it. But from the start we've emphasized the importance of having stakeholders be a part of the process."
  - Chad Bowechop (Makah Tribe): "As a tribal government, we've taken a lot of time to analyze the National Ocean Policy and ways we can include treaty rights, cultural interests and our role as a sovereign government. The treaty with the Makah Tribe was intended to continue our cultural way of life, and to allow us to represent our interests. Our treaty also clearly differentiates our tribe as a resource trustee, not a stakeholder."

## National Ocean Council Update

- An update on the latest efforts of the U.S. National Ocean Council (NOC) and other regional ocean planning efforts was presented by Deerin Babb-Brott, NOC Director:
  - “First, let me share thanks for your work from all of our federal partners. The work you are doing through the RPB here on the West Coast is necessary and important. The emphasis of what you are doing should continue to focus on your region, what you’d like to do with this group and how you’d like to do it. We have worked with federal agencies to enhance their capacity to work in this area, and work with willing partners.
  - There are currently five regions with RPBs in place. The Northeast RPB has turned in its draft plan to the NOC for approval, and the Mid-Atlantic RPB will do the same shortly. Once approved, those RPBs will transition to implementation of their plans. This will include integration of data products on an ongoing basis and addressing Ecosystem Based Management. The Northeast Plan was praised for their bicameral, bipartisan work that incorporated a high level of stakeholder engagement.
  - The NOP wants to make sure their work enhances that of the RPBs. All existing collaborations are important to include. The Northeast RPB strongly invested in the Fisheries Management Council and a data development process.
  - Embrace the knowledge and perspective of your tribal members. Take time to figure out a regional identity and be patient with one another and the process. Decide how to collaborate and incorporate interdisciplinary work whole still carrying out your mandates.”
- Director Babb-Brott then summarized key aspects of the Northeast Regional Planning Body’s draft plan:
  - The Plan features trends in environmental review, potential conflicts, coordination best practices, and stakeholder engagement.
  - The Northeast RPB Data Portal has several layers from species locations to marine transportation. The Portal is not just a data atlas, but is intended to enhance the utility of information products. Ultimately, the Plan can provide data for decision making in deciding placement for marine activities.
  - The plan focuses on understanding how and when agencies will use information. Focus on interagency coordination and communication. Engaged ocean stakeholders are key for implementation, and the Data Portal can be used for engagement.
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
  - Comments & Questions
  - Chad Bowechop, Makah Tribe: “The RPB and Ocean Partnership can look to the National Ocean Council’s Governance Coordinating Committee (GCC) for guidance,

assuring that this will continue in the future. Resources and time have been invested to make sure the RPB succeeds. In order for the Makah Tribe to be properly represented, the ocean will need to be central to the position. We should look into funding of RPB and GCC in terms of coordinated investment strategies.”

---

### **Draft RPB Work Plan**

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen provided an update on the latest status of the RPB’s draft work plan:
  - Some elements of the work plan need to be decided, such as governance issues. One idea is to frame the plan around regional perspectives. The core functions of the plan are coordination, sub-regional ocean planning, and other focus areas. The RPB Work Plan will harmonize the sub-regional plans.
  - Coordination and communication is another major topic. How with the RPB support communication between tribes, states and federal government? We need to know who to talk to. We need to be realistic about the differences between parts of the region and build transparency.
  - For sub-regional planning, we need to look at existing plans and identify gaps. The states and tribes will determine what is important to plan around. We must also determine how the sub-regional plans will be communicated to the full RPB and, likewise, how the RPB will support sub-regional work.
  - The RPB will also support effective partnerships, coordinating with the West Coast Ocean Partnership and leveraging data coordination. Working groups and advisory committees will be organized in the future to address this.
- {SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}

---

### **Public Comment**

- Meeting attendees were provided opportunity for public comment {*summaries below are not verbatim, but intended to capture key points*):
  - Brent Greenfield, National Ocean Policy Coalition: “Commercial and recreational interests along West Coast need to be involved from very beginning. There is not a substitute for engagement regarding commercial and recreational interests, including the need for a stakeholder advisory committee. It is unfortunate that no direct engagement is called for in the NOP. Local officials should be able to participate on the RPB. What are the terms and processes for accepting funding? The Coalition encourages leaving estuaries out to be managed through existing channels. People who live on the coast should be approached immediately. Clarify

interpretation of some of the language so as to be clear when issues are already under law. There is an implication that existing regulations aren't rigorous enough, and the RPB shouldn't make anything more rigorous. Communication is necessary. Engage user groups to identify topics and priorities, the RPB should not decide beforehand. Avoid proposing any actions that would negatively impact economic opportunities. "

- Jim Hausner, California Marine Affairs & Navigation Conference (CMANC): "The White House Council on Environmental Quality told us to be engaged. Why is NOAA is circumventing a process for marine protected areas? Please conduct outreach, not support. Outreach will need to be extensive. How will you engage stakeholders if RPB members are not interested? The West Coast is way too large for only two representatives from each state. There should be a public review of planning process. The Plan should be certified, and the budget should be shaped by the Plan. It has been closed process so far. I agree with previous speaker comments about considering stakeholder advisory councils on several issues. Receipt of funds is troublesome to California folks. Provider to funds can have access to the whole process. If someone provides funds, they shouldn't get more or less access than the public to the process.
- Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association: "The Southern Oregon Ocean Resource Coalition (SOORC) was founded when the Oregon Marine Reserves process was initiated. Other stakeholders had input on selecting marine reserves. After reserves were placed, SOORC continued to work on wind and wave energy installations in fishing areas. The user group helped find sites so they didn't affect industries. Cables were sited in Coos Bay without consulting fishermen, so there is no fishing there, causing a \$1.25M impact to industries according to the Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). The next cable had to be done with fisheries input. I am not against development of the ocean but want to have input so that it doesn't impact industry. We have experience with development and siting projects. I hope that stakeholder engagement is encouraged to the max. Endorse stakeholder advisory council. "
- Lars Maloney, Pacific Seafood Group: "I agree with previous comments. Pac Seafood operates plants all over West Coast. We are dedicated to sustainable fisheries and honoring all input. We want to ensure fisherman have a good living and we have sustainable communities. We are full speed ahead behind regulations because they support sustainability - good, long-term sustainability. "
- Scott McMullen, Oregon Fisherman's Cable Committee: "The West Coast is different than other regions. The fishing industry shares use of the ocean better than other places. Thirty years ago, a crabber-towing agreement was reached to develop lanes to travel, allowing both industries to work. Twenty years ago, cable agreements were reached. Other groups formed to collaborate on marine renewable energy projects. The collaborative relationship with fisherman and project developers causes less

impact on industry and works well for siting. There are many informal arrangements also, such as between the shrimp fleet and military testing. I am pleased to hear that this process won't supplant existing arrangements. Using the Pacific Fishery Management Council expertise will also be very useful."

- Onno Husing, Lincoln County Planning & Development Dept.: "I work for local government but have been involved with marine policy for a long time, since 1976. In 2011, I received resources from NOAA to go to Chicago and be on panel for the first anniversary of the National Ocean Policy (NOP). I was very enthusiastic then about the momentum behind marine planning and better management. No single industry is driving what happens offshore. I want this process to succeed. An earlier speaker said be kind to each other through this process because this is hard stuff. Communities in Oregon have pushed for marine spatial planning. The NOP was informed by good work from Oregon. Everyone can agree that planning is good, but at end of day, it is very contentious. With industry interests, there are winners and losers. Build upon Oregon Territorial Sea Plan work. Maybe we got ahead of ourselves with our spatial planning because industries weren't ready yet. We need robust inventory of work before planning starts. Local government voices are needed at the table, but I can't imagine adding more people on the panel. Local government participation in process, from ground up, how we engage you, rather than other way around will be very important. I read the executive summaries for the Pew report and NOP report to refresh my memory. The Pew report talked about marine spatial planning but also said there should be statutory reform that rationalize and legislate marine planning so it's not on the edges. Other think tanks should begin having that conversation even if it's not really an RPB task.
  - Meagan Flier (Grand Ronde): I'm curious to know if you have a system in mind to engage the local communities? Maybe we can pass that along to other communities as a model.
  - Onno: Establish social capitol with well-respected folks on coast. What drove us together was the federal offshore agenda. Work with existing groups and get them to participate. Combat burnout among engagers. You need groups that will hang in there, develop institutional knowledge, and keep inputting. It's unfortunate that we only get together when we feel threats and want to fight back. Be for something - for protecting environment, for knowledge of the ocean, for planning - not negative.
- *RPB Member Discussion:*
  - Jennifer Mattox, California State Lands Commission: "Past planning has been spurred by a single force (energy). This is slightly different because it happens before an issue. What successful messaging can be developed around not being driven by a specific pressure, but to enhance compatibility and decrease conflict? This can help folks understand what they're getting into when addressing uses."

- Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe: "I just came from the WA Marine Resources Summit where there was discussion of how to work together and how to present ideas on a committee. There is overlap with the RPB. Small government, large process going on and some scoping happens. It is important for large entities to not just check off the box that we've talked to everyone. Lend credence to all input to make the process work better."
- John Stein, NOAA: "I am trying to be optimistic. Keeping it positive is important. We heard a lot of comments on outreach and coordination, public review, and stakeholder advisory committees. The sub-regional component is what has come from those thoughts. We need to think about the best way to get engagement and involvement from stakeholders."
- Patty Snow, Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development: "From a state perspective, the sub-regional approach is what has made states sign on. A sub-regional approach can include all sorts of folks to develop what works for that sub-region."

---

### **RPB Work Plan Review - Continued**

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen continued the discussion regarding the RPB's draft work plan between RPB members:
  - "The sub-regions are where the work will get done. We will return to engagement discussion when we get to communications and engagement plan. We need clarity on when we start engagement to avoid bureaucracy. The caveat is that sub-regional engagement is crucial for success."
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
  - RPB Member Open Discussion:
  - Jennifer Hennessey, WA Dept. of Ecology: "I agree with the functions that make sense on the work plan and appreciate comments. It would help to make the goals more specific and crisper on the statement of three things: support effective decision making for example; better information about our ocean resources; and something about uses, such as understanding current uses and promote compatibility. It might help with the communication strategy if we honed the goal statements more and were more clear about what we're going to do. Allay fears about what the RPB is and isn't."
  - Megan Van Pelt, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation: "West Coast stakeholders fall under full region-wide coordination and communication. Maybe make it clear what exactly will happen during sub-regional engagement, and what the differences are. The recreational and commercial folks in other regions are represented by commissions or some other mechanism, as well, which we should look into."

- John Stein, NOAA: “Thinking about moving ahead on the work plan, Jen (Hennessey, WA Dept. of Ecology) brought up honing the goals. Do we want to work on that? Onno proposed a robust inventory of work as a starting point. Thoughts? Engagement of stakeholders is critical. We need folks on coast to help with engagement.”
  - Megan Van Pelt, Tolowa Dee-ni’ Nation: “I agree that the goals need to be refined. How will work proceed? Will the charter need to be revised or could we work at sub-regional level to fine tune goals? Did the goals come from the NOC Handbook?”
    - John Hansen, RPB Coordinator: “Yes, text for the goals initially came from the handbook, but we refined them for the West Coast. I don’t think we want to amend our existing charter, but we should definitely refine our goals and timeline as we proceed. This can also feed back into our communications and engagement efforts.”
  - Jennifer Mattox, California State Lands Commission: “Since this is a public facing document, is there a way to make this document more streamlined - develop a rallying cry, capture the vision and goals? Or an easy illustration that takes the work plan into a graphic to illustrate interactions between all folks? Something that is easy for public to understand.”
  - Caren Braby, OR Dept. of Fish and Wildlife / Pacific Fishery Mgmt. Council: “I appreciate the comments about goals and region-wide priorities and planning. Looking back on document, that isn’t clear but it should be emphasized. There should be some treatment of flexibility for sub-regional plans and sub-regional goals.”
- 

### **West Coast Ocean Data Portal Update**

- West Coast Ocean Data Portal Co-Chairs And Lanier (OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development) and Steve Steinberg (Southern California Coastal Water Research Project), joined by consultant Allison Bailey (SoundGIS), presented an update on the Portal’s work in support of the RPB.
  - Four of the eight RPBs have a data portal. On the West Coast, the data portal was created separate from the RPB. The ODP should be linked on the RPB homepage.
  - The ODP provides a mechanism for sharing and integrating data in an organized and searchable manner. BOEM uses the ODP to get their own data out, for example.
  - The ODP is scalable to needs and responsive to new tasks. Specific data sets can be pulled together for specific purposes - it could be focused based by RPB.



- {Allison provided live demo of ODP and story map; SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}
- Andy Lanier, ODP Co-Chair / OR DLCD: “The ODP wasn’t set up to support the RPB and I’m not sure where we go in future. The West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean Health (WCGA) provided structure and framework. The challenge now is a new umbrella organization. How does the ODP connect to sub-regions and subject matter? There are basic support needs to “keep the lights on.” Specific tasks with the ODP require varying levels of capacity, including funding and coordination. We hope to be written in to RPB somehow so the ODP can be supported. The best option for using funding is base needs and project coordinator.”
- RPB Member Discussion
  - Chad Bowechop, Makah Tribe: “This is a vital service. We’ve been involved with a cross jurisdictional vessel safety project on the relative risk of existing vessel traffic. The project was collaboratively developed. How do we present data into model to understand relative risk? The project spans many boundaries, including international boundaries to work with the Canadian First Nations. The ODP can be used to identify transit areas and categorize specific areas. Models need to consider the “what ifs.” Story maps can be used to make connections.”
  - Steve Steinberg, ODP Co-Chair: “The portal is data agnostic, not issue driven, not limited to a particular data types, and can include whatever we want. The catalog can index to any key terms – just tell it what you want. What other data would be useful, how do you want to find it? That infrastructure exists already – now we deploy it.”
  - Ed Bowles, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife: “As a state, we implore the feds to pay for it, but partners need to have skin in the game to support this valuable resource. The State hasn’t requested the legislature to support the ODP, but maybe could if we had clarity on what was needed. After a discussion of how to deploy/divvy up, he could go ask Oregon to commit. The dilemma as we sub-regionalize, how does portal help that? Structure hierarchy to service local planning efforts, overarching coordination and integration function at ecosystem level, not just locally.”
  - Megan Flier, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde: “I am supportive of the ODP. Should ODP be an explicit goal in the framework to emphasize value and necessity? Question about story map: how was renewable energy focus chosen?”
    - Andy Lanier, ODP Co-Chair: “When we came up with idea of story maps, we wanted to bridge regional data needs and focus on West Coast-wide issues. Marine renewable resources were identified has an issue from the RPB survey. Oregon has experience from marine planning in the context of need for new industry, existing natural resources, and the human use



landscape. We chose marine renewable energy as a target to show all the bells and whistles and it will be useful for context regardless.”

- Bridgette Lohrman, US EPA: “If you were fully funded, what would you want the portal to do? What do other portals do that you’d want to do that can’t do right now?”
  - Andy Lanier, ODP Co-Chair: “The Portal does well on focus areas. We need a gap analysis to see what is missing. Having the resources to fill those gaps is a key priority for further funding. Synthesizing data across sub-regions is a priority as well. Sub-regional data might need to be massaged to get it to work into the Portal seamlessly across region.”
  - Steve Steinberg, ODP Co-Chair: “We had a program coordinator that did some of that work before. We also had annual network meetings to bring the providers and users of data together to connect. There is a strong human network around this, and we would love to do that again. We would like to highlight questions folks are trying to answer and find out the gaps and priorities. We could find data and put it in, but needs to have a purpose to be useful. The human network is a big component of ODP.”
  - Andy Lanier, ODP Co-Chair: “The ODP is providing technical assistance to entities that don’t have the capacity to provide data and is building a braintrust of how to share data. Working with existing bodies of data ensures the ODP is not remaking the wheel. An example is the Ocean Observing System that highlights changing ocean conditions and also has a community of practitioners. Some of the goals are to connect data providers and decision makers and connect all data providers.”
- John Stein, NOAA: “The ODP is foundational if we want RPB success. It is important for engagement, transparency, and making data comparable across sub-regions. The Portal needs to be at ecosystem scale. Does anyone not see RPB as foundational piece? If the RPB endorses the Portal, it makes it easier seek funds in support of the Portal.”
- Caren Braby, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife / PFMC: “I appreciate the work of the ODP. Regarding regional goals of the RPB, I suggest supporting decision making, understanding ecosystem and understanding uses. We can’t do any of those without information; maybe the ODP can be the connector and we can say it is essential to plan or coordinate.”

- Lucie Hazen (Stanford Center for Ocean Solutions) provided an update on their support of early efforts to inventory regional scientific products for the West Coast in support of developing a regional ocean assessment for the RPB.
  - “COS is at the interface of policy and science to push forward policy making. The regional inventory we have compiled includes 200 sources, more than half of which are analytical work. The work started with the ODP, then through partnerships with agencies, literature searches, and input from RPB members.
  - The inventory is structured in different categories – biological, human, and physical. One that’s coast-wide assessment of estuary systems on West Coast. Oceans assessment only has a few entries, but it’s a result of categorization. Only by primary fit, many assessments could go in multiple places. The assessment is not exhaustive, but it provides an estimate of gaps. Some of the gaps are heritage, infrastructure, population, and boundaries (anything that isn’t web-searchable isn’t included here). Also, outside of ODP scheme are desalination, mining, dredged materials disposal, and a few other topics. More research could possibly fill that in.
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
- RPB Member Discussion
  - Meagan Flier, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde: “There is a lack of cultural or tribal aspects in the assessment. How do we incorporate that? If they don’t exist, do we need to prioritize that? Also, is the assessment in report form?”
    - Lucie Hazen (Stanford COS): “Some of the information in the assessment is focused on harmful algal blooms or fisheries, for example. For those, tribally-contributed information was not characterized as ‘heritage’ but instead on those topics. But if there is more information you or others can provide, we can include it. And at this point the assessment is just an inventory in spreadsheet (MS Excel) format, no synthesis has been performed.”
    - John Hansen, RPB Coordinator: “This is a starting point, and COS is turning to the RPB to decide what we need more information on and what is the most important in order to do our work. This will be a staged process, and it needs to be realistic based on funding. Through the work plan, we can think about what to do on RPB/ODP front then figure out a plan and budgets.”
  - Jennifer Hennessey, WA Dept. of Ecology: “Thank you for the update. It’s helpful to provide the spreadsheets for folks to delve into. A brief executive summary, a few pages, along the lines of this presentation would be great to have. Doesn’t mean we ignore biological work because there are many sources, but we can think about synthesis.”
  - Caren Braby, PFMC: “The NOAA Annual Report to PFMC on the state of the California current provides a snapshot of the ecosystem in a few metrics. It would be nice to building on existing tools and platforms. Is there a way to add to that

annual report? Where is the NOAA data used for that report now? Are they in the portal?"

---

### **RPB Communications and Engagement Plan Draft**

- Eric Poncelet and Annie Kilburg of Kearns & West presented an update to the RPB on the draft Communications & Engagement (C&E) plan they were contracted to produce over summer and fall 2016.
  - Annie Kilburg, Kearns & West: "In the first round of stakeholder assessment, nine phone interviews were conducted to help scope what interests will be crucial. This provided a broad perspective. Some of the major findings and key needs were:
    - Clarify the RPB's role, authority, function, and benefits.
    - Communicate early in process - do not wait until the end.
    - Coordinate interests with existing and future uses.
    - Provide an outline of plan.
    - Develop outreach materials to help engage.
    - Measure success and re-evaluating every 6 months.
    - Provide a projected timeline.
    - For the goals - increase understanding and increase engagement.
    - Major areas: members, agencies, coastal communities, tribes, ocean interest groups (fishing, recreation, shipping, etc).
  - The real focus is how to reach non-members who aren't already participating. To address the key findings, we believe you should organize members to do engagement. Some examples of communication activities are email lists (quarterly?), document review (state agencies?), members outreach (coordinate efforts, local entities, presentations), put more information on the website and develop a social media strategy (effective, non-formal, agendas, updates, meeting announcements), webinars/meetings as appropriate. Develop a fact sheet/one pager that states why the RPB important, benefits, benefits, etc. FAQs, Stock PPT on RPB, so members can easily use at will to unify message."
  - Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West: "The proposed schedule of activities over the next year doesn't include many specific activities to address the goals. Use this review process to flesh out those activities. The Communication and Engagement Plan should be a working document and doesn't need to be static. What are the types of engagement activities? The proposed review process is to engage in discussions with members and the public. Collect written comments and revise the Plan by Dec 31."

- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*

- RPB Member Discussion

- Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe: "I'd like to see more specific marine industries included, especially marine extractive industries. Also, how will we fund the outreach we include in this plan?"
    - Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West: "The draft was strategically designed to recognize there isn't much funding and most of the work will be done by the coordinator and members. The RPB needs to decide what it thinks is important, but its clear that no stakeholders should be excluded, the RPB members have made this clear."
  - Megan Van Pelt, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation: "I question the charge of the RPB in terms of engaging other stakeholders. Each RPB member represents their own entity; is it the job of the agencies to do engagement related to the RPB, or is it the job of the RPB itself?"
    - Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West: "This is a key question for the RPB members to decide. Overall, we envision RPB members doing the outreach on behalf of the RPB, along with RPB staff, but only as capacity dictates."
  - Amy Wirts, US Coast Guard: "The Coast Guard is concerned about additional requirements being applied for outreach; research about how to increase stakeholder awareness my be useful for our work plan. We should highlight the RPB as a resource to members of the public, industry, others that can put stakeholders easily in touch with whomever they need. Maybe our framework needs a concise statement to remind people of the exact nature of the RPB."
  - Patty Snow, OR DLCD: "Here in Oregon, state agencies can reach out to local government and others. We should use existing venues as much as possible."
  - Joan Barminski, US Bureau of Ocean Energy Management: BOEM has a task force for renewable energy outreach that can be used to share information about the RPB. There is a synergy that could be developed between the two organizations. Capitol Hill Oceans week is another option. Someone from this group might be going there."
    - Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West: "Think about strategic approaches to do effective engagement. What are the meetings? Who goes to them and when do they take place? What activities have a good return on investment?"
  - John Stein, NOAA: "We couldn't do a huge survey due to funding and time constraints through our contract with Kearns & West, but we want to use the opportunity of this meeting to hear from public what you think will work."
-

## Public Comment

- Meeting attendees were provided opportunity for public comment {*summaries below are not verbatim, but intended to capture key points*):
  - Pete Stauffer, Surfrider Foundation: “Surfrider works on a range of ocean and coastal stewardship issues. It is a chapter based organization with 30 local chapters from Washington to San Diego. We strongly support the concept of regional ocean planning. We need to understand what the potential impacts could be on ecological resources and also human uses, such as fishing, recreation, maritime transportation, so we can understand tradeoffs. What kinds of outreach should the RPB use? All of the above. Public meetings and workshops, in coastal communities, and in larger population centers, website outreach and online comment opportunities, and stakeholder advisory bodies. There are existing bodies at state and local levels who could be leveraged for this purpose. Leverage partners, government agencies, tribes, and ocean interest groups to reach different stakeholders. For example, Surfrider has a list of 1,000 local businesses that could be used to leverage the number of messengers to hear about the process and know how to engage. The regional process should build upon state level efforts such as the OR Territorial Sea Plan update and WA Marine Spatial Planning process. The goal should not be to supersede, but to integrate with existing efforts. We support the idea of sub-regions to think about geography because meaningful engagement at that large a geographic scale is non-feasible.
  - Brent Greenfield, National Ocean Policy Coalition: “I strongly encourage everything to go up for public comment. The Communication and Engagement Plan and goals need to be collectively defined and agreed to. For the Ocean Assessment Update - include ecosystem and economic uses and existing and societal benefits. The framework should make clear that information and data used to develop products are based on good science with data quality. The RPB processes should be subject to the same public comment as other statutory bodies. Establish a formal place on the RPB for commercial interests. If they can't be included for funding reasons, then don't move forward to change things. Outline and analyze all concerned groups. List which activities are aspirational and will need more funding. Anything that motivates support for planning, should be motivating support for participating in dialogue. Stress that the RPB is not a decision making body. Be forthright about potential impacts, regulatory impacts are going to happen. Don't just focus on key benefits, also include key implications, positive and negative. Outreach efforts will clearly demonstrate that there are potential regulatory implications. The entire Communication and Engagement Plan should be implemented before moving forward with the planning process.”
  - Jim Hausner, California Marine Affairs & Navigation Conference (CMANC): “I have heard several times that local coastal community and recreational interest groups

don't necessarily live on the coast, so how do you incorporate that input? Keep that in mind when pursuing outreach - it should be to whole states."

- Kelly Barnett, Port of Garibaldi: "I represent many stakeholder groups that have been mentioned today. There is so much bureaucracy in one room that could impact my livelihood. Please be considerate of those who have been engaged in this work forever - especially tribes. I came to represent people I work with and live with every day. Most of them are not into webinars and won't come to public meetings because it costs them money to leave work and get involved. Be patient with us, please don't see things in boxes. The ocean is dynamic and is constantly changing. Where we fish today and recreate today might change tomorrow - it's not static."

## END OF DAY 1 (Weds Oct 25)

---

## Day 2 - Thursday October 26

### **RPB Sub-Regional Approaches Review**

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen (RPB staff) provided an overview of the options for developing sub-regional approaches for the West Coast through the framework of the West Coast RPB.
- John Hansen, RPB Coordinator: "The goal is to prioritize existing planning and not to reinvent the wheel or takeover what is already working. The sub-regional approach should be predictable and manageable. We have a large group with limited capacity/staff, but we want to hear from you what it should look like on the ground."
- Sub-regions will be formed voluntarily through sub-regional planning teams (SRPT). RPB members will determine the approach, who needs to be in conversation, how to work with non-RPB members, and what the planning product looks like. Products from sub-regions will go to the RPB for approval then up to the National Ocean Council, to be implemented by federal agencies once approved at national level. There is no mandate for state or tribes to implement what is in the plans, but the hope is that it's a productive process. Other regions haven't gotten to the implementation stage yet, so it's a work in progress. The West Coast is taking a bit of a different approach.
- Some issues to consider are scale, existing plans, overlapping scales/areas, non-RPB members, voluntary, timing and capacity. We need to define what a sub-regional "agreement" may entail. Do we need to have something on paper to define the process? This is up for RPB members to decide at sub-regional scales."
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*

- The dialog then shifted focus to sub-regional dialogs already underway, first highlighting discussions on a Washington Pacific Coast sub-region:
  - The WA coast sub-regional dialog has focused on identifying sub-regional needs and tasks. Early input has highlighted three needs: project notification process, data sharing and maintenance, and addressing data gaps. States and tribes are working on their own marine planning efforts, which may be enhanced by federal interaction, but the group will definitely defer to state and tribal processes underway or forthcoming.
  - Brian Lynn, WA Dept. of Ecology: "I haven't been intimately involved in the conversation but there are many details to work out. The concept is sound and not superseding anything, just bringing folks together to try to enhance. We are also thinking about how to define sub-regions. There is a general sense of who players are. How far do we cross into OR if at all? There are larger questions for the RPB like what is the process to determine sub-regions."
  - Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe: "The Quileute Tribe has been involved in the state's planning process and reviewing documents. There previously was a draft MOU between the state and the Washington treaty tribes, but didn't come together. An MOU doesn't really work for the RPB - it's not the "glove that fits." My understanding is that everyone wants to complete a sub-regional organization. Looking at the players, ex officio players may not vote, but do shape the process in some way so it's important. We discussed including British Columbia and OR as ex officio but have not yet made a decision. Is it beneficial to have sub committees of academia, industry, etc. WA has four treaty tribes on the coast that have strong working relationships with the State. We haven't had a sub-regional planning meeting in over a year, but I think there's an interest. How much time members want to devote and if we want them to engage is all up for discussion. We're early in the process."
  - Katrina Lassiter, WA Dept. of Natural Resources: "Having a sub-region may not help us with planning already underway, but may raise the profile and legitimacy of what we come up with. Several coastal tribes are working on their own plans. Bringing the process to the level of a sub-regional RPB might help get federal government more interested in engaging."
  - Chad Bowechop, Makah Tribe: "Our tribe is focused on how does the process work, how do we feed our interests into the process, how do we all reach desirable outcomes? A sub-regional dialog and plan provides means and assurance that we can get treaty related interests sent up the line to GCC and NOC. In order for tribes to understand complex processes, has to be a clear avenue of consultation, has to be meaningful and needs to have this implementation plan or else it's meaningless. In order for Makah to understand resources are addressed at highest level, we understand the harmonization of ocean authorities, recognize the trust responsibility of the federal government. Goes back to when tribes were wards of the state, not always fair. Integrate that concept with NOP, support multi-departmental



consultation at the highest level. Away from silo of one lead agency, most of issues require a number of department attentions. We support enhancing government-to-government consultation, which could resemble our MOA with the US Coast Guard on how we agreed to address oil pollution. Implementation was work list, meet twice a year. This gets back to RPB discussion on sub-regional planning.”

- The conversation then shifted to a new dialog focused around southern California and a ocean planning pilot project happening in San Diego.
  - Walt Wilson, US Navy: “Earlier this year we saw a briefing at the California State Lands Commission about marine planning in San Diego. As this discussion was starting, we realized there’s an RPB being developed. The Navy needs to engage to protect our mission in areas we operate. The Navy reached out to John Hansen and State Lands to talk further. The Port of San Diego came along, a longtime partner in stewardship in southern California, and we realized we could help get everyone on the same page. Its not the Navy’s intention to start or initiate anything on its own, we just want to get coordinated. How sub-regions manifest will be different from each other. Navy has been involved in marine planning for a long time, through training areas for different activities and other work. We were involved in an offshore fin fish aquaculture project off San Diego, but regulatory constraints sent them to Mexico. But we developed a map (shown), to figure out where we could put them. It took three years to get the map unclassified. All the training areas have different uses and infrastructure involved. Just San Diego county alone is a very busy area. We worked very hard with aquaculture companies to figure out where they could be. Still in safety zones, and they think they can work with that. Probably something that’s important for national food security, so easy to see value, but figure out a way to do it. Partner with as many people as possible to ensure no encroachment. Many layers to this map, not even everything is shown here. We see value in working with local groups and capturing their momentum and bring it to this group. But to be clear, this is not a sub-region, just a start to a relationship, that may eventually become sub-region or something similar within the RPB.
  - Jennifer Mattox, CA State Lands Commission: “We are coming to this venue to capture momentum. CA SLC is the trustee of California’s submerged lands, and non-tidal waterways of beds of navigable rivers. We have a lot of regulatory agencies and process in CA, not easy to navigate. Active state legislature, determined that legislative granting to local authorities instead of SLC, boundaries of granted lands, in this example Port of San Diego. They then manage trust resources, but must do so aligning with SLC rules. SLC retains general oversight, and can file a complaint to check that rules are being adhered to. Regulatory process is difficult because infrastructure is partially in and out of granted lands. More bureaucracy to navigate. For this pilot project, we are engaged with the Port of San Diego, and heard concerns about management, realized its in our best interest to proactively co-manage. Following that we were then brought on to RPB.



We still have many questions about what a 'sub-region' means, such as what would trade offs be, what resources and expertise exist to help, and what can we contribute. Hopeful and worried, but clear there is lots of good data that we want to use and connections we can make. For our San Diego project, we are looking at it holistically. How are we going to collaborate with the other entities? The State Water Board, Fish and Wildlife Commission, lots of areas that are already designated as protected. The RPB will provide a single venue to collate all those things, to see where opportunities exist. We will look not just at economic development, but also find the pressures. Spatial planning and cohesive effort to bring together MPA monitoring, maybe can see the negative pressure, could enhance all the processes if we could bring together all the data into one stack, to see the overlaps with agencies and charters, pick off low-hanging fruit of how to make it better. The RPB should facilitate decision-making, not taking away decision-making authority. The initial response from conservation organizations is they are hungry for this. The effort would relieve conflict-based pressure. Well-meaning people want to do a project and can work together to reduce conflict."

- Meagan Flier, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde: "It's great that Southern California is getting together in a coalition, but are they missing tribes? What about cultural resources or fishing resources? A big topic of discussion is engaging the recognized and non-recognized tribes."
  - Jennifer Mattox, CA State Lands Commission: "It has been a pleasure to serve as tribal liaison for SLC. We've had public review and tribal consultation review with our tribal consultation policy, we now have a website, and participate with office of Governor Brown's tribal advisors. This is a very proactive administration in terms of tribal coordination with a robust tribal coordination program throughout state. Now the outreach effort is with non-coastal tribes and non-recognized tribes."
- John Hansen (RPB Coord.) then asked the group if there was any additional update or input to share regarding other areas of the coast, including elsewhere in California or in Oregon.
  - Patty Snow, OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development: "We have the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan update from four years ago. It goes out three miles and addresses marine renewable energy. WA goes far outside the territorial sea in terms of collecting data. I don't think tribes here in Oregon are working on marine spatial plans, but maybe we can talk about it this afternoon. The Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) and BOEM task force are places where we can start to get input. We haven't spoken as a state in terms of what it would look like. It probably wouldn't look exactly like WA, but rather maybe like the Northeast RPB. There are concerns from stakeholders about offshore plans so constituents might want to address those issues with planning."

- Caren Braby, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife / Pacific Fishery Management Council: “It is important for data to inform planning. Although the planning process only went out to three miles, some of the datasets went farther than that. From the PMFC perspective, there is a lot of information on fisheries, stocks, and landings that could inform the RPB region-wide and sub-regional efforts. Which data types would be worthwhile and most relevant? Information can be sensitive or proprietary – similar to some of the tribal cultural resources. The challenges are to figure out how to use that information.”
- Joan Barminski, US Bureau of Ocean Energy Management: “Our Oregon task force work is minimal now. In our new California task force, we are trying to work with the central coast on the potential for offshore wind energy. We’re not calling it a sub-region, just filling in on a slice of stuff that’s in the area. We’re also looking at other resources in that area and involving states, feds, etc.”
- Meagan Flier, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde: “Earlier, Megan (Van Pelt, Tolowa Dee-ni Nation) brought up some good points in terms of the five themes/points from the tribal caucus discussion. We should encourage non-recognized tribal input, as well as from tribes that are federally recognized. Maybe we could work with the feds to do some of that research, and get tribal liaisons to help us with that outreach. The idea of ex officio positions, with caveats, may not be sufficient for the tribe. It is really important to consider ancestral lands and cultural points of view. If we were to move forward, state delineations would impact border tribes and we need to figure out how to manage that. Sub-regions don’t have to be exclusive, considering tribal areas are not bound by state lines.”
- Ed Bowles, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife: “In Oregon, some spatial planning has been strategic but most of it has been reactive to issues. Overarching goals are incorporated, but there isn’t a great overarching context for all of the spatial planning efforts. The RPB isn’t going to be a planning body, but a collaboration. Plans are being done locally, with the best possible information and good quality database. The hard part is harmonization with tradeoffs. Actual planning will occur in appropriate jurisdictions. Even with FACA requirements, we won’t be able to get enough engagement for planning to be right, so we need to stay big enough to facilitate and maintain transparency and good governance.”
- John Stein, NOAA: “This highlights the differences up and down the coast in our region. Tribes highlight that state boundaries may not be a good way to define things. Maybe the boundaries should stay fuzzy. There is value in sharing of information. We should work by the ‘no surprises rule’ and get information in front of people early and often.”

---

## Public Comment

- Meeting attendees were provided opportunity for public comment {*summaries below are not verbatim, but intended to capture key points*}:
  - Peter Flouneroy, International Law Offices of San Diego: “There is an agreement between the CA State Lands Commission and Port of San Diego, and I’m glad the Navy and Maritime Alliance has worked with them too, but its interesting that commercial fisherman didn’t know about it at all. How is this an all encompassing process? We found out about it from a Port Commission agenda, but still don’t really know what it means. If it’s the beginning of a process of marine planning, good, but it needs to be broadened. Don’t look at the Port of San Diego as a friend. The thing that used to fund the Port was the airport, but not anymore. So now they want to build as many hotels, restaurants, etc., which doesn’t include commercial infrastructure. Suggest: change the name of this group to not include ‘planning.’ So change to ‘regional coordinating committee’ or something, people will understand the name more, because planning scares people. Way too many sitting up here also, EPA should get one person, etc. Also there are too many tribal representatives here. Just have one articulate person. Being too big, you can’t get anything done with groups be this big. The PFMC has councils with sub groups to advise them. These sub-bodies feed into a smaller council. Not sure social media is an appropriate forum to get word out or get word in. Understand that this group has no money. One of the things the PFMC does now is webinars, and we really like those. Entity that fisherman don’t always look at as friend is NOAA, NMFS manages fisherman not fish, fisherman are the endangered species, but we work with NMFS, but we want a seat at the table. Two initial purposes of the ocean: navigation and fishing. Now have aquaculture, green power, oil drilling, we have more uses of ocean. But fishermen keep getting more and more diluted. According to NMFS, it used to be 50% of seafood that Americans consumed was caught by US fisherman, now its up to 92% of fish coming from foreign fisheries. NMFS does lots of good things, has good info. But there needs to be a higher priority given to fishermen, and primary ocean uses.”
  - Jessica Hamilton Keys, Consultant: “I’ve worked previously for NOAA, focused on just NOP, also served as a liaison to NOC. I’ve worked previously for the State of Oregon, as well. I’m very happy to see such strong involvement from the tribes, as well as a seat for PFMC. Is anyone having a conversation about prior recommendations about sub-regions? Historical knowledge about how these things might work is very helpful. Maybe start by identifying existing plans, make a list today to fit category for sub-regional plans. Very important to understand where the tribes are, so they can be effectively included in the conversation. You should look not at just state boundaries, there is opportunity around Klamath or Columbia for states to work together. But there is a capacity issue. One other benefit of engaging stakeholders is that they can be cheerleaders to talk to folks. There was friendly competition in the NE and Mid-Atlantic regions, easy to go talk to DC. You can use stakeholders to share the love up the chain. You can use data as a way to start the process, and then build the relationships from there.”

- Brent Greenfield, National Ocean Policy Coalition: “Regarding the RPB’s sub-regional approach, the Coalition strongly urges that any sub-regions documents will be available for public comment, including sub-regional priority planning topics. Any RPB work plan should be subject to revision based on input and discussion from members and ex officio members. Clarify that sub-regions should also include input and feedback from stakeholders and other interests. We urge that any sub-regional process will be made available for public comment as well as with RPB for approval.”
- 

### **West Coast Ocean Partnership Recap**

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen (RPB staff) provided a brief review of the West Coast Ocean Partnership activities, and relation to the RPB.
  - *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
- 

### **Meeting Review & Close**

- RPB Coordinator John Hansen (RPB staff) provided a review of topics discussed during the meeting, highlighting key themes and potential next steps.
- Key tasks coming out of the meeting include:
  - Input on the Communication and Engagement Plan; a draft will come out soon for comment and feedback.
  - Refine RPB’s broad goals; this will be an ongoing discussion.
  - Develop RPB work plan.
  - Continue data coordination and ocean assessment, including emphasis on need for funding.
  - Sub-regional dialogues - Continue conversations about governance and other issues.
- Some themes of public comment: “Effective engagement is important. It takes time to build the process in the right way. The website has summaries of all calls and who is on them. We will ramp up the website to build transparency. Collaboration on all levels is important. What are sub-regions and what happens at the regional level? We need to be clear on what we’re doing and not doing - clarify the RPB role.”
- *{SEE FULL PRESENTATION SLIDES IN APPENDIX}*
- RPB Member Discussion

- Caren Braby, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife / PFMC: “I like the idea of elevating the role of the Ocean Data Portal to a core function of the RPB, something we should highlight and support. Maybe we could shift the language about data and emphasize it needs standalone support moving forward. We should also call out the need for a strategic funding plan as a designated task for the RPB, in addition to the Data Portal.”
- Ed Bowles, OR Dept. of Fish & Wildlife: “We should work through the language to better define what ‘planning’ efforts really are focused on. True ecosystem-based management planning may not be sub-regional, so we should nuance the language to include the possible need for sub-regional groups even if its not for planning.”
- Bridgette Lohrman, US EPA: “I agree with pulling out data portal and the importance of data to everyone. Can we clarify the next steps with the ocean assessment work? I see assessment as a sub bullet of data portal to inform what is going to go in to data portal.”
  - John Hansen, RPB Coordinator: “Technically, the ocean assessment is a separate task and serves to make sure we have a baseline of where the data and science already exists in our region. This table will turn into a work plan and then we will provide feedback and input, followed by aligning it with identified planning topics. We’ll then work to identifying gaps with an eye towards devoting energy to funding/filling those gaps. The ocean assessment is meant to be a multi-year process to inform the RPB process. This inventory is just a starting point.”
- Jesse Beers, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians: “Thanks to the Johns and everyone else. Thanks to everyone for being involved and making public comments. I only speak for the central and southern Oregon coast, and we don’t have a plan now but we’re involved in our watersheds, in the ocean, gathering and fishing, and water quality, etc. I’m really excited to get back there and work with sub-regional planning groups. We are already starting to engage, fisherman, local groups, etc. I am excited for this group to engage with those existing efforts. When we get more tribes to the table, which I think is a good thing to get more people to the table, it may take longer. We need to take that into consideration and we have short life spans. If the RPB has as much information and people as possible, we learn from as many people as possible, the final product will be better and there will be less push back. Thanks for everyone for being here and thanks for letting us participate.”
- John Stein, NOAA: “It has been a really good couple of days. Thanks to all of you for participating. I echo the existing comments. Looking back at Deerin’s comments - allow for mistakes. Be kind and do a good job of that. Break down barriers to allow things to be better.”

---

- **END OF FULL RPB MEETING**

- *In afternoon of Day 2 (Thurs Oct 26), there were separate breakout sessions held between various parties, including the Tribal Members Caucus, the West Coast Ocean Data Portal, and Washington Coast sub-regional team, among others.*