



OLYMPIC COAST NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

Navigating the Future

Management Plan Review



PUBLIC SCOPING AND ISSUES ANALYSIS

PART 3: **ADVISORY COUNCIL ISSUE PRIORITIZATION WORKSHOP REPORT**



MARCH 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. WORKSHOP STRUCTURE1

III. WORKSHOP RESULTS3

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS.....18

V. NEXT STEPS.....19

APPENDIX A. List of Advisory Council primary and alternate members.....21

**APPENDIX B. Advisory Council recommendations
to Sanctuary Superintendent22**

APPENDIX C. Rationales for Individual Topic Scores30

I. INTRODUCTION

This document was created to assist Olympic Coast Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) members, the public, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) staff and Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) staff in understanding the outcomes of the OCNMS Advisory Council (Council) Issue Prioritization Workshop, held January 29 and 30, 2009. This is the third in a series of documents being produced as part of the Public Scoping and Issues Analysis (scoping) phase of OCNMS' *Navigating the Future* management plan review process. This scoping phase is focused on gathering public comments and, in consultation with the Council and IPC, selecting priority issues to address in OCNMS' revised management plan.

The two preceding documents, titled *Part I: Scoping Summary* and *Part II: Topics Analysis Report*, summarized and analyzed the public comments received during the scoping public comment period (September 15 – November 14, 2008). The purpose of the Issue Prioritization Workshop was for Council members to use the scoping public comments as a platform from which to develop recommendations for the Sanctuary Superintendent on priority issues to be addressed in the revised management plan.

The Council is comprised of representatives of state and local governments, other federal agencies, Coastal Treaty Tribes, marine industry, conservation organizations and citizens. There are 21 seats on the Council, of which 15 are voting members and 6 are governmental seats considered non-voting ex-officio representatives (Appendix A). Each seat has a primary and alternate member. The Council operates under a charter and serves the Sanctuary in an advisory role. Thus the opinions and findings of the Advisory Council as reflected in the workshop summary do not necessarily reflect the position of OCNMS and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. However, OCNMS greatly values the Council's recommendations and considers all Council recommendations carefully. Council members provide an invaluable service to the Sanctuary as subject area experts, sounding boards for pending management decisions, and connections to and spokespersons for the broader community that is interested in the work of the Sanctuary.

Throughout the *Navigating the Future* process, the Council will play a critical role by advising the Sanctuary Superintendent on priority issue selection, leading and participating in workgroups that address priority issues, commenting on recommended strategies developed by workgroups, providing feedback on the draft and final management plans, and making recommendations on strategic matters related to how OCNMS conducts management plan review.

II. WORKSHOP STRUCTURE

The workshop was held January 29 and 30, 2009 at the University of Washington's Olympic Natural Resources Center in Forks, Washington. It was facilitated by Robert Wheeler and Blake Trask of Triangle Associates, Inc. The primary goals of the

workshop were for Council members to understand and discuss the 37 topics identified in the *Topics Analysis Report* and provide the Sanctuary Superintendent with advice on the relative importance of each. The Council achieved this through scoring and ranking of each topic. A secondary goal was for the Council to provide, if possible, a recommended list of topics to be addressed in the revised management plan. This prioritization exercise recognized that, while many topics are of importance to sanctuary management over the long-term, some will be more important than others in the next five to ten years.

In advance of the workshop, Council members were asked to review a series of documents relevant to sanctuary management, including the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, OCNMS' designation document, the OCNMS 2008 Condition Report, the IPC Addendum to the Condition Report, the Washington Ocean Action Plan, the Treaties of Neah Bay and Olympia, and the IPC Charter. In addition, each Council seat (primary plus alternate) was asked to complete a homework assignment for which they scored each topic on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 = extremely low priority for OCNMS and 5 = an extremely high priority). It was recommended that topic scores be based on the following criteria:

- Benefits to the resource;
- Urgency of the topic;
- The extent to which the topic advances the mission and goals of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries; and
- Limiting Factors – for example, factors that may limit a successful outcome.

OCNMS asked primary and alternate Council members to work together to submit one response per seat prior to the workshop. The facilitator used these initial results as a basis from which to launch discussion at the workshop.

Over the two days, the facilitator led Council members through a series of discussions focused on achieving consensus on both the scoring (or importance of the topic *independent* of other topics), as well as the ranking (or *relative* importance in comparison to other topics) of these 37 topics to sanctuary management over the next five to ten years. The Council also had opportunity to identify additional topics not raised during public scoping. Part of this process focused on the Council discussing the descriptions of each topic and further refining the topic description, if that was needed. Through these discussions, the Council added the following criterion to list above: “is it a responsibility of OCNMS to take action to address the topic?” For example, some important actions could be the responsibility of other agencies or entities, and therefore be scored as a low priority for action by OCNMS. Additionally, the Council discussed the fact that it should not score a particular topic lower just because OCNMS currently performs work related to that topic. Consequently, there was no scoring bias associated with the continuation of current management actions.

For the purposes of this workshop, consensus was defined as agreement of all participants (including voting, non-voting, primary and alternate representatives) including all statements other than formal disagreement (Table 1). If the Council could not reach consensus on a particular topic, there would be a formal vote with only the voting

members allowed to participate, as per the Council Charter. However, this was not necessary because the Council worked solely by consensus throughout the workshop.

TABLE 1. Consensus was reached if no Council members (including alternates) formally disagreed with the decision. This table is adapted from “*Facilitator’s Guide to Participatory Decision-Making,*” 1996.

<i>Consensus</i> →			← <i>No Consensus</i>		
Endorse	Endorse with a minor point of contention	Agree with reservations	Abstain	Stand aside	Formal disagreement
<i>“I like it”</i>	<i>“Basically I like it”</i>	<i>“I can live with it”</i>	<i>“I have no opinion”</i>	<i>“I don’t like this but I don’t want to hold up the group”</i>	<i>“I cannot support this”</i>

III. WORKSHOP RESULTS

The Issue Prioritization Workshop was well-attended, with all but two seats represented (Appendix A). The Council discussed the characterization of each topic to develop a common understanding of its scope. They worked by consensus to score and rank all of the topics, and then agreed to forward their scores and rankings to the Sanctuary Superintendent along with additional recommendations (Appendix B).

At the start of the workshop sanctuary staff provided a synopsis of information in the OCNMS 2008 Condition Report that was relevant to each of the 37 topics raised during the public scoping process. Sanctuary staff wanted to ensure that Council members had reviewed relevant information in the Condition Report, but emphasized that the Condition Report was not the only document upon which the Council should base its topic prioritization decisions. Throughout this discussion, Council members raised concerns about aspects of the Condition Report, including 1) the IPC’s request to be a co-author on the report, which was denied by the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries; 2) the inaccurate characterization that salmon and crab fisheries are not managed using stock assessments; 3) the need to quantify, rather than make generalized inferences about, the impacts of different types of fishing gear on seafloor habitats in the Sanctuary; 4) the use of the term “degraded habitat” when discussing the effects of bottom trawling in the Sanctuary; 5) the need for more information about the effects of climate change on Sanctuary resources; 6) the need to clarify use of the term “ecosystem-based fisheries management”; and 7) the fact that the Condition Report, which is a highly visible public document, did not include meaningful information about the coastal treaty tribes, their relationship with marine resources and the socioeconomic value of these resources to the tribes.

Sanctuary staff then provided a brief overview of the current Sanctuary goals and objectives, as well as thoughts on reviewing the goals and objectives as part of the management plan review process. In particular, sanctuary staff made note of several documents that the Council was asked to consider in preparation for the workshop, including the National Marine Sanctuaries Act purposes and policies, the National Marine Sanctuaries Strategic Plan (2005) and OCNMS' current goals and objectives, which should be used to guide the goals and objectives review and the Council's issue prioritization decisions at the workshop.

After these presentations by sanctuary staff, the Council worked on scoring the topics, working topic-by-topic, reviewing and discussing the initial scores submitted by each seat as part of the homework assignment. First, Council members worked to achieve a common understanding of each topic. In some cases, especially when there was high variation in the scores, members chose to share the rationales for their scores in order to reach this common understanding. This discussion is summarized in Appendix C. Next, each seat was given the opportunity to revise its score. Once individual scores were revised, the scores were averaged across all seats to provide a single score (Table 2). The standard deviation was also indicated to provide a measure of variability in individual scores for each topic.

In some cases, the Council agreed to add clarifying language to a topic title (shown in bold italics in Table 2) in order to convey their interpretation of the topic. For example, the topic "Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing" was limited in scope by the phrase "assessing the impacts of" to distinguish between assessing impacts and taking management action and to remove management actions from consideration during the scoring. Also, the Council requested that "Fisheries Stock Assessment" be separated into two topics - one that focused on formal stock assessment, and one that focused on research to support formal stock assessment.

The Council agreed not to score the topic "Administration – Sanctuary Goals and Objectives" because it recommended reviewing these goals and objectives as an essential step in the management plan review process.

During the second part of the workshop, Council members primarily focused on ranking topics, and where appropriate, grouping related topics (Table 2). Topics were grouped together if they were sufficiently similar to allow consideration by a single working group or if they possessed other important commonalities. The Council used a color-coding process (Appendix B) to rank the highest priority topics (green), second tier priority topics (blue), topics that should be combined or "lumped" with other topics (yellow), and topics that were perceived as beyond the scope of the current management plan review process (pink). Additionally, there were two topics (Invasive Species and Administration – Infrastructure) that were left unresolved and were colored gray.

TABLE 2. Topic descriptions, the OCNMS Advisory Council’s average score (with standard deviation), and an explanation of the Council’s ranking

Highest Priority Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>TREATY TRUST RESPONSIBILITY</p> <p>Average Score: 4.8 Standard Deviation: 0.5</p>	<p>Description: Tribal treaties along with associated federal statutes, Executive Orders, and court rulings have established a unique legal relationship, an overarching federal trust responsibility of the United States to Indian tribes. This trust responsibility establishes legal obligations of the United States to Indian tribes, including the protection of treaty fishing rights. OCNMS must honor its treaty trust responsibilities.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that the topic of treaty trust responsibility is of the utmost importance to everything that OCNMS does, and the topic needs to be considered throughout the management plan and management plan review process.</p>
<p>COLLABORATIVE & COORDINATED MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 4.8 Standard Deviation: 0.5</p>	<p>Description: A collaborative and coordinated approach is essential to effective management of OCNMS. Active partnerships result in more effective resource protection efforts and provide a more transparent and inclusive structure for management of Olympic Coast marine resources within tribal, local, state, federal and international jurisdictions.</p> <p>Council Ranking: There was strong agreement among Council members that OCNMS should focus on improving partnerships, collaboration, and coordination in the revised management plan.</p>
<p>RESEARCH FOR <i>COLLABORATIVE ECOSYSTEM-BASED</i> MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 4.8 Standard Deviation: 0.4</p>	<p>Description: A scientific research program that focuses on ecosystem-level processes, species-habitat associations, and interspecies interactions and is conducted in collaboration with partners is essential.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council modified the title of this topic to emphasize the importance of 1) collaborating on research projects and sharing data/results and 2) ecosystem-based management as a driver of research. Council members ranked this topic as a high priority because there is a great need for increased research in the Sanctuary and because research to support collaborative ecosystem-based management will help to inform future ecosystem protection measures. There was a general recommendation to combine Habitat Characterization, Living Resource Monitoring, Water Quality Monitoring, Climate Change, Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing (assessing the impacts) and Fisheries Stock Assessment (research to support) into this topic because these efforts all are closely related, collaborative in nature, and inform ecosystem-based management.</p>

Highest Priority Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>HABITAT CHARACTERIZATION</p> <p>Average Score: 4.7 Standard Deviation: 0.5</p>	<p>Description: OCNMS and its partners have made progress mapping habitats in the Sanctuary, but much work remains to be done. There is a need to complete characterization of seafloor habitats and identify species-habitat associations to effectively inform management decisions.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council made this a high priority because so little of the Sanctuary has been mapped. Moreover, these data would support the work of many governments, agencies and non-governmental organizations, as well as inform management decisions. The Council recommended grouping Habitat Characterization under Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management because the topics are closely connected and should be considered by the same work group.</p>
<p>LIVING RESOURCES MONITORING</p> <p>Average Score: 4.7 Standard Deviation: 0.5</p>	<p>Description: Long-term monitoring of biological resources is critical to the successful management of the Sanctuary. Long-term and collaborative monitoring is required to assess the current status (abundance) and condition (health) of key species in the Sanctuary, as well as seasonal and multi-year trends.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council strongly supported addressing this topic in the revised management plan. As with Habitat Characterization, the Council recommended grouping Living Resource Monitoring under the topic Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management because the topics are closely connected and should be considered by the same work group.</p>
<p>SPILL PREVENTION, PLANNING & RESPONSE</p> <p>Average Score: 4.6 Standard Deviation: 0.7</p>	<p>Description: The potential for a catastrophic spill remains a significant threat to marine resources in the Sanctuary. Involvement in regional planning efforts to strengthen prevention and response capabilities, including evaluating impacts of alternative response technologies, encouragement of equipment deployment drills off the outer coast, training staff, and protection of cultural resources and shoreline habitats are all important aspects of sanctuary management.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic high given the risk that the Sanctuary faces from oil spills and the importance of oil spill prevention and response activities.</p>

Highest Priority Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>WATER QUALITY MONITORING (<i>water column properties</i>)</p> <p>Average Score: 4.4 Standard Deviation: 0.9</p>	<p>Description: Biological resources and their dependent uses, as well as human health, can be impacted by degraded water quality. Water quality monitoring off the Washington coast should involve collaborative efforts that should focus on improving understanding of physical and chemical processes, assessing potential degradation of water quality, monitoring ecological impacts, and improving data sharing.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council strongly supported addressing this topic in the revised management plan because maintaining water quality is essential to protecting Sanctuary resources. The title was modified to ensure that a broad suite of monitoring parameters were included. The Council recommended grouping Water Quality Monitoring under the topic Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management</i> because the topics are closely connected and should be considered by the same work group.</p>
<p>CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>Average Score: 4.3 Standard Deviation: 0.6</p>	<p>Description: Ongoing changes to the climate and marine ecosystem have been documented, yet there is considerable uncertainty about current and future consequences at local, ecosystem and oceanic scales. Increased coordination and cooperation among resource management agencies would improve planning, monitoring and adaptive management to address this phenomenon.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that the issue of climate change and its potential effects on Sanctuary ecosystems are important and should be addressed in the revised management plan. The Council recommended grouping Climate Change under the topic Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management</i> because much of the work related to climate change would be monitoring, the topics are closely connected, and both topics should be considered by the same work group.</p>
<p>OCEAN LITERACY</p> <p>Average Score: 4.2 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Enhancing the public’s awareness and appreciation of natural and cultural resources is a cornerstone of OCNMS’ mission. Ocean literacy, broadly defined, is an understanding of the ocean’s influence on you, and your influence on the ocean.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that Ocean Literacy is a high priority for OCNMS. Council members recommended grouping the topics of Community Outreach and Visitor Services under Ocean Literacy because Ocean Literacy encompasses these topics in addition to formal education programs.</p>

Second Tier Priority Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>ADMINISTRATION - REGULATIONS, PERMITTING & ENFORCEMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 3.2 Standard Deviation: 1.1</p>	<p>Description: When OCNMS was designated in 1994, NOAA promulgated regulations to protect Sanctuary resources. These regulations outline the requirements of OCNMS’ permitting program, through which permits can be issued to conduct an otherwise prohibited activity for a limited number of reasons. The responsibility for enforcing these regulations falls primarily to NOAA’s Office of Law Enforcement. Potential improvements to OCNMS regulations, permitting process, and enforcement program should be considered.</p> <p>Council Ranking: Council members varied in their opinions of this topic. Some supported addressing certain aspects of this category, such as OCNMS’ permitting process or improving the enforcement program. Others supported the topic but viewed it as something to be considered within the context of each priority issue. Others viewed it as a high priority because it is a core function of OCNMS. Consequently, the Council recommended that this topic be considered a second-tier priority.</p>
<p>PUBLIC & PRIVATE RESOURCE USE - SOCIOECONOMIC VALUES</p> <p>Average Score: 4.0 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Resource management should support socioeconomic values and human use, and value human beings as part of Washington’s coastal and marine ecosystems. Protection of living resources, habitats and water quality, as well as sustainable use that supports local economies and cultures should be management priorities.</p> <p>Council Ranking: In general, the Council felt that this was an important issue, but ranked it as a second-tier priority. The Council recommended grouping Public & Private Resource Use – Commercial Development, Public & Private Resource Use – Compatibility Analysis and Public & Private Resource Use – Recreational Opportunities under this topic because all three are related to protecting local economies and valuing the socioeconomic importance of Sanctuary resources.</p>
<p>MARINE DEBRIS – ABANDONED SUBMERGED EQUIPMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 3.7 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: Marine debris in subtidal areas injures wildlife and marine habitats, and is a persistent problem for which removal and reduction efforts are necessary.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but viewed it more as a resource protection tool than as a topic in and of itself. The Council recommended grouping it under the topic of Living Resource Conservation.</p>

Second Tier Priority Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>MARINE DEBRIS – SHORELINE CLEAN-UP</p> <p>Average Score: 3.7 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: Marine debris on the shore injures wildlife and marine habitats, degrades the wilderness aesthetic of outer coast beaches, and is a persistent problem for which removal and reduction efforts are necessary.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but viewed it more as a resource protection tool than as a topic in and of itself. The Council recommended grouping it under the topic of Living Resource Conservation, but emphasized that OCNMS’ participation in the Washington Coast Clean-Up should continue (this project could be included under Ocean Literacy or Community Outreach).</p>
<p>LIVING RESOURCE CONSERVATION</p> <p>Average Score: 3.5 Standard Deviation: 1.2</p>	<p>Description: OCNMS hosts abundant and diverse wildlife communities that are threatened by an array of human activities. OCNMS should be proactive in promoting wildlife conservation and mitigating the numerous activities (e.g., recreational, commercial, military etc.) that can impact wildlife.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic as a second-tier priority because it felt the emphasis of the management plan in regards to living resource, water quality and habitat protection should be on research and monitoring (gathering information) and not on enacting protection measures (particularly regulations). While supportive of protection issues, some members expressed concern that, at this time, there is not enough available information to justify/support OCNMS making the types of regulatory changes proposed by the public during scoping. The Council recommended grouping the topics of Habitat Protection and Water Quality Protection under Living Resources Conservation because they all relate to resource protection.</p>

Grouped Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>FISHERIES STOCK ASSESSMENT (<i>research to support</i>)</p> <p>Average Score: 4.0 Standard Deviation: 0.7</p>	<p>Description: Stock assessments provide important information about the health of fish populations and serve as the foundation for many fisheries management decisions. Some believe that current assessments of groundfish stocks off Washington are inadequate for management of groundfish on a regional basis, and that improved fisheries stock assessments for the Washington coast will assist fisheries management decisions.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that stock assessments are important and need to be improved, but clarified that NOAA Fisheries conducts fisheries stock assessments already and OCNMS' role should be to conduct research that will support these stock assessments. The Council recommended grouping this topic under the topic Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management because the topics are closely connected and should be considered by the same work group.</p>
<p>LOCAL AND CUSTOMARY KNOWLEDGE</p> <p>Average Score: 3.9 Standard Deviation: 0.7</p>	<p>Description: OCNMS needs to develop a holistic, ecosystem-based management approach that incorporates tribal and non-tribal knowledge about the ecology of sanctuary resources. OCNMS needs to work with tribal and non-tribal communities to catalogue this knowledge and use it to inform management decisions.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important to include in the management plan, but felt that it related closely to and should be addressed within the context of Ocean Literacy and Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management.</p>
<p>WATER QUALITY PROTECTION</p> <p>Average Score: 3.9 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Unimpaired water quality is essential to the health of the marine ecosystem. Protecting/maintaining water quality is important when seeking to balance human use of the Sanctuary with conservation goals.</p> <p>Council Ranking: Council member opinions on this topic varied. Some felt that it was very important. Others felt that it was important, but that there was not enough information available to know whether it should be a high priority for this management plan. The Council felt that this topic was closely related to the other protection topics and recommended grouping it under Living Resource Conservation.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY OUTREACH</p> <p>Average Score: 3.9 Standard Deviation: 0.9</p>	<p>Description: Involvement of local and regional communities in OCNMS programs is vital. It is important that people on the Olympic Peninsula and in the region are aware of the Sanctuary's presence and management goals, and have meaningful opportunities to be involved in sanctuary programs. This will foster a sense of marine stewardship</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but recommended grouping it with Ocean Literacy because community outreach activities are rooted in the effort to improve ocean literacy.</p>

Grouped Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>HABITAT PROTECTION</p> <p>Average Score: 3.9 Standard Deviation: 1.3</p>	<p>Description: In seeking to balance human use of the Sanctuary with conservation goals, habitat protection should be a priority. OCNMS needs to develop a holistic approach to conservation and management of the marine ecosystem(s) within its boundaries, including a plan to protect seabed, water column, and biogenic habitats and habitats that support marine mammals and seabirds.</p> <p>Council Ranking: Council member opinions on this topic varied. Some felt that it was important – especially as it relates to protecting the Sanctuary from oil spills. Others felt that the topic was important, but that there was not enough evidence of habitat impacts in the Sanctuary to justify a high ranking (i.e., the emphasis over the next 5 to 10 years should be on gathering information on habitat impacts, not implementing protection actions such as regulations). In the end, the Council felt that this topic was closely related to the other protection topics and recommended grouping it under Living Resource Conservation.</p>
<p>MARITIME HERITAGE - LIVING CULTURES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.8 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: Within the Sanctuary system OCNMS is unique in that it is entirely encompassed by the usual and accustomed fishing areas of the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute tribes and the Quinault Indian Nation. OCNMS needs to expand its knowledge of and improve its communication messages about both the Native American cultures that have lived along Washington’s Outer Coast for thousands of years, as well as the more recent history of non-tribal residents and fishers.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this was an important topic, but felt that it was best addressed within the context of (i.e., grouped under) Ocean Literacy. Additionally, there was a suggestion that the public comments under this topic related to understanding paleo-shorelines and past human use of the coast be incorporated under the Climate Change topic.</p>
<p>PUBLIC & PRIVATE RESOURCE USE - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 3.8 Standard Deviation: 0.9</p>	<p>Description: Commercial development in coastal waters has the potential to harm resources and qualities of OCNMS, yet it often involves technologies for which environmental impacts have not been thoroughly evaluated. Improved understanding of potential environmental impacts of ocean technologies will help OCNMS determine if proposed projects are compatible with sanctuary goals and objectives and existing use.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but recommended grouping it under Public & Private Resource Use – Socioeconomic Values because the commercial development topic is closely related to protecting local economies and valuing the socioeconomic importance of sanctuary resources.</p>

Grouped Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>PUBLIC & PRIVATE RESOURCE USE - COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS</p> <p>Average Score: 3.7 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: The National Marine Sanctuaries Act allows for public and private uses of sanctuary resources, as long as those uses are not prohibited by other authorities and are compatible with the primary mandate of resource protection. This makes compatibility determination a key function of sanctuary management.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but recommended grouping it under Public & Private Resource Use – Socioeconomic Values because the compatibility analysis topic is closely related to protecting local economies and valuing the socioeconomic importance of sanctuary resources.</p>
<p>VISITOR SERVICES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.4 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: The sanctuary visitor experience could be enhanced through more interpretive signage and experiential, field-based interpretive programs on the outer coast. Modern outreach technology can be used to engage the public and inform a wider audience about the Sanctuary.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but recommended grouping it with Ocean Literacy because visitor services are rooted in the effort to improve ocean literacy.</p>
<p>PUBLIC & PRIVATE RESOURCE USE - RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.3 Standard Deviation: 1.1</p>	<p>Description: Recreational opportunities in OCNMS need to be maintained and enhanced. The living resources that recreational users come to see and enjoy need to be protected.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic was important, but recommended grouping it under Public & Private Resource Use – Socioeconomic Values because the recreational opportunities topic is closely related to protecting local economies and valuing the socioeconomic importance of sanctuary resources.</p>
<p>NON-POINT SOURCE POLLUTION</p> <p>Average Score: 2.9 Standard Deviation: 1.4</p>	<p>Description: Runoff from upland sites may contain pollutants, including toxins and pathogens. Understanding of the types and sources of non-point source pollution is essential to OCNMS’ ability to address potential impacts to sanctuary resources.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that non-point source pollution was an important topic, but there was concern about OCNMS becoming involved in monitoring upland runoff when other agencies already have this responsibility. It was agreed that non-point source pollution of many kinds may affect the Sanctuary and that this topic should be grouped under Water Quality Monitoring. It was also recommended that OCNMS should only conduct monitoring in the marine environment (not in upland areas).</p>

Grouped Topics	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>MARITIME & ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY – WEATHER FORECASTING</p> <p>Average Score: 2.8 Standard Deviation: 1.4</p>	<p>Description: Maintaining both maritime and environmental safety is a common goal of marine industry and governments with authority in the region. Large portions of the Washington outer coast do not have National Weather Service doppler radar coverage. Expanded radar coverage would improve marine safety on the outer Washington coast.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that OCNMS should support improvements to the weather monitoring infrastructure on the Outer Coast. The Council recommended grouping this topic under Maritime & Environmental Safety - Vessel Management because a primary goal of both topics is to improve vessel management and safety. However, the vessel management topic ended up being ranked as a topic not to be addressed in the management plan.</p>
<p>MARITIME & ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY – NAVIGATION</p> <p>Average Score: 2.8 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Maintaining both maritime and environmental safety is a common goal of marine industry and governments with authority in the region. Improvements to navigational aids and nautical charts can improve marine safety and reduce the risk of environmental impacts from oil spills.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council recommended grouping this topic under Spill Prevention, Planning & Response because the issue of navigation in the Sanctuary is most important within the context of preventing and responding to spills. However, there was some disagreement as to the extent that navigation should be a concern of OCNMS.</p>
<p>ECOSYSTEM IMPACTS OF FISHING <i>(assessing the impacts)</i></p> <p>Average Score: 2.6 Standard Deviation: 1.5</p>	<p>Description: Uncertainty exists related to ecosystem-level impacts from physical disturbance to seafloor habitats and effects of biomass removal from fishing within the sanctuary area. An ecosystem-based management approach that considers potential impacts of fishing can promote sustainable fisheries.</p> <p>Council Ranking: There was significant discussion about this topic, the public’s comments on this topic, and the implications of how this topic is characterized (either as focused on assessment or management). Eventually, the group agreed to modify the title with the phrase ‘assessing the impacts’. Among those who voiced opinions, there was general agreement that OCNMS should not engage in management or regulation related to the ecosystem impacts of fishing, but that research to support management decisions by other entities with regulatory authority constitutes an appropriate role for OCNMS. Given the focus on assessment, the Council recommended that this topic be grouped under Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management.</p>

Topics Not to Include in Management Plan	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>MARITIME & ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY - VESSEL MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 3.3 Standard Deviation: 1.1</p>	<p>Description: OCNMS is co-located with the entrance to the inland water ports of Seattle, Tacoma and Vancouver, British Columbia, and the marine route to major regional oil refining facilities. Maintaining both maritime and environmental safety is a common goal of marine industry and governments with authority in the region.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that this topic is important but that it is the primary responsibility of other agencies and should not be a high priority for OCNMS to address in its revised management plan. However, the Council stressed that OCNMS should continue working with the U.S. Coast Guard to maintain the Area to be Avoided program and recommended that this activity be captured under the Spills Prevention, Planning and Response topic.</p>
<p>MARITIME HERITAGE - CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 3.3 Standard Deviation: 0.9</p>	<p>Description: Characterizing and protecting maritime archaeological and cultural resources is an important role of OCNMS. Currently, these resources are inadequately characterized within the Sanctuary.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic as a low priority for inclusion in the management plan, noting that Native American tribes have the primary responsibility for archeological/cultural sites in the Sanctuary (though they do not necessarily have the lead on shipwrecks).</p>
<p>MILITARY ACTIVITIES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.2 Standard Deviation: 1.4</p>	<p>Description: The U. S. Navy conducts operations within OCNMS, with military training, warning and operating areas, as well as equipment research and development in the Quinault Underwater Test Range (QUTR). OCNMS regulations contain a number of exemptions related to these activities. The U.S. Navy is currently conducting environmental analyses of these activities and plans to expand the QUTR as well as increase training and other operations in OCNMS.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic as a low priority for inclusion in the management plan with minimal discussion. Council members expressed concern that there is little that OCNMS can do about military activities in the Sanctuary and that the management plan was better directed at other, higher priorities.</p>

Topics Not to Include in Management Plan	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>ADMINISTRATION - FLEXIBILITY TO RESPOND TO EMERGING ISSUES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.6 Standard Deviation: 1.2</p>	<p>Description: In an era of rapidly advancing technologies, intense human pressures on the regional and global environment, and improved understanding of ecosystem interactions and resiliency, issues are likely to arise that are not anticipated during management plan review. A framework that guides OCNMS’ responses to emerging issues would help to address these issues more thoughtfully and effectively.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council agreed that OCNMS’ ability to respond to emerging issues and be adaptive in its management strategies is important. However, the Council felt that such flexibility is an intrinsic element of all of OCNMS’ programs, and that the topic did not need to be addressed in isolation. Rather, the flexibility to respond to emerging issues should be a principle upon which the management plan is constructed.</p>
<p>MARITIME & ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY - HARBORS REFUGE</p> <p>Average Score: 2.0 Standard Deviation: 0.8</p>	<p>Description: Maintaining both maritime and environmental safety is a common goal of marine industry and governments with authority in the region. Harbors of refuge are areas where disabled vessels can shelter while repairs are made. The lack of such harbors along the Olympic Coast was identified as a concern.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic as a low priority for inclusion in the management plan, with minimal discussion. Members felt that there are no places within the Sanctuary that would be suitable for a harbor of refuge and that OCNMS should not consider this topic in its revised management plan.</p>
<p>BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT</p> <p>Average Score: 1.7 Standard Deviation: 1.1</p>	<p>Description: The current boundaries of the Sanctuary were determined during the designation process to represent a distinct ecosystem, informed by the best available science at the time. Adjustment of sanctuary boundaries could be considered during the management plan review process.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council ranked this topic as a low priority for inclusion in the management plan. There was little support for OCNMS exploring boundary adjustments. Several Council members stated that there was no justification for changing the Sanctuary boundaries.</p>

Topics Not to Include in Management Plan	Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking
<p>FISHERIES STOCK ASSESSMENT <i>(formal stock assessment)</i></p> <p>Average Score: 1.6 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Stock assessments provide important information about the health of fish populations and serve as the foundation for many fisheries management decisions. Some believe that current assessments of groundfish stocks off Washington are inadequate for management of groundfish on a regional basis, and that improved fisheries stock assessments for the Washington coast will assist fisheries management decisions.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council split this topic into two separate topics: one that addressed research to support stock assessments and one that addressed formal stock assessments. The Council did not think that OCNMS should be conducting formal stock assessments, but did think that OCNMS should conduct research to support stock assessments. Thus, the Council ranked the Fisheries Stock Assessment (formal stock assessment) topic as a low priority for inclusion in the management plan, but ranked the Fisheries Stock Assessment (research to support) higher.</p>
<p>No resolution</p>	<p>Description of Topic and Explanation of Ranking</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATION – INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Average Score: 3.2 Standard Deviation: 1.0</p>	<p>Description: Expanding OCNMS operations and programs with additional funding and infrastructure would improve sanctuary staff’s abilities to meet the current and future research, education, outreach and resource protection needs. OCNMS operations and programs need to be expanded and supported with appropriate funding and infrastructure.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council was not able to reach a resolution on the ranking of this topic. It was agreed that replacing the R/V Tatoosh is a critical need.</p>
<p>INVASIVE SPECIES</p> <p>Average Score: 3.0 Standard Deviation: 0.9</p>	<p>Description: While invasive species are not currently known to cause significant harm in the Sanctuary, there are ecological and socioeconomic risks, often severe, associated with a compromised ecosystem if invasive species are introduced and spread over wide areas. Monitoring for introductions of non-native and invasive species should be proactive and routine to mitigate or prevent establishment of invasive species.</p> <p>Council Ranking: The Council was not able to reach a resolution on this topic. Members seemed to agree that exotic, invasive species are important to consider. However, they felt that there was not enough information available about the risk of a non-native species invasion in the Sanctuary to know how to rank the topic. Several members suggested grouping this topic under Administration - Flexibility to Respond to Emerging Issues or under Living Resources Monitoring.</p>

In addition to providing its scoring, ranking, and comments on each topic, the Council provided these additional findings to the Sanctuary Superintendent:

- The Council recommended that OCNMS hold an annual meeting between the Council and the IPC.
- Treaty trust responsibility is inherent in everything done throughout MPR and the management plan.
- The Sanctuary goals and objectives should be reviewed as part of the management plan review process.

The Council also discussed the six preliminary priority topics developed by the IPC and Sanctuary (provided below). These preliminary priority topics were identified in the Federal Register Notice, dated September 15, 2008, that initiated the management plan review process. The Council recognized a high degree of agreement between the IPC priority topics and the Council's high priority topics.

1. **Improved Partnerships** - Recent initiatives for regional ocean management, including the formation of the Olympic Coast Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC), the Washington Ocean Action Plan and the West Coast Governors Agreement on Ocean Health, provide the sanctuary with new opportunities to strengthen partnerships, particularly with the four coastal treaty tribes and the state of Washington in their role as governments. The sanctuary will work in active partnership to provide a more transparent, cooperative and coordinated management structure of Olympic Coast marine resources within tribal, state and federal jurisdictions.
2. **Characterization and Monitoring** - There is a need to develop an understanding of baseline conditions of marine resources within the sanctuary, ecosystem functions, and status and trends of biological and socioeconomic resources to effectively inform management. OCNMS in conjunction with IPC and other entities will work to resolve these needs.
3. **Spill Prevention, Contingency Planning and Response** - The risk from vessel traffic and other hazards remains a significant threat to marine resources. The potential for a catastrophic oil spill remains a primary concern and while advances in maritime safety have been made since the sanctuary was designated, better coordination is needed for response to these threats. Oil spills cause immediate and potentially long term harm to marine resources as well as socioeconomic impacts to coastal communities.
4. **Climate Change** - Climate change is widely acknowledged, yet there is considerable uncertainty about current and future consequences at local, ecosystem and oceanic scales. Increased coordination and cooperation between resource management agencies are required to improve planning, monitoring and adaptive management to address this phenomenon.
5. **Ocean Literacy** - Enhancing the public's awareness and appreciation of marine, socio-economic, and cultural resources is a cornerstone of the

sanctuary's mission. Recent regional initiatives offer opportunities for the sanctuary, in conjunction with IPC and other entities, to expand educational contributions and reach a larger audience.

- 6. Marine Debris** - Coastal marine debris is a persistent and poorly diagnosed problem within the sanctuary that negatively impacts natural and socioeconomic resources and qualities.

The Council concluded the workshop with agreement by consensus that the Sanctuary Superintendent should advance the Council's topic scoring and ranking to the IPC for review and comment at its February 6, 2009 meeting. The Council's agreements and recommendations are captured in a letter to the Sanctuary Superintendent and are included in this report section as Appendix B.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The workshop was open to the public with two informal 15-minute public comment periods each day. Four members of the public provided comments. The public comments addressed protection of rockfish populations, promoting watchable wildlife, the Neah Bay tug, the structure of the Scoping Summary document, oil spill prevention, and recreational fishing opportunity.

Fred Felleman, representing the Northwest Office of Friends of the Earth, noted that they had over 500 members provide scoping comments. About half of these were from Washington state and the rest were scattered throughout the country. He felt that the number of commenters on a given topic should have been represented somewhere in the *Scoping Summary*.

Mr. Felleman was also concerned about the lack of engagement of communities in the management plan review process. He would like to see the documentation include more about what people said and to see these comments treated with great respect.

Mr. Felleman also commented that counting oil spills does not tell the story of threats. You need information on near misses and other events that may not lead to a spill but better characterizes the real risk of oil spills. He expressed disappointment that OCNMS does not comment to the Washington State Legislature on issues, such as support for the Neah Bay rescue tug.

David Jennings, a private citizen from Olympia and diver experienced with the Reef Environmental Education Foundation (REEF) surveys, noted that the rockfish populations in the Strait of Juan de Fuca have virtually disappeared due to overharvesting. He recommended changes to State recreational fishing regulations to prevent overfishing. He would like to see the sanctuary designate the area as a "no take" area (to serve as a watchable wildlife area).

Dan Leiman, Clerk/Treasurer for the City of Forks, who works with the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and currently serves on the WDFW Marine Sport Fishing Advisory group, commented on fishing issues. He voiced support for topic #6 (Collaborative and

Coordinated Management). Mr. Leiman noted that topic #7 (Community Outreach) is important. He noted that topic #8 (Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing) promotes sustainable fisheries, and stressed that all fisheries are important to the coastal communities, including tribal communities. He voiced support for topic #9 (Fisheries Stock Assessment) because limitations imposed by depleted species (such as yelloweye rockfish) restrict where people are able to fish. He stated that Washington waters should not be combined together with the entire (west) coast for population estimates. He stated that #13 (Living Resource Conservation) is important, but that local residents need somewhere to fish. He stated that #29 (Recreational Opportunities) is very important to local communities. He also wanted to stress the importance of the United States Coast Guard's Station Quillayute River. He stated that Forks strongly supports #34 (Treaty Trust Responsibility) and treaty rights.

Mayor Nedra Reed of Forks, Washington attended a portion of the workshop on Friday, January 30. She took the opportunity to welcome the Advisory Council to Forks and stated that the City of Forks was pleased to have the Sanctuary as a neighbor.

V. NEXT STEPS

Following the workshop, the Advisory Council Chair formally forwarded to the Sanctuary Superintendent the results of the workshop along with additional recommendations and guidance from the Advisory Council (Appendix B). The Superintendent then forwarded this information to the Olympic Coast Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) for review and discussion at its meeting on February 6, 2009. The IPC will review and comment on the Advisory Council recommendations and will provide the Sanctuary Superintendent with its recommendations on the priority issues to be addressed in the revised management plan.

While the Advisory Council and IPC are both advisory bodies, the IPC is fundamentally different from the Advisory Council in that its members are all sovereign governments (the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute Tribes, the Quinault Indian Nation, and the state of Washington) that have co-management authority over fishery resources and fishing activities in the Sanctuary. The Sanctuary is entirely encompassed by the Usual and Accustomed fishing areas of the coastal treaty tribes. Thus, the Sanctuary's interaction with the IPC occurs on a more formal, governmental level. The IPC provides a regional forum for resource managers to exchange information, coordinate policies, and develop recommendations for resource management within OCNMS.

Sanctuary staff, taking into consideration the public's comments, the recommendations of the IPC and Council, and the policies and legislative mandates that guide ONMS, will work in consultation with the Council and IPC to finalize a list of priority issues to be addressed in the revised management plan. Sanctuary staff will produce a *Priority Issue Work Plan* that details:

- the priority issues that the Sanctuary has chosen to address in its revised management plan;
- the formation of expert work groups to address these priority issues;

- how action plans and strategies will be developed for these priority issues over the next six to twelve months.

The *Priority Issue Work Plan* is the fourth document to be produced as part of the scoping phase of *Navigating the Future*. Once the *Priority Issue Work Plan* is published, the next phase of *Navigating the Future* begins - Action Plan Development. Action plans form the backbone of sanctuary management plans. Usually comprised of a series of specific strategies and activities, action plans detail the work that a sanctuary intends to do on priority issues over the next 5 to 10 years. Action plans contain specific tasks, estimated budgets and timelines for conducting work, as well as performance measures for assessing success.

APPENDIX A

**List of current Advisory Council primary and alternate members.
Those whose names are in bold font attended one or both days of the workshop.**

<i>Seat</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Primary</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
Citizen-at-large	Voting	Roy Morris	Bob Boekelheide
Education	Voting	Ellen Matheny	Gene Woodwick
Research (Chair)	Voting	Terrie Klinger	John Calambokidis
Conservation	Voting	Fan Tsao	Jody Kennedy
Chamber of Commerce/Tourism	Voting	Meredith Parker	Mike Gurling
Marine Industry (Vice Chair)	Voting	Bob Bohlman	Frank E. Holmes
Commercial Fishing	Voting	Doug Fricke	Vacant
Hoh Tribe	Voting	David Hudson	Joe Gilbertson
Makah Tribe	Voting	Steve Joner, Micah McCarty*	Vacant
Quileute Tribe	Voting	Mel Moon	Katie Krueger**
Quinault Indian Nation	Voting	Ed Johnstone	Joe Schumacker
Local Counties	Voting	Al Carter	Phil Johnson, Mike Doherty
WA Dept. of Ecology	Voting	Chip Boothe	Diane Butorac , Rebecca Post
WA Dept. of Natural Resources	Voting	Brady Scott	David Roberts
WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Voting	Teresa Scott	Vacant
Northwest Straits Commission	Non-voting	Ginny Broadhurst	Vacant
U.S. Coast Guard	Non-voting	Capt. Bill Devereaux	Capt. Scott Pollock
National Park Service	Non-voting	Karen Gustin	Steve Fradkin
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Non-voting	Kevin Ryan	Lorenz Sollmann
U.S. Navy*	Non-voting	George Hart***	John Miller
National Marine Fisheries Service	Non-voting	Steve Cops	Janet Sears

*Micah McCarty, Vice Chair for the Makah Tribe participated as the Makah representative

**Jennifer Hagan, marine biologist for the Quileute Tribe, attended the workshop in Katie Krueger's place.

*** The U.S. Navy submitted the workshop homework assignment but was unable to attend the workshop.

APPENDIX B
Advisory Council recommendations to Sanctuary Superintendent

**SANCTUARY
ADVISORY
COUNCIL**



Dr. Terrie Klinger, Chair
Bob Bohlman, Vice-Chair
Teresa Scott, Secretary

January 30, 2009

Representation

Citizen-At-Large
Conservation
Tourism/Economic Development
Commercial Fishing
Marine Business
Education
Research
Hoh Tribe
Makah Tribe
Quileute Tribe
Quinault Indian Nation
Clallam County
Jefferson County
Grays Harbor County
Washington State:
Dept. of Ecology
Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Dept. of Natural Resources
Olympic National Park
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
NOAA Fisheries
U.S. Coast Guard
U.S. Navy
Northwest Straits Commission

Carol Bernthal, Superintendent
Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
115 E. Railroad Avenue, Suite 301
Port Angeles, WA 98362

RE: Topic Recommendations for OCNMS Management Plan Review

Dear Superintendent Bernthal:

On January 29 and 30, 2009 the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) Advisory Council (AC) held a workshop at the Olympic Natural Resources Center in Forks, WA. The primary goals of the workshop were to understand and discuss the topics identified through the scoping process and then to provide the Sanctuary Superintendent with advice on scoring and ranking for each topic. This memo and attachments provide the results of that process, including a list of recommendations and topic scorings and rankings to serve as tools for OCNMS management plan review (MPR).

Over the first half of the workshop, the AC scored and worked to better define and clarify the 37 topics that arose out of the 2008 MPR public comment process. Ultimately, Council members were able to develop a common level of understanding and successfully clarified their rationale for developing scores on each topic.

Artwork: David Sones

On the second day of the workshop, the AC primarily focused on the ranking and – where the AC thought appropriate – the grouping of topics that were deemed to be similar. This process built upon the AC’s scoring discussion and efforts to understand the ideas and concepts behind each of the 37 topics, and ultimately led to a ranking of the revised and grouped topics considered to be MPR priorities.

OLYMPIC COAST NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
115 East Railroad Ave., Suite 301 Port Angeles, WA 98362
360/457-6622· 360/457-8496 fax
<http://ocnms.nos.noaa.gov/>

From this thoughtful, consensus-based process, the AC brings forward the following:

Grouping and ranking process and results:

- The AC went through an extensive scoring, grouping, and ranking process. A more detailed description of the process is provided below.

Additional findings:

- The AC discussed and agreed to recommend to the Sanctuary Superintendent to hold an annual coordination meeting between the AC and IPC.
- Treaty trust responsibility is inherent in everything done in the MPR and the management plan.

Closely tied to and accompanying our findings, please find the attached work products:

- Attachment 1: Scoring Worksheet – This spreadsheet contains the final scores that individual AC member representatives both developed prior to the workshop and, occasionally, modified during the workshop scoring discussions, based on the following criteria:
 - Benefits to the resource;
 - Urgency of the topic;
 - The sanctuary is suited to carry out the efforts surrounding this topic area;
 - The topic meets sanctuary mission and goals; and
 - It is a duty of the sanctuary to carry out the topic.
- Attachment 2: Ranking Worksheet – This spreadsheet represents the product of the AC's discussions during the post-rating grouping exercise, as well as the final ranking dialogue. This attachment provides our recommendations for sanctuary staff as they continue to refine the priority topics for the continued management of OCNMS. We reorganized the 37 topics into various color schemes:
 - *Green*: we support forwarding this topic as the highest management priority.
 - *Blue*: we believe this to be important but considered it a second-tier priority.
 - *Yellow*: we have chosen to group together these topics and linked them to associated topics that were considered high (green) or secondary (blue) priorities.
 - *Red*: these were not seen as topics to be prioritized for further review.
 - *Gray*: these topics were unresolved.

In addition, we often provided specific comments and recommendations associated with each topic that sanctuary staff should review and incorporate as appropriate into the next steps of the MPR process.

During the course of the workshop, AC members also discussed the six priority topics identified by the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) and sanctuary that were included in the Federal Register Notice dated September 15, 2008. The AC recognizes a high degree of consensus with the IPC priority topics and the AC priority topics. The AC concluded the meeting with agreement by consensus that the Sanctuary Superintendent advance the AC

topic rankings to the IPC for review and comment at their upcoming February 6, 2009 meeting.

On behalf of the members of the Advisory Council, I am happy to provide our work to you and sanctuary staff as you move forward with the OCNMS management plan review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'TK', is positioned to the left of a vertical blue line.

Terrie Klinger, Chair
OCNMS Advisory Council

Attachments

OCNMS Management Plan Review
Advisory Council Issue Prioritization Workshop
January 29 and 30, 2009

Attachment 1. AC Scores for Topics Raised During Public Scoping *(in descending order based upon average score)*

Note: The text in red italics was added by Advisory Council members during the course of the workshop. Additionally, the Advisory Council split some topics in two; in these cases, both topics retain the original topic number, but one is denoted with a lowercase 'a' (e.g., #8 and #8a).

Topic No.	AC Seat Score Topic	AC Seat Score																			Average (scale 1-5)	Standard deviation		
		Citizen-at-large	Education	Research	Conservation	Tourism	Industry	Fishing	USCG	Navy	ONP	USFWS	NMFS	WA Ecology	WA DNR	WDFW	Hoh	Makah	Quileute	Quinault				
34	Treaty Trust Responsibility	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	5.0	5	5	5	5	5	4.8	0.5
6	Collaborative & Coordinated Management	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4.5	5.0	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.8	0.4
32	Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based</i> Management	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5.0	4	5	5	4	4	4	4.7	0.5
10	Habitat Characterization	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5.0	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.7	0.5
14	Living Resources Monitoring	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	5	5	5	4	5	3.5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.6	0.7
33	Spill Prevention, Planning & Response	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5.0	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.4	0.9
36	Water Quality Monitoring (water column properties)	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	4	4.5	3.5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.3	0.6
5	Climate Change	3	5	4	5	4	3	5	2	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.0	5	3	3	5	5	5	4.2	1.0
26	Ocean Literacy	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	2	2	5	5	5	4	4	4.0	5	3	3	3	3	3	4.1	1.0
9a	Fisheries Stock Assessment <i>(research to support)</i>	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4		3		5	4	4	2.0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.7
30	Public & Private Resource Use - Socioeconomic Values	4	5	3	4	2	5	5	3	3	3	4		3	3.5		5	5	5	5	5	5	4.0	1.0
15	Local and Customary Knowledge	4	5	4	4	4	3	5	3	3	4	4	4	3	3.5	3.3	4	5	4	5	5	5	3.9	0.7
37	Water Quality Protection	5	5	4	4	3	3	2	4	3	5	5		3	4	4.5	4	5	2	5	5	5	3.9	1.0
7	Community Outreach	5	3	4	4	5	5	5	3	2	5	4	4	4	4	3.8	3	3	3	4	4	4	3.9	0.9
11	Habitat Protection	5	5	5	5	4	5	1	5	3	4	5	1	4	3	4.5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.9	1.3

OCNMS Management Plan Review
Advisory Council Issue Prioritization Workshop
January 29 and 30, 2009

Topic No.	Topic	AC Seat Score																				
		Citizen-at-large	Education	Research	Conservation	Tourism	Industry	Fishing	USCG	Navy	ONP	USFWS	NMFS	WA Ecology	WA DNR	WDFW	Hoh	Makah	Quileute	Quinault	Average (scale 1-5)	Standard deviation
23	Maritime Heritage - Living Cultures	4	5	4	3	4	3	3	4	2	5	5		3	3.5	3.3	4	4	4	4	3.8	0.8
27	Public & Private Resource Use - Commercial Development	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	4.5	3	3	2	4	3.8	0.9
28	Public & Private Resource Use - Compatibility Analysis	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	3	3		3	3	3	3	3.7	0.8
16	Marine Debris - Abandoned Submerged Equipment	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	5	4	4	4	4.5	3	4	3	4	3.7	0.8
17	Marine Debris - Shoreline Clean-Up	4	2	3	5	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	4.5	4	4	3	4	3.7	0.8
1	Administration - Flexibility to Respond to Emerging Issues	3	4	4	4	4	5	3	2	1	4	5	5	1	4	3.5	4	3	5	3	3.6	1.2
13	Living Resource Conservation	3	5	4	5	2	5	2	2	4	5	5		4	3	4.5	2	3	2	3	3.5	1.2
35	Visitor Services	5	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4.0	3	2	3	2	3.4	0.8
20	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Vessel Management	5	4	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	4	5		3	4	2.0	3	3	1	4	3.3	1.1
29	Public & Private Resource Use - Recreational Opportunities	4	2	3	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	2	1.5	4.0	3	3	1	4	3.3	1.1
22	Maritime Heritage - Cultural Resource Management	4	5	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	5	3	4	2	2	2.8	4	3	3	3	3.3	0.9
24	Military Activities	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	1	5	4	5	5	3	3	5.0	1	2	1	2	3.2	1.4
2	Administration - Infrastructure	5	3	4	3	2	4	2	2	1	4	4		3	3	3.0	4	3	3	4	3.2	1.0
31	<i>Administration</i> - Regulations, Permitting & Enforcement	4	3	4	3	2	5	3	3	2	4	4	1	3	3	1.0	3	4	5	3	3.2	1.1
12	Invasive Species	3	2	4	3	2	3	3	4	1	4	3		3	4	3.5	3	3	1.5	4	3.0	0.9

OCNMS Management Plan Review
Advisory Council Issue Prioritization Workshop
January 29 and 30, 2009

Topic No.	Topic	AC Seat Score																					
		Citizen-at-large	Education	Research	Conservation	Tourism	Industry	Fishing	USCG	Navy	ONP	USFWS	NMFS	WA Ecology	WA DNR	WDFW	Hoh	Makah	Quileute	Quinault	Average (scale 1-5)	Standard deviation	
25	Non-point Source Pollution	3	4	2	5	2	5	5	5	1	3	3		2	2.5	1.5	2	3	1	3	2.9	1.4	
21	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Weather	1	2	2	3	1	4	5	1	3	4	4		1	4	2.0	5	3	1	4	2.8	1.4	
19	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Navigation	2	4	2	3	2	3	3	4	2	3	3		1	2	4.5	3	3	1	4	2.8	1.0	
8a	Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing <i>(assessing the impacts)</i>	5	1	3	3	2	4	1	4		5		1	4	4	2.0	1	2	1	2	2.6	1.5	
18	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Harbors Refuge	3	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	1	3	2		1	1	2.0	2	2	1	2	2.0	0.8	
4	Boundary Adjustment	1	4	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	4	2		3	1	2.0	1	1	1	1	1.7	1.1	
9	Fisheries Stock Assessment <i>(formal stock assessment)</i>	1	1	1	1	0.5	2	1	2	4	3	4	1	1	2	2.0	1	1	1	1	1.6	1.0	
3	Administration - Sanctuary Goals & Objectives	The AC recommends that the Sanctuary goals and objectives be revised as part of the Management Plan Review process; therefore, this topic does not need to be scored or ranked.																					

OCNMS Management Plan Review
Advisory Council Issue Prioritization Workshop
January 29 and 30, 2009

Attachment 2. AC Rankings for Topics Raised During Public Scoping

Note: The text in red italics was added by Advisory Council members during the course of the workshop. Additionally, the Advisory Council split some topics in two; in these cases, both topics retain the original topic number, but one is denoted with a lowercase 'a' (e.g., #8 and #8a).

Topic No.	AC Seat Score		Comments
	Topic	Average (scale 1-5) Standard deviation	
3	Administration - Sanctuary Goals & Objectives		The AC chose not to score and rank this topic. The AC decided that the sanctuary goals and objectives should automatically be reviewed as part of the management plan review process
34	Treaty Trust Responsibility	4.8 0.5	
6	Collaborative & Coordinated Management	4.8 0.4	
32	Research for <i>Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management</i>	4.7 0.5	
10	Habitat Characterization	4.7 0.5	* Propose lumping with #32
14	Living Resources Monitoring	4.6 0.7	* Propose lumping with #32
33	Spill Prevention, Planning & Response	4.4 0.9	
36	Water Quality Monitoring (water column properties)	4.3 0.6	* Propose lumping with #32
5	Climate Change	4.2 1.0	
26	Ocean Literacy	4.1 1.0	
31	<i>Administration</i> - Regulations, Permitting & Enforcement	3.2 1.1	
30	Public & Private Resource Use - Socioeconomic Values	4.0 1.0	
16	Marine Debris – Abandoned Submerged Equipment	3.7 0.8	*The AC sees this as a resource protection tool or function; propose lumping with Living Resource Conservation (#13)
17	Marine Debris – Shoreline Clean-Up	3.7 0.8	*The AC sees this as a resource protection tool or function; propose lumping with Living Resource Conservation (#13) *WA Coast Clean-Up participation should continue as part of Ocean Literacy (#26) and Community Outreach (#7)
13	Living Resource Conservation	3.5 1.2	
9a	Fisheries Stock Assessment (<i>research to support</i>)	4.0 0.7	*Propose lumping with Research for Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management (#32)
15	Local and Customary Knowledge	3.9 0.7	*Propose splitting/lumping/linking with Ocean Literacy (#26) *Propose splitting/lumping/linking with Research for Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management (#32)
37	Water Quality Protection	3.9 1.0	*Propose lumping with Living Resource Conservation (#13) *If the three protection topics are going to be lumped, let them all be lumped under Living Resource Conservation (#13)
7	Community Outreach	3.9 0.9	*Propose lumping with Ocean Literacy (#26)
11	Habitat Protection	3.9 1.3	*Propose lumping with Living Resource Conservation (#13)
23	Maritime Heritage - Living Cultures	3.8 0.8	*Propose lumping with Ocean Literacy (#26) *Propose lumping comments related to paleo-shorelines with Climate Change (#5)
27	Public & Private Resource Use - Commercial Development	3.8 0.9	* Propose lumping with Public & Private Resource Use - Socioeconomic Values (#30)

OCNMS Management Plan Review
Advisory Council Issue Prioritization Workshop
January 29 and 30, 2009

Topic No.	Topic	AC Seat Score		Comments
		Average (scale 1-5)	Standard deviation	
28	Public & Private Resource Use - Compatibility Analysis	3.7	0.8	* Propose lumping with Public & Private Resource Use - Socioeconomic Values (#30)
35	Visitor Services	3.4	0.8	* Propose lumping with #26 (Ocean Literacy)
29	Public & Private Resource Use - Recreational Opportunities	3.3	1.1	* Propose lumping with Public & Private Resource Use - Socioeconomic Values (#30)
25	Non-point Source Pollution	2.9	1.4	* Propose lumping with Water Quality Monitoring (#36); but the Sanctuary should only conduct this monitoring in the marine environment (not in upland environments)
21	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Weather	2.8	1.4	*Sanctuary should support infrastructure improvements *Propose lumping together Maritime & Environmental Safety - Vessel Management, Weather, and Navigation topics (#19, #20 and #21)
19	Maritime & Environmental Safety – Navigation	2.8	1.0	*Propose lumping with Spill Prevention, Planning & Response (#33) *There was consensus on the ranking for this topic, but some AC members stated that they were only going along with the ranking because they didn't want to hold the group up.
8a	Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing (<i>assessing the impacts</i>)	2.6	1.5	* Propose lumping with Research for Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management (#32)
20	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Vessel Management	3.3	1.1	*This topic can be colored as red (i.e., not a priority) as long as the Area To Be Avoided (Maritime & Environmental Safety – Navigation, #33) is recognized as an important function of sanctuary
22	Maritime Heritage - Cultural Resource Management	3.3	0.9	*Note that tribes have the lead on archeological/cultural sites but not necessarily shipwrecks
24	Military Activities	3.2	1.4	
1	Administration - Flexibility to Respond to Emerging Issues	3.6	1.2	*Ability to respond to emerging issues is important but no working group is necessary *Management plan needs to be adaptive and flexible
18	Maritime & Environmental Safety - Harbors Refuge	2.0	0.8	
4	Boundary Adjustment	1.7	1.1	
9	Fisheries Stock Assessment (<i>formal stock assessment</i>)	1.6	1.0	
2	Administration - Infrastructure	3.2	1.0	*AC feels that replacement of the RV Tatoosh is critical
12	Invasive Species	3.0	0.9	*Propose lumping with Administration - Flexibility to Respond to Emerging Issues (#1) *Propose lumping with Living Resources Monitoring (#14)

Key:

Green = the AC supports forwarding this topic as the highest management priorities

Blue = the AC considered this to be important, but considered it a second-tier priority

Yellow = the AC chose to group together these topics and link them to associated topics that were considered high (green) or secondary (blue) priorities

Red = these were not seen as topics to be prioritized for further review.

Gray = these topics were unresolved.

APPENDIX C
Rationales for individual topic scores.

The Council's recommendations, along with its topic scores and rankings (see Table 2 and Appendix B), were the result of two days of intensive discussion. It is difficult to summarize this lengthy discussion or capture all the details of Council members' ideas on each topic, especially when not every member chose to express his/her thoughts on every topic. However, to provide context for the individual topic scores it is helpful to summarize comments *where members shared their rationale* for choosing a particular score. These comments, excerpted from the workshop notes and tapes, are summarized in bulleted format here. The comments are organized by topic and the topics are presented in the same order as Table 2.

Administration – Sanctuary Goals & Objectives (Topic #3)

- Teresa Scott (WDFW) expressed concern about prioritizing topics and issues prior to the revision of the Sanctuary goals and objectives.
- The Council agreed not to score the topic “Administration – Sanctuary Goals and Objectives”. Instead, it recommended reviewing the Sanctuary goals and objectives as an essential action to be completed during the management plan review process.

Treaty Trust Responsibility (Topic #34)

- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) said this topic cannot be taken for granted. Public education has been less than adequate.
- Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) said there is a need to incorporate this information about the relationship into the MPR. He suggested that a workgroup put this information together. He stated that there is a sense of the need to improve relationships and to define how to move forward from here on these relationships.

Collaborative and Coordinated Management (Topic #6)

- Teresa Scott (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)) was concerned that the term “management” could be interpreted to mean joint management where authority doesn't exist.
- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) noted that differing authorities and expertise when combined provide beneficial results, particularly with good coordination.

Research to Support *Collaborative Ecosystem-Based* Management (Topic # 32)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) noted that collaborative ecosystem based management is a core function of the sanctuary and one that the NOAA Fisheries Service scored very high (5). He also expressed that, while the NOAA Fisheries Service is extremely supportive of OCNMS research, the agency is concerned that this research be coordinated within the larger context of the California current.

- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) said that the Makah scored this very high with the notion that there would be a collaborative approach to research.
- Jody Kennedy and Fan Tsao (Conservation seat) stated that research to support collaborative ecosystem-based management will help to inform future ecosystem protection measures.

Habitat Characterization (Topic # 10)

- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) stated that the Makah Tribe's score was based on a collaborative approach to habitat characterization.

Living Resources Monitoring (Topic # 14)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Spill Prevention, Planning and Response (Topic # 33)

- Roy Morris (Citizen at Large) initially scored this low based on the assumption that other agencies or entities have this authority and responsibility. The Citizen-at-Large seat adjusted its score following discussion on the role sanctuary staff plays in planning, prevention and response.
- Brady Scott (Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR)) scored this as a 5 based on the fact that spills are one of the biggest threats to all sanctuary resources (the DNR factored in the importance of the Neah Bay tug when scoring this topic as a 5).

Water Quality Monitoring (Topic # 36)

- Douglas Fricke (Commercial Fishing) scored this topic based on the assumption that monitoring efforts would be collaborative and not duplicative.
- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) and Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) both stated that their scores were based on the Sanctuary taking a collaborative approach.
- Terrie Klinger (Research seat) noted that other research entities (even within NOAA) are interested in pursuing water quality monitoring in the Sanctuary, so if the Council calls this topic out as important, it might actually attract resources from other agencies and entities. Council members seemed to view this point as an important reason for scoring this topic high.

Climate Change (Topic # 5)

- While no members stated specific rationales for their scores, it seemed evident from the discussion that those who scored this topic high did so because 1) research and monitoring to address climate change could require a different design than current monitoring efforts, 2) emerging issues such as ocean acidification are not captured in current monitoring efforts and 3) new funding could become available to support climate change research in the Sanctuary.

Ocean Literacy (Topic # 26)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Administration - Regulations, Permitting & Enforcement (Topic #31)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) stated that this topic is a core function (regulations and permitting are core management tools), but scored it low because regulations, permitting and enforcement are an outcome of management. If the process related to this topic is procedural, then that is different and NOAA Fisheries Service might score it higher.
- Teresa Scott (WDFW) stated that there was no clear statement of a problem associated with this topic. Thus, she gave it a low score to reflect that there was no problem related to this topic that would cause it to be a high priority.
- Brady Scott (DNR) emphasized the enforcement piece of this topic, which could be lacking. DNR also thought this was a core function and asked why this should be a topic.
- John Calambokidis (Research) said his high score was based on the fact that he thought the enforcement program could be stronger.
- Micah McCarty and Steve Joner (Makah Tribe) stated that they scored this topic high because there is a need both to improve the permitting process and to have further discussion on the permitting process.

Public and Private Resource Use – Socioeconomic Values & Human Use (Topic #30)

- Joe Schumacker (Quinault Indian Nation) said that the Quinault Indian Nation scored this with the understanding that the tribal perspective was included.

Marine Debris – Abandoned Submerged Equipment (Topic # 16)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Marine Debris - Shoreline Clean-Up (Topic # 17)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Living Resource Conservation Topic # 13)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Fisheries Stock Assessment (*formal*); Fisheries Stock Assessment (*research to support*) (Topic #9)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) emphasized that the NOAA Fisheries Service believes stock assessments to be of critical importance but scored this topic low because the Sanctuary does not have a historic role in performing fisheries stock assessments.
- Terrie Klinger (Research) scored this topic low because stock assessments and related research are performed by other entities.
- Steve Joner (Makah Tribe) said the Makah would support and score higher Sanctuary involvement in research if it addressed issues such as stock structure and larval distribution.
- Joe Gilbertson (Hoh Tribe) stated that the Hoh Tribe defined this topic broadly and gave it a high score.

- Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) emphasized that any research should be done with partners.

Local and Customary Knowledge (Topic # 15)

- Doug Fricke (Commercial Fishing) said that his high score is based on a desire to see the Sanctuary get local information from the fishing industry.
- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) stated that the Makah Tribe scored this topic high because the tribes have a lot of experiential information, especially related to fishing, which would help to inform peoples' understanding of fishing impacts.
- Jody Kennedy (Conservation seat) noted that her seat's score was initially based upon the thinking that this topic would be a part of Collaborative and Coordinated Management. But they saw the topic differently after the discussion and increased their score.
- Jennifer Hagan and Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) said that the Quileute Tribe based its score (4) on the importance of evaluating the Tribes in their 21st Century context as fisheries co-managers that have their own technical, policy and legal staffs. The portrayal of tribal usage and customs during treaty time is valuable from a cultural standpoint but should not stand alone.

Water Quality Protection (Topic #37)

- Capt. Bill Devereaux (U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)) said that the USCG gave this a high score because it viewed non-point source pollution issues (excluding oil) as significant.
- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) said there was not any assessment available as the basis for scoring.
- Brady Scott (DNR) gave this topic a low score because he did not know what is being protected.
- Joe Schumacker (Quinalt Indian Nation) said within the existing Sanctuary this topic is a high priority; hence it was given a high score.

Community Outreach (Topic #7)

- Douglas Fricke (Commercial Fishing) scored this high because he would like to see more community involvement in projects that occur in the Sanctuary (i.e., wave energy, cable-laying, etc.)

Habitat Protection (Topic #11)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) was not comfortable scoring this topic because the condition of habitats in the sanctuary and relative threats have not been assessed. He stated that his discomfort with the Condition Report (and the discomfort he heard expressed during the Condition Report presentation at the start of the workshop) led him to think that the Sanctuary is not ready to address this topic. He believes that habitat protection is a fundamental role of the Sanctuary but that an assessment would be necessary to determine if regulatory or other intervention is appropriate to consider. Thus he scored the topic low.

- Doug Fricke (Commercial Fishing) was concerned about sponge and coral protection. The fishing community feels there should be some preservation of coral and sponge habitat but does not want to see overreaction that leads to the demise of fishing.
- John Calambokidis and Terrie Klinger (Research seat) gave this a high rating because it is consistent with the mission of the Sanctuary.
- Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) stated that the Quileute Tribe initially gave this topic a high rating, but had concerns about how this issue would be addressed and as a result adjusted its score to a 3.
- Micah McCarty (Makah Tribe) scored this topic in the context of environmental protection. The Sanctuary needs to be an ally in oil spill response and other marine hazards. The original support of the Makah Tribe for Sanctuary designation was to prevent oil exploration.
- Brady Scott (DNR) sees habitat characterization as important but did not understand that specific habitats were threatened, so he gave it a moderate score.

Maritime Heritage – Living Cultures (Topic #23)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Public & Private Resource Use – Commercial Development (Topic #27)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Public & Private Resource Use – Compatibility Analysis (Topic #28)

- Kevin Ryan (USFWS) recommended development of a formal compatibility analysis process for the Sanctuary (it was inferred that this was the rationale for his score).

Visitor Services (Topic #35)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Public and Private Resource Use – Recreational Opportunities (Topic #29)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Non-point Source Pollution (Topic #25)

- Capt. Bill Devereaux (USCG) scored this high because there is no place where anyone in the maritime world is studying this. Because non-point pollution sources are fairly low in the Sanctuary area, it could be an important research site.
- Chip Boothe (Washington Department of Ecology) stated that his agency scored this low because it does not think addressing non-point source pollution is the Sanctuary's role.
- Jennifer Hagan (Quileute Tribe) agreed and indicated that the Quileute Tribe's score reflected the fact that the topic is important, but there are other agencies working on it.

Maritime and Environmental Safety – Weather Forecasting (Topic #21)

- Captain Devereaux (USCG) acknowledged that this is important but thought current efforts were good, so his rating was low.
- Doug Fricke (Commercial Fishing) said this topic is a high priority for the fishing community.
- Brady Scott (DNR) stated that he scored this topic high because of the need for Doppler radar coverage of the southern coast, which was identified as a high priority in the Washington Ocean Action Plan.

Maritime and Environmental Safety – Navigation (Topic #19)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing (*assessing the impacts*) (Topic 8)

- Steve Cops (NOAA Fisheries Service or NMFS) explained the NMFS score by saying that the category seems overly narrow by focusing on only one type of impact. NMFS is fully supportive of OCNMS assessing the full spectrum of anthropogenic impacts, including fishing, and would encourage a holistic perspective in ecosystem assessments.
- Micah McCarty stated that the Makah Tribe's score was based on monitoring and characterization of ecosystem impacts of fishing. Micah McCarty stated that there needs to be ground-truthing to establish a baseline and quantify the resilience of the system.
- Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) said that the Quileute Tribe's score reflected the fact that this topic should not be a lead theme for the Sanctuary, but that the topic should be noted as a collaborative research and monitoring effort.

Maritime and Environmental Safety – Vessel Management (Topic #20)

- Kevin Ryan (USFWS) scored this high because of the success of the Area to be Avoided (ATBA) program.
- Captain Bill Devereaux (USCG) said others already do this work but noted poor vessel monitoring in the southern sanctuary.
- Terrie Klinger (Research seat) linked this topic with oil spill prevention.

Maritime Heritage – Cultural Resource Management (Topic #22)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Military Activities (Topic #24)

- The U.S. Navy was not able to attend the workshop but did submit the topic scoring homework exercise. The Navy scored this topic as a 5 and said that, “We must be on the same page. The Navy in their DEIS/OEIS explains how the Navy will continue to do the same exercises they have done in the past, just more of those types of exercises. Keyport wants to expand the area they do their work in but it is the same type of work they have been doing all along.”

Administration – Flexibility to Respond to Emerging Issues (Topic #1)

- Chip Boothe and Diane Butorac (Washington Department of Ecology) scored this topic low for the reason stated above: this topic is an inherent part of all Sanctuary programs, not a stand-alone topic.
- John Calambokidis (Research seat) thought that responding to emerging issues is integral to the Sanctuary's work and found it difficult to score, in comparison with issue-oriented topics.

Maritime and Environmental Safety – Harbors of refuge (Topic #18)

- No Council members provided specific rationales for scores.

Boundary Adjustment (Topic #4)

- Steve Fradkin (National Park Service (NPS)) stated that the NPS scored this topic high not because it felt the boundaries should definitely be adjusted, but because it wanted to see the boundaries considered during the management plan review process (especially in relation to the deep sea canyons, small portions of which are within current Sanctuary boundaries).

Administration – Infrastructure (Topic #2)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) commented that an analysis of current infrastructure and infrastructure needs is needed before the Council can say whether this topic is a priority.
- Jennifer Hagan and Mel Moon (Quileute Tribe) stated that their rationale for their score was the same as Mr. Copps'.

Invasive Species (Topic # 12)

- Steve Copps (NOAA Fisheries Service) said he would like to see a risk assessment before providing a score for this topic.