



Envisioning a National System of Marine Protected Areas: A West Coast Region Public Dialogue in Seattle, Washington

Breakout Group Responses

This document provides a synthesis transcription of comments received from participants during breakout groups at the December 13, 2005, West Coast Region Public Dialogue held in Seattle, Washington.

Background

Marine protected areas (MPAs) in the United States are widely used as a tool for helping conserve the nation's wealth of natural and cultural resources for all Americans and the world. These precious resources, including coral reefs, kelp forests, whales, shipwrecks, and a wide variety of marine life in the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes, are vital to the economic sustainability of the nation for this and future generations. MPAs provide recreation and economic opportunities for millions of Americans; help sustain critical habitats and marine resources; and act as an "insurance policy" by helping protect marine resources from human impacts.

Over the past two decades, the use of place-based marine conservation and management tools, including the use of MPAs, has risen dramatically. Currently, there are hundreds of federal, state, territory, and tribal authorities and thousands of sites in U.S. waters. Each site may have varying definitions of types and purposes. These sites range from multiple-use to no-take reserves, although less than one percent (1%) of MPAs in the U.S. are no-take reserves. The complexity of MPAs and their recognition as vital tools for marine conservation and management are the foundation of Presidential Executive Order 13158 on MPAs, which was signed on May 26, 2000. The Executive Order directs the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Department of the Interior to work with other federal agencies and consult with states, territories, tribes, and the public to develop a scientifically based, comprehensive national system of MPAs. The MPA Center was established to execute this role.

As part of this effort, the MPA Center has outlined a multi-year process to engage the nation in developing the national system of MPAs. This process includes collecting and considering continuous stakeholder and partner input for the development of the national system, enhancing relationships with stakeholder organizations engaged in these issues, developing and applying sound science about marine resources and their use, and communicating clear, consistent information about the process. The process includes a series of workshops and Regional Public Dialogue meetings to enable the MPA Center to receive input from a wide variety of stakeholders and partners to inform the development the draft Framework for the national system of MPAs.

West Coast Region Public Dialogue

The fifth in the series of regional public dialogue meetings and second of two in the west coast region was held December 13, 2005 in Seattle, Washington at the Center for Wooden Boats. After initial remarks and presentations from the MPA Center and Dr. Walter Pereyra, MPA Federal Advisory Committee member, participants were broken out into small groups to facilitate their input in response to the following five questions:

- 1) What are the west coast's important marine economic, recreational, and other types of uses and values that you want to be considered in developing a national system of MPAs?
- 2) What are the west coast's important natural and cultural resources that you think a national system of MPAs should conserve and sustain for future generations?
- 3) How could your interests in the west coast's natural and cultural resource issues benefit from some kind of national system of MPAs?
- 4) How should NOAA and Department of the Interior continue to work with stakeholders like you on the west coast to develop the vision for the national system?
- 5) Other comments?

The notes below were recorded on paper flip charts during the meeting and subsequently transcribed verbatim. The comments from each individual and group have been aggregated under each of the five respective questions. In addition, comments submitted via e-mail with regard to the Seattle meeting have also been included.

All input received during this and other dialogues is on the public record and will be considered in developing the draft framework for a national system of MPAs. At this preliminary stage in the effort, the MPA Center does not intend to respond to any comments received via these dialogues. Once a draft framework for the national system is developed, NOAA will publish it in the *Federal Register* for formal public comment and will subsequently provide a formal response to any comments received.

This and other reports from workshops, as well as regularly updated information about the MPA Center's work to develop of the national system of MPAs can be found at <http://mpa.gov/>. For more information, contact Jonathan Kelsey, NOAA National MPA Center, via phone at: 301-713-3155 ext. 130, or by e-mail at: mpa.comments@noaa.gov.

Summary of Breakout Group Responses

Question 1:

What are the West Coast's important marine economic, recreational, and other types of uses and values that you want to be considered in developing a national system of MPAs?

- Sustainable fisheries
- Biodiversity
- Healthy community
- Healthy coastal/ near shore habitat
- Value traditional knowledge/ cultural
- Functioning estuaries
- Public access
- Recreational opportunities (e.g. kayaking, whale watching, boating, diving)
- Education/ research
- Cultural use and knowledge
 - Tribal
- Access to beaches/ coastlines (and wildlife)
- Collaboration among multi-jurisdictions
- Maintaining traditional rights
- Transportation
- Shipping
- Military uses
- Aquaculture
- Oil and gas
- Wind farms/ alternative energy
- Seabed mining
- Protecting historical markers
- Shoreline development
- Waste disposal
- Use of environmental services
- Aesthetic value – wilderness value – intrinsic value
- View scapes
- Spiritual value
- Fishing industry
- Ecotourism – Oregon (as income generator)
- Access for recreation/ on and offshore
- Non-extractive (tidepools)
- Consider oil and gas extraction – appropriateness?
- Renewable ocean energy – what types appropriate
- Commercial and recreational shellfish
- Aquaculture
- Tribal – usual and accustom area and rights and limitations
 - Complex issues
- Areas closed to non-living and living extraction
 - Similar to national park
- Biological conservation
- Whaling – extracting
- Marine transportation

- Commercial and recreational fishing
- Wildlife viewing
- Shipping
- Cruise tourism
- Existence value
- Spiritual value
- Government to government relationship
- Enable legislation that preserves and protects treaties
- Preservation of native whaling
- Ecological services
- Education
- State/ federal/ tribal boundaries of marine areas
- Non-living resource extraction
- Beach walking
- Coastal development
- Coastal access
- Coastal community welfare
- Seafood processing
- Research
- Preservation of food supply
- Invasive species
- Aquaculture/ ocean ranching
- Salmon farming
- Oil spills
- Toxics - Pristine area protection
- Fisheries and fishing capacity
- Sustainability
 - Fish stocks
 - Shellfish: Aquaculture- oyster/clam
- Public access to marine environment: shoreline and pelagic
- Diving and non extractive uses on par with extractive uses
- Mineral extraction has been excluded and should be kept as such
- Concern in Oregon: Open water aquaculture
 - Water quality, pollution, diseases, parasites, introduction of invasive species
- Preservation of culture and economy and working waterfront
- Gentrification of waterfront and communities is a concern
- Connectivity: Need to connect MPAs to on another and upland areas
 - Biological connectivity
 - Cultural connectivity
- Extra-regional economic values have negative impacts, concern over how MPAs will effect them
- Local determination of site designation, nomination, management, establishment of goals and objectives
- Maritime heritage – submerged cultural resources – way to establish connection to environment
 - Historical value
- Tribal interests: In maintaining access to resources and tribal rights

- In Oregon: Restoring keystone species, sea otter, for restoring ecosystem function.

Question 2:

What are the West Coast's important natural and cultural resources that you think a national system of MPAs should conserve and sustain for future generations?

- Biodiversity
- Fish populations – exploratory fisheries (Tribes)
- Representative habitats
 - Complex structure
- (migratory) sea birds and mammals, inverts, kelp eelgrass etc. etc.
 - including residents and transients
- geologic features
 - bluffs, rocky outcrops
- systems and processes
 - physical and cultural processes
- adjoining uplands
- sacred sites and cultural sites
- shipwrecks
- deep water habitat (away from shore)
- benthic, rocky habitat
- beaches, mudflats, estuaries
- seamounts, vents, canyons
- deep sea sponge beds
- public access
- salmon
- flyways (stop-over sites)
- salmon
- cultural corridors (tribal) – connections
- Islands
- Wilderness areas
- Fragile/ slow recovering habitats for fisheries or corals
- Areas of complex diverse habitats
- Sand shed – estuaries and creeks
 - Huge erosion problems/ dredging
- Natural shoreline processes
- Protect shipwrecks and cultural resources
- Kelp beds and coastal estuaries
- Forage fish spawning habitat
- Nurseries habitat
- Tribally important habitat and culturally important areas
- Unique biological assemblages
- Marine mammal migration routes
- Artificial reefs
- Consider expanding upland protected areas to nearby marine areas
- Protect reference sites for scientific study
- Coastal wilderness: Aesthetic
- Biodiversity (including genetic diversity)

- Evolutionary potential
- Endangered species
- Non-listed species of concern
- Oceanographic features, including ocean convergent zones (i.e. “the Big Eobly” off Cape Flattery)
- Damages awarded to region, not Federal treasury in response to litigation
- Bird islands
- Marine mammal haulouts/ rookeries
- Representative habitats
 - Intertidal, terrestrial, kelp forests, subtidal, benthic, coldwater corals
- River deposition
- Sediment transport
- Undeveloped shoreline
- Feeder bluffs
- Geologic features that support resilience
- Fish and shell fish production areas
- Shipwrecks
- Shell middens
- Other native cultural sites
- Forts
- Lighthouses
- Preserve fluvial processes
- Hydrological regimes
- Global warming/ sea level rise/ acidification
- Dunes
- Consider ecological processes; primary and secondary production, etc.
- Expand reserves? Such as into Strait of JDF or San Juans
- Places of ecological uniqueness
- Representative ecosystems or habitats
- Life stage sites of importance
 - Forage fish spawning areas
 - Bird breeding and feeding areas
 - Bird wintering sites
 - Haul-out sites
 - Areas of species concentrations
- Key oceanographic features that support ecosystem processes
 - Kelp forest
 - Benthic habitat
 - Currents & upwelling
- Setting goals – specific and as quantitative as possible
- Establish performance measures up front
- Ecosystem-based management requires identification of goals, measures of success
 - Need an ‘end game’ especially for fishing communities

Question 3:

How could your interests in the West Coast’s natural and cultural resource issues benefit from some kind of national system of MPAs?

- Public awareness
- Help coordination – among levels
 - Communication
 - Collaboration
- Strengthen protection
- ID or recognizing national significance
- Incentives
 - Tools, training brought to local/ state level by feds (e.g. NOAA CSC)
- Funding
- Migratory species – benefit from migratory corridors
- International incentives
 - Supplemented with national level (e.g. Commission on Environmental Cooperation)
- Federal level support in conflict resolution
- Interact with terrestrial side (bridge and connect w/ Department of the Interior+)
- Connection between upland/ marine/ creation of corridors (spillover)
- People need cohesive outreach from agencies: 1) keep area protected; 2) keep people from breaking the law due to lack of knowledge
- Education/ Outreach
- Sustainable Fisheries – Maintenance
- Information Clearinghouse – MPA Center
- Set research objectives by bringing multi-disciplinary researchers together
- Facilitate communication across political and organizational boundaries
- Problem with terminology
- Remove duplicate efforts (e.g., geographic information systems (GIS))
- Utility corridors/ cable crossings to consider natural/ cultural resources
- How are inland waters considered? Make sure they are considered in a national system
- Better resource management results
- Gap analysis
- Drawing together MPA Managers at regional and national levels
- Coordinating management authorities and goals
- Incorporate government to government relationship with tribes into the national system – Priority!
- Highlight unique resources; influence ecotourism, economic tourism, public education
- Serve as role model internationally
- Demonstrate how shore-based/ upland impacts affect marine areas
- Allows for more experimentation/ replication of research
- Better enforcement for areas by increasing perception of value and increased stewardship
- MPA Center can add value by providing goals
 - Setting goals at ecological scale (e.g., all life stages of highly migratory species)
- Coordinating efforts at larger scales: California current
- Linking the ecosystems to specific species for purpose of public involvement and education and leveraging funds
- Acres and dollars are not sufficient for goal setting
- Various goals (social, economic, biological) need to be integrated
- Need to coordinate communication about goals for regions
 - Across agencies
- Need to have conversation on the definition of region

- Help local entities consider entire suite of tools
- Promote cohesive, comprehensive efforts (ecosystem based management)
- Coordination of protection of resources off Oregon coast
 - Few goals set for long-term in that area
 - Structural impediments to communication and cooperation
- Southern resident orca whale management and ecosystem
- Salmon
- Roles of MPAs, local communities, other tools
- San Juan Islands: Don't need your help
- Basic research and monitoring of ecological systems
 - Can be supported by fishermen
- Highlight scientific findings divorced from regulatory action
- MPA problem: Infringes on treaty rights – limits access
- A priority data gap that needs filling is 1) research/ scientific understanding of whether existing MPAs work; 2) the logical connections within ecosystems that need to be understood before establishing MPAs (also baseline biodiversity data)
- MPA approaches need replicate reserves
- Need to ensure that research/ science information is accessible to all (also involve in data collection)
- Build in traditional environmental knowledge
- Need clearly states objectives for MPAs
- Need international component – this is critical aspect of marine management in WA and the northwest
- Integrate count/ local government
- Need dedicated, long-term funding to ensure good monitoring and management
- Monitoring / traditional knowledge should lead to adaptive management
- Need to consider up/inland sources of impacts
- Streamlining/ harmonization of agency approaches and agency cultures
- Clearing house effort/ communication on research/ legal frameworks/ +more (use existing mechanisms more effectively)
- Look at distributed networks for sharing information
- Need more 'teeth' and accountability for process results
- Look at climate and invasive impacts – resiliency issue need to be considered
- DILEMA: Creating new governance mechanisms requires sharing of power and take a long time –vs. – using existing mechanisms that may have limited scope

Question 4:

How should NOAA and Department of the Interior continue to work with stakeholders like you on the West Coast to develop the vision for the national system?

- More public awareness/ campaign
 - Outreach
 - Specifics, value-added (not process)
- More focused dialogue with Northwest Straits and other similar efforts
- Targeting groups with multiple stakeholders
- Meetings more accessible (e.g. in MPA locations)
- Listserv/ email
 - Identify several mediums to communicate
- More collaboration with tribes

- Sovereign nation
 - Approach is different (understand perspectives)
- No one knows what you mean by a ‘system’
- What will be developed by MPA Center?
- Will MPA Center be able to allocate funds?
 - These questions affect how you will work with stakeholders in future
- Oregon stakeholder not included in process
- Hold meetings in coastal/ non-urban areas with economic ties to ocean
- Have other comment/ participation methods than internet/ email
 - Ideas: Pacific Fishery Management Council meetings
 - Piggyback existing efforts
 - Marine Science Center
 - Chamber of Commerce in coastal communities
 - National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council
 - CREST-Columbia River Estuary Studies Task Force
- Terrestrial analogy to MPA to inform public
- Cross-deputization w/ federal marshals for tribal enforcement
- Greatly increased recognition of tribes - dialogues and negotiations with tribes (must have to ensure success in Pacific Northwest)
- Regional approach to water rights vs. state sovereign action
- Stay in touch with local issues by monthly coordination and updates
- Processes that monitor issues of regional importance
- Communicate by face-to-face visits with important local entities
- Ensure national system processes are embedded in regional ocean governance
- Develop regional legislation/ earmarks
- Support for regional research
- Communicate benefits/ results of research driven by local interests
- Regional = Pacific Northwest
- Cascadia and Columbia river drainage are two representative important regional systems to consider
- Publicize how system is being developed
- Establish guidelines for what should be in management plans
- Harmonize plans across Federal agencies
- Trust fund taxes/ tariffs from shipping industries to support mitigation of environmental degradation
- In person, face-to-face, often (frequent) communication with stakeholders
- Early communication
- Identify key stakeholder group representatives
- Put a national MPA employee in Washington state or Pacific Northwest
- Strengthen abilities of MPA Center and use as Department of the Interior/ NOAA liaison for working with stakeholders
- Need to cast broader net – San Francisco and Seattle not enough
- Interest in Alaska is very high
- Need to include Canada in some way
- The Nature Conservancy: Eco-regional assessments and conservation planning efforts: Need to integrate with this effort
- Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Committee – will get marine reserves in Oregon; need to communicate our vision and mission – public outreach
- Integration with current processes and activities

- World Wildlife Fund/The Nature Conservancy: Bering Sea conservation plan – will be doing eco-regional assessment in Northwest Coast
- Ongoing nomination process
- Bottom up – top down: Needs to incorporate local processes and work and integrate under the larger Center goals
- Need to find areas where scale is the issue and needs are different
- engage commercial fishermen, processors, and other that know marine ecosystems well
- county marine resource committees (Marine Resource Councils) via Northwest Straits Commission
- trade shows to get to people in the industry
- state/ local agencies
- National Association of County Officials – maybe?
- Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Committee
- Washington Policy Committee
- Sea Grant
- Northwest Marine Trade Association (Mike Cambell)
- Ocean commissions recommendations need to be integrated
- Look at regional ocean councils from Ocean Commission to implement National System Process

Question 5:

Other comments?

Tribal considerations:

- Need significant recognition of tribes' sovereignty and the important resources they protect
- Northwest tribes have far reaching authorities
- Larger meeting with tribes is good start, but need to meet individually with each on a government-to-government basis
- Other stakeholders' need to understand the government-to-government relationship between tribes and U.S.
- Long term process needs long-term relationship established with tribes
- Look at: 1) US Environmental Protection Agency "Indian Policy"; 2) CBD-AKWE: KON guidelines; 3) Parks Victoria work with Indigenous peoples – all three are good examples
 - Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission is willing to help coordinate this effort
 - Good communications is key to working with tribes

Other:

- Helpful if framework put MPAs in context
 - How do MPAs work within larger picture of other management schemes
 - Is conservation in MPA stand-alone in order to work? If not stand-alone, need context and what does that look like?
- Clarify objectives
- How MPAs compliment ocean zoning
- Final set of recommendations – existing sites to strengthen protection of biodiversity (e.g. national marine sanctuary should prohibit more than oil and gas development)
- Marketing and media

- Further define
- Targeted/ narrowed message
- Definition leaves out private protected areas
- Make it important for private owners to want to be engaged
- Start with the tribes
 - Northwest Indian Fishery Commission has contact with many tribes
 - Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission
- ECC – Environmental Cooperation Council is good forum for transboundary stuff
 - Washington and British Columbia (head of Washington Department of Ecology and British Columbia Environment)

Comments Submitted by E-mail

“Dear Mr. Jonathan Kelsey:

Thanks for accepting my RSVP for the Seattle dialog meeting in Seattle on Dec 13. Yes I would like to formally submit my list of 15 issues that I and other Depoe Bay principals feel are important regarding future MPAs. We are hopeful that these comments will be included in the workshop report, along with other comments we receive during the meeting.

Fifteen talking points important to Depoe Bay citizens regarding MPAs off the Oregon coast.

- (1) What are the scientific criteria to be used to design MPAs? How large? Where located? How many? Will there be vertical zoning of the ocean also? Is it true that a state developed marine reserve will meet the requirement for an MPA in the same area of ocean? That is, will a state developed marine reserve trump the requirement for an MPA?
- (2) What are the multiple use issues? Will some ocean-life removal be allowed? Will NOAA developed MPAs be located in federal waters only? (3) What is the methodology for estimating the socioeconomic impacts from MPAs?
- (4) What is the methodology for estimating the values to ocean health restoration from MPAs?
- (5) Will "values" be compared to "impacts" as part of the analysis of any MPA.
- (6) How do MPAs and marine reserves dovetail with aquaculture zones? With wave power-plant zones? With other ocean zones?
- (7) How does NOAA define sound science or best-available science? What criteria will be used to demonstrate that the science used is good enough?
- (8) Research and education should include Oregon students and not just MPA project people.
- (9) Will MPAs last forever? Are MPAs a permanent federal takeover of previously public-usable ocean?
- (10) Will MPAs off Oregon be of site-specific design or one-size-fits-all design?
- (11) Will federal funding be available to Depoe Bay entities for activities supporting the development and management of MPAs?
- (12) What federal, state, or local management controls will characterize MPAs?
- (13) Can local governments eventually take control of NOAA developed MPAs?
- (14) How will pollutants residing within the boundaries of an MPA be minimized or considered in the evaluation of MPA performance?
- (15) What methodology will be utilized when (a) natural and cultural resources, and (b) regionally-important sustainable uses are optimized? This goal of optimization is honorable, but developing the actual methodology is very difficult. This feels more like a political goal than a real technical goal.

Regards,
Jack Brown, PhD
Councilor, City of Depoe Bay
Member Oregon's Ocean Policy Advisory Council”