

OPAC Meeting Materials
October 23-24, 2008

Table of Contents

<i>Item</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Table of Contents	1
Draft Agenda	2-3
Draft Agenda for Proposals	4
Draft Summary of October 7, 2008 Meeting	5-7
Memo on Conflict of Interest Policy	8-9
Results of OPAC Straw Poll on Proposed Sites	10-11
State Agency Site Proposal Analysis	12-13
Draft State Agency Analysis Summary Sheet	14
State Agency Review: Draft Site Analysis Worksheet	15-72
General Proposal Site Metrics	73

Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Council

Draft Meeting Agenda*

Thursday and Friday, October 23 and 24, 2008, Regular Meeting
Florence Events Center (FEC), 715 Quince St., Florence

*Please note that this agenda is an attempt to give notice of the intended sequence of events at the meeting. Time or topics may change up to the last minute, but the Chair will try to make sure that public comment opportunities are related to discussion of major issues or decisions as indicated below.

Wednesday Evening – OPAC Social

6 pm TBA

Thursday – Regular OPAC Meeting

Florence Events Center, Florence

8 am Welcome and Introductions – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair), *Council Members*

8:05 am Review and Approval of Minutes of *last* OPAC Meeting (10 minutes) - *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair), *Council Members*
Scott will **review** the minutes and ask for amendments and council **adoption**, as amended.

8:15 am State Agency Analysis (105 minutes) – *Cristen Don & Dave Fox* (ODFW)
Cristen and Dave will **present** the state agencies' analysis of the 20 sites proposed as marine reserves.

10 am Break (15 minutes)

10:15 am State Agency Analysis (105 minutes) – *Cristen Don & Dave Fox* (ODFW)
Continuation: Cristen and Dave will **present** the state agencies' analysis of the 20 sites proposed as marine reserves.

12 Noon Working Lunch (60 minutes) – *Robin Brown* (ODFW)
Robin Brown will **present** information on the interaction between pinnepeds (seals and sea lions) and fish on the Oregon coast.

There are several dining options available to the public near the FEC.

1 pm Presentation by Site Proposers (150 minutes) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Groups who have made proposals to OPAC for marine reserves will be invited to **present** their ideas to OPAC. Equal time will be allotted for a presentation on each individual site. Presenters may reserve some of their time allotment for answering OPAC questions.

3:30 pm Break (15 minutes)

3:45 pm Presentation by Site Proposers (150 minutes) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Continuation: Groups who have made proposals to OPAC for marine reserves will be invited to **present** their ideas to OPAC. Equal time will be allotted for a presentation on each individual site. Presenters may reserve some of their time allotment for answering OPAC questions.

6:15 pm Adjourn

Friday – Regular OPAC Meeting
Florence Events Center, Florence

- 8 am Welcome and Introductions – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair), *Council Members*
- 8:05 am Public Comment (TBD) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Members of the public who wish to provide comments to OPAC on the Oregon Marine Reserves(MR)/Marine Protected Area (MPA) process, proposed sites or on OPAC’s MR/MPA recommendations to the Governor are asked to sign in prior to the 2:30 pm public comment period. **Everyone who signs up will have 3 minutes in which to speak. The comment period will continue until everyone who has signed up by Friday at 2:30 pm has had a chance to speak.**
- 10 am Break (15 minutes)
- 10:15 am Public Comment (TBD) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Continuation
- 12 Noon Working Lunch (45 minutes) – *TBD*

There are several dining options available to the public near the FEC.
- 12:45 pm Public Comment (TBD) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Continuation
- 2:15 pm Break (15 minutes)
- 2:30 pm Public Comment (TBD) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Continuation
- TBD OPAC Deliberations (TBD) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
OPAC will begin **discussion** and **deliberation** on the sites proposed as marine reserves.
- Time permitting, the remainder of the agenda will commence upon completion of the public comment period.*
- TBD Assessment and Census (30 minutes) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
OPAC will **conduct** a preliminary, non-binding internal census among its members to assess areas of agreement and disagreement over proposed sites. This assessment will help inform future deliberations, and shall not be construed as a statement of policy or decision by OPAC.
- TBD Other Issues Raised by Members; Announcements of Coming Events (15 minutes) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
- TBD Adjourn
-

Contact Information: Jay Charland — 503 373-0050 x 253 jay.charland@state.or.us

DRAFT – Schedule Subject to Change as Necessary

Ocean Policy Advisory Council
Presentations by Site Proposers

October 23, 2008
1 pm to 6 pm

1 pm Presentation by Site Proposers (300 minutes) – *Scott McMullen* (OPAC Chair)
Groups who have made proposals to OPAC for marine reserves will be invited to **present** their ideas to OPAC. Equal time will be allotted for a presentation on each individual site. Presenters may reserve some of their time allotment for answering OPAC questions.

Time	Ordinal #	Name	Presenter/Group
1 pm	01	Tillamook Head	Mike Manzulli
1:15 pm	02	Cannon Beach and Manzanita	Bob Rees, Jerome Arnold
1:30 pm	03	Cape Falcon	Our Ocean
1:45 pm	04	Three Arch Rocks I	Our Ocean
2 pm	05	Three Arch Rocks II	Jim Carlson, Jim Young (NCAT)
2:15 pm	06	20 Miracle Miles	Pickering
2:30 pm	07	Cascade Head I	Our Ocean
2:45 pm	08	Cascade Head II	Bob Rees, Rennie Ferris
3 pm	09	Cape Foulweather I	Our Ocean
3:15 pm	10	Cape Foulweather II	Jim Carlson
3:30 pm		Break	
3:45 pm	11	Whale Cove to Devil's Punchbowl	John Sherman
4 pm	12	Otter Rock	Loren Goddard, NSAT
4:15 pm	13	Cape Perpetua	Our Ocean
4:30 pm	14	Heceta Head to Cape Perpetua	Paul Engelmeyer
4:45 pm	15	Siltcoos	Our Ocean
5 pm	16	Cape Arago	Our Ocean
5:15 pm	17	Seven Devils	Bill Russell
5:30 pm	18	Redfish Rocks	Leesa Cobb, POORT
5:45 pm	19	Mack Reef I	Peg Reagan
6 pm	20	Mack Reef II	Our Ocean
6:15 pm		Presentations end	

Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Council
DRAFT Meeting Summary
October 7, 2008
Port of Umpqua
Reedsport, Oregon

Issues Decided/Positions Taken

- The summary of the August 19, 2008 Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) meeting was approved as distributed. 0:05:15
- OPAC approved changes to the Procedures Document as presented at the meeting. 2:59:05
- OPAC did not appoint representatives of OPAC to the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health Working Groups. Voting and *ex-officio* members participating in the Working Groups will do so as individuals. 2:50:25

Action Items

- The Executive Committee will set an agenda for the meeting on October 23 & 24 consistent with the discussion at this meeting.
- Jay Charland and Steve Shipsey will update the OPAC Procedures Document as approved by OPAC.

Presentations

- *OPAC Procedures Document* Jay Charland, DLCD, gave a short presentation on proposed changes to the OPAC Procedures Document.

Next Meetings

OPAC: October 23-24, 2008. Florence, Oregon

OPAC: November 17-18*, 2008. Lincoln City, Oregon

*The OPAC meeting on November 18 is tentative.

Territorial Sea Plan Working Group: TBD

Attendance

Members Present (voting): **David Allen** (Public at Large); **Jack Brown** (Coastal City Official); **Paul Engelmeyer** (Statewide Conservation or Environmental Organization); **Jim Good** (Public at Large); **John Griffith** (South Coastal County Commissioner); **Robin Hartmann** (Coastal Conservation or Environmental Organization); **Scott McMullen** (North Coast Commercial Fisheries); **Brad Pettinger** (South Coast Commercial Fisheries); **Jim Pex** (South Coast Charter, Sport or Recreational Fisheries); **Fred Sickler** (Coastal Non-Fishing Recreation); **Terry Thompson** (North Coastal

County Commissioner); **Frank Warrens** (North Coast Charter, Sport or Recreational Fisheries). [11/14]

Members Present (ex officio): **Jon Allan** (DOGAMI); **Aaron Borisenko** (Department of Environmental Quality); **Ed Bowles** (Office of the Governor); **David Fox** (Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife); **Onno Husing** (Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association); **Paul Klarin** (Department of Land Conservation & Development); **Jim Myron** (OPRD); **Jay Rasmussen/Jeff Feldner** (Oregon Sea Grant); **Cathy Tortorici** (NOAA Fisheries). [10/11]

Members Absent: **Jim Bergeron** (Ports, Marine Transportation, Navigation); **Dalton Hobbs** (Dept of Agriculture); **Robert Kentta** (Oregon Coastal Indian Tribes); **Louise Solliday** (Department of State Lands). [4]

Staff: **Jay Charland** (Department of Land Conservation & Development, OPAC Staff); **Cristen Don** (Department of Fish and Wildlife); **Laurel Hillman** (Department of Parks and Recreation); **Steve Shipsey** (Department of Justice, OPAC Counsel).

Public Comment speakers (with affiliation if provided): **Susan Allen** (Our Ocean); **Linda And** (Oregon Shores); **Ruth Barker** (Merchant); **Annie Birnie** (Our Ocean); **Steve Bodnar** (SOORC and CBTA); **Daryl Bogardus** (Commercial Fisherman); **Linda Buell** (Garibaldi Charters); **Mike Buell** (Garibaldi Charters); **Mel Campbell** (Merchant); **Jim Carlson** (Our Ocean); **Joe Cook** (Retail Business); **Nancy Fitzpatrick** (Oregon Salmon Commission); **Mark Freeman** (Port of Siuslaw); **Nick Furman** (ODCC/SOORC); **Gus Gates** (Surfrider Foundation); **Mike Gaul** (Port of Coos Bay); **Loren Goddard** (DBNSAT); **Larry Hammons** (STEP); **Unknown Heck** (Englund Marine); **John Holloway** (RFA-OR); **Lucie LaBonte** (Curry County); **Scott Lancaster** (Y Marina); **Cliff Lance** (NW Steelheader); **Aaron Longton** (POORT); **Megan MacKay** (PMCC); **Paul Merz** (Salmon Troller); **Van Messner** (Coos Bay Marine); **Charlie Plybon** (Surfrider Foundation); **Peg Reagan** (CLN); **Bob Reese** (Our Ocean); **Dennis Richey** (Oregon Anglers); **John Rinderer** (Tourist); **CC Rinderer** (Tourist); **Carol Rodele** (High Tide Café); **Patrick Shannon** (Our Ocean); **Rod Sullens** (None); **Chris Unknown** (None); **John Ward** (Steelheaders); **Margery Whitmer** (Betty Kay Charters).

Others in Attendance: **Michelle Aquí** (POU); **John Boyd** (Douglas County); **Susan Chambers** (The World Newspaper); **Dean Frost** (F/V Sleep Robber); **Ginny Goblirsh** (Port of Newport); **Roy Hageman** (DBNSAT); **Lyle Keeler** (None); **Rinda Keeler** (None); **Ron Kreskey** (Congressman Peter DeFazio); **Bradley Lane** (NW Steelheader); **Mike Lanfe** (SOORC); **Hugh Link** (ODCC/SOORC); **Kary Meier** (Attorney); **Steve Miller** (None); **Tom Moore** (None); **Susan Morgan** (State Rep); **Armand Peña** (Salmon/Trout Advisory Committee); **Valerie Peña** (STEP Member); **Reg Pullery** (Port of Bandon); **Fran Recht** (PSMFC); **Jim Relaford** (Four Ports Group); **Thelma Rimbey** (None); **Donald Rimbey** (None); **Dean Rohn** (None); **Melanie Rollin** (Surfrider Foundation); **Mark Siipola** (Army Corps of Engineers); **Robin Sullivan** (None); **Ron Turman** (Turman Tackle); **Unknown** (Unknown); **Unknown** (Unknown); **Unknown**

(Unknown); **Larry Unknown** (10 Mile STEP); **Billy Unknown** (10 Mile STEP); **William Usrey** (10 Mile STEP); **Kathy Wall** (SOORC); **Chuck Willer** (Coast Range Association).

Distributed Materials

Draft Agenda

Draft Summary of August 19, 2008 Meeting

Materials from the *Four Ports Group*

Site Review Materials from ODFW

Materials from the Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)

Materials on the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health

OPAC Procedures Document

Video Index

<i>Item</i>	<i>Time Index</i>
Call to Order, Welcome & Introductions	0:01:00
Review and Approval of Minutes	0:05:15
Presentation on the <i>Four Ports Group</i> by Jim Relaford	0:06:00
Discussion of review timeline	0:11:55
Preview of Marine Reserve proposals by Cristen Don	0:27:00
Marine Reserve proposal review process by Ed Bowles	0:49:35
STAC Update by Jay Rasmussen	2:19:10
West Coast Governors' Agreement, Jessica Hamilton	2:33:30
OPAC Procedures Document, Jay Charland.	2:59:05
Public Comment	3:03:50
One segment of the public comment was re-recorded due to a technical problem.	3:56:15
Marine Reserves proposal evaluation process	5:06:22
Other Business	7:27:17
Meeting adjourned	7:28:07

For a copy of the video record of this meeting, please contact Jay Charland at (503) 373-0050 x253 or at jay.charland@state.or.us.



DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 22, 2008

TO: Ocean Policy Advisory Council

FROM: Steven E. Shipsey, Assistant Attorney General
Natural Resources Section

SUBJECT: Guidance on Conflict of Interest

As the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) prepares to begin discussion and deliberation on the twenty nominations for Marine Reserves in the Oregon Territorial Sea, this memorandum will provide brief guidance on state law provisions that require OPAC members to declare an actual or potential conflict of interest prior to such discussion or debate.

Under Oregon's Government Ethics Law, all public officials, including members of OPAC, must comply with applicable provisions of ORS chapter 244. ORS 244.010(1). With regards to public officials participating in decision making, state ethics law concerns itself primarily with any "actual conflict of interest" or any "potential conflicts of interest." For purposes of ORS chapter 244, the terms have defined meanings:

"Actual conflict of interest" means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative¹ or any business² with which the person or a relative of the person is associated unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of circumstances described in ["potential conflict of interest"]. ORS

¹ "Relative" means:

- (a) The spouse of the public official;
- (b) The domestic partner of the public official;
- (c) Any children of the public official or of the public official's spouse;
- (d) Siblings, spouses of siblings or parents of the public official or of the public official's spouse;
- (e) Any individual for whom the public official has a legal support obligation; or
- (f) Any individual for whom the public official provides benefits arising from the public official's public employment or from whom the public official receives benefits arising from that individual's employment. ORS 244.020(14).

² "Business" means any corporation, partnership, proprietorship, firm, enterprise, franchise, association, organization, self-employed individual and any other legal entity operated for economic gain but excluding any income-producing not-for-profit corporation that is tax exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code with which a public official or a relative of the public official is associated only as a member or board director or in a nonremunerative capacity. ORS 244.020(2).

244.020 (1).

“**Potential conflict of interest**” means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person’s relative, or a business with which the person or the person’s relative is associated, unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:

(a) An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.

(b) Any action in the person’s official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the person’s relative or business with which the person or the person’s relative is associated, is a member or is engaged.

(c) Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation that is tax-exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. ORS 244.020(11).

To summarize, the focus of the conflict of interest provisions is on *financial* interests. The starting inquiry is whether the public official will or may financially benefit from the action. Financial benefit includes avoiding a final detriment or avoiding a cost.

If an OPAC member has an **actual conflict of interest**, the member must first announce publicly the nature of the actual conflict. ORS 244.120(2). The OPAC member must then refrain from participating as a public official in any discussion or debate on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises or from voting on the issue. ORS 244.120(2)(b)(A). However, if the OPAC member’s vote is necessary to meet a requirement of a minimum number of votes to take official action, the OPAC member is eligible to vote, but is not to participate in any discussion or debate on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises. ORS 244.120(2)(b)(B).

If an OPAC member has a **potential conflict of interest**, the member must announce publicly the nature of the potential conflict prior to taking any action thereon in the capacity as an OPAC member.

The OPAC minutes will reflect any announcement of an actual or potential conflict of interest. When an OPAC member gives notice of an actual or potential conflict of interest, ORS 244.130(1) requires OPAC to record the actual or potential conflict in the official records of the public body. In addition, OPAC has discretion to provide the Oregon Government Ethics Commission a notice of the actual or potential conflict and how it was disposed of within a reasonable period of time. Finally, failure of an OPAC member to disclose an actual or potential conflict of interest is not a basis for a court to void a decision or action of OPAC. ORS 244.130(2).

Should any OPAC member have questions regarding the ethics law, please feel free to consult with me.

Sullivan

OPAC Site Proposal Score Sheet							
Site #	Name	MPA meets sideboards	Ecological	Criteria Rating			Overall Rating and Comments
				Avoid Significant Economic Impacts	Collaboration	Enforcement	
14	Tillamook Head						Y N A 5-12-5
6 & 19	Cape Falcon						9-8-5
7 & 16	Three Arch Rocks						4-12-6
8 & 17	Cascade Head						7-11-5
9 & 20	Cape Foulweather						7-11-5
1	Whale Cove to Devil's Punchbowl						4-13-5
2	Otter Rock						16-1-5
5	20 Miracle Miles						2-15-5
10 & 15	Cape Perpetua						12-6-4
11	Sitkoos						2-15-6
12	Cape Arago						4-13-6
18	Seven Devils						8-10-5
4	Redfish Rocks						18-8-5
3	Mack Reef I						15-3-5
13	Mack Reef II						3-14-6

Charland

OPAC Site Proposal Score Sheet							
Site #	Name	MPA meets sideboards	Ecological	Criteria Rating			Overall Rating and Comments
				Avoid Significant Economic Impacts	Collaboration	Enforcement	
14	Tillamook Head						5 5 12
6 & 19	Cape Falcon						9 5 8
7 & 16	Three Arch Rocks						4 6 12
8 & 17	Cascade Head						7 5 11
9 & 20	Cape Foulweather						7 5 11
1	Whale Cove to Devil's Punchbowl						4 5 13
2	Otter Rock						16 5 1
5	20 Miracle Miles						2 5 15
10 & 15	Cape Perpetua						12 4 6
11	Siltcoos						2 6 15
12	Cape Arago						4 6 13
18	Seven Devils						8 5 10
4	Redfish Rocks						18 5 3
3	Mack Reef I						15 5 3
13	Mack Reef II						3 15 6 74

State Agency Site Proposal Analysis

Purpose

The purpose of the state agency analysis is to describe the strengths and weaknesses of potential marine reserve sites to assist OPAC in determining which sites are appropriate for further evaluation. The analysis is contained in the following Site Analysis Worksheets, which is a living document that can be updated as needed and distributed in final form prior to the November OPAC meeting.

Analysis Review Method

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) received twenty publicly submitted marine reserve proposals by the September 30, 2008 deadline. Copies of the proposals were distributed to the Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (collectively, “the agencies”). The agencies internally reviewed each proposal, and conducted a review workshop in mid-October.

ODFW developed the following site analysis worksheets based on findings from the review workshop and other internal staff input. The analysis incorporates agency information and experiential knowledge along with information contained in the site proposals. Focusing on the merits of the site itself, agency staff based their review on how well the proposed sites meet the OPAC coarse review criteria (listed below).

Notes on the Worksheet

Several sites had identical or overlapping boundaries. In both cases, agency staff reviewed the merits of each site individually. For reporting purposes, sites with identical boundaries are presented in the same worksheet table. Sites with overlapping but not identical boundaries are presented in separate worksheet tables.

Several sites also proposed a Marine Protected Area (MPA) to complement the proposed marine reserve. The agencies reviewed the MPAs according to the strict sideboards previously stated by ODFW: the MPA must be necessary to help the overall site achieve ecological benefits while minimizing significant economic impact. If the MPA did not meet the sideboards, the agencies reviewed only the marine reserve portion of the proposal.

OPAC Site-specific Criteria

- 1) Habitat representation
 - a) proposed site includes a variety of habitat types; or
 - b) in regions of homogenous habitat, the proposed site includes a valued contiguous single key habitat type; or

Draft 10/22/08

- c) proposed site includes special natural features or characteristics
- 2) Proposed site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, but small enough to avoid significant adverse economic or social impacts on ocean users and coastal communities
- 3) There is, in reasonably close proximity to the proposed site, an area that can be used as a nonreserve comparison area
- 4) Proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure such as a submarine cable, dredge spoil disposal site, wave energy project, port access point, or ocean outfall pipeline.
- 5) Proposal describes adjacent protected areas in the terrestrial or marine environment, if present, and/or describes adjacent marine, land, or watershed uses that may affect the site
- 6) Proposed site will avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts on ocean users and coastal communities. The proposal includes information on existing and potential future uses/users of the proposed study area, and an estimation of the degree to which uses/users will be positively or negatively affected.
- 7) Proposal was developed by collaborative community-based groups comprised of coastal community members, ocean users and other interested parties
- 8) Enforcement/compliance of proposed site (if later designated as a marine reserve) is realistic

System-wide criteria

- 1) There are a total of nine or fewer recommended sites
- 2) The sites are dispersed along the coast.
- 3) Collectively, sites represent key habitat types in replicate.
- 4) Collectively, sites are large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, but small enough to avoid significant adverse economic or social impacts.

Draft State Agency Analysis Summary Sheet							
	10/23/2008						
Site #	Name	MPA meets sideboards	Criteria Rating				Overall Rating and Comments
			Ecological	Economic Impact Avoidance	Collaboration	Enforcement	
14	Tillamook Head	n/a	high	low	low	high	low - little opportunity to resolve economic impacts
6 & 19	Cape Falcon	no	medium	medium-low	medium-low	medium-low	medium - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts
7 & 16	Three Arch Rocks	no	high	low	medium-low	high	low - little opportunity to resolve economic impacts
8 & 17	Cascade Head	no	medium-high	medium-low	medium-low	low	medium-low - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts and difficulty in enforcement (note: multiple proposals in same area of coast, systemwide criteria would limit site selection)
9 & 20	Cape Foulweather	n/a	medium-high	medium-low	medium-low	medium-high	medium - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts (note: multiple proposals in same area of coast, systemwide criteria would limit site selection)
1	Whale Cove to Devil's Punchbowl	n/a	medium	medium-low	low	high	medium-low - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts (note: multiple proposals in same area of coast, systemwide criteria would limit site selection)
2	Otter Rock	n/a	medium-low	high	high	high	high - potential to be pilot project. Need to explore effectiveness of small site and possibly reconfigure, if warranted
5	20 Miracle Miles	n/a	high	low	low	low	low - little opportunity to resolve economic impacts
10 & 15	Cape Perpetua	no	medium-high	medium	medium	medium	high - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts
11	Siltcoos	yes	medium-low	medium	low	low	low - minimal ecological benefits and low collaboration and enforcement
12	Cape Arago	no	high	low	low	medium-high	low - little opportunity to resolve economic impacts
18	Seven Devils	n/a	medium-high	medium-low	medium-low	medium-high	medium - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts
4	Redfish Rocks	yes/no*	medium-high	medium-high	high	high	high - potential to be pilot project. Need to evaluate economic impacts to fishers not involved in the POORT economic survey.
3	Mack Arch I	yes	high	medium	medium-high	medium-high	high - further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts
13	Mack Arch II	no	high	medium-low	low	high	low - little opportunity to resolve economic impacts (note: multiple proposals in same area of coast, systemwide criteria would limit site selection)

* Redfish Rocks MPA's: "yes" for the Redfish Rocks MPA and "no" for the Bycatch Reduction MPA

State Agency Review: Draft Site Analysis Worksheet

Proposal No. 14 – Tillamook Head			
	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, rocky intertidal areas, 77 offshore rocks, and a rugged rocky coastline. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 77 m (42.1 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR is 8.6 km (4.6 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 1.43 km² (353 acres) (note: habitat map likely underestimates reef area). While the reef area is relatively small, it consists of numerous patches of rock that generally have concentrated fish populations. The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The MR has about 6.2 km (3.3 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of boulder fields and small rocky outcrops at the base of cliffs. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermillion rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 87 seabird nesting colonies and 3 pinniped haulouts, including one used by Stellar sea lions. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cape Falcon and Three Arch Rocks would provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Influence of the Columbia River on a nearby marine reserve. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No cables, dredge disposal sites, proposed ocean energy projects, or ocean outfall pipes in the proposed MR. • The closest permitted discharger is the Cannon Beach/Oceanside sewage treatment plant (STP) outfall, which is not an ocean discharger. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Ecola State Park is adjacent to the proposed MR on the eastern/landward side. Ecola State park is a high use park, receiving approximately 530,000 visitor days in 2007 (based on car counts in the parking lot). Park use is concentrated in the summer months. The proposed site is within the park's viewshed. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. Haystack Rock Marine Garden is approximately 2.6 km south. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do not avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts. Little opportunity exists to resolve economic and social impacts to ocean users at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is a major fishing ground for the Garibaldi groundfish charter fleet. Would limit fishing opportunities of fleet. • This area is the closest available fishing grounds for the recreational groundfish fishery out of the Columbia River. When wind is blowing north, cannot fish much further south. • Major commercial Dungeness crabbing grounds. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Salmon troll • Some trawl • Some sardine fishing occurs in upper western portion of site <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish out of Columbia River and Garibaldi (mostly charter, some private sport anglers) • Ocean salmon • Some fishing from shore • Some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewshed off of Ecola State Park from offshore development

			NOTES
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Low	Criterion 7 Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low. Minimal input and support for the site provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by an individual • Individual participated in discussions with the Cannon Beach Community Action Team, but decided to propose different area • General local support for marine reserves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – City of Cannon Beach – Haystack Rock Awareness Program – Ecola Creek Watershed Council
			NOTES
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	High	Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is high. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site easily observed from land • Good landmarks (Tillamook Head and lighthouse). • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement
			NOTES
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is ecologically significant • Little opportunity at this site to resolve economic impacts • Low collaboration and support for the site

Proposals No. 6 & 19 – Cape Falcon (Cannon Beach and Manzanita)

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, rocky intertidal areas, 48 small offshore rocks, and a rugged rocky coastline. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 76 m (42 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR is 7.8 km (4.2 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 0.59 km² (146 acres) (note: habitat map likely underestimates reef area). While the reef area is relatively small, it consists of numerous patches of rock that generally have concentrated fish populations. Most of the rocky area is shallower than 25 m (14 fm). The MR has about 5.1 km (2.8 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists of small boulder fields at the base of cliffs and some wave-cut sandstone platforms. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 30 seabird nesting colonies and 2 small harbor seal haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tillamook Head and Three Arch Rocks would provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Effectiveness of marine reserve in patchy rocky reef habitat. <p>Criterion 4</p>

			<p>Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables or dredge disposal sites in the proposed MR area. • The closest permitted discharger is the Arch Cape STP, just slightly north of the site. Arch Cape STP is not an ocean discharger. • Tillamook PUD holds a preliminary permit for ocean energy development in the proposed MR (west of Cape Falcon). <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Oswald West State Park is adjacent to the proposed MR on the eastern/landward side. Oswald West is one of the most visited state parks in Oregon, receiving approximately 962,000 visitor days in 2007. The park has a campground which annually receives approximately 15,400 overnight visitors (the campground is currently closed due to hazard trees). Park use is concentrated in the summer months. The proposed site is within the park’s viewshed. There is a small residential inholding (Cape Cove) in the park’s north end; houses are on septic systems. The shoreline has a very small amount of shoreline protected structure (SPS, or riprap). • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts and inform design/reconfiguration to minimize negative impacts. Further evaluation of site could investigate potential use of an MPA to assist in minimization of economic/social impacts to ocean users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For charter groundfish, some of the few areas on the north coast shallow enough to fish when 20 fm closures are in effect (20 fm closures affect north coast more than south coast) <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Some nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Some flatfish trawl at western edge, but generally farther offshore • Some salmon troll, but generally farther offshore • May be some mussel harvest near northern boundary (depends where site boundary is) <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charter groundfish

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing from beach popular between Arch Cape and Cape Falcon (3.75% of park visitors) • Some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses some potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewshed off of Oswald West State Park from offshore development • Safe harbor at Smuggler's Cove would not be impacted. • Unclear if/how site might impact preliminary permit issued for wave energy <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	Med-Low	<p>Criterion 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium-low due to limited input.</p> <p>This site was proposed twice: 1) by the Cannon Beach and Manzanita Action Teams, and 2) by Our Ocean as part of their network proposal</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Cannon Beach, Arch Cape, Seaside, Manzanita, Nehalem, other surrounding areas • Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – local conservation organizations (members from Haystack Rock Awareness Program, Ecola Creek Awareness Program) – statewide conservation organizations (Coastwatch members, Our Ocean environmental coalition) – local government (city council members, Ecola Watershed Council members) – business owners – conservationists – non-fishing ocean recreational users (surfers) – other interested citizens <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 interviews with: ocean users from the fishing industry, conservation community and elected officials • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <p>Public meetings/outreach regarding site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community action team held 20 meetings between February and September 2008. Unclear whether meetings announced and open to the public.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Pacific City <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 2 community leaders – 3 business owners • General local support for marine reserves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – City of Cannon Beach – Haystack Rock Awareness Program – Ecola Creek Watershed Council <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Med-Low	<p>Criterion 8:</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium-low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South portion visible from shore (because of highway proximity) • North portion not readily visible from shore • Good use of landmark as a regulatory boundary • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evaluation and work may be able to reduce and minimize economic/social impacts. • Could use evaluation period to consider using an MPA, in a portion of the currently proposed MR site as a tool to minimize economic/social impacts.

Proposals No. 7 & 16 – Three Arch Rocks

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, rocky intertidal areas, 36 offshore rocks, and the mouth of an estuary. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 70 m (38 fm). Unique features of the site are the large seabird nesting colonies on Three Arch Rocks and Pillar and Pyramid Rocks. <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR is 9.4 km (5.1 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 4.48 km² (1,107 acres) and some offshore gravel bottom habitat. The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The MR has about 7.2 km (3.9 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of ledges and vertical faces around the bases of cliffs and some scattered boulder fields. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 103 seabird nesting colonies, including some of the largest colonies in Oregon, and a pinniped haulout on Three Arch Rocks used as a pupping area by Steller sea lions. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cape Kiwanda and adjacent Haystack Rock would provide a suitable comparison area for rocky reef habitat.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yaquina Head would provide a suitable comparison area for seabirds. • Example research project: Effects of marine reserve on estuary-ocean connection. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables or dredge disposal sites in the proposed MR area. • Tow lanes do cross the proposed site. • The closest permitted discharger is the Netarts/Oceanside STP, just outside of the site. Based on DEQ testing of bacteria samples, the water is relatively clean. • Tillamook PUD holds a preliminary permit for ocean energy development in the proposed MR (west of Three Arch Rocks). <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – 3 state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Cape Meares State Scenic Viewpoint (medium high use-almost 500,000 visitors in 2007), Oceanside Beach State Recreation Site (small park, approximately 300,000 visitors in 2007), and the northern tip of Cape Lookout State Park (not many visitors at the northern end adjacent to proposed MR). Unclear how/if an MR designation would affect shoreline development and the potential to use SPS to harden the shoreline. The Cape Meares National Wildlife Refuge is adjacent to the northern tip of the proposed MR. A small coastal town is also adjacent to the proposed MR. Parts of the adjacent shoreline are identified as Snowy Plover habitat. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies Netarts Bay Estuary as a “conservation” estuary. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands, including Three Arch Rocks and Pillar and Pyramid Rocks, are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. Three Arch Rocks National Wildlife Refuge is subject to a seasonal boating closure, during which boats are not allowed to approach within 500 feet of the rocks. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do not avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts. Little opportunity exists to resolve economic and social impacts to ocean users at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site includes main fishing ground for the Garibaldi commercial nearshore limited entry fishery (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore). Could result in significant shift of effort to smaller, currently less used areas. • Site includes main fishing ground for the local recreational (sport and charter) groundfish fishery. Could result in significant shift of effort to smaller, currently less used areas. • Site includes main fishing area to the south for Garibaldi, as it is closest to port. Would limit private sport fishing opportunities in the area.

			<p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Dungeness crab • Some salmon troll likely – terminal fishing area • Some trawl • Some sardine fishing occurs in upper western portion of site <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish (charter and private sport anglers) • Ocean salmon – terminal fishing area • Some fishing from shore at southern end of site • Some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposers suggest recreational use in Netarts Bay may benefit; potential for more crab harvest in bay • Site will protect the viewshed off of Cape Meares State Park from offshore development • Site will protect the viewshed of coastal communities from offshore development • Unclear if/how site might impact preliminary permit issued for wave energy • Unclear if/how site might impact shoreline protection structure (SPS) permitting <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium-low due to limited input.</p> <p>This site was proposed twice: 1) by the Netarts-Oceanside Community Action Team, and 2) by Our Ocean as part of their network proposal</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Netarts and Oceanside. • Interest: information not provided in proposal. <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 interviews with: residents, ocean users and business owners

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <p>Public meetings/outreach regarding site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held community action team meetings monthly beginning in March 2008. Unclear whether meetings announced and open to the public. • Presentations to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Citizen’s Planning Advisory Committee of Netarts – Oceanside Neighborhood Association – Netarts Community Club • ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Pacific City <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 5 local citizens – 2 community leaders <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	High	<p>Criterion 8</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land • Good landmarks • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little opportunity at this site to resolve economic impacts

Proposals No. 8 & 17 – Cascade Head

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med-High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, rocky intertidal areas, 73 offshore rocks, and the mouth of an estuary. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 68 m (37 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR is 14.8 km (8 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 7.1 km² (1,754 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The northern third of the large reef off of Lincoln City (Siletz Reef) extends into the site. The MR has about 12.4 km (6.7 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of ledges and vertical faces around the bases of cliffs and some scattered boulder fields. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on Siletz Reef provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 88 seabird nesting colonies and three pinniped haulouts on Cascade Head, including a large California sea lion haulout and a haulout used by Stellar sea lions. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southern half of Siletz Reef would provide a suitable comparison area for the rocky reef portion of the site. It is more difficult to find comparison areas for Cascade Head. Nearby sandy bottom habitat would provide comparison areas for some aspects of the sandy habitat in the site. Other aspects of the headland could be

			<p>compared with other large headlands such as Tillamook Head or Cape Perpetua.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example research project: Effects of marine reserve on nearshore, estuary, watershed, and terrestrial linkages <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. • A towlane crosses the proposed site. • There is one small permitted discharger at the north end of the proposed site, at Neskowin, but it is not an ocean discharger. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – The adjacent terrestrial environment is a mix of urban and protected natural areas. Lincoln City is a large coastal community that likely has urban runoff issues; the adjacent beach is a heavily used urban beach environment. The U.S. Forest Service Cascade Head Scenic Research Area and The Nature Conservancy Cascade Head Preserve, both adjacent to the proposed MR, encompass marbled murrelet critical habitat. D River and Roads End State Recreation Sites are adjacent to the proposed MR. D River received more visitors in 2007—approximately 1,140,000—than any other state park in Oregon. In addition to heavy visitation, D River has periodic beach closures due to water quality issues. There are a high number of shoreline structures along this stretch of coast, and Road’s End has the highest density of permitted SPS on the coast. YWCA Camp Westwind is adjacent to the proposed MR area. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies the Salmon River Estuary as a “natural” estuary. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts to commercial crabbing, salmon fishing and charter groundfish. Redesign/reconfiguration of site during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts. Further evaluation of site could investigate potential use of an MPA to assist in minimization of economic/social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major commercial Dungeness crabbing grounds, north and west of Siletz reef and off Cascade Head. • Siletz reef is a major fishing ground for the Depoe Bay charter groundfish fleet. About 1/3 of reef (northern portion of reef) is included in the site. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Salmon troll, occurs immediately outside of reef area • Some nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore), most occurs south of site • Some trawl currently on western boundary and near northern boundary, historically more heavily used <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish (mostly charter) • Salmon fishing at mouth of Salmon River. If boundary includes mouth of Salmon River could be affected. • Some recreational crabbing from beach at Road's End • Some shore fishing • Some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe harbor near Salmon River mouth would not be impacted. • Unclear if/how site might impact shoreline protection structure (SPS) permitting <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criterion 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium-low due to limited input.</p> <p>This site was proposed twice: 1) by the Lincoln City Nearshore Action Team, and 2) by Our Ocean as part of their network proposal</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Lincoln City, Otis, Newport and surrounding areas. • Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – local government (city officials, watershed council members) – statewide conservation organizations (Our Ocean environmental coalition) – business owners – conservationists – non-fishing ocean recreational users (surfers) – other interested citizens <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 interviews with: ocean users and fishers, conservationists, and elected officials.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <p>Public meetings/outreach regarding site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between February and September 2008, held 11 community action team meetings. Unclear whether meetings announced and open to the public. Presentation to Lincoln County Fishermen Involved in Natural Energy (FINE) ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Pacific City <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 business owners 5 sport fishermen General local support for marine reserves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Lincoln City <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Low	<p>Criterion 8</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot see about 40% of site from land (Salmon River north) Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> North and south straight lines are good Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Medium-low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further evaluation and work may be able to reduce and minimize economic/social impacts. Evaluation phase could be used to better understand potential impacts to charter groundfish fishery and commercial Dungeness crab fishery. Site design may need further refinement to minimize impacts to ocean users Site design could consider using an MPA as a tool to minimize impacts to ocean users

Proposals No. 9 & 20: Cape Foulweather

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med-High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 56 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 61 m (33 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR is 7.1 km (3.8 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 3.6 km² (890 acres). The rocky areas form a nearly continuous reef along the shoreline, with long narrow kelp beds. Most of the reef is shallower than 25 m (14 fm). The MR has about 7.8 km (4.2 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists of steep cliff faces with some ledges and a large wave-cut sandstone platform at Otter Crest. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, tiger, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the inshore reef provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 18 seabird nesting colonies and four harbor seal haulouts. <p>Criterion 3: Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas immediately north of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Spillover effects on nearby fishing areas. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, towlanes or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. • There are two minor permitted dischargers in the proposed MR area: The Inn at Otter Crest and City of Depoe Bay outfalls. Both are ocean dischargers. • Highway bridge construction at Beverly Beach is ongoing. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect</p>

			<p>the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Four state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Rocky Creek State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 175,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Otter Crest State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 458,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Devil's Punchbowl State Natural Area (approximately 668,000 day-use visitors in 2007) and Beverly Beach State Park (approximately 169,000 day-use visitors in 2007, with an additional 148,000 overnight campers at the park's campground). DEQ monitoring has shown high bacteria levels at Beverly Beach. Outside of the park areas, there is scattered residential development (including the community of Otter Rock) adjacent to the proposed MR site. The cliff above the beach is slumping in areas, leading to potential future shoreline protected structure (riprap). • Marine – The northern portion of the proposed MR encompasses Whale Cove Habitat Refuge. Otter Rock Marine Garden is located at approximately the mid-point of the eastern MR boundary. Otter and Gull Rocks, along with other offshore rocks and islands, are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts to commercial crabbing, salmon fishing, urchin and recreational fishing. Redesign/reconfiguration of site during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts. Further evaluation of site could investigate potential use of an MPA to assist in minimization of economic/social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing area for Depoe Bay in south wind • High use commercial Dungeness crabbing grounds <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Urchin, good portion of the fishery out of Depoe Bay occurs here • Some nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Some trawl currently occurs, historically more heavily used <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean salmon • Fishing from shore • Kayak fishing • Recreational groundfish (some Depoe Bay charter, but more occurs north, very little Newport charter, important

			<p>for private boat sport fishing)</p> <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewsheds of State Park areas from offshore development <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	Med-Low	<p>Criteria 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium-low due to limited input and minimal support for site.</p> <p>This site was proposed twice: 1) by the Newport Area Community Action Team, and 2) by Our Ocean as part of their network proposal</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Newport, Otter Rock, and Depoe Bay. • Interest: information not provided in proposal. <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 interviews with: residents, ocean users and business owners from Newport, Otter Rock, and Depoe Bay. • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <p>Public meetings/outreach regarding site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held community action team meetings between March and September 2008. Unclear whether meetings announced and open to the public. • Presentation to Lincoln County Fishermen Involved in Natural Energy (FINE) • ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Pacific City <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 3 local citizens – 1 community leader <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>

Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Med-High	<p>Criteria 8</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium-high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land • South boundary not easily distinguishable from sea without electronics. Bridge at Beverly Beach may be visible from sea. • No big headlands, but overall pretty good • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		<p>Medium-low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evaluation and work may be able to reduce and minimize economic/social impacts. • Site design may need further refinement to minimize impacts to ocean users • Site design could consider using an MPA as a tool to minimize impacts to ocean users 	

Proposal No. 1 – Whale Cove to Devil’s Punchbowl

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 47 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 61 m (33 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR is 5.2 km (2.8 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 2.2 km² (544 acres). The rocky areas form a nearly continuous reef along the shoreline, with long narrow kelp beds. Most of the reef is shallower than 25 m (14 fm). The MR has about 3.9 km (2.1 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists of steep cliff faces with some ledges and a large wave-cut sandstone platform at Otter Crest. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, tiger, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the inshore reef provides evidence of the area’s abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 16 seabird nesting colonies and three harbor seal haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas immediately north of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Spillover effects on nearby fishing areas. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, towlanes or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. • There is one minor permitted discharger in the proposed MR area: The Inn at Otter Crest, which is an ocean discharger.

			<p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Three state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Rocky Creek State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 175,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Otter Crest State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 458,000 day-use visitors in 2007), and Devil's Punchbowl State Natural Area (approximately 668,000 day-use visitors in 2007). Outside of the park areas, there is scattered residential development (including the community of Otter Rock) adjacent to the proposed MR site. The cliff above the beach is slumping in areas, leading to potential future shoreline protected structure (SPS, or riprap). • Marine – The northern portion of the proposed MR encompasses Whale Cove Habitat Refuge. Otter Rock Marine Garden is located along the eastern MR boundary. Otter and Gull Rocks, along with other offshore rocks and islands, are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts. Redesign/reconfiguration of site during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts. Further evaluation of site could investigate potential use of an MPA to assist in minimization of economic/social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing area for Depoe Bay in south wind • High use commercial Dungeness crabbing grounds <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Urchin, good portion of the fishery out of Depoe Bay occurs here • Some nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Some trawl currently occurs, historically more heavily used <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean salmon • Fishing from shore • Kayak fishing • Recreational groundfish (some Depoe Bay charter, but more occurs north, very little Newport charter, important for private sport fishing) <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The site addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure. See above. Site will protect viewsheds from State Park areas from offshore development</p>

			<hr/> NOTES
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Low	Criterion 7 Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by an individual <hr/> NOTES
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	High	Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is high. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land • Good north and south boundary landmarks • No big headlands, but overall pretty good • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> NOTES
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Medium-low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evaluation and work may be able to reduce and minimize economic/social impacts. • Site design may need further refinement to minimize impacts to ocean users • Site design could consider using an MPA as a tool to minimize impacts to ocean users

Proposal No. 2 – Otter Rock

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	Criteria: 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas	Med-Low	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in the shallow depth range, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 22 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 18 m (9.8 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site would allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits for some species, but its relatively small size and restricted depth range may limit benefits. The proposal requests that the site be designated as a pilot marine reserve with provisions for adjusting boundaries, if warranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR is 3.5 km (1.9 nm) in north-south length and extends about 1.2 km (0.7 nm) offshore. Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 0.9 km² (222 acres). The MR has about 1.2 km (0.6 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of a large wave-cut sandstone platform at Otter Crest. Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, some mobile benthic invertebrates (e.g, red urchins), and fish species with very limited home ranges (e.g. copper, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The small size and restricted depths of the rocky reef limit the number of fish species potentially benefited. Other features - The site has 9 seabird nesting colonies and two harbor seal haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas immediately north of the site provide suitable comparison areas. Example research project: Changes in protected urchin population with nearby urchin harvest area. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, towlanes or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. There is one minor permitted discharger in the proposed MR area: The Inn at Otter Crest, which is an ocean discharger.

			<p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Two state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Devil’s Punchbowl State Natural Area (approximately 668,000 day-use visitors in 2007) and Beverly Beach State Park (approximately 169,000 day-use visitors in 2007, with an additional 148,000 overnight campers at the park’s campground). DEQ monitoring has shown high bacteria levels at Beverly Beach. Outside of the park areas, there is scattered residential development adjacent to the proposed MR site. The cliff above the beach is slumping in areas, leading to potential future shoreline protected structure (riprap). • Marine – The northern portion of the proposed MR encompasses approximately half of Otter Rock Marine Garden. Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The current size, location and characteristics of the site avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts to Depoe Bay and Newport commercial and charter fisheries have been vetted in those respective communities. • Opportunities for fishing still available in nearby vicinities. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some Dungeness crab • Urchin <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some recreational groundfish (charter, private sport, kayak fishing) • Some shore fishing • Some extractive diving (spear fishing, subtidal invertebrate harvest) <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The sight addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure. Outfall pipe north of site could potentially be impacted in the future.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>

Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	High	Criteria 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group that included significant fishing interests. Level of collaboration was high and there is a good amount of support for the site. This site was proposed by the Depoe Bay Nearshore Action Team (NSAT). Communities of place/interest represented in group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Depoe Bay. • Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – charter fishing industry – business owners – local governments – other interested citizens Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial, charter, and recreational fishermen • Cities of Depoe Bay and Newport • Local urchin diver Public meetings/outreach regarding site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSAT meetings are public meetings, held once a month at Depoe Bay City Hall. Meetings are also posted on the city's website. The NSAT has been meeting since 2005. • Presentation to Lincoln County Fishermen Involved in Natural Energy (FINE) • 4 public community outreach meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Attended by: interested citizens, local community leaders, representatives of commercial, charter, and recreational fishermen, local business owners, some environmental organizations. – Depoe Bay on January 10, 2008, approximately 70 attendees – Newport on January 17, 2008, approximately 30 attendees – Depoe Bay on January 29, 2008, approximately 30 attendees – Otter Rock on February 17, 2008, approximately 32 attendees • Public comment at OPAC meetings • ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Pacific City Endorsement/support of site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Depoe Bay • 1 letter of support by sport fisherman • FINE • At public outreach meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Depoe Bay on January 10, 2008 Of approximately 70 meeting attendees, the majority supported proposal, 5 needed more information, and a couple did not agree
-------------------------	--	-------------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Newport on January 17, 2008 Of approximately 30 meeting attendees, most were supportive - Depoe Bay on January 29, 2008 Of approximately 30 meeting attendees, most were supportive when asked for a show of hands - Otter Rock on February 17, 2008 Of approximately 32 meeting attendees, there was unanimous support. A supplemental vote on extending the area north to Cape Foulweather also received unanimous support. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	High	<p>Criteria 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land • Good boundaries <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is strong, overall, in meeting the coarse review criteria. • Potential to be pilot project. • Continued work will need to explore effectiveness of small site and possibly reconfigure, if warranted and with community collaboration.

Proposal No. 5 – 20 Miracle Miles

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	Criteria: 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, rocky intertidal areas, gravel bottom habitat, kelp beds, 153 offshore rocks, and the mouths of two major estuaries. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 68 m (37 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR. However, the site completely closes the area available to the Depoe Bay nearshore recreational fishery. It is likely that much of the fishing effort out of Depoe Bay would be shifted to the reefs from Yaquina Head to Seal Rock, likely causing severe depletion of fished species on those reefs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR is 41.9 km (22.6 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 31.4 km² (7,759 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. Major rocky reefs include the large reefs off of Lincoln City (Siletz Reef), Government Point, and along Cape Foulweather. There are also kelp beds along Depoe Bay and Cape Foulweather. The MR has about 23.7 km (12.8 nm) of rocky shoreline. There are a variety of rocky intertidal habitats including steep cliffs, boulder fields, and wave-cut platforms. Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermillion, brown, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive fisheries in the site provide evidence of the area's abundant fish population. Other features - The site has 118 seabird nesting colonies and eight pinniped haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seal Rock would provide a suitable comparison area. Example research project: Comparison of marine reserve effects on adjacent protected rocky reefs. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area, although Tillamook PUD holds a preliminary permit for ocean development less than 1 km north of the proposed MR. • A towlane crosses the proposed site. • There are three minor permitted dischargers in the proposed MR area: Neskowin, which is not an ocean discharger, and The Inn at Otter Crest and City of Depoe Bay outfalls, both of which are ocean dischargers. • Highway bridge construction at Beverly Beach is ongoing. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial (not including state parks) – The land adjacent to the proposed MR is a mix of urbanized coastal communities, smaller coastal communities, scattered residences, and protected areas. Lincoln City is a large coastal community that likely has urban runoff issues; the section of adjacent beach is a heavily used urban beach environment. The U.S. Forest Service Cascade Head Scenic Research Area and The Nature Conservancy Cascade Head Preserve, both adjacent to the proposed MR, encompass marbled murrelet critical habitat. There are many shoreline structures along this stretch of coast, and Road’s End has the highest density of permitted SPS on the coast. YWCA Camp Westwind is adjacent to the proposed MR area. • Terrestrial (state parks) – Eight state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Roads End (approximately 450,000 day-use visitors in 2007), D River (which received more visitors in 2007—approximately 1,140,000—than any other state park in Oregon), and Gleneden Beach State Recreation Sites, Fogarty Creek State Recreation Area (approximately 189,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Boiler Bay State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 529,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Rocky Creek State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 175,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Otter Crest State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 458,000 day-use visitors in 2007), and Devil’s Punchbowl State Natural Area (approximately 668,000 day-use visitors in 2007). D River has periodic beach health advisories due to water quality issues. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies the Salmon River Estuary as a “natural” estuary. Siletz Bay is a “conservation” estuary. • Marine – The proposed MR encompasses Boiler Bay Intertidal Research Reserve, Pirate Cove Subtidal Research Reserve, Whale Cove Habitat Refuge, and Otter Rock Marine Garden. Otter and Gull Rocks, along with other offshore rocks and islands, are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do not avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts. Little opportunity exists to resolve economic and social impacts to ocean users at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area encompasses most, if not all, the fishing ground for the Depoe recreational (sport and charter) groundfish fishery. Would leave little or no recreational fishing opportunities in the area.

	social impacts		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major commercial Dungeness crabbing grounds. <p>Fisheries affected:</p> <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab • Urchin • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Some trawl currently occurs, historically more heavily used <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish (charter and private sport) • Ocean salmon • Salmon fishing at mouth of Salmon River. If boundary includes mouth of Salmon River could be affected. • Fishing from shore • Kayak fishing • Some recreational crabbing from beach at Road's End • Some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4:</p> <p>Finding: The site addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean Lake intertidal area heavily used for tidepooling/collection. Could be impacted. • Safe harbor near Salmon River mouth would not be impacted. • Unclear if/how site might impact shoreline protection structure (SPS) permitting • Outfall pipe off of Otter Rock could potentially be impacted in the future • Site will protect viewsheds off of State Park areas from offshore development <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>7) Community collaboration</p>	Low	<p>Criterion 7</p> <p>Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by an individual <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>

Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Low	Criteria 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is low. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot observe from land north of Salmon River • Area too large to patrol effectively • To straighten west boundary would require multiple waypoints <hr/> NOTES
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little opportunity at this site to resolve economic impacts 	

Proposals No. 10 & 15 – Cape Perpetua (Heceta Head to Cape Perpetua)

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med-High	<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats and, in the case of the more homogeneous sand bottom habitat, has a valued, contiguous habitat area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR consists mostly of sandy bottom habitat in both the shallow and deep depth ranges, but also has some rocky reef habitat, and a significant amount of gravel bottom habitat. Other habitat features include rocky intertidal areas, 33 offshore rocks, and the mouth of Yachats River. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 54 m (30 fm). The site is unique because it is within an oceanographic retention area inshore of Heceta Banks and has been the focal point of hypoxia occurrences on the coast. <p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR is 26 km (14 nm) in north-south length and the north half extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. The southern half extends to about 25 m (14 fm) depth. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with some large gravel areas in the northern part of the MR. Small rocky reef habitat patches totaling approx. 1.1 km² (272 acres) are present in the northern part of the MR within the 30 m (16 fm) to 50 m (27 fm) depth range. While the reef area is relatively small, it consists of numerous patches of rock that generally have concentrated fish populations. The MR has about 21.8 km (11.8 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of large wave-cut platforms and boulder fields. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, brown, tiger, vermilion rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon), and may encompass the home ranges of some flatfish species (e.g., starry flounder). • Other features - The site has 74 seabird nesting colonies and 5 pinniped haulouts, including a large haulout used by Steller sea lions. <p>Criterion 3</p>

			<p>Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas immediately north of the site provide suitable comparison areas for rocky reef, gravel, and sand bottom habitat. Areas immediately south of the site provide suitable comparison areas for sand bottom habitat. • Example research project: Marine reserve effects in gravel habitat and patchy rocky reef habitat. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, towlanes or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. • There is one minor permitted discharger in the proposed MR area: the City of Yachats, which is an ocean discharger. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – The terrestrial area adjacent to the proposed MR is primarily in public ownership. The proposal indicates that eighty percent of the adjacent watershed area is in public ownership (federal and state), with seventeen percent dedicated as wilderness. Six state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: Smelt Sands State Recreation Site (approximately 240,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Yachats State Recreation Area (approximately 617,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Yachats Ocean Road State Natural Site (approximately 213,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Neptune State Scenic Viewpoint (approximately 503,000 day-use visitors in 2007 at three viewpoint areas), Stonefield Beach State Park (approximately 56,000 day-use visitors in 2007), Tokatee Klooohman State Natural Site (no visitor data), Washburne State Park (approximately 184,000 day-use visitors in 2007 plus additional overnight campers), and Heceta Head Lighthouse State Park (approximately 450,000 day-use visitors in 2007). In addition to the state park, there is a federal campground and visitor center at Cape Perpetua. The City of Yachats is adjacent to the northern portion of the MR; other rural residences are scattered along stretches of the adjacent land. The beaches along adjacent shoreland contain Snowy Plover critical habitat, and portions of adjacent land contain Marbled Murrelet critical habitat. • Marine – The proposed MR encompasses Yachats and Cape Perpetua Marine Gardens, as well as Neptune State Park Intertidal Research Reserve. Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts to commercial and recreational fishing. Redesign/reconfiguration of site, including the MPA portion, during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less recreational fishing occurs in this area compared to many other areas to the north and south • MPA would allow commercial crabbing and salmon fishing to try and minimize negative economic impacts. <p>Fisheries affected:</p> <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab, high use • Salmon troll, cyclic, but can be important certain years. Relatively high use for being inside of 3 miles. • Mussels (in Yachats) • Some trawl currently occurs, historically high use trawl area • Some squid, infrequent (last time likely in the 1990s) • Some halibut, infrequent (not recently due to regulations) <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean salmon, out of Florence (charter and sport) • Salmon fishing at mouth of Yachats River. If boundary includes mouth of river, could be affected. • Shore fishing • Probably some sport halibut (likely not common) • Intertidal collection • Smelt <p>Criterion 4:</p> <p>Finding: The site addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewshed off of State Park areas from offshore development • Site will protect the viewshed of local businesses and coastal communities from offshore development • Cape Perpetua Visitor Center provides opportunities for education and outreach • Major draw for tourists/visitors to the area in order to experience wildlife/wilderness <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Med	<p>Criteria 7</p> <p>Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium.</p> <p>This site was proposed twice: 1) by the ocean conservation action teams in Florence and Yachats, and 2) by Our Ocean as part of their network proposal</p>

Communities of place/interest represented in group:

- Group composed of 22 members.
- Place: individuals from Florence, Yachats, Seal Rock, Tidewater, Waldport and surrounding areas.
- Interest/expertise:
 - local conservation organization (Siuslaw Chapter of Surfrider Foundation)
 - statewide conservation organizations (Audubon Society, Coast Watch members, Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition, Our Ocean environmental coalition)
 - local government (Yachats city council member)
 - sport fishing
 - non-fishing ocean recreational use (SCUBA divers, surfers)
 - business owners
 - coastal home owners
 - conservationists
 - natural scientists
 - natural resource economist

Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:

- 2 former commercial fishermen, and current recreational fishermen from Florence
- 3 commercial salmon fishermen
- A recreational fisherman, and member of the Florence STEP group
- A former commercial/recreational fisherman, past mayor of Florence
- Surf shop owner and recreational fisherman from Newport
- Many recreational users, both extractive and non-extractive, from Newport area
- 5 commercial crabbers from Newport
- Longliner from Newport
- A recreational fisherman and president of the Siuslaw Fishermen's Association in Florence
- A recreational fisherman in Yachats
- Review and input provided by a professor of natural science
- Siuslaw National Forest - Waldport and Hebo District rangers and staff, forest supervisor and staff in Corvallis office.

Public meetings/outreach regarding site:

- Presentations to:
 - Community Issues Forum
 - Midcoast Watershed Council
 - Siuslaw Watershed Council
 - Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation District
 - Siuslaw National Forest
- Presentation to Lincoln County Fishermen Involved in Natural Energy (FINE)
- ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Charleston

			<p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 2 federal agencies (USFWS, USDA Siuslaw National Forest) – Siuslaw Watershed Council – 4 environmental organizations (Surfrider Foundation, Native Fish Society, Audubon Society, View the Future) – 20 local businesses – 17 citizens • City of Yachats <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	<p>Criteria: 8) Enforcement</p>	Med	<p>Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land • Large area to patrol • No real north and south landmarks or MPA/MR boundary landmark • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to better understand the social/economic impacts. • Site design may need further refinement to minimize impacts, including potential reconfiguration of the MPA and the north and south boundaries to minimize impacts. • Evaluation to better understand what soft bottom species are likely to benefit from this site.

Proposal No. 11 - Siltcoos

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	Yes	<p>Finding: The MR area alone would be ineffective in providing benefits to most mobile sandy-bottom animals due to its limited depth range and narrow east-west extent. The proposed MPA would be necessary for the site to potentially achieve ecological significance.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Need laEcological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med-Low	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR and MPA combined consist mostly of a homogeneous sand bottom habitat that meets the criterion of a valued, contiguous habitat area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR/MPA consists almost entirely of sandy bottom habitat in both the shallow and deep depth ranges. Other habitat features include the outlets of Siltcoos and Tahkenitch Lakes. The total depth range of the MR/MPA is from the shore to 71 m (39 fm). The boundary between the MR and MPA is at about 25 m (14 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The MR/MPA is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR/MPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline -The MR/MPA is 11.4 km (6.2 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with some small gravel areas. There is no rocky intertidal habitat. The site provides an example of a high-energy exposed sandy habitat. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates. It is unclear if the MR will encompass the home ranges of sandy bottom fish species. • Other features - The site has 2 harbor seal haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas immediately north and south of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Marine reserve effects in high-energy sandy bottom habitat. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cables, dredge disposal sites, towlanes, or outfall sites in the proposed MR area. • The proposed MR's southwestern boundary is adjacent to and slightly overlaps with the Reedsport OPT preliminary permit area.

			<p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – The Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area is adjacent to the proposed MR. The beaches along adjacent shoreland contain Snowy Plover critical habitat, and it is unclear if/how an MR designation would affect restoration work. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies the Tahkenitch and Siltcoos Estuaries as “natural” estuaries. <p>NOTES</p>
Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	Med	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts.</p> <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab, in both MPA and MR portion • Some salmon troll, most in MPA portion • Some trawl currently occurs, historically high use trawl area. <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean salmon, out of Winchester Bay • Shore fishing <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The sight does not address all potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South boundary of site appears to slightly overlap with Reedsport wave energy project area, which has received a preliminary permit. Unclear how may or may not impact. <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	Low	<p>Criteria 7 Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by Our Ocean staff

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Low	<p>Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not readily visible from land • No good landmarks from water • Good straight boundary lines <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal ecological benefits and low collaboration and enforceability

Proposal No. 12 – Cape Arago

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 119 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 62 m (34 fm). Cape Arago is unique in that it is in a north-south biological transition area with a mix of northern and southern species. <p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline The MR is 10.5 km (5.7 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to 62 m (34 fm) depth. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 2.8 km² (692 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The MR has about 4 km (2.2 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of boulder fields, ledges, and vertical faces around the bases of cliffs. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermillion, brown, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 4 seabird nesting colonies and a 2 harbor seal haulouts. The large pinniped haulout at Simpson Reef is just north of the site. <p>Criterion 3</p> <p>Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas immediately to the north of the site, and areas off of Bandon provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Comparison of marine mammal predation between protected and fished areas.

			<p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, tow lanes, outfall sites, or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. • Four cables cross the proposed MR. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Two state parks are adjacent to the proposed MR: The very southernmost tip of Cape Arago State Park, and Seven Devil’s State Recreation Site (approximately 72,000 day-use visitors in 2007). Also adjacent are scattered residences and small residential communities, such as the community at Five Mile Point along the southern portion of the proposed MR. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. . <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do not avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts. Little opportunity exists to resolve economic and social impacts to ocean users at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site would limit many fishing opportunities in the area. • Site encompasses entire fishing area for the Coos Bay commercial nearshore limited entry fishery. • Site includes main fishing ground for the Coos Bay charter groundfish fishery. Could result in significant shift of effort to smaller, currently less used, areas. • When 20 fm closures are in effect, this site contains some of the few opportunities to fish in the area. <p>Fisheries affected:</p> <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Dungeness crab, high use in sandy areas between rocks and below South Cove • Salmon troll, heavy use • Dinglebar • Urchin, major purple urchin spot for Coos Bay fishers, red urchin mostly north of site • Some trawl occurs on western boundary <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish, charter and private sport anglers. Most of private sport fishing occurs north of headland.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some spear fishing, mostly occurs north of headland • Some fishing from shore • Potentially some intertidal collection at south end of site <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal does not address all potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe harbor and anchorage in South Cove would not be impacted • Some protection of viewshed from offshore development • South Cove provides educational opportunities, which could potentially be impacted • Potential impact to future laying of cables <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Low	<p>Criterion 7: Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by Our Ocean staff • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Med-High	<p>Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium-high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good south visibility from Cape Arago • May be hard to identify south boundary due to private land • Good north landmark • Five Mile Point would make a good southern boundary for enforcement purposes • Good straight boundary lines <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little opportunity at this site to resolve economic impacts • Minimal collaboration and support to date

Proposal No. 18 – Seven Devils

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	N/A	
Ecological Significance	Criteria: 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas	Med-High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 77 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR is from the intertidal area out to 55 m (30 fm). Cape Arago is unique in that it is in a north-south biological transition area with a mix of northern and southern species. <p>Criterion 2 Finding: There is inadequate information to determine if the site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR. More information on the extent of rocky reef habitat would be needed prior to making a conclusion on the adequacy of the site's size (see below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – 10 km size guideline The MR is 3.8 km (2.1 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to 55 m (30 fm) depth. The site extends approx. 4.1 km (2.2 nm) in an east-west direction. Depending on the amount and configuration of rocky habitats present, the MR may have adequate habitat and depth range to meet the size guideline even though it is smaller than 5 km. Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with current habitat maps showing approx. 0.84 km² (208 acres) of rocky reefs, primarily in shallow parts of the site. Based on fishing activity, it appears that the maps under-represent rocky reef habitat, leaving out potentially significant rocky areas in deeper waters. The MR has about 4.7 km (2.5 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat consists primarily of boulder fields and ledges and vertical faces around the bases of cliffs. Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, and many mobile benthic invertebrates. Depending on the actual size of the rocky reef habitat, the site could encompass fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion, brown, grass rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive recreational fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. Other features - The site has 4 seabird nesting colonies and a no pinniped haulouts. The large pinniped haulout at Simpson Reef is just north of the site. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas immediately to the north of the site, and areas off of Bandon provide suitable comparison areas.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example research project: Comparison of marine mammal predation between protected and fished areas. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, tow lanes, outfall sites, cables or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – The very southernmost tip of Cape Arago State Park is terrestrially adjacent to the proposed MR site. Other land adjacent to the proposed site is primarily private forest land. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. . <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts. Redesign/reconfiguration of site during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts. Further evaluation of site could investigate potential use of an MPA to assist in minimization of economic/social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaves some fishing opportunities available in the area • Site encompasses most of fishing area of the Coos Bay commercial nearshore limited entry fishery. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Dungeness crab • Dinglebar • Salmon troll • Urchin, purple urchin, red urchin mostly north of site <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational groundfish, charter and private sport anglers. Most of private sport fishing occurs north of headland. • Some spear fishing, mostly occurs north of headland • Potentially some intertidal collection at south end of site <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal does address all potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p>

			NOTES
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Med-Low	<p>Criterion 7</p> <p>Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was medium-low due to some input and some level of support for site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by an individual <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal was submitted by an individual who had attended several community meetings, starting in July 2008, to discuss possible community interest of marine reserves in the Bandon/Coos Bay area. Meetings were attended by recreational and commercial fishermen, port staff and commissioners, scientists, conservationists, and community leaders. No consensus was reached at the third and final meeting. Group agreed to meet again after the public proposal process had ended to review proposals for the Bandon/Coos Bay area and to continue working together. <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1 local environmental organization – 3 local scientists – 1 sport fisherman – 3 local citizens <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Med-High	<p>Criterion 8</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium-high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good south visibility from Cape Arago • May be hard to identify south boundary due to private land • Good north landmark • Good straight boundary lines <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts.

Proposal No. 4 – Redfish Rocks

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	MPA: Yes BADR: No	<p>MPA Finding: The MPA is necessary to help the overall site achieve ecological benefits, including providing for a diversity of habitats and depth ranges and allowing the site to be of sufficient size, while minimizing significant economic impact.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the Redfish Rocks MR and MPA portion of the proposal.</p> <p>Bycatch and Discard Reduction MPA (BADR) Finding: The proposed Redfish Rocks MR/MPA has a diversity of habitats, are large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meet the criteria for ecological significance. The proposed BADR is not needed for the Redfish Rocks MR/MPA to achieve ecological significance.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	Med-High	<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>Finding: Together, the MR and Redfish Rocks MPA have an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR/MPA has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 7 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the MR/MPA is from the shore out to 88 m (48 fm). The site is unique in that it is in a very strong upwelling area near Cape Blanco. <p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Finding: Together, the MR and Redfish Rocks MPA are large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR/MPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR/MPA is 2.8 km (1.5 nm) in length parallel to the shore and extends offshore about 7.5 km (4.1 nm). The STAC size and spacing report states that each potential place for a marine reserve is unique and that the size and shape be tailored to each site. While the Redfish Rocks MR/MPA does not strictly meet the 5 – 10 km alongshore length guideline, other factors lead to the finding that the MR/MPA is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits. These other factors include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the wide depth range (0 – 88 m) (0 - 48 fm) encompasses a wide variety of nearshore species and allows for an inshore-offshore corridor, – the relatively large area of rocky reef habitat encompasses many rocky reef species' home ranges, – the relatively large contiguous reef complex and kelp bed at Redfish Rocks minimizes vulnerability to edge effects and spillover loss, – the high habitat diversity will likely encompass more species, and – the relatively long east-west length of the site (7.5 km, 4.1 nm) means the site still has a relatively large

			<p>overall area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with approx. 3 km² (741 acres) of rocky reefs. The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The proposal includes the rocky intertidal areas on the offshore rocks, but does not include the rocky intertidal area along the coast • Species home ranges - The MR/MPA is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion, brown, grass, gopher, black and yellow rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive fisheries on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 29 seabird nesting colonies and no pinniped haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site. The Humbug Mountain and adjacent Island Rock area and the Orford and Blanco Reef areas provide suitable comparison areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example research project: Kelp-urchin-fish interactions. Effects of a MR/MPA on a more heavily fished site. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, tow lanes, outfall sites, cables or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR area. <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – The northern portion of Humbug Mountain State Park is terrestrially adjacent to the proposed MR site. Humbug is a relatively low use park, receiving approximately 58,000 visitors in 2007. The park has a campground which received an additional 25,000 visitors. The highway area is prone to landslides; the Gregory slide area is just north of the site. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. . <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and</p>	<p>Med-High</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The current size, location and characteristics of the site avoid significant adverse economic and social impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic study performed to estimate fishing ground loss and percent relative value loss to Port Orford fleet.

	social impacts		<p>Information was used to help determine site location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low level of recreational fishing out of Port Orford. • To minimize economic impacts, MPA portion would allow for all fishing except groundfish and net fishing. • To minimize social and economic impacts, the coastal shoreline rocky intertidal area was not included in the marine reserve, to remain available for clamming. • North wind protection at site, but also south of site around Humbug Mountain. • Opportunities for fishing still available in nearby vicinities. <p>Fisheries affected:</p> <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore), moderate use • Dungeness crab, majority occurs in MPA portion • Salmon troll, majority occurs in MPA portion • Some urchin, all within MR portion • Some flat abalone, all within MR portion <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some recreational groundfish • Some extractive diving (spear fishing, subtidal rock scallop and red abalone harvest) <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewshed off of Humbug Mountain State Park from offshore development • No other existing or proposed infrastructure known <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>7) Community collaboration</p>	High	<p>Criterion 7</p> <p>Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group that included significant fishing interests. Level of collaboration was high and there is a good amount of support for the site.</p> <p>This site was proposed by the Port Orford Ocean Resource Team (POORT).</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: individuals from Port Orford. • Interest/expertise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – POORT Fishermen’s Board: Port Orford commercial fishing fleet – Advisory bodies:

- 1) Port Orford Marine Reserve Working Group
 - business owners
 - local government (port commissioner, planning commission)
 - statewide environmental organizations (Surfrider Foundation, Ecotrust, PMCC)
 - commercial fishing
 - recreational fishing
- 2) Science and Policy Advisory Committee
 - natural scientists
 - statewide environmental organizations (Surfrider Foundation, Ecotrust, PMCC)
- 3) Socioeconomic Advisory Committee
 - Ecotrust
 - Community Economic Development
 - social scientist

Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:

- Focus groups with commercial fishing fleet of Port Orford
- Surveys for local organizations and businesses, local commercial fishermen
- Local government, including city of Port Orford, the Port of Port Orford, Curry County commissioners.

Public meetings/outreach regarding site:

- Public meetings to discuss the Community Stewardship Area and to work with community members to consider several different areas for a proposed MR/MPA site.
- POORT Fishermen's Board issued consensus statement on marine reserves.
- Starting in July 2007, POORT initiated outreach campaign:
 - 3 Surveys: including a local organization and business survey, fishermen's fears survey, and objectives survey
 - Media Communication: Several press articles released to address the community, both locally and in surrounding areas.
 - 2 Public Meetings and Lectures: meeting to discuss fishermen's fears regarding marine reserves and panel discussion on marine reserves.
 - Focus Groups: targeting commercial fishing fleet of Port Orford.
 - Mailings: to the broader community and more specific stakeholder groups.
 - One-on-one communication with members of the fishing fleet.
 - POORT website and listserv
 - Newsletter produced by POORT
 - Mail box and window sign: mail box outside POORT office allowed for returning surveys or submitting comments to POORT after hours or with anonymity. Dry erase board in window of POORT office provided meetings announcements.
- Posters depicting the site and with additional information placed on display in Port Orford public library. Press release announced display and an informational meeting to unveil final proposal on September 24, 2008.
- Public comment at OPAC meetings.

			<p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Port Orford • Port Orford/North Curry County Chamber of Commerce • Environmental organizations - Surfrider Foundation and Our Ocean environmental coalition. • FINE (supports MR portion only). <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	<p>Criteria: 8) Enforcement</p>	High	<p>Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good visibility from land. Can see in multiple directions. • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Rocks offshore provide fair landmark for MR/MPA boundary <p>Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is strong, overall, in meeting the coarse review criteria. • Potential to be pilot project. • Continued work will need to evaluate economic impacts to fishers not involved in the POORT economic survey.

Proposal No. 3 – Mack Reef I

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	Yes	<p>MPA Finding: The MPA is necessary to help the overall site achieve ecological benefits, including providing for a diversity of habitats and depth ranges and allowing the site to be of sufficient size, while minimizing significant economic impact.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: Together, the MR and MPA areas have an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR/MPA has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, mud bottom in the deeper areas, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 101 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the site is from the intertidal area out to 110 m (60 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: Together, the MR and MPA areas are large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR/MPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline - The MR/MPA is 11.6 km (6.3 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to the Territorial Sea boundary. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand and mud, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 5.5 km² (1,359 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The deeper water and mud bottom at the outer edge of the MR/MPA provides habitat for deeper water species not normally found in the nearshore. The MR/MPA has about 11 km (5.9 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat includes large boulder fields, wave-cut platforms. • Species home ranges - The MR/MPA is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion, brown, grass, black and yellow, gopher rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive commercial fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. The southern boundary of the site cuts across an otherwise contiguous rocky reef, potentially leading to edge effects. • Other features - The site has 77 seabird nesting colonies, including very large colonies at Hunter's Island and Crook Point, and three pinniped haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas to the south of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Alongshore connection of marine reserves separated by an MPA. <p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, tow lanes, outfall sites, cables or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR or MPA area. The proposed MR and MPA areas, as well as the adjacent terrestrial area, are fairly undeveloped and relatively pristine in terms of human effects. • Pistol River estuary-flows into MPA <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Cape Sebastian State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint, and Pistol River State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint are adjacent to the proposed MR and MPA areas. Both park areas are fairly low use (Cape Sebastian received approximately 81,000 day-use visitors in 2007, Pistol River approximately 68,000), and neither park has a campground. In addition to the state parks, Crook Point National Wildlife Refuge is adjacent to the proposed area. The refuge is closed to public access. The adjacent private land outside of the park and refuge areas is not very developed. • Estuarine – LCDR classifies the Pistol River Estuary as a “natural” estuary. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts. Redesign/reconfiguration of site, including the MPA portion, during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good distance from both the ports of Brookings-Harbor and Gold Beach. Fairly remote area. Less recreational fishing occurs in this area compared to many other areas to the north and south. • MPA to allow commercial crabbing and salmon fishing to try and minimize negative economic impacts. • Black rockfish zone (area based fishery regulation) pushes Brookings nearshore limited entry fishery up into Mack Reef area. Important black rockfish fishing area for some commercial boats. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness crab, some still occurs in northern MR portion • Urchin, in southern MR portion. Historically important, less effort now. • Flat abalone, within southern MR portion <p>Recreational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In past, some Brookings charter groundfish in southern MR portion (much less currently) • One charter boat from Gold Beach will on occasion fish within the northern MR area • Likely shore fishing • Potentially some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewsheds off of State Park areas from offshore development • Safe harbor and anchorage at Mack Arch Cove would not be impacted • No other existing or proposed infrastructure known <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Med-High	<p>Criterion 7 Finding: The proposal was developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration was medium-high.</p> <p>This site was proposed by a community group.</p> <p>Communities of place/interest represented in group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group composed of 16 members. • Place: individuals from Pistol River, Gold Beach, Brookings and surrounding areas. • Interest/expertise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – statewide conservation organization (Coast Watch members) – sport fishing – non-fishing ocean recreational use (SCUBA divers, surfers) – former commercial fishermen – educators – business owners – coastal property owners – conservationists – natural scientists <p>Communities of place/interest contacted and/or provided input:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An urchin and abalone diver • 5 charter boat operators from Gold Beach and Brookings • Surf shop owner • Port of Brookings-Harbor commissioner • Former commercial fisherman and business owner • 2 commercial fishing interests from Gold Beach • County commissioner • 4 commercial fishing interests from Brookings • Seaweed harvester • Several commercial fishing interests from Port Orford • A commercial fishing expert from Brookings • A retired resource management professional and recreational fisherman from Brookings • Oregon state police • A representative of Oregon Anglers and the Recreational Fishing Alliance. • 4 Ports Group (Brookings-Harbor and Gold Beach representatives) <p>Public meetings/outreach regarding site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation to the 4 Ports Group • ODFW/Sea Grant workshop at Charleston <p>Endorsement/support of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1 federal agency (USFWS) – 1 seaweed harvester – 1 commercial fisherman – local business owners – local property owners – long time residents – recreational fishermen – non-fishing recreational ocean users (SCUBA divers, surfers, kayakers, birders) – Surfrider Foundation (environmental organization) – former commercial fishermen – natural scientists – frequent visitors to the south coast <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
--	--	--	---

Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	Med-High	<p>Criterion 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is medium-high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA and north MR have good observation from land (enforceability is high). South MR not as good observation from land (enforceability is medium-high). • Boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North and south straight lines are good – Straightening outer/western boundary would aid enforcement <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:		<p>High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evaluation could be used to better understand social/economic impacts and investigate re-configuration and/or use of an MPA to minimize economic impacts. 	

Proposal No. 13 – Mack Reef II

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the MR portion of the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 119 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the site is from the intertidal area out to 48 m (26 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline The MR is 14.2 km (7.7 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to 48 m (26 fm) depth. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 5.6 km² (1,384 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The MR has about 12.8 km (6.9 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat includes large boulder fields, wave-cut platforms. • Species home ranges - The MR/MPA is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion, brown, grass, black and yellow, gopher rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive commercial fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 95 seabird nesting colonies, including very large colonies at Hunter's Island, Crook Point, and Mack Arch, and three pinniped haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas to the south of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Spillover effects on the fishery to the south of the site.

			<p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, towlanes, outfall sites, cables or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR or MPA area. The proposed MR and MPA areas, as well as the adjacent terrestrial area, are fairly undeveloped and relatively pristine in terms of human effects. • Pistol River estuary-flows into MPA <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Cape Sebastian State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint, Pistol River State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint, and Samuel H Boardman State Park are adjacent to the proposed MR and MPA areas. Cape Sebastian and Pistol River are fairly low use parks (Cape Sebastian received approximately 81,000 day-use visitors in 2007, Pistol River approximately 68,000), and neither park has a campground. Boardman is a higher visitation park, receiving approximately 809,000 day-use visitors in 2007. In addition to the state parks, Crook Point National Wildlife Refuge is adjacent to the proposed area. The refuge is closed to public access. The adjacent private land outside of the park and refuge areas is not very developed. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies the Pistol River Estuary as a “natural” estuary. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. . <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
<p>Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts</p>	<p>Criteria: 2) Size 4) Infrastructure 6) Economic and social impacts</p>	<p>Med-Low</p>	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts to commercial nearshore limited entry fishing, crabbing, and salmon fishing as well as extractive recreational uses. Redesign/reconfiguration of site, including the MPA portion, during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good distance from both the ports of Brookings-Harbor and Gold Beach. Fairly remote area. Less recreational fishing occurs in this area compared to many other areas to the north and south. • This site limits the Brookings commercial nearshore limited entry fishery to fish within the black rockfish zone (with restricted daily trip limits of 200 lbs/day). • Dungeness crab high use area and soft shell testing area. <p>Fisheries affected: Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Dungeness crab

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urchin, historically important area with less effort now. • Flat abalone Recreational <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In past, some charter groundfish (much less currently) • One charter boat from Gold Beach will on occasion fish within the northern portion of the site • Likely shore fishing • Potentially some intertidal collection <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewsheds off of State Park areas from offshore development • Safe harbor and anchorage at Mack Arch Cove would not be impacted • No other existing or proposed infrastructure known <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Community Collaboration	<p>Criteria: 7) Community collaboration</p>	Low	<p>Criteria 7 Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low and there is minimal support for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by Our Ocean staff • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>
Other factors	<p>Criteria: 8) Enforcement</p>	High	<p>Criteria 8 Finding: Enforceability of this site is high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land. • Good straight boundary lines. <hr/> <p>NOTES</p>

OVERALL STRENGTH OF SITE:	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little opportunity at this site to resolve economic impacts• Minimal collaboration and support to date• Multiple proposals in same area of coast, system-wide criteria would limit site selection
----------------------------------	--

General Proposal Site Metrics
10/22/2008

Units	Site	Name	Area Sq. km	Perimeter km	Approx. Shoreline m	Length of Shoreline m	Length of Rocky Shore m	Number of Islands #	Island Area sq.m	Subtidal Area sq. km	Max Depth m	Average Depth m	Percent Shallow %	Percent Deep %
	14	Titanook Head	61.44	36.45	8,560	15,929	6,199	77	54,610	61.39	-77	-43.79	23.62	74.90
	19-MR	Cape Falcon II MR	51.62	34.05	7,830	12,173	5,153	48	15,490	51.62	-76	-42.12	26.30	72.71
	19-MPA	Cape Falcon II MPA	145.11	60.43	20,210	28,364	7,841	105	79,723	145.11	-77	-39.43	28.16	70.53
	6-MR	Cape Falcon I MR	51.62	34.05	7,830	12,173	5,153	48	15,490	51.62	-76	-42.12	26.30	72.71
	6-MPA	Cape Falcon I MPA	145.11	60.43	20,210	28,364	7,841	105	79,723	145.11	-77	-39.43	28.16	70.53
	7-MR	Three Arch Rock I MR	63.45	35.51	9,370	15,867	7,198	36	20,662	63.43	-70	-35.05	33.73	65.03
	7-MPA	Three Arch Rock I MPA	70.64	42.99	11,240	17,708	7,752	5	9,545	70.63	-77	-34.84	36.62	61.84
	16-MR	Three Arch Rock II MR	63.45	35.51	9,370	15,867	7,198	36	20,662	63.43	-70	-35.05	33.73	65.03
	16-MPA	Three Arch Rock II MPA	70.64	42.99	11,240	17,708	7,752	5	9,545	70.63	-77	-34.84	36.62	61.84
	8-MR	Cascade Head I MR	87.94	48.60	14,810	23,239	12,381	73	38,456	87.94	-88	-35.56	30.10	68.39
	8-MPA	Cascade Head I MPA	117.42	60.13	20,220	27,852	10,529	25	19,788	117.42	-65	-35.13	28.71	69.74
	17-MR	Cascade Head II MR	87.94	48.60	14,810	23,239	12,381	73	38,456	87.94	-68	-35.56	30.10	68.39
	17-MPA	Cascade Head II MPA	117.42	60.13	20,220	27,852	10,529	25	19,788	117.42	-65	-35.13	28.71	69.74
	9	Cape Foulweather I	44.00	30.85	7,140	12,073	7,757	56	48,634	44.00	-61	-35.22	31.09	67.60
	20	Cape Foulweather II	44.00	30.85	7,140	12,073	7,757	56	48,634	44.00	-61	-35.22	31.09	67.60
	2	Oiler Rock	3.38	9.47	3,470	4,779	1,203	22	24,343	3.36	-18	-9.47	100.00	0.00
	5	20 Mileade Miles	247.17	116.05	41,850	44,915	23,706	153	101,834	247.17	-68	-36.40	29.43	69.09
	1	Whale Cove to Devils Punch	31.59	27.30	5,150	5,505	3,933	47	40,818	31.55	-61	-37.17	26.56	72.27
	10-MR	Cape Perpetua I MR	99.48	75.75	25,980	39,638	21,755	33	44,156	99.48	-54	-27.01	45.76	53.13
	10-MPA	Cape Perpetua I MPA	51.43	33.47	12,650	39,638	21,755	0	0	51.43	-55	-38.86	5.75	91.76
	15-MR	Cape Perpetua II MR	99.48	75.75	25,980	39,638	21,755	33	44,156	99.48	-54	-27.01	45.76	53.13
	15-MPA	Cape Perpetua II MPA	51.43	33.47	12,650	39,638	21,755	0	0	51.43	-55	-38.86	5.75	91.76
	11-MR	Sillicos MR	22.53	26.86	11,360	11,437	0	0	0	22.53	-24	-10.84	100.00	0.00
	11-MPA	Sillicos MPA	42.84	30.51	11,360	11,437	0	0	0	42.84	-71	-43.24	8.92	88.24
	12-MR	Cape Arago MR	49.04	31.08	10,490	13,651	6,274	119	11,263	49.03	-62	-25.71	49.52	49.98
	12-MPA1	Cape Arago MPA1	49.73	48.52	15,320	17,796	14,841	94	73,522	49.73	-89	-48.17	18.42	78.42
	12-MPA2	Cape Arago MPA2	94.40	43.84	14,376	22,456	6,861	138	82,204	94.40	-72	-32.29	36.09	62.33
	18	Seven Devils	49.04	31.08	3,780	5,552	4,695	119	11,263	49.03	-55	-25.71	49.52	49.98
	4-MR	Redfish Rocks MR	6.81	10.79	2,750	4,960	2,030	7	33,956	6.78	-41	-20.35	60.13	39.40
	4-MPA1	Redfish Rocks MPA1	14.92	17.49	2,750	0	0	0	0	14.92	-88	-63.23	0.00	100.00
	4-MPA2	Redfish Rocks MPA2	326.30	105.89	37,660	55,590	17,678	209	157,013	326.30	-76	-47.07	30.76	68.33
	4-MPA3	Redfish Rocks MPA3	170.79	73.19	23,100	33,143	12,320	105	110,417	170.79	-87	-37.62	28.43	70.16
	3-MR1	Mack Reef I MR	9.91	14.68	3,880	10,630	6,357	40	103,684	9.81	-43	-18.35	71.10	27.73
	3-MR2	Mack Reef I MPA1	7.35	13.03	3,400	8,614	4,659	56	106,925	7.24	-52	-20.29	64.34	34.39
	3-MPA	Mack Reef I MPA2	50.96	35.17	11,580	4,194	0	5	653	50.96	-110	-56.64	15.22	82.72
	13-MR	Mack Reef II MR	37.49	39.02	14,200	28,709	12,769	119	234,486	37.26	-48	-19.66	66.56	32.27
	13-MPA	Mack Reef II MPA	111.94	66.33	23,380	23,982	12,418	128	185,904	111.94	-111	-60.77	11.02	86.90